

## PETITIONS, ETC.

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

332. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city council, Miami Beach, Fla., relative to national unity on the Middle East conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

333. Also, petition of the city council, Binghamton, N.Y., relative to daylight saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## THE DEDICATION OF THE MEDICAL COLLEGE OF OHIO

## HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, October 12, our distinguished colleague and close friend from my own great State of Ohio, Congressman CHARLES MOSHER, was the principal speaker at the banquet, during the dedication of the first building on the permanent campus of the new Medical College of Ohio in Toledo, in my congressional district. His address was entitled "Declaration of Interdependence: Scientists, Students, Professors, Politicians—We Need Each Other!"

As the ranking minority member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, and as a recognized authority in the vital, complex field of public policy formation for science and technology, CHARLES MOSHER was well equipped to offer stimulating and insightful remarks to those assembled, and he did not let them down.

As the Toledo Blade commented in an editorial a few days later—

Mr. Mosher, a living example of enlightened statesmanship, spelled out articulately and eloquently the need for closer ties between the Medical College of Ohio and area universities, and between the medical community and the government. His appeal for more extensive training of doctors so that they are better acquainted with the processes of government—particularly those involving decisions of funding medical science—was especially well taken.

I believe that the full text of CHUCK MOSHER's speech in Toledo deserves and demands special attention, and so I include it here for the Members:

DECLARATION OF INTERDEPENDENCE: SCIENTISTS, STUDENTS, PROFESSORS, POLITICIANS—WE NEED EACH OTHER!

I do feel very privileged to participate in this happy occasion this very significant, important celebration.

It happens that back in the 1950's I was a very active member of the Ohio Senate, in Columbus, as Chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Health. And I remember well our early discussions, out of which finally developed (was it in 1964?) the Ohio General Assembly's decision to charter a new, state supported medical college here at Toledo.

So, it is with considerable personal satisfaction that I participate in this celebration of very impressive, tangible evidence that medical education and the medical sciences are indeed now in being, are alive and well, a dynamic force in this community.

My satisfaction in witnessing this accomplishment . . . my enthusiastic congratulations to all who have been most responsible for it, for this superb new Life Sciences Building . . . are rooted in an acute awareness of the difficult decision-making process required to bring this school to fruition, and

also of the often agonizing decisions which constantly will burden all who are responsible for charting its future.

I emphasize that the first crucial decisions, the birth pains for the Medical College at Toledo, were political decisions, voting decisions in the state legislature. By the time your charter finally was voted, I was long since gone from Columbus to Washington. I cannot claim any personal credit for it; but from long legislative experience I am intimately aware of how complex that political process is, at best. So, to all of you, I urge your very realistic awareness . . . indeed, I warn you . . . that the future of this college, its vigor and quality and usefulness, will continue to depend in large part on policy decisions voted in both Columbus and Washington.

I strongly suggest that you who are most aware of and concerned for medical education, for medical research, for higher education in general (the realities, the needs and problems, the vast opportunities) . . . I suggest it is imperative that you take a most aggressively active, personal role in our political process. We legislators truly need your help as we struggle to process and vote wise and effective decisions. We politicians live a very kaleidoscopic, fragmented life, buffeted constantly by every conceivable interest. Often, it is extremely difficult to give any major problem . . . such as medical education . . . the concerted attention it may deserve. Each of us may become quite knowledgeable in some policy area related to our committee assignment. But in general it is true that we must rely on strong staff support and on the advice of presumed "experts". Most of us need and welcome the information, advice and criticism we receive from informed and concerned citizens and, certainly, concerning health policy decisions, or medical education and medical science decisions, we surely need (and I urgently solicit) the assistance of many of you who are here this evening.

I implore you to communicate with your state legislators in Columbus and with your representatives and Senators in Washington, more frequently and more effectively. I repeat, we truly need your help!

I further suggest it might be appropriate now for medical colleges to begin to make an overt effort, as part of the curriculum, to "educate" future physicians concerning the rationale and processes of government, especially the formulating of public policy decisions which impact on the life sciences and the delivery of health services.

Only 25 years ago, I am told, about 31 percent of all medical research in the United States was funded by the federal government. By 1972, last year, that proportion had leaped to 63.7 percent. I'm guessing that long before the year 2000, at least 90 percent of policy for the funding of the life sciences will be by government decisions.

Thus, it is clear that all aspects of health services increasingly will be subject to social pressures, to legislative decisions. Hopefully these will be carefully and wisely considered, but sometimes, inevitably, by popular whim. It is my observation that doctors in general know little about the whys and hows of such decisionmaking. I submit it is imperative they learn.

Now, I assume that the legislative decision in Columbus by which the Medical College at Toledo was chartered, resulted from a conviction that Ohio was training too few doc-

tors. There was public discussion, some expert evidence, strong and increasing popular pressures, vigorous competition among several metropolitan areas where a new medical college might be located, and then the struggle to get funds appropriated . . . these essentially political pressures brought this school into being, the politically perceived need for Ohio to train more physicians.

(And, as a footnote, let me assure you that I use such phrases as "political process" or "political decision" only in their favorable sense, I use them with respect and devotion, despite my painful awareness of the faults, distortions, scandals that so weaken our political system.)

Essentially those same political pressures . . . the popular alarm because there are too few doctors, the skyrocketing costs for health care, the inequitable distribution of medical services, and unequal ability to pay for those services, especially as related to a growing popular belief that good health and good health care should be birthrights for all Americans rather than the privilege of a wealthy few . . . those same political pressures inevitably will produce from the Congress (perhaps as soon as 1974) some form of National Health Insurance Program for federally sponsored medical services available to all of us.

Nobody can say at this point what the details of that national program will be. A wide range of plans are being discussed. But I believe I am accurate in reporting that there does prevail among congressmen an uneasy belief that the success of any form of national health services program will require, first of all, a major increase in trained manpower . . . more physicians, more nurses perhaps, and probably a great many more paramedical technicians and assistants.

So, from the Ohio General Assembly in Columbus, and it is strongly echoed from Washington, there is a very forceful mandate on the Medical College at Toledo to produce more physicians. That is why this school exists, that is why we are dedicating a great new Health Sciences Building.

But what kind, what quality of physicians should Toledo produce, and what shall be the training emphasis here? I suspect neither Columbus or Washington is yet giving you any precise mandate as to your professional product, other than just the popular demand for more and more.

And certainly I don't have the credentials to offer expert judgments in attempting to answer those crucial questions: What kind of physicians shall we produce, and how shall we do it?

But I do have my own personal prejudices and hopes in that regard. As with paintings, I don't know much about art, but I know what I like. And so, just to be provocative, I will describe in quick, broad terms the physicians I hope the Medical College at Toledo will graduate.

First, I hope you will NOT attract nor train men and women who look upon their MD degree and license to practice as primarily sure tickets to personal wealth. I do not resent in anyone the accumulation of a modest fortune, if it is well earned in some useful, productive and creative, legitimate way; but I would resent it very much if this medical college became largely a trade school, producing mostly clever, glib, efficient, bedside-manner physicians intent on the business of making a profit. Personally, I am very pleased by recent reports that today's medical stu-

dents are more socially concerned and service minded, men and women of sharpened conscience.

It is difficult to teach such qualities as humane compassion, sensitivity, moral wisdom, intellectual curiosity, creative imagination, scholarliness, sense of humor, humility and persistent, lifelong passion to learn . . . but I do believe you can, and you must, encourage those qualities in your students and in the physicians you graduate.

Especially, apropos this new Health Sciences Building which we now celebrate, I hope Toledo will produce physicians who by training and habit will be throughout their professional careers effective problem solvers, rather than mere routine prescribers or manipulators.

As I see it, the tremendous importance of involving a medical student in laboratory science, is to acquaint him (or her) with, and encourage a thorough understanding and appreciation of the scientific attitudes and methods, hopefully to excite a lifelong professional interest in, and by habit an intellectual bent toward the search for new knowledge and better understanding, so that his medical practice shall be always a continuing extension of his medical education.

I hope there will be here a very aggressive effort to involve medical students in the research of the scientists who shall be the primary users of these laboratories; but I suggest also the increasing involvement of undergraduates, of pre-med students from the neighboring universities of Toledo and Bowling Green. And most certainly, your clinical teaching faculty should have access to these laboratories and should be encouraged to become actively involved in good research.

My reference to the University of Toledo and to Bowling Green State University indicates a strong hope that this medical college will increasingly, intimately interrelate with those two universities. Frankly, I doubt the wisdom of any professional school isolated from a university atmosphere, and I assume this is not. It is of the very essence of a university that all its various elements shall be interacting, interdependent, mutually stimulating and mutually nourishing; and a medical college surely needs to be part of such a university community . . . especially so if, as many experts are saying, there needs to be a strong introduction to the biomedical sciences for undergraduate students, well before they enter a medical college.

Anticipating this evening, some weeks ago. I asked a friend, Dr. Frank Huddle, senior specialist for science and technology in the Library of Congress Research Service, for advice on what I should say here. And, because he is a sometime philosopher and classicist, I was not surprised when he urged me to take as my inspiration for these remarks several excerpts from *New Atlantis*, written by Sir Francis Bacon very early in the 17th Century. Some of you may remember that Bacon describes there an imaginary foundation for education and science which he calls "Salomon's House" and for its purpose he says:

"The end of our foundation is the knowledge of causes, and secret motions of things; and the enlarging of the bounds of human empire, to the effecting of all things possible."

And in later passages, Bacon describes how that foundation will send into all parts of the universe "merchants of light" who shall gather in "all the books and abstracts, and patterns of experiments of all other parts", while others will try new experiments, others will analyze and interpret . . . and then most significantly Bacon tells his plans for activities which we today often label "technology transfer", the broad and use-

fully effective spreading and application of new knowledge.

Frank Huddle told me that Bacon's concept of Salomon's House in *New Atlantis* created a great stir in intellectual circles of that day and was immediately responsible for the founding of The Royal Society, now long since a most distinguished and famous British institution.

He also said, "Tell them in Toledo, it is imperative that scientists, students, teachers and physicians be Baconians, rather than Cartesians." And when I raised my questioning eyebrow, he went on to explain that the Cartesian ideal is for great minds (or talented scientists, I suppose) to work alone, in isolation and secrecy, whereas Baconians (as described in *New Atlantis*) are greater team players, working together in the gathering, sharing, critical analysis, spreading and application of a broad spectrum of new knowledge.

So, that Salomon's House ideal is exactly the burden of these remarks tonight, my enthusiastic hope and expectation that the dedication of this Health Sciences Building, symbolizes a genuine, firm commitment to the philosophy that graduates of the Medical College at Toledo shall be trained to work together in the ways of science . . . to have a persistent thirst for new knowledge, and better understanding and to make careful, methodical, critical distinctions and interpretations.

Despite all the glittery, sophisticated achievements of medical science in recent years, despite all the prophecies and promises of near magical technologies and miracle medicines, expectations of an end to disease and longer life for everybody . . . despite all this rhetoric which has raised the pressures of popular expectation and impatient demand to a probably impossible level . . . I am increasingly convinced that today's physicians and medical scientists, in relative terms (relative to 50 or 100 years from now), really don't begin to know enough, are really not adequate to the demands upon them. I am convinced we have only begun to learn the what and the how at least of the future of the medical profession.

But I very quickly and readily admit that also is even more true of my own political profession. And, incidentally, I am sure that students of government (or of political science if you accept that term) often would benefit greatly by more exposure to and understanding of the hard sciences, the disciplines of the laboratories.

Scientists hypothesize and experiment. Physicians practice. And the political decision making process now is largely by mere trial and error. But note that in all of these professions . . . in hypothesizing, experimenting, practicing, and process by trial and error . . . in each of these exercises there is inherent the basic assumption that the truth is very tentative, almost certain to change, surely in need of perfecting. Note that all of us . . . scientists, professors, physicians, legislators . . . enjoy considerable status as professionals; but I submit that anyone who professes, no matter what, should always be accepted with a grain of salt, with fingers crossed, with skepticism . . . and it is imperative that every professional be challenged and insistently challenged again, so that he (or she) shall be kept humble and forced to rethink, and to learn more.

Thus, you can see that my own view of what today's education for tomorrow's medical practitioners should be, obviously is still rooted in the then very revolutionary recommendations of the famed Flexner report in 1910. After more than 60 years, Flexner still has a lot of validity. Some impatient critics are demanding that we should speed medical education by diluting it with short cuts; but I am very skeptical of any such urgings.

Again, I protest against any willingness to turn medical schools into mere trade schools. I urge that university officials resist strongly any popular or governmental or financial pressures which might now stampede them into unwise, retrogressive expedients. Hopefully, I interpret this dedication of your new science building as Toledo's dedication to maintaining *quality* and *progress* in medical education.

But at the same time, I fully recognize and insist on the necessity for change, change that improves and makes progress. Goals and priorities inevitably must change, to meet the needs of our changing way of life; of society's new demands. America today is profoundly different from the America of 1910, the year of the Flexner Report, recognized as a great turning point in the history of medical education. But I submit that we almost constantly are passing through possible turning points, through crossroads in policy making. Public policy is never fixed, it is dynamic, constantly wracked by the stresses and strains of new and changing people pressures; and in our increasingly intricate, interdependent society, certainly the goals, priorities and methods of medical education and medical science constantly will feel those stresses and strains.

If the future of medical education and medical science today seems to be extraordinarily uncertain, hanging in the balance, I suggest that is only part of the painfully apparent fact that *all* of our national policy directions are extremely uncertain right now. The future directions and levels in medical schools and in the health sciences will depend on decisions, political decisions yet to be made in many other areas . . . and no accurate prediction of those decisions is yet possible.

What will be the nature of a national health insurance system when it comes? Will the emphasis be on prepayment for medical services, or on the traditional fee-for-service system? An emphasis on preventive medicine, on ambulatory care, on group practice, much greater emphasis on and demand for more effective therapy . . . for care, rather than merely supportive care? Will there be an expansion, or contraction of hospital services as we know them today? Those are only a few of the questions which pop into my mind, to which none of us as yet can venture responsible answers.

And until there are some fairly definite answers, medical colleges can only guess what our medical manpower will be, which specialties will be in short supply, and thus what emphasis should be changed in training patterns. We can only guess . . . except as we surely know that we will need to train MORE medical personnel, and more will be women, and more will be from minority group origins.

What does it mean, as some are telling us, that medical colleges should no longer gear their output so much to the demands of the medical profession as to the needs of society?

Perhaps it means (and I assume this would be a really radical change) that physicians of the future might be trained not so much for the traditional one-to-one, doctor-patient relationships, for attention to the individual who is ill, but trained rather to be part of a team of physicians, nurses and other paramedicals whose target will be the health needs of groups or of communities of people. It is argued that this social emphasis is necessary to "optimize", to make more effective and at lower costs and with greater equity, the services of physicians who are in limited supply.

That troublesome choice, like many others, will depend increasingly on decisions we will make in Washington. But one very significant turn was taken very recently when the President proposed and both houses of the Congress voted, in differing forms, legislation for rapidly expanding Health Main-



tenance Organizations (HMO's) with federal government encouragement, guidance and financial assistance. The House vote on September 12 was overwhelmingly favorable, 369 to 40. There are fundamental differences between the House and Senate bills, and these will be difficult to compromise in the Conference Committee; but I submit that message from Capitol Hill is now very clear, the federal government soon will begin some form of very significant increased support for HMO's, as an attempt to improve the delivery of more effective, more economical health services . . . and this is only one step, with others to follow.

Now, I also suggest it is extremely important to recognize that many other public problems, many national needs and opportunities, and therefore national policy decisions which are well outside the realm of medical sciences and medical practice as usually perceived, nevertheless do influence profoundly and immediately our national health standards, the morbidity and mortality rates of the American people. Among today's examples of such national policy decisions that come quickly to mind are those required because of pollution and ecological concerns, or the energy and food scarcities, nutrition problems, narcotics, alcohol and tobacco abuses, highway and air traffic casualties, crime in the streets and proposed gun controls, plus prison and courts reform, fire prevention and safety, bad housing, poverty . . . you name it!

Thus, the traditional realms of medical science and medical services are expanding into and are inextricably part and parcel of the much larger complex of all our public policy decisions. Surely, for example, medical research must increasingly be concerned with environmental health problems, with all public health problems in the broadest sense.

There is an immense popular enthusiasm and concern today for a complex pattern of human experience, impossible as yet to define in precise terms but which is often labeled the "Quality of Life". That enthusiasm and concern is strongly reflected in policy makers. And we see it particularly in the amazing (in some respects now alarming) leap in levels of expectation, the heightened standards demanded as acceptable or popularly anticipated, or required of government . . . for the conservation and enhancement of natural resources, protection of a balanced ecology, abatement of all forms of pollution, protection of consumers, eradication of poverty and hunger, provision of good housing . . . these are only a few of those popular demands; and certainly very high on any such list in the public's mind is better health services. And many people actually expect an end very soon to all major illnesses.

These popular demands, these extremely heightened expectations, are not being met in actual practice. President Johnson's promise to end poverty has so far failed miserably. Many of President Nixon's most heralded proposals are as yet only rhetoric . . . witness his "welfare reform" program. Bitter experience is beginning to prove very convincingly that it is most often a serious mistake, inevitably misleading and disappointing, to pick any small piece of the great complex of public problems and with great fanfare and promise (but usually with far too little funding) try to target a crash program for the solution of that particular piece of our problems, when we perhaps by that very effort tend all the more to neglect other related problems. Time after time, we legislators learn the probability that in trying to solve one problem, we inflame or create others . . . for human society is an extremely complex, organic whole, somewhat like the individual human organism.

Do not misunderstand me. I do not say solutions to our social problems are impossible. I am not discouraged. I say only that

we in government have much to learn, have only begun to seek the effective scientific understanding and therapeutic treatment of social ills. We are as yet only groping, as I suspect medical practitioners are as yet only groping.

But the public, with its heightened expectations and impatience, tends to be considerably disappointed and disillusioned with all of us, for our failure to produce the miracles the public often believes we promised them. Scientists, teachers, physicians, politicians . . . all of us share a certain uneasy lack of credibility, of disdain in much of the popular opinion today, because we so obviously fail to accomplish what an impatient society expects of us.

The space program's dramatic successes are perhaps an element in this unhappy situation. I have constituents who say to me, "Now that NASA has put men on the moon and returned them safely, how come you can't put a man into Lake Erie and return him safely."

The public finds it very difficult to understand the truth, as you and I know it, that most of our great public problems . . . medical, social, health, energy, food, housing, transportation and environmental problems, including Lake Erie's pollution and eutrophication . . . these are far, far more complicated and difficult than was the seeming miracle of traveling to and from the Moon.

NASA's superb Apollo effort is the rare example of a crash program that succeeded. The Manhattan Project, to create an atomic bomb, was another such success. But I suggest that crash programs in the health sciences are as yet of very dubious wisdom or value. At the moment, with considerable fanfare and rhetorical promise, we are committing vastly increased funding to targeted research for the conquest of cancer and to cures for heart disease. Those have been named officially by the White House and the Congress as the two great priorities for our health expenditures, presumably because statistically they are the two greatest killer diseases.

Along with everyone else, I voted for those crash funds. I hope both efforts are a surprising success, and very soon. Personally, I feel extremely vulnerable to both cancer and cardiac troubles.

But as a legislator largely involved in the whole realm of national science and technology policy decisions, I am very skeptical about the wisdom or efficacy of such extreme distortions of program effort as are represented in the crash funding of targeted cancer and heart research. Other diseases also are big killers; and still other diseases do not kill so much as just make life miserable. It might best be recognized that death does not happen to any one person nearly so often as do distressing, debilitating illnesses for which we desperately need cures in order to enhance our "Quality of Life."

The fact is, during this period of enforced budget constraints, by allocating more money narrowly to cancer and heart research, we are robbing funds from all other elements of medical research; some programs are being barely maintained at previous levels in terms of absolute dollars, others are getting fewer dollars . . . all really are getting much less support, because the dollars are eroded by inflation. Thus, we may terribly handicap the ability of medical colleges, including Toledo, to improve and expand their research efforts, to meet the broader, valid demands upon them.

Most significant of all is the fact that in narrowly targeting research on cancer and heart disease, we quite probably, almost certainly are cutting back in the broad, basic fields of biomedical research which undergird and sustain all applied research, and which actually will be found essential to the success of even the target research.

It is true that nearly all national policy decisions translate into money, into expend-

iture levels as a measure of their priority importance. Nevertheless, it should be evident to all of us by now that more dollars do not necessarily buy more productive research nor at any level of our health services delivery system will a greater concentration of dollars necessarily buy that much more health. We've still a lot to learn about how best to invest the taxpayer's dollars in support of good research; but I suggest, perhaps the first requirement should now be stability of funding.

The doubts, the skepticism, the unhappy realities I have stated in my last few paragraphs apply throughout the whole spectrum of all science and technology policy making and funding in the federal government today. The uncertainties are everywhere, just as they are in the medical sciences . . . in part because of the rigid budget constraints and inflation; in part because of the huge pressures of popular expectation and demand, contrasted to the disappointing product of the golden age of expensive and expanding scientific activity in the past 20 years; in part because of the vigorously competing claims of many other public needs and government activities, many of which assert the necessity for changing priorities for research.

The fact that all of us are groping, that all science related policy is in flux, is dramatized in the new and uncertain responsibilities that have been loaded onto the National Science Foundation and its Director, Dr. Guy Stever, after the President dismantled his Office of Science and Technology and removed his Science Advisor from the White House level. These uncertainties also are seen in controversies over the future of NASA and the AEC; the inadequate funding for NOAA and the Coastal Zone Management program; the wide ranging struggle for jurisdictional control, directions and priorities in our immense new emphasis on energy-related research; the growing resistance to military R&D; the growing realization of how much we still have to learn in the environmental sciences; the growing awareness that many of our great national laboratories are not being used fully, nor as effectively and creatively as they should; and in the policy controversies current between the Congress and the Administration . . . especially the very controversial, new initiatives in decision-making by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

I wish we could find examples of that in the political world! Dr. Huggins described for us this afternoon a biological process which he asserts is established with certainty, nothing about it is treacherous, he said. The examples I have just cited and many other examples that could be cited, indicate that we in government . . . in the executive and legislative alike . . . have hardly begun to understand fully the needs and opportunities in science and technology as tools for the solution of vast public problems; there is a crucial need for us to strengthen, to be more foresighted and effective in our policy making procedures. And, in that regard, I urge your attention to a newly authorized staffing arm of the Congress, our Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), as one truly hopeful sign that we may be moving in the right direction.

Above all, we need more long time stability and assurance in our authorizations and appropriations for all basic research, especially in support for the life sciences. We have been afflicted with too much go-and-stop, stop-and-go, hurry up-and-wait.

And as a final note of unhappiness, I will inject here my own strong impression that Ohio, our own state, is very inadequate in any efforts it may be making on an official organized basis . . . I know of no such efforts . . . to provide vigorous leadership and support for the sciences and for new uses and development of technology. Obviously,

your new Health Sciences Building is an exception to this complaint. But I do believe some Ohioans with special genius should be given a mandate, and the means necessary, to identify more clearly what needs and opportunities and resources exist in our state and for our state. And I especially emphasize that word *opportunities*. For example, I am confident there should be organized far more positive, creative, profitable working relationships between Ohio and the federal government. And I do hope that some of you present here tonight might be persuaded to work more vigorously to achieve that purpose.

Now, in conclusion, I remind you again of the distinction between the Baconian and the Cartesian ideals . . . the Cartesian emphasis on the great mind at work productively, but in seclusion and secrecy, in contrast to the Baconian belief in the many working productively together, sharing and distributing the fruits of their new knowledge. I cited the Health Sciences Building we are dedicating here as a prime example today of that Baconian idea, where excellent scientists, medical students, undergraduate students and members of the clinical faculty will be working and learning and sharing productively together.

I spoke also hopefully, of a growing interrelationships, mutually nourishing, between this medical college and the Universities of Toledo and Bowling Green.

I mentioned a variety of other such interrelationships . . . group practice of medicine; the interaction of many other national policy decisions with developments in policy for health services and for the life sciences; the danger in distortions from individual, crash programs, that result in neglect of broadly based stability in scientific research; and the need for a more productive coordination between the State of Ohio and the federal government, to use and develop more fully the scientific and technological resources of our State.

And I have reiterated in several ways a strong, urgent belief that physicians and scientists should be much less shy, should in fact be much more activist . . . but wisely and knowledgeably activist . . . in participating in the political process by which so many profoundly important decisions are made in government which dictate the directions in which the medical professions and medical education must move.

My subject tonight, as listed on the program, was "Science and Public Support of Research". Perhaps I have touched on that subject, but superficially.

But now I have decided the title of these overly long remarks really should be "A Declaration of Interdependence".

I hope I don't sound too much like Karl Marx's "Workers of the World Unite!"

I do say to scientists, to students, to professors, to physicians, to administrators, and to policy-making politicians . . . we very much depend on each other, we need each other!

#### MATCOM CELEBRATES INTERNATIONAL CREDIT UNION WEEK

### HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, this week, October 22-26, is International Credit Union Week. Some 280 credit unions in the State of Maryland are observing the

event, and among them is the MATCOM Federal Credit Union at Edgewood Arsenal.

Organized in 1953 by civilian and military employees of the Army Materiel Command in Baltimore, MATCOM has experienced enormous growth since then. Today, it enjoys a membership exceeding 14,000 and its assets are approaching \$9 million. It is the 12th largest credit union in Maryland.

Like many credit unions, it grew from small beginnings. For the first 3 years or so, volunteers performed the work necessary to maintain and build the credit union. By the end of 1956, the board of directors had decided that MATCOM had grown to the point where it was necessary to hire a paid staff member to manage the office during the 3 days a week when the office was open. At that point, MATCOM had 324 members and \$47,245 in assets.

Over the next 22 months, MATCOM experienced a 574 percent growth. A second employee was added to the payroll in October 1958. Today, MATCOM employs seven full-time and three part-time staff members.

MATCOM has provided needed financial assistance to thousands of members, making 43,623 loans during its 20 years of service. Funds have been borrowed for hundreds of reasons. There is little doubt that the loan services it provides have averted personal tragedies for many of its members.

Members' savings accounts earn generous dividends, which are compounded semi-annually. An interest refund of 5 percent was paid on June 30 of this year. Members can borrow at low interest rates, and many who have found it difficult or impossible to borrow from outside sources have found MATCOM ready to help them. Since its inception, it has made loans totaling \$41,411,153.

The kind of service which MATCOM provides the civilian and military personnel of the Edgewood Arsenal area of the Aberdeen Proving Ground is representative of the benefits offered by the 23,000 Federal credit unions throughout the United States to their 20 million members. It is a record of which they can be justly proud, and I take pleasure in congratulating them this week. Their services are invaluable, and I wish them continued growth in the future.

#### BOLL WEEVIL ERADICATED IN U.S. TEST

### HON. EDWARD YOUNG

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, a number of economic and ecological benefits will flow from a boll weevil eradication program: First, cotton—unlike oil-base synthetics—is produced by an eternal energy source, the Sun. Second, 40 percent of all agricultural pesticides in the United States go into

the cotton crop, whereas a successful eradication program can reduce this amount up to 75 percent. Third, the export demand/internal supply squeeze on cotton will be relieved, not only by the recapture of the \$200 million annual loss to boll weevil damage, but also by the increased acreage planted to cotton by those farmers who previously had given up on cotton as a profitable crop.

I call to your attention a fine article prepared by the United Press International which appeared in the Washington Post of October 24, 1973:

#### BOLL WEEVIL ERADICATED IN U.S. TEST

Agriculture Department scientists said yesterday a successful two-year test proves they now have the techniques needed to drastically reduce the volume of pesticides used in farming by virtually eradicating a historic insect pest—the cotton boll weevil.

Since more insecticides are currently used to control the boll weevil than any other insect, its eradication would reduce the volume of pesticides pumped into the environment by American agriculture by about one-third, officials said in a statement. They added that elimination of the insect to the point at which it is no longer an "economic pest" would trim cotton production costs by around \$275 million a year.

The two-year experiment, officials said, succeeded in practically exterminating the weevil in test areas by use of a carefully timed and staged combination of control measures including sex-lure traps and release of sterile male weevils.

Agriculture Department officials said the pilot test, which proved elimination of the boll weevil as an economic pest is "technically feasible . . . by the use of ecologically acceptable techniques," was conducted in a 5,000-square-mile area of Southern Mississippi and adjacent parts of Louisiana and Alabama.

By last spring, officials said, surveys found no evidence of boll weevil reproduction in 235 of the 236 cotton fields in the core of the test area where all suppression techniques were used. The only weevils found were in a lightly infested field near the border of the core area.

#### NATIONAL SECURITY—TOP PRIORITY

### HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, a popular political cry in recent years has been "We must reorder our priorities." By this is meant, of course, that we must take money away from military programs so that the "savings" can then be made available to certain social-welfare-type endeavors.

For just as long, others of us here in Congress have tried to illustrate the dangers of such rhetoric. We have pointed out, for example, that the same inflation which boosts food prices also undermines the funds we have available for an already precarious military posture.

Fortunately, there still exist a number of newspapers in this country which are invaluable allies in making some of these



factors known to the American people. One such editorial voice belongs to South Carolina's largest newspaper, the State. Earlier this month, the State printed a particularly outstanding editorial, which made an invaluable contribution to American military preparedness.

So that my colleagues may have the benefit of the timely points made in the editorial entitled "Top Priority Must Go to National Security," from the State, I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

**TOP PRIORITY MUST GO TO NATIONAL SECURITY**

Americans who worry about their nation's security can take some comfort from the Senate's approval of \$21 billion for the procurement and development of weapons, but the comfort may be temporary. And it certainly should not lead to complacency.

There are strong forces in Congress these days, and especially in the Senate, which would whittle defense expenditures to the bone. This week's final 91-7 vote of approval for weapons procurement is misleading. More indicative of the serious threat to national security is the 49-47 vote by which the Senate barely saved the Navy's Trident missile submarine program.

The attitude of the self-styled liberals in Congress is both dangerous and disheartening. For one thing, it reflects either an ignorance or an indifference to the potential threat of Russian superiority in weapons systems. In some areas of defense activity, notably in naval developments, the Russians already are outstripping America's rate of progress.

Furthermore, there is a tendency among many congressmen to use the Pentagon as a whipping boy or scapegoat in their efforts to gain funds for use elsewhere. Capitalizing on the unpopularity of the American involvement in South east Asia, several ranking Democrats in Congress seek to divert needed military funds to their pet domestic programs.

Sen. Hubert Humphrey was in full voice (when isn't he?) during the debate on the weapons procurement bill. Seeking to trim the measure by \$750 million, the Minnesota senator called upon the Senate to exercise "fiscal responsibility."

"I hear that time and again," he shouted. "Let's have some of it."

We agree that fiscal responsibility is indeed needed in the halls of Congress. But it should be applied not just to military spending but to the hosts of social welfare programs which have grown at a rate far surpassing anything in the defense sector.

In 1963, for example, defense spending accounted for almost 50 per cent of total national budget. This year, that ratio is expected to be in the range of 30 per cent. But, thanks to non-defense spending, the federal budget itself has grown 150 per cent in that decade, aptly described as "the era of triumphant liberalism."

For social welfare programs alone, federal expenditures burgeoned from \$37 billion in 1965 to \$92 billion within six years. And despite President Nixon's efforts to curb such spending, there seems little inclination on the part of the Democratic Congress to slacken the pace.

Federal spending has gotten completely out of hand. But the onus for extravagance rests not upon the military but upon the domestic sector.

Between two of the goals enumerated in the Constitution of the United States—"to provide for the common defense" and "to promote the general welfare"—Americans must insist that Congress give priority to the former. Without it, the latter could be meaningless.

**URANIUM ENRICHMENT VIEWS OF HOLMES ALEXANDER**

**HON. CRAIG HOSMER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, many newspapers throughout the Nation recently carried Columnist Holmes Alexander's article discussing the Nation's new needs for nuclear fuel. I have received considerable favorable response and helpful comments from readers of the item and am pleased to ask that it be reproduced below as it was syndicated.

**A LANGUISHING BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY**  
(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The United States still holds an important and wealth-producing "atomic monopoly." But this multibillion-dollar advantage lies dormant and neglected. Deadline for decision making comes up next month when the Joint Atomic Energy Committee opens its October hearings on what to do about the uranium-enrichment industry. This business is already earning substantial revenue in a Free World market that could absorb 40 times its present supply.

Rep. Craig Hosmer (R-Calif.) knows more than anybody else about this obscure and neglected area of the energy crisis. This 11-term Congressman and Rear Admiral (U.S. Naval Reserve) worked as a lawyer at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory before election to the House in 1952 and has concentrated on nuclear-related matters ever since. In an extraordinary appeal this month, Hosmer asked the press, members of Congress and of the Administration, as well as the industrial and scientific community for "comment and discussion." He adds:

"These will be particularly valuable if made in the form of oral and written statements for the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Phase II, hearings, but the anonymity of anyone wishing to submit data to me in confidence will be fully respected."

At the risk of offering a dull column on an opaque subject, I think it in the public interest to donate my mite. There is no need to beat the gongs about the clear and present energy crisis nor about the need for America to make money that would ease the deficit in our international balance of payments. But there exists a residual superstition about the Hiroshima A-bomb, and a popular reluctance to believe in the vast potential of "peaceful" atomic uses.

Since the invention in 1950 of the H-bomb, the A-bomb has become nonexistent, a horse-and-buggy relic of the military arsenal. As a consequence, the manufacture of "enriched uranium" at the three government plants at Oak Ridge, Tenn., Paducah, Ky., and Portsmouth, Ohio, was drastically cut back, and the atomic concentration was reduced from a military high to a commercial low.

As Hosmer points out, the enriching of uranium is a "service," not a "product." The customers are the U.S. companies and industrialized friendly nations which have use for reactors to generate power. This is a very profitable business, and some 40 per cent of the sales are in the revenue-raising export trade.

In the so-called "separative" work, each unit sells for \$50, and by the end of the century the sales are calculated to peak at \$56-billion. At the present writing, the Atomic Energy Commission's cash receipts for sales to domestic and foreign buyers have passed the \$1-billion figure.

It will be asked—why would such a lucra-

tive and monopolistic enterprise need any promotion? One hangup is that the Nixon Administration has been waiting around for private industry to take over. The history of superstition, along with the financial risk and the antitrust laws, have proved too great an inhibition.

Hosmer is proposing to transfer the AEC facilities to a government corporation, the U.S. Enrichment Corp., as a starter. This will keep the business going, but only until "a responsible" U.S. applicant appears, at which time the government corporation will "suspend . . . for as long as private U.S. firms undertake to supply demand."

Immensely complex as the matter is, the essential ingredient is simplicity itself—popular acceptance of which will allow Congress and the Administration to get a move on.

**HOWARD PHILLIPS ON ANTI-POVERTY PROGRAMS**

**HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, Howard Phillips, the former Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, has been writing a number of columns explaining the true situation within the governmental bureaucracy that is supposedly fighting poverty. These columns should be read by all in the Congress in order that a better understanding be obtained of this area.

Mr. Phillips urges the Nixon administration to stand up against the bureaucrats and their vested interests and to do the business of the people. At this point I include in the RECORD Phillips' article "How So-Called Anti-Poverty Programs Really Work" from the October 20, 1973, issue of Human Events:

**HOW SO-CALLED ANTI-POVERTY PROGRAMS REALLY WORK**

(By Howard Phillips)

The degree of influence exercised by liberal Democrat members of the "legal services establishment" on some officials of the Administration can be deduced from the following personal communication to a top OEO official from an OEO grantee:

"What the s--- do you mean sending me a letter like this? Do you read what you sign or are you unable to understand the legal implications (including the lack thereof) of things which you write?"

"You and Steve seem to be hell-bent on putting me in a position where ULI no longer is in existence as of tomorrow and this whole f--- up mess over at OEO becomes a matter of public controversy which will make any current problems with CRLA look like a Sunday School picnic. Jean"

The author of the above diatribe, sent June 30, 1971, was Jean Cahn, a member of the OEO National Advisory Committee on Legal Services and co-dean of the Urban Law Institute, which has been funded at a rate in excess of \$550,000 per year by OEO and has received additional hundreds of thousands from other federal departments. ULI's co-dean is Edgar Cahn (Jean's husband), the former special assistant to R. Sargent Shriver, the first director of OEO.

Mrs. Cahn was complaining to Fred Speaker, then head of the OEO Legal Services Program, that he had signed a letter to her which affirmed that OEO was "presently planning to fund the Urban Law Institute of

Antioch College at a level in excess of ULI's fiscal 1971 funding level."

This was not enough for Mrs. Cahn, who wanted a firm commitment on which she could borrow funds. In order to get what she wanted she threatened Speaker and Steve Huber, then in charge of legal services research and development projects, with public criticism "which will make any current problems with CRLA look like a Sunday School picnic."

This Cahn-Speaker "dialogue" bears consideration for more than the obvious irony of a federal grantee insisting in its "right" to federal subsidy. In a larger sense it typifies the legalized extortion engaged in by an elite group of Washington liberals at the expense of the over-all public.

Mr. Cahn referred to CRLA (California Rural Legal Assistance), an OEO-financed program which California Gov. Ronald Reagan had the temerity to veto, thereby incurring the daily disfavor of the nation's press and the Liberal Establishment in general, which sought to make the governor's decision and the Nixon Administration's reaction to it a *cause célèbre*.

Speaker and his superiors at OEO well knew the ability of the legal services "club" to harass divert and besiege bureaucrats who were less than fully cooperative. At the drop of a phone call there would be editorials in the *Washington Post*, *New York Times*, *New Republic*, and other Establishment organs. Investigative reports would appear on national television and thousands of letters would be generated, through the efforts of grantee employees and advisers whose causes and pocketbooks seemed threatened by shifts in policy.

To an Administration sure of its course and sufficiently confident to counter criticism of its policies, the threat of harassment would have little impact. Unfortunately, however, most Nixon Administration officials quickly learn that embarrassing press controversies are to be avoided. Surrendering a few hundred thousand, or million, dollars here and there, even to the President's enemies, provokes far less criticism from superiors than would a nasty article on page one of the *Washington Post*.

This tendency to avoid controversy—even such avoidance requires surrender in substantive points—became even more pronounced in the wake of Watergate, when top White House officials determined it necessary to limit the fronts on which the President was being attacked (forgetting the idea of themselves attacking on all those fronts).

The opposition learned very early how to read the signals. When your demands are in danger of being rejected, threaten attack. Offer "protection" in the form of a kind word from a newsmen, to those who cooperate. In this manner, the bureaucracy continues to respond not to any Nixon-led "New American Revolution," but to the policies, programs and people of the Liberal Establishment who still dominate domestic decision-making in the fifth year of Richard Nixon's presidency.

Until Nixon is himself prepared to assert leadership in the shaping and implementation of domestic policy, he will be President in name only, yielding the "business of the people" to continued domination by the "hit men" of the prevailing liberal orthodoxy.

#### MELWOOD TRAINING CENTER

### HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to visit the Melwood

Horticultural Training Center during their fourth annual day in the country affair. This was a most enjoyable and informative occasion.

Melwood is a private, nonprofit center which uses horticulture to teach vocational skills, job responsibility, and work attitudes to mentally retarded young people at three training sites in Prince Georges and Charles Counties in Maryland. During its brief, 10-year existence, Melwood has been transformed from a mere concept to a functioning institution which has been described as a "model for the Nation." The graduates of Melwood are going on to lead productive lives holding competitive jobs side by side with nonhandicapped workers.

This project is impressive both because of its results and because it serves as a national example of what concerned citizens can accomplish. I am extremely pleased to have the opportunity to commend the work of the Melwood Center and wish it every success in the future.

#### FDA'S WAR AGAINST VITAMINS AND THE BEGINNING OF A COUNTERATTACK

### HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the Food and Drug Administration's increasing propensity to issue sweeping new regulations in the guise of protecting the consumer has reached a new high with the final regulations, of August first of this year, on vitamins and food supplements.

They are prohibiting the food supplement industry from making claims about their products even when the claims are scientifically accurate. They presume to judge how much and what ingredients may be included in a "food supplement" even though eminent nutritionists widely disagree in this field.

Already pending before this Congress are several bills designed to correct these regulations. I call attention to H.R. 643 which I have the honor to cosponsor as well as several other bills now before the subcommittee on Public Health and Environment of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Hearings will be held next week on this important consumer legislation.

A recent article in the magazine *Private Practice* published by the County Medical Associations tells exactly what these regulations will do unless we enact legislation immediately. I would like to reprint that article at this time in the Record.

The article follows:

#### FDA'S WAR AGAINST VITAMINS AND THE BEGINNING OF A COUNTERATTACK

(By J. F. Baldacchino, Jr.)

Few groups in the United States, it is probably safe to say, are more familiar with the Food and Drug Administration's proclivity for issuing sweeping new regulations than the practicing physician. Although purportedly designed to bring about "consumer pro-

tection," in practice these regulations, often have the opposite effect. Yet, even practicing physicians may be startled by the sheer scope of the agency's recently proclaimed vitamin-mineral regulations.

Briefly stated, the new edicts, first published as proposals in the January 19 issue of the *Federal Register* and decreed as final regulations on August 1, 1973, will:

Limit the potencies of the permitted nutrients in a vitamin-mineral food supplement to a low, narrow range;

Redefine as "drugs" many products previously defined as "food supplements," subjecting them to the same unrealistic efficacy requirements that already plague the pharmaceutical industry;

Prohibit the food-supplement industry from making a number of promotional claims or suggestions about its products, even when scientifically accurate;

Limit the permissible combinations of ingredients in a dietary supplement; and

Limit the ingredients which may be included in a dietary supplement by permitting the inclusion of only those vitamins and minerals deemed necessary by the F.D.A.

The regulations establish what the F.D.A. terms a "U.S. Recommended Daily Allowance (RDA)" for each of 19 vitamins and minerals recognized as "essential" by the agency. According to the F.D.A., these Recommended Daily Allowances which are generally higher than the old Minimum Daily Requirements that they replace, are "sufficient to meet the nutritional needs of essentially any healthy individual." In defense of this position, the F.D.A. points out that the RDAs are based upon the recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council.

"The single most important purpose and effect of the regulations," Alexander M. Schmidt, F.D.A. commissioner, declared, "is to require full and honest labeling and fair promotion of vitamin and mineral products, whether marketed as foods, dietary supplements or as drugs . . . The regulations don't ban any vitamin or mineral from the market or force any manufacturer willing to provide proper formulation and full labeling out of business."

The fact remains, however, that the allowances for many of the nutrients fall extremely short of the dosages suggested by other, equally reputable nutrition experts. The RDA for Vitamin C, for example, is 60 milligrams. Yet, Dr. Linus Pauling, winner of a Nobel Prize for his research in chemistry, recommends that persons take 50 times that amount daily to prevent colds.

Despite the wide variation of opinion among nutritionists, the F. D. A. regulations arbitrarily accept the RDAs as "facts" and decree that all food supplements containing more than 150 per cent of the RDA will henceforth be redesignated as drugs.

While there has been much confusion concerning the fate of these newly classified drugs, with many fearing that all food supplements exceeding the upper limits on nutrient levels would be confined to use by prescription only, the F.D.A. denies this charge, pointing out that many of the newly defined "drugs" will probably be sold, like aspirin, as over-the-counter products.

Despite the F.D.A.'s denials, critics are less than satisfied. Initially, they point out, the recent orders already subject two nutrients to prescription sale. Beyond this, the F.D.A. admits that it plans to review the remaining products to decide which others should be similarly restricted. In view of the agency's past actions, they argue, it is difficult to be optimistic.

Restricted to prescription use thus far will be any vitamin product containing in excess of 10,000 I.U. of Vitamin A or 400 I.U. of Vitamin D. The reason for this, according to the F.D.A., is that there is a danger of toxicity in the ingestion of these vitamins in



amounts exceeding those levels. Such danger, the agency says, is well documented in the medical literature.

The National Nutritional Foods Association challenges the F.D.A. claim. An examination of the evidence, declares this organization, which has been presented by the F.D.A. to substantiate its claim, "demonstrates . . . a total lack of support" for its position.

The NNFA points out that of the 104 references published in the December 14, 1972 *Federal Register* to support the agency's restrictions on Vitamins A and D, 84 were published before the Food and Nutrition Board, National Research Council, and National Academy of Sciences published its "Recommended Dietary Allowances," Seventh Edition in 1968.

"At the time when the overwhelming majority of the reports in the Vitamin A bibliography were available," the NNFA study continued, "the Food and Nutrition Board stated on Page 23 of its publication that, 'If large doses of Vitamin A (20 to 30 times the RDA) or of carotene are ingested for long periods of time, manifestations of toxicity develop.'"

The RDA for Vitamin A is 5,000 I.U. per day. Thus, the NNFA continued, in referring to toxicity at levels of 20 to 30 times the RDA, the Food and Nutrition Board speaks of manifestations of Vitamin A toxicity when taken at dosages of 100,000 to 150,000 I.U. per day for long periods of time.

Similarly, the NNFA study states, in its consideration of Vitamin D toxicity, the Food and Nutrition Board's 1968 publication states that, "there is no evidence that intakes of the order of 2,000 to 3,000 I.U. per day produce hypercalcemia beyond infancy."

"It is thus obvious," the NNFA concluded, "that notwithstanding the reports set forth in the bibliography used to support the present proposal, the Food and Nutrition Board has considered the problem of toxicity at levels far beyond the arbitrary and unreasonably low levels for which prescription requirements are now being suggested."

This is the same Food and Nutrition Board which the F.D.A. has cited so proudly as the source for its vaunted RDAs and has referred to as "the recognized authority for determining vitamin and other nutritional requirements for the human . . ."

The new F.D.A. regulations have also been challenged by the National Health Federation, which represents health food enthusiasts. "There is no question about the fact that we will go to court," said Clinton Miller, the federation's vice president. He said that the suit would allege that the F.D.A. hasn't any authority to establish minimum and maximum amounts of vitamin and mineral content of supplements and that, in any event, lengthy agency hearings have not established the need for such restrictions.

Mr. Miller said that the federation also will pursue efforts to get Congress to overturn the regulations. It claims 165 House sponsors so far for a bill to prohibit F.D.A. restrictions on vitamins and minerals unless a safety threat can be demonstrated.

In New York, Morris Aarons, general counsel for the National Association of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers, which represents smaller drug and vitamin makers, called the F.D.A. action "absolutely wrong and without basis." He said that if necessary the association would take legal steps to block the regulations.

Edgar Udine, president of Hudson Pharmaceutical Corp., an 80%-owned subsidiary of Cadence Industries Corp., said that under the new regulations "people will have to pay more for vitamins if they want to continue taking the same dosages."

If public reaction to the new regulations has been laced with confusion on the prescription issue, there can be little doubt about the meaning of the other F.D.A. decrees which shed a great deal of light on the

agency's attitude toward the taxpayers who support it. These, according to the new edicts, are findings of fact:

"Lay persons are incapable of determining, by themselves, whether they have, or are likely to develop, vitamin or mineral deficiencies. There is no rationale for allowing the promotion of dietary supplements of vitamins and/or minerals to the general public. . . . Vitamin or mineral deficiencies are unrelated to the great majority of symptoms like tiredness, nervousness, and rundown condition. . . ."

That many experts disagree with these so-called "facts" means nothing to the F.D.A. Indeed, even where there is agreement that food supplements may do some good, bureaucrats at the F.D.A. worry that the average consumer, poor creature, lacking the omniscience that stems from government employment, might be confused by scientifically accurate statements and buy more than he needs.

To preclude such a catastrophe, the F.D.A. regulations forbid manufacturers from making numerous truthful statements about their products.

Prohibited, for instance, will be any true claim or even an implication that any diet of ordinary foods may not supply adequate nutrients. Also proscribed will be any suggestion, even if correct, that the vitamin content of foods is affected by the soils in which they are grown or by the manner in which they are stored or processed.

Carrying its concern to even more extreme lengths, the agency has reduced to a handful the combinations of ingredients that will be available in coming years. Outlawed will be such products, now available, as a B-complex formula or the combination of calcium and Vitamin D. Never mind that many experts recommend such combinations. Never mind that many people want to buy them. Never mind that—with few, if any, exceptions—none of these products are toxic—or are even claimed to be.

Virtually banned by the regulations will be the sale of the "P" vitamins, otherwise known as the bioflavonoids. Although these items can be sold as single-ingredient products, no claims whatsoever can be made concerning their nutritive value or may they be included in combination with any of the "essential" vitamins or minerals.

The reason for this restriction, the agency says, is that there is no scientific evidence to prove any nutritive value in the bioflavonoids; and "it is false and misleading to combine nutrients of proven value with food factors of unproven nutritional value because of the clear implication that the latter have nutritional value similar to the former."

Despite the F.D.A.'s flat denunciation of the bioflavonoids, however, there are hundreds of studies which attest to their value in preventing bodily disorders.

Discovered in 1936 by Albert Szent-Gyorgyi—a Hungarian physician, chemist and Nobel Prize winner—the bioflavonoids were found to help patients with bleeding problems that had not responded to Vitamin C. Because the substances appeared to have a curative action on the permeability of capillaries, they were called Vitamin P for permeability.

Prevention Magazine reports that it found more than 500 studies attesting to the efficacy of the bioflavonoids in almost every known disease state. It declared that, "We found that there are more than 200 different substances under the umbrella generally known as bioflavonoids. Not all of them are biologically active. We found that they are never toxic even in massive doses."

How many studies were found that judged the bioflavonoids ineffective? *Prevention Magazine* discovered only two, and stated that, ". . . It is these two studies both published in the *Journal of the American Medi-*

*cal Association* which reverberate through a subsequent review of the literature which is quoted in the *Pharmacological Basis of Therapeutics*, the text of which Dr. Alfred Gilman co-authored and which Dr. Gilman quotes in the decision which, as a member of the National Academy of Sciences, he drew up for the F.D.A."

There is significant data on the other side. In a national symposium at the New York Academy of Sciences held in 1955, for example, scientists reported that bioflavonoids appear to strengthen the wall of capillaries. In many disorders, such as polio, chicken pox, coronary thrombosis, ulcers, diabetes, high blood pressure and hemorrhages the walls of the capillaries are weakened. Because of this condition, scientists have searched for ways to decrease capillary fragility. Numerous drugs have been tried, but at the symposium in New York City, scientists reported in many cases the bioflavonoids seemed to be the most effective—and with no side-effects.

The intransigence which has characterized F.D.A. pronouncements on this subject has taken its toll in public opinion. Public response to the new edicts has been the strongest in the agency's history, with more than 95 per cent of all comments opposed.

Responding to this outcry, more than 165 members of Congress have agreed to co-sponsor HR 643, introduced by Rep. Craig Hosmer (R-Cal.), that would prevent the Food and Drug Administration from banning the sales of truthfully labeled food supplements for reasons other than safety and fraud.

"Many of us are aroused," says Hosmer, "at the thought of the F.D.A. putting unneeded restrictions and regulations on vitamins and vitamin supplements. This, in my opinion, is just another attempt by the bureaucrats to control our very lives. I am confident that the majority of the American people have the wisdom and good sense to consume these items properly and beneficially."

With Congress finally peering into the F.D.A.'s closet, perhaps a few other skeletons might be brought out for public inspection. A good place to start: The aforementioned regulations keeping proven medications off the American market.

## COLLEGE FOR PRISON INMATES PROPOSED

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a bold new educational concept for rehabilitation in the correctional system.

The State University of New York and the Department of Correctional Services are exploring the establishment of a college for inmates to be located at the Department's complex at Bedford Hills, about 40 miles north of New York City.

Chancellor Ernest L. Boyer and Commissioner Peter Preiser recently announced that the proposed college, the first of its kind in the Nation, would make it possible for both men and women to engage in full-time study toward a 2-year degree in liberal arts or science.

In addition, a joint task force established by the university and the Department of Correctional Services will conduct a thorough study of higher educational opportunities in the 24 different correctional facilities of the State.

Chancellor Boyer emphasized that the college would be a unique experiment—a correctional facility which also serves as a separate campus—and would supplement the wide range of credit and occupational courses currently offered by State university at seven of New York State's correctional facilities.

Initially, the college would offer associate in arts and associate in science programs to 250 inmates. The task force would develop methods of selecting qualified students from the statewide inmate population and would work toward a network of programs which would draw upon the statewide higher education resources of the university. Chancellor Boyer said that administrative and faculty personnel for the college would be recruited from within the university itself.

Chancellor Boyer and Commissioner Preiser anticipate a program of counseling, remedial work, and college-level instruction at other correctional facilities which would provide basic academic or technical skills and introduce the possibility of full-time collegiate study for other groups of inmates.

Commissioner Preiser stressed the value of a liberal arts education in helping inmates to understand society and their place in it and in seeing themselves as a functional part of that society.

I commend Dr. Boyer and Commissioner Preiser for the tremendous strides they are making in helping to return prisoners to society to lead productive lives. The net result of this innovative program will most certainly benefit society at large as well as the inmates involved.

#### CONSTITUENTS WANT IMPEACHMENT

### HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my colleagues an indication of how my constituents and the Nation feel about the impeachment of the President. Beyond my role as a legislator, responsible to my own conscience, I must also, of course, take into account the diverse views and interests of my constituents. Each must strike this balance in his or her own way: to weigh out consciences with the views of the people we were elected to represent. Where little conflict arises, all the better. In such a case as this, where public opinion may be running well over 50 to 1 in favor of impeachment, I submit that the choice has already been made and that it is the duty of the Congress to begin impeachment proceedings immediately.

It is in this spirit that I enter the following statistics concerning the letters and telegrams I received between Saturday and last night. I urge my colleagues to do the same, so we may all see more clearly where the country stands.

In favor of impeachment, 291; opposed to impeachment, 6.

#### LEGAL SERVICES ABUSES

### HON. DAVID C. TREEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. TREEN. Mr. Speaker, the September 22 issue of Human Events included an article by former OEO Acting Director Howard Phillips which, quoting an OEO-financed publication, spelled out a number of recent legal services activities of questionable character. I hope the points raised will receive serious consideration before Congress takes final action on this legislation.

#### LEGAL SERVICES ABUSES

(By Howard Phillips)

Who would argue with the concept that America's less affluent citizens should have equal access to the nation's system of justice? Yet how many citizens realize that tax dollars appropriated under the banner of "legal aid for the poor" is in fact used to subsidize a wide-ranging liberal agenda for social change?

The fact is that present legal services activities subsidized by the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) and other government agencies are used to finance a nationwide network of nearly 3,000 legal services attorneys, hundreds of organizations, and additional thousands of support personnel who are almost totally free to establish their own priorities for issues to receive attention and access to legal services resources. With nearly \$80 million in support annually from OEO alone, they work full-time, using the judicial system to change public policy.

The scope and nature of the "high-impact litigation" by these dedicated activists with law degrees is regularly reflected in *Clearinghouse Review*, a publication financed by OEO through a grantee at the Northwestern University School of Law.

The August 1973 edition of the magazine is typical, with case reports on legal services activities as diverse as a class action attack on the U.S. Postal Service for refusing to hire persons with histories of illegal drug abuse, a suit against Roy Ash, the head of the Office of Management and Budget, challenging the President's impoundment of funds for environmental programs, and a U.S. Supreme Court appeal insisting on the right of an unmarried minor to obtain contraceptives.

Other recent or pending cases receiving aid through the OEO program include:

A Pennsylvania suit challenging the detention of a convicted felon accused of committing an additional crime while free on bail;

A Washington State suit in which attorneys of the Prison Legal Services Project argued that their client, imprisoned on a marijuana charge, had been subjected to cruel and unusual punishment;

A Miami case arguing that seizure of an automobile by the U.S. Bureau of Customs in connection with an allegation of illegal possession of drugs violated the plaintiff's right to due process;

A Merced, Calif., case to gain reinstatement of a high school student accused by school administrators of participating in a race riot and improperly having in his possession a bicycle chain;

A suit by the Western Center on Law and Poverty contesting a college's termination of federal aid to a student convicted of battery in connection with a campus racial melee;

New York and Hawaii suits, knocking down the requirement that government employees be citizens of the United States;

A class action demanding that an Iowa statute prohibiting the civil service employment of convicted felons to be set aside;

A successful challenge to the denial to aliens of Medicare supplemental medical insurance benefits;

A suit supporting the demand of the Eastern Kentucky Welfare Rights Organization that tax-exempt status be denied hospitals refusing to provide free services to poor people;

A Boston class action challenging the city's right to discontinue or threaten to discontinue methadone treatment without a hearing;

A suit by the National Juvenile Law Center against parents who withdrew their child from psychiatric treatment;

A San Francisco Youth Law Project challenge to the State of California's attempt to reconvict a juvenile defendant of second degree murder after his initial conviction was reduced by a juvenile court judge to manslaughter;

A Missouri suit questioning the transfer to adult court jurisdiction of a minor charged with four counts of murder;

A West Virginia case demanding that the warden of the State penitentiary show cause why a prisoner should be denied his liberty before assigning the prisoner to solitary confinement;

A Norwalk, Conn., case challenging the authority of the state welfare department to close down a local welfare office solely on the grounds of administrative efficiency.

Although the above list represents only a partial sampling of one month's reported activity, it is well to observe that many of the cases described appear to have been undertaken in clear violation of regulations and statutes governing legal services activity.

Theoretically, OEO-funded attorneys are precluded from providing representation to those who are not poor or who are voluntarily poor, and in criminal cases. Unfortunately, these prohibitions, drafted with gaping loopholes, have been broadly interpreted and weakly enforced by the national office of legal services.

This points clearly to the need for Congress to spell out with precision the uses to which it wishes legal services appropriations to be put.

Shall legal services be provided so that minor children may bring suit against their parents? Are non-citizens to be represented while needy children are turned away? Are suits on behalf of prison inmates to be allowed at the expense of the noncriminal poor? Should attorneys for the poor be concentrating on marijuana and student disorder cases?

These are just a few of the questions which the U.S. Senate should face when it takes up the proposal for a Legal Services Corporation later this month. For, while attention has focused on presidential usurpation of congressional power, legal services attorneys seem to be having a far greater impact on the course of public policy than either Richard Nixon or Carl Albert.

#### SOUTHERN JOURNALISM LOSES A LEADER

### HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, one of the South's most astute political columnists passed away unexpectedly yesterday in Memphis, Tenn. William B.



Street, political editor of the Memphis Commercial Appeal, was respected throughout the South by fellow journalists and politicians alike.

Bill Street was my friend, but our friendship never kept him from taking issue with me when he felt it necessary. I would sometimes call on him for advice on important matters and his comments always cut through to the basic facts. He was a master at paring away the rhetoric and getting to the real issues involved.

The Memphis Commercial Appeal has lost a man of stature. Its readers will miss Bill's sharp and incisive columns. I have lost a good friend and want to express openly my condolences to his wife, Maxine, and the rest of his family.

THE HONORABLE J. VAUGHAN  
GARY

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of sadness and a deep sense of personal loss that I received word of the passing of my good and longtime friend and former colleague, J. Vaughan Gary of Virginia on last September 6.

Vaughan Gary served his country well and often in many and diverse capacities. He was a soldier during the First World War, a practicing lawyer in Richmond, president of the Richmond Bar Association, and a trustee of the University of Richmond. His service to both his State and his country continued with his service in the Virginia General Assembly from 1926 to 1934.

After leaving the legislature his public service continued as chairman of the Virginia advisory legislature council committee. He was also a leader in the study of the interaction of Federal and State governments in slum clearance and penal reform.

In 1945, Vaughan was elected to the House of Representatives and served here for 20 years until his retirement in 1965 at the age of 72. It was my great honor to have served with Vaughan Gary on the Appropriations Committee, January 28, 1946, until his retirement. We served together on the State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary Subcommittee of which I was chairman, and on Foreign Aid Subcommittee of which he was chairman.

Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to have known and served with Vaughan. He was a true Virginia gentleman, with whom I traveled over most of the world. He enjoyed a host of friends on both sides of the aisle during his two decades in the House. I am sure his memory is cherished by all those who knew him and that my sense of personal loss is shared by many, both in this Chamber and in the other body.

To Mrs. Gary and her family, I extended the Rooneys' deepest sympathy and personal condolences.

AMBASSADOR YASUKAWA'S SPEECH  
TO JAPAN-AMERICAN SOCIETY  
OF WASHINGTON

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Takeshi Yasukawa of Japan made his first speech since coming to the United States before the Japan-America Society of Washington on October 11.

As one who served in Washington more than 10 years ago from 1957 to 1961, Ambassador Yasukawa is an old friend of the United States and it is a pleasure for me to welcome him to the United States in his new capacity.

Ambassador Yasukawa's speech was a statesmanlike address and I was gratified to find in it his belief in the firm bond uniting Japan and the United States through our joint commitment to democratic freedoms.

The Ambassador's speech was also notable for its measured and frank discussion of the security and economic problems which face our two countries and for his confidence that these problems would be solved through cooperation between us.

Because of his excellent statement of our problems and his optimistic appraisal of their solution, I am pleased to submit Ambassador Yasukawa's speech herewith for the information of my colleagues.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS BY H. E. TAKESHI YASUKAWA

It is a great pleasure and honor for me to have this opportunity to make by first speech as Japan's Ambassador to the United States before the Japan-America Society of Washington.

I served in our Embassy in Washington more than 10 years ago, from 1957 to 1961, and tonight I am very pleased to meet many old friends I have known since then. Tonight, I have also a great pleasure of meeting many new friends and nothing is more encouraging and reassuring in performing my duties as Ambassador than to meet old friends and new friends all assembled in this room.

In the realm of international relations there are many dimensions. There are the economic dimensions, the political ones, and there are also the cultural dimensions. Your distinguished Society symbolizes the human dimension in U.S.-Japanese relations at its best. You are the personification of what is finest, most sensitive, and most informed in this respect, and as a result, the Japan-America Society is an important forerunner for advancing greater understanding and rapport between our two countries.

Your invitation therefore gives me a very welcome opportunity to share with you my views of U.S.-Japanese relations as they are today, and also to offer you my hopes and expectations for the future.

The timing is appropriate for another reason. The partnership between our two countries, which has matured very rapidly over the past quarter century—and especially over the last few years—has now reached a critical threshold. Indeed, the entire structure of international relations is in transition. The cold war confrontation is hopefully being eased by cautious steps toward a more stable and less dangerous deterrent balance and by the gradual expansion of East-West commercial and other exchanges, although we have a long way to go before a truly stable

and lasting peace can be established all over the world.

North-South relations, between the developed one third and the developing two thirds of the world's peoples, are also being transformed by such "new" issues as the threatened gap between world demand and supply of energy resources, industrial raw materials and food, as well as by the demands of the developing countries for increased capital and technology.

Simultaneously, the international economic structures which have supported over the last quarter century the most rapid world economic growth and trade expansion in history may no longer be fully adequate to meet the world's current and future needs.

All these developments at once are now compelling governments and private interests around the globe to examine new trends and forces, and to weigh possible solutions which in many cases have little precedent in the past.

As Prime Minister Tanaka observed during his recent visit to the United States, "world politics have reached the most significant turning point since the war." The new dimension of our time, Mr. Tanaka indicated, is an "international interdependence" which creates "challenges (that) can be met only through global cooperation, and especially through the close collaboration of Japan, the United States and Europe." It is precisely this new dimension in the Japanese-American partnership that I should like to explore with you today.

The enduring foundations for our trans-Pacific partnership were succinctly summarized by President Nixon and Prime Minister Tanaka in the joint communique they issued, following their summit talks in Washington, last August 1. These are: "a common political philosophy of individual liberties and open societies, and a sense of interdependence."

Japan and the United States are firmly bound together by our shared commitment to democratic freedoms. This same bond, of course, also links Japan to the other great democracies as well, and it is one of the reasons why Secretary of State Kissinger has been seeking lately about what amounts to an Atlantic-Pacific community of democratic powers.

Given this common philosophical foundation, Japan and the United States have developed a natural interdependence over the last two decades. At the peak of cold war tensions in the early 1950s, our two countries entered into a mutual security arrangement, which was renewed and revised in 1966. Under the treaty, the United States is committed to defend Japan against an armed attack. Japan, on its side, provided military bases to the United States as a contribution to the maintenance of peace and security in the Far East. These security links remain in force and are still the ultimate guarantee of Japan's security.

As I mentioned before, the world is now moving from an era of confrontation to one of dialogue. As a result, one now hears an argument in Japan that we no longer need the U.S.-Japan Security Pact. But I cannot accept such an argument. The most important element for the security and development of a country is for people to be able to do their day-to-day work with a sense of security. The Japanese people have been able to devote themselves to nation building, the economic development of their country, in particular, with such a sense of security for the last 20 years. Though world tension is becoming more relaxed, if the U.S.-Japan Security Pact were to be abolished, it is easy to foresee how insecure many Japanese would feel.

On the other hand, I realize that not a small number of Americans feel that Japan's defense efforts, in comparison with the com-

commitments given by the United States for the defense of Japan, are inadequate. I cannot accept this argument either. In the small territory of Japan, crowded with 104 million people, large U.S. bases are maintained. The Japanese government, in order to maintain these U.S. bases effectively, takes heavy responsibilities not only financially, but also politically and psychologically. I should like to refer, in this respect, to the testimony of former Secretary of State Rogers who said that these U.S. bases in Japan contributed not only to the defenses of Japan, but also to the peace and security of the Far East, and thereby served the interests of the United States itself. The U.S.-Japan Security Pact therefore conforms to the mutual interests of both Japan and the United States.

Furthermore, Japan's Self-Defense Forces, which currently consume about one percent of the gross national product, are now undergoing a five-year \$15 billion modernization program, which will greatly improve Japan's self-defense capabilities within her constitutional limits.

On the economic front also, the Japanese-American interdependence has matured over the years, and has changed significantly in quality and potential. For many years—in fact, even in the late 19th century—the United States has been the principal market for Japanese exports. The nature and quality of these exports has changed enormously, however, especially during the last decade or so as the fast-growing Japanese economy has become increasingly competitive in high-technology, high-quality industrial and consumer goods.

For the United States, Japan has long been its largest overseas market, second in value only to the continental U.S.-Canadian trade. Moreover, U.S. exports to Japan are more diversified than U.S. exports to any other country. Japan is by far the world's largest customer for American farm products. In the last U.S. fiscal year, Japan became the first country in the world to import more than \$2 billion of American agricultural commodities a year. Japan is also a major world market for both U.S. raw materials and manufactured goods, including a high growth in demand for very high technology manufacturers—computers, aircraft, machine tools, etc.—and for quality consumer goods, such as home appliances and sporting goods and high-fashion apparel.

As might be expected in so vast and complex economic interdependence, we have had our share of problems—on both sides—in this relationship. Until the mid-1960s, most of the problems were on the Japanese side—substantial trade deficits with the United States and chronic payments deficits on a multilateral basis. During the mid-60s the deficits shifted to the U.S. side. And, during the last two years, as overall U.S. trade slipped into unprecedented deficits, Japan found itself in the unaccustomed position of being America's largest creditor on trade account, and a major surplus country in foreign currency reserves.

You will recall that it has taken a number of cooperative measures among all the principal trading and financial powers—including two successive multilateral currency realignments—to begin to reverse the deficit trend in U.S. trade. Japan took the most stringent measures in this joint global effort, including a 36 percent upvaluation in the yen against the dollar, unilateral tariff cuts and removal of quantitative restrictions and other trade barriers, selective export restraints, accelerated purchases of U.S. exports, an accelerated outflow of Japanese direct foreign investments, and a virtually complete decontrol of foreign investment in Japan.

You are also aware, I am sure, of the rapid and very welcome results of these combined efforts to restore equilibrium to U.S. imports from Japan grew by only 10.4 percent over

the same period in 1972, while U.S. exports to Japan increased 68.6 percent. The U.S. deficit in its trade with Japan will almost certainly be cut in half this year, and should be in near balance once again within another 12 to 24 months. Largely as a result of the multilateral currency realignments, overall U.S. trade is also moving toward the black, and may be in reasonable balance by the end of 1973.

The efforts made by the United States in controlling domestic inflation, increasing the productivity of its industry and encouraging its industry to exploit foreign sales opportunities, undoubtedly, have made essential contribution to the improvement of the situation and the maintenance and furtherance of such efforts are expected in the future.

Much more important, probably, we need to understand that the world economy will never be quite the same again, now that we have crossed this historic threshold. One of the most important features is the emergence of new economic powers, such as the enlarged European community and Japan. The Soviet Union, China and the other centrally planned economies have so far had only a marginal impact on wider international trade, but that impact may increase rapidly.

And, as I suggested earlier, the resource-rich developing countries are demanding a much larger voice in world economic affairs, and a much larger share of world capital, technology, management expertise, and the benefits of economic growth and social modernization.

The most urgent task the world faces is to develop workable solutions to these common problems. We have reached a historic turning point where we need to cooperate creatively on the basis of our interdependence which has newly emerged.

High on our agenda is the job of restoring a healthy momentum to world trade expansion. The abnormal trade imbalances of the last couple of years not only undermined world monetary and price stability, they also revived protectionist formulas which threatened the orderly development of international trade. The GATT negotiations on trade which were successfully launched last month by the Ministerial Conference held in Tokyo, must succeed in upholding the principle of free trade while making necessary adjustments to the world trade mechanism to meet our present needs.

The healthy expansion of the world economy naturally requires world monetary reform. We must combine all our efforts to reach satisfactory solutions on this important issue by July next year as agreed in Nairobi last month. The most careful attention must also be paid to the problem of ensuring equitable access to finite energy resources and essential minerals and other industrial raw materials—especially in times of political stress. And the advanced industrialized democracies would also be wise to pool their research efforts in the development of alternative energy sources and raw materials substitutes.

There are a number of other difficult questions on our immediate agenda. One is inflation, which is apparently endemic in some measure to all high-growth, high-consumption societies, and which has become an international rather than a purely domestic concern. Another is industrial pollution and the management of environmental quality. This has also become an international concern first, because it is a costly byproduct of industrialization and second, because the effects of air and water contamination are not contained by imaginary national boundaries.

Perhaps the most urgent common problem we face is the challenge of speeding economic modernization of the developing regions. This is a matter, not of choice, but of necessity to endure future world stability and peace, to sustain world economic growth and

prosperity, and to fulfill the legitimate aspiration of well over half the world's population.

Aid to the developing nations is, in fact, one of the stoutest pillars in Japan's foreign policy. Japan's annual aid outflow, which reached two and three quarters billion dollars last year, is second only to U.S. aid in value, and represents nearly 1% of our GNP. Japan's economic cooperation program is expanding steadily in value, and should match current U.S. aid levels in several years. For example, Japan is assuming a larger share of the economic aids to developing countries in Asia.

Of course, this does not mean that the role of the United States has diminished. On the contrary, it remains highly important. I am convinced that this provides one of the areas where Japan and the United States can most effectively cooperate. In this connection, I should like to emphasize that aid to the developing countries enjoys full support of our people. Deeply committed to the promotion of international security and peace, the people of Japan believe that a generous and effective foreign aid program is their principal contribution in this respect.

Now, I have referred to some of the important problems we face today. Although many of these problems are economic in origin, their political significance can never be ignored.

Japan is already trying to broaden its participation in world affairs, both multilaterally and bilaterally. Following Prime Minister Tanaka's visit to the United States, Japan has been very active in the current session of the United Nations, where it is contributing not only at the policy level, but to which it has also made a substantial financial contribution to ease the problems of this world-organization.

Moreover, as you are aware, Prime Minister Tanaka has been busy since late September in a broadly-based trip to Europe and the Soviet Union. His travels have been described in American newspapers as "the most extensive round of international summitry ever undertaken by a Japanese Prime Minister". Certainly his trip symbolizes a new phase in Japan's role in the world, in which it is trying to strengthen its ties and understanding with the European nations, and also to underscore that Japan is very much involved in world affairs today. This is another indication that Japan is preparing to "carry more load", politically and economically, in the international field.

For my part, I am optimistic about the future, Japan is not a large country; it is barely the size of California, with half the population of the United States. It is also a very vulnerable country—crowded and strategically vulnerable in this age of weapons of mass destruction, and vulnerable also in the sense that it depends for survival on imports of 90 percent or more of its energy and raw materials requirements. Very clearly, Japan's vital interests lie in a world that is at peace, and is working together to share the benefits of stable growth and prosperity. It is understandable, therefore, that we Japanese are eager to make our full contribution to the building of a more peaceful and more prosperous world society.

There is another important reason for my optimism. This is the extraordinary experience our two countries have shared in building one of the most productive and dynamic partnerships in the history of international relations. It is a remarkable relationship because our two peoples are, in so many respects, different and even distant from each other's comprehension. We had profound differences in an earlier generation, and we have had misunderstandings and even apprehensions of each other over the past few years. As my Prime Minister mentioned when he visited here last summer, "our capacity



to communicate with each other is seldom equal to the demands of our evolving relationship."

Yet our relationship has evolved and matured. We have surmounted our most difficult problems, and are learning new reasons for broadening and deepening our cooperation. The United States and Japan, the two most productive societies in the community of democratic nations, are making their interdependence work for the common good.

That, I believe, is the most exciting dimension of the Japanese-American partnership, and a living demonstration to the world that peace and cooperation are indeed possible.

Let me thank you once more for your kind invitation to be with you this evening, and for your courteous attention. In speaking before the members of the Japan-America Society, I feel that I am speaking with understanding friends rather than to a number of persons in the United States who understand and are interested in Japan and U.S.-Japanese relations will grow substantially. For in the final analysis, the human dimension is the critical one, and our mutual capacity for understanding is the key for consolidating and amplifying the progress which has already been made.

Thank you most sincerely.

#### YOUNG REPUBLICANS CONCERNED OVER PROPOSED UNICEF CONTRIBUTIONS

**HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in the October 4 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I pointed out that UNICEF, a United Nations agency heavily dependent on American financial contributions, is on the verge of giving aid to both North Vietnam and Communist controlled areas in South Vietnam. UNICEF's executive board has already authorized extending aid to North Vietnam and to the Communists in the South as part of a \$30 million program for Indochina in 1973-74. Recent reports indicate that Hanoi is now negotiating with UNICEF officials in order to obtain this assistance.

The Young Republican National Committee, representing approximately 500,000 young Americans, has expressed its concern over the proposed UNICEF contributions. At its board meeting on October 21, the National Committee adopted the following resolution:

Whereas, the United States has spent over 46,000 lives; \$150,000,000,000+; and 10 years fighting a "no-win" war in Vietnam, and

Whereas, the American people expressed strong opposition to the proposals for giving post-war aid to Communist North Vietnam, and

Whereas, UNICEF has stated their intent to supply aid to North Vietnam and Communist controlled areas of South Vietnam and

Whereas, UNICEF receives about 30% of its budget from the United States Government and additional funds from voluntary contributions from American citizens, especially on Halloween of each year, therefore

Be it resolved, that the Young Republican National Federation urges the state and local Y.R. organizations to inform their local communities of the intent of UNICEF to supply aid to North Vietnam and Communist controlled areas of South Vietnam.

I commend the Young Republican National Committee for adopting this resolution. Young Republicans can play a major role in educating their communities on this important issue.

#### CAFETERIA PRICES FOR GENERALS

**HON. LES ASPIN**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I recently revealed that while Pentagon cafeteria prices continue to climb, Army generals can still gorge themselves of a sumptuous full-course meal for only \$1.

The Star-News enterprising columnist, John Cramer, has discovered that the chief of the Army Materiel Command, Gen. Henry A. "Hank" Miley, has a similar mess operating at the AMC's new headquarters in Alexandria.

General Miley recently spent \$12,000 to set up carpeting and to equip his 10th floor commanding generals mess.

Mr. Cramer compares cost of a full meal for the general at his mess—\$1.70—to the same meal purchased by the ordinary civil servant in the regular AMC cafeteria at \$3.67. Now, Mr. Speaker, a general makes at least \$40,000 when all his benefits are added in. A secretary probably earns less than \$10,000. Mr. Speaker, why is it that the highly paid general buys a cheap meal, while a secretary making four times less pays more than double for the same meal? I wonder what General Miley's answer is?

Mr. Cramer's article follows:

GENERAL MILEY'S MESS BEATS SECRETARY'S,  
\$1.70 TO \$3.67

(By John Cramer)

The millicrats do very nicely when it comes to lunching in style—cheaply and partly at taxpayer expense.

Take four-star Gen. Henry A. (Hank) Miley who bosses the big Army Materiel Command from new headquarters on Eisenhower Avenue in Alexandria.

Recently, he spent \$12,000 (a one-time expense to the taxpayers but with continuing cost for lost office space) to set up, carpet and equip a 10th-floor Commanding General's Mess, seating 30 generals, colonels and top civilians.

He staffs it, full-time, with a warrant officer and four enlisted men (at continuing cost to taxpayers).

In Miley's mess, a cocktail costs 55 cents and a beer 50. In a first floor bar, called the Supply Room, where the working stiffs can buy a drink, a cocktail goes for \$1.25 and a beer for 75 cents, though occasional "specials" offer lower prices.

Miley's mess has waiter service. The hired hands pay a premium for it if they eat in the Supply Room. Most elect an adjoining cafeteria, where all items are sold a la carte; no specials.

Lunch in Miley's mess still costs a flat \$1.25, though official word is that it soon will go to \$1.50. On any given day it offers a choice of two entrees.

So, just for fun, I took a typical entree from a typical Miley menu (Aug. 31) and priced the general's lunch at what his secretary would have had to pay had she bought the same items at price-controlled rates in the AMC cafeteria.

I assumed that both had a single pre-

lunch cocktail—his at 55 cents, hers at \$1.25—plus a modest 15-cent tip. Then, when the secretary moved next door to the cafeteria, she found herself paying:

Soup du jour: bean with bacon or jellied tomato madrilaine, 35 cents.

Ham and asparagus roll, with cheddar cheese sauce, 95 cents.

Southern style corn, 25 cents; hot roll, 10 cents; butter, 3 cents.

Lemon pudding, sherbet or ice cream, 25 cents.

Large coffee, 25 cents.

So, including a cocktail, Miley and company would end up paying \$1.70 with waiter service. The secretary, with a 4 percent sales tax on \$2.18 for her lunch, would pay \$3.67. (No tax on a general's mess.)

Moreover, we can assume that the servings in the general's mess are fairly generous and not subject to the strict portion control typical of government cafeterias. We further can assume that it's permissible to ask for "seconds."

In fairness to the general, let it be said that executive dining rooms are common in both industry and nondefense U.S. agencies though never, ever staffed by military personnel.

In fairness, too, let it be added that Miley is something of a pliker free-loader compared with other top brass in the area.

A later review in this column will report just how handsomely Pentagon millicrats lunch at taxpayer expense.

#### NATIONAL SECURITY: THE DOLLAR IMPACT

**HON. FLOYD SPENCE**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, since becoming a Member of Congress my primary interest has been national defense. I have devoted a great deal of time to studying the relative strengths and weaknesses of our military posture in the world, vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. As in the case of most of those who have troubled to research this complex subject, digging beyond the rhetoric for a close look at the facts, I have become alarmed. In my opinion, it is increasingly important that we somehow make the American people aware of what our country faces militarily.

Fortunately, among those who have taken the initiative in this area is an especially able colleague of ours, who is also a close personal friend. Congressman LARRY HOGAN has supplied a very effective and articulate voice to the one priority which transcends all others in importance—that of national security. I, for one, am grateful for LARRY's efforts in this regard, and I know that millions of Americans share my respect and admiration for his vital work.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, Congressman HOGAN delivered an address which was exemplary of those outstanding contributions which I mentioned earlier. It is important that each of us has the opportunity to read and consider the points LARRY made in the speech he delivered before the national security symposium of the Reserve Officers Association on October 18, 1973. Therefore, I submit the address by Congress-

man HOGAN, entitled "National Security: The Dollar Impact," to be printed in the RECORD at this point:

**NATIONAL SECURITY: THE DOLLAR IMPACT**  
(Address by Congressman LARRY HOGAN)

I want to talk today about the relationship between our economy and our military expenditures for national defense.

One of the most important upward pressures on inflation is, of course, government spending. Costs balloon when the federal budget rises, and the rising federal budget balloons costs still further. In 1960 we were spending less than one hundred billion dollars. Today we are spending over two and one-half times that amount. If we are to get a handle on rising prices, we will have to get a handle on government spending.

However, while virtually everyone extols the virtues of thrift, especially for Uncle Sam, specifically where the cuts should come is one of the most complex and difficult areas of deliberation which Congress faces.

One part of the budget that receives a great deal of attention, primarily because its size makes such a spectacular target, is defense spending. But it is our allocations for defense that deserve the most thoughtful and meticulous scrutiny of all, for our survival as a nation is at stake.

America is blessed with a very broad economic base that provides more goods and services to more people than any other nation in the world. Our gross national product is well over a trillion dollars. We could never have developed that kind of economic base and industrial capability if we had been weak. We have had both the ability and the resolve to protect our national interests.

Our ties to other nations grow more important all the time. Our trade in essential raw materials is growing. For some time we have looked overseas to get a large share of aluminum and manganese and tin. But now our own resources of all types of materials are diminishing, and we are blocking access to some of our other resources. In the immediate years to come, we will begin to import at least half of the iron, lead and tungsten we need. Petroleum imports are growing at tremendous rates.

The demand for petroleum is one of the most visible problems. If your gas station is closed when you run out of gas, or if you could get only ten gallons last time you wanted to fill the tank, you were feeling the pinch first-hand.

Last winter schools and factories in the midwest had to shut down from shortages of heating oil, and this spring farmers did not have sufficient fuel to dry crops. The worst might be yet to come.

The lesson that energy is an essential ingredient in our economy is not new, but it is being driven home with more force now than ever before.

Regardless of the arguable reasons for the shortages we face, one fact is clear: As our demand for energy escalates, our need for imported oil is going up with it. Domestic petroleum production has leveled off, exploration, for various reasons, is decreasing, but demand for energy in this country is growing at almost five percent a year. The shortage will largely be filled with oil, and the oil supply will have to come from the Middle East where Iran and the Arab States have the available reserves. We brought in only 4 to 8 percent of our total oil supply from the Middle East last year. By 1985 the share will have grown to 30 or 40 percent. If an oil tap that large were ever cut off, it would create more problems than a few motorists staying home on a vacation weekend. The economy might be mortally wounded.

At a time when our economic dependence on imported oil is increasing, potential threats that might deny access to that oil are increasing as well. The Arabs have just

increased rates and indicated they intend to cut production.

Control of sea lanes by the U.S. Navy is no longer a foregone conclusion. The Soviet Navy has been growing by leaps and bounds to the point that Capt. John Moore, editor of the highly respected *Jane's Fighting Ships*, recently suggested that the Soviets have overtaken us as the number one naval power. They continue to build submarines and increase submarine construction capacity. Their fleet has now been expanded to include one deployed and at least one aircraft carrier under construction. The use of aircraft carriers is a wholly new area of sea control for the Soviet Union.

The presence of these ships and the Russian manned missile sites are not aimed at Israel but rather at our own fleet.

The size of the Soviet fleet is sobering but so is global reach. Their presence in the Mediterranean has been boosted to a complement of over 60 ships, and they are well established in the Indian Ocean. There is a clear possibility—and a dangerous one because of the location of the oil-rich Persian Gulf—that the Indian Ocean will become a private pond for the Russian Navy.

The existence of all those foreign ships does not necessarily suggest the likelihood of hostilities in the foreseeable future. But oil is so vital to our economy that we would be foolish to disregard the potential threat if our supply lines are cut off during some crisis.

Relaxed tension between the East and the West cannot assure our security, and this is not the time for our country to be lulled into the belief that a promising outlook for detente obviates the need to be strong militarily. I welcome better relations in the world, as everyone does, but I am also aware of the needs of national security and the importance of maintaining our strength. During a recent speech here on the Hill, the West German Defense Minister observed that there were not three different Soviet Unions, one with whom we have detente, one who is backing Arab hostilities and another in conflict with Red China, they are all one and the same.

Raw materials in general, and oil in particular, are not our only economic ties to the outside world. The interdependence of all nations has been growing steadily for years. Trade statistics reflect our own increased involvement. Six years ago the United States exported over thirty billion dollars in goods and imported a little more than 26 billion dollars in goods from other countries. Last year, five years later, the United States exported over 48 billion dollars and imported over 55 billion dollars in goods. This economic fact of life has a dramatic effect on our military posture.

Some effects of our trade have had highly visible impacts on the country: The wheat deal with the Soviet Union, imports of automobiles and cotton products from Western Europe and a variety of imports from Japan. Multinational corporations have grown in size and influence, and foreign direct investment in American domestic industry has increased suddenly in the last year. This also has serious ramifications for our position in the world balance of power.

All of this points to growing economic interdependence in the world. Our economy is now very sensitive to the degree of cooperation, good relations, and support of our allies, and even our adversaries.

In spite of this, critics of defense spending want to make unilateral reductions in American manpower stationed abroad and cut back military support and assistance to weaker countries, as well as to reduce our weapon and hardware development and production. Nothing could do more to undermine the confidence of allies and raise questions about the integrity of American

commitments and threaten our own security. You simply cannot implement that kind of policy in isolation. That is, you cannot alter sensitive security and military policy without affecting trade and monetary relations. Where such action might have been feasible years ago, today it works against the orderly progress of important negotiations and the general stability of international economic relations.

As an interesting side comment, many of those who have been the most vociferous foes of military spending are now clamoring for the shipment of more arms and planes to Israel. Apparently they don't see this as any way impractical or paradoxical.

The protection of trade relations is one area that requires us to spend money on defense. The economic consequences of *not* spending that money go far beyond the potential threat of trade disruption. Other consequences strike at the functioning heart of the domestic economy in a direct way.

The Defense Department is far and away the biggest business organization in the world. During the last fiscal year DOD employed a little over one million civilians and paid them twelve-and-a-half billion dollars. There are currently 2,350,000 men and women in uniform here and abroad. The economies of many sections in the country are intensely dependent on military installations. In any one area, removal of an installation, or part of it, would create an economic vacuum. (Again in the hypocrisy by many of those Congressmen who argued the loudest for military cutbacks, screamed the loudest when military bases in their congressional districts were closed.) But the point I'm trying to make that our domestic economy can be seriously delocated by defense cuts.

The effect of removing base functions and dock facilities from New England is devastating. Rhode Island estimates the loss and dislocation of over 25,000 jobs in a region where unemployment is already high. The direct payroll loss equals five percent of the state's total income, with secondary effects of lost local expenditures magnifying the impact. Massachusetts, also in the throes of unemployment, is being hit as hard. In other words if the defense worker has no money to shop in his local stores, those whose livelihood are dependent upon those stores are also dislocated.

Severe economic dislocations are even more likely to occur when funding reductions are made in military research, development and procurement. The impact of lost contracts for specialized industry creates pockets of economic depression around the country.

Over seven percent of the country's total work force is employed in defense. The proportion of defense-related employment in manufacturing is comparable to the overall seven percent ratio. There are also large numbers of defense-related employees in mining, transportation, communications and electronics.

At the peak of the Vietnam war, 1968, one-tenth of the work force was in defense in one form or another. Five-and-one-half percent of private business employment was involved in defense work. Three years later, total defense employment had dropped two-and-one-half percent, and defense-related employment in private business had dropped an incredible two percent to three-and-one-half percent.

Reduction of men in uniform because of the ends of our involvement in Southeast Asia, has put more men into the domestic workforce and this aggravates the unemployment problem created by defense cutbacks.

It is no coincidence that overall unemployment in the country rose a little more than two percent over the same period as defense spending decreased. The unemployment ills of the country in the last two or



more years have been closely tied to reduced government purchasing power in the defense field.

A particularly disconcerting aspect of defense unemployment is its impact on highly skilled groups in the work force. Part of America's greatness is her reserve of skilled manpower, and our economy is rooted in the innovations and technological progress created by a broad base of scientists and engineers. Think of the automobile, the sewing machine, the jet engine, nuclear power, computers, or the laser. Breakthroughs like these hold together our complex economic structure. Let the reservoir of scientists dry up, let the expertise of engineers waste away, neglect the training of technicians, and the economy will stagnate.

Defense spending on research, development and procurement has a lot to do with the skilled manpower resources and industrial base for the economy as a whole. Defense industries support and provide the scientists that ultimately contribute to innovations in the civilian sector. Progress in defense technology spills over into useful benefits in non-military areas. Progress in one area is inseparable from progress in the other for industries such as aviation, communications, medicine and electronics. Communication satellites are one important example among many. The early exploration in this area was done by the Army Signal Corps. Since then, the work has expanded into a multi-million-dollar industry.

Take away defense contracts, and highly educated and experienced scientists and engineers are deprived of their jobs, with virtually no opportunity for similar employment. Only two years ago there were nearly 100,000 unemployed workers in the aerospace industry. This can have serious implications for the continued advance of aerospace technology and recruitment of young scientists into the field. Fortunately, many of the very large number of unemployed scientists are back at work, but not without a battle.

Take the B-1 bomber as an example. It is estimated that the 13.6 billion dollars gross investment in this system will generate a cumulative rise of 37 billion dollars in the gross national product. That means 60,000 aerospace jobs and 100,000 supporting jobs around the country. The tax revenue returned to our Treasury from the resulting incomes could be as much as seven billion dollars for the federal government and four billion dollars for state and local governments. In spite of that economic picture, the bomber has been a highly controversial project and has been threatened with cancellation more than once.

Just as we need to maintain a strong base of skilled manpower in the country, we also have to see that vital industrial capacity does not seriously erode from neglect.

There are a number of highly specialized industries in the country that depend on government contracts for their survival. As has become evident in recent years, they simply do not have the financial strength to carry enormous overhead costs, much less tool up for new projects on their own without government contract support.

The dangers of withdrawing that support over the long term are two-fold. First, we will undermine our basic industrial capacity. Industrial potential has been one of the pillars of America's greatness in facing crises. Its importance was clearly demonstrated in World War II.

Second, we will lose the technological edge that enables us to maintain a healthy trading position with other industrialized nations. This country has long been on the frontier of technology, and we are traditionally the leading exporter of sophisticated machines and equipment. The competitive edge will be quickly lost to Europe and Japan if we give our specialized industries no support. Without arguing the merits of the plane,

that is exactly what we did by canceling the supersonic transport, a plane that is being produced now by England and France together. The balance-of-payments loss we suffer from canceling that project may prove to be very costly as well as the domestic employment.

Shipbuilding is a very good example of an area where defense spending is crucial. The nation has to have a strong merchant marine, particularly in this day and age. We need to carry imported oil and other products in our own ships as often as possible to reduce the outflow of American dollars. The demand around the world for tankers is growing at such a pace as to question whether enough ships will be available to carry our oil. There are 47 tankers under construction or on order in this country today. Without shipbuilding subsidies from the Federal Government, this industry would have disappeared long ago.

After 1966, private shipyard employment in the United States began to drop off. Employment in naval shipyards had already begun to fall by then. But now we have managed to turn that trend around, and our shipbuilding potential is being revitalized. Production is beginning to move again at a vigorous pace. We are still at a competitive disadvantage with Japan in shipbuilding, as in so many other areas.

Forty-eight percent of American shipbuilding is devoted to naval vessels, and the percentage is higher if one excludes non-self-propelled vessels such as oil drilling rigs. The defense budget, then, accounts for almost half of shipyard work. After revitalizing the industry, if we turn around and cut back on support now, the immediate impact will be layoffs and lost income. If the cuts are substantial, we will have to close many of the yards and forego any hopes of competing in world shipbuilding.

In looking for savings, we must be sure not to whittle away at the substance of defense programs. The distinction between fat and lean is often not made, and criticism is too frequently directed at defense spending in general—across the board. The reason is not because particular items in the budget are unnecessary, but because the budget, on the whole, seems so large. Those large figures need to be put into perspective.

Inflation has created distortions in defense spending. If we look at recent budgets in terms of constant dollars, the squeeze between demands for drastic cuts and the demands for an adequate defense becomes evident.

While critics call for a reduction in the military budget and a reordering of priorities, the fact is that since 1968, defense spending has gone down by 34 billion constant 1974 dollars, and other federal spending has gone up by 50 billion constant dollars. In fact, defense spending is down by ten percent, again in constant dollars, since fiscal year 1964. That was before we became deeply enmeshed in the Indochina war. Were it not for the dramatic rise in costs associated with increased military wages, retirement and fringe benefits, and were it not for inflation, defense spending would be much smaller than it appears.

Indeed it is reasonable to ask: Is the level of defense spending today too small? Inflation has dangerously affected the kinds and numbers of weapons we buy today and most drastically, those we need to develop and improve. As costs rise and real purchasing power diminishes, it may be that we spend too little on defense rather than too much.

Suggestions to cut military spending even further may be motivated by a desire to hold down the federal budget and fight inflation, but the result would do a great deal more harm than good. Harm would be done not only to the military security of the country, but also to the economy. What is penny wise is often pound foolish. We can only be as

healthy economically as we are strong militarily. This fact must not be forgotten.

The economies of Japan and Germany were rebuilt at such a staggering rate because they did not have to spend money for military defense. They concentrated on profitable industries while sheltered under our very protective defense umbrella. Clearly economy and defense are inextricably entwined and established.

MAJ. GEN. CHARLES CARMIN NOBLE

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, during the great Mississippi River flood of 1973, the people of Louisiana and the entire lower Mississippi Valley came perilously close to disaster. During this period the Nation's largest river reached levels in Louisiana and throughout other valley States, not previously experienced during the lifetimes of many of the residents.

Our flood this year was the third greatest flood of the century. Only the floods of 1927 and 1937 crested at higher levels. The threat posed by these waters was far-reaching and severe. But the human suffering and loss was substantially lower than in the previous floods. By way of comparison, approximately 40 deaths were attributed to the flood this year; in 1927 the death toll was 216. During the flood period last year, some 40,000 persons were evacuated from their homes, all in an orderly manner. During the flooding of 1937, more than 800,000 persons had to leave their homes, many of them literally fleeing for their lives.

One may ask, "Why this striking difference?" I believe that the difference is that this year we had both an effective flood control system and a man who was so capable and so determined that he was going to make the system work, complete or not.

To fully appreciate the contribution of this man, we must trace the development of the situation beginning before the flood waters ever began to rise.

The residents of the lower Mississippi Valley had not experienced a major flood since 1945. Many different groups, for a variety of reasons, felt that the need for new flood control construction was not pressing. Floods were felt to be a thing of the past. Those who most depended on an effective flood control system, had been lulled into complacency by the uneventful course of recent history.

Fortunately for the residents of the lower Mississippi Valley, the President of the United States, acting at the request of the U.S. Army, had in 1971, appointed a distinguished engineer and soldier, Maj. Gen. Charles C. Noble, to serve as president of the Mississippi River Commission. Furthermore, Major General Noble would also serve as division engineer for the lower Mississippi Valley Division. As an experienced engineer, General Noble realized that floods continued to pose a major threat to the people of the Mississippi Valley. As unusually

heavy rains fell throughout the vast drainage system of the Mississippi River, he began to prepare for a major flood.

In speeches throughout the State, he warned that conditions were ripe for a major flood during 1973. He stated before a committee of the Louisiana State Legislature "I am paid to worry, so I am worrying," awoke the minds of many to the danger at hand. But, General Noble did more than worry. He was responsible for protecting the lives and property of millions of American citizens along the length of the lower Mississippi River, and he began to act to carry out that responsibility.

He began by pressing ahead with a divisionwide, flood fight exercise scheduled for the spring of 1973. In order to make the exercise as realistic for the military as for civilians, he directed that members of the levee boards and other local agencies be invited to fully integrate their activities with the Commission's plans. The feedback and the sense of involvement generated by this civilian participation strengthened the overall flood control program.

In other areas, General Noble began preparatory actions, often against the backdrop of harsh criticism. These actions were based on his concern for the residents of the Mississippi Valley whom he was sworn to protect. He knew that every effort must be made to provide the maximum possible protection to those threatened by flooding. After careful study he came to the conclusion that the existing plan for flood protection in the lower valley, the M.R. & T. project, was basically sound. This plan, expressing the intent of the Congress and the best thinking of engineers familiar with the flood protection system, would form the foundation for his decisions in the days ahead. Although the M.R. & T. project was less than half completed, General Noble had to make it as effective as possible against the flood he believed was soon to come.

From December through June, General Noble was up and down the more than 1,200 miles of the swollen river. He led the preparations for the flood in cities and towns throughout the valley. City officials and private citizens alike benefited from his advice and assistance. He kept in constant communication with local directors in areas all along the river. By keeping abreast of what was going on and what was needed, he was able to make the necessary rapid decisions that often meant life or death. He was determined that every possible effort be made to protect lives and property.

I do not believe that it would be an exaggeration to say that General Noble's efforts were a major factor in our victory over the river. His professional competence and unquestioned integrity provided the sound decisions and the responsible leadership necessary to meet the crisis. Hard decisions, in an atmosphere of conflicting pressures, had to be made to make the plan work. In these decisions, he proved time and time again that his sole desire was to protect the residents of the valley area in accordance with the adopted plan. No sign of

personal enrichment or desire for personal recognition ever colored his actions. His accomplishments, far above the call of duty, clearly mark General Noble as deserving of the highest honors this Nation can bestow.

It is ironic that at this time of highest recognition, Maj. Gen. Charles Noble is being forced to retire before the end of a normal 4-year tour of duty as president of the Mississippi River Commission. As a result of being passed over for promotion to the grade of permanent major general, General Noble will be forced to retire in August of 1974, instead of September of 1975.

Recent events clearly show that the people of the lower Mississippi Valley would be poorly served by the forced retirement of this valuable officer. He is the driving force behind the program to repair the damages to the flood control system resulting from the recent flooding. Furthermore, programs under his direction are modernizing the existing system and increasing its overall effectiveness. The successful completion of these repair and construction programs requires the unique blend of determination and experience that only General Noble can provide.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that the next selection board considering promotions to the grade of permanent major general will favorably act on Charles Carmin Noble. In the event that the board should fail to act, I hope that the President, upon appropriate recommendation from the Secretary of the Army, would grant an extension of service for this dedicated and distinguished public servant. The people of Louisiana and the entire lower Mississippi Valley need the services of Major General Noble for the full 4-year term.

#### RESOLUTION ON COMPILATION OF EVIDENCE

**HON. IKE F. ANDREWS**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, when the House reconvenes next week, I shall introduce a resolution directing the Committee on the Judiciary to prepare a compilation of information and evidence tending to prove or disprove the commission of any act by Richard M. Nixon which amounts to an impeachable offense.

I am including this resolution in the RECORD, prior to introducing it, for consideration by my colleagues and invite any who wish to do so to join in cosponsoring it:

A resolution directing the Committee on the Judiciary to prepare a compilation of information and evidence tending to prove or disprove the commission of any act by Richard M. Nixon which amounts to an impeachable offense

Whereas, in recent months allegations have been made with respect to the possible commission of impeachable offenses by Richard M. Nixon with respect to his campaign for election to the office of President in 1972

and his conduct of the office of President; and

Whereas, such allegations have created a situation of utmost national gravity and have led many citizens to request that the House of Representatives consider the initiation of impeachment proceedings; and

Whereas, the Committee on the Judiciary has begun an investigation with respect to impeachment proceedings; and

Whereas, Members of the House of Representatives should have access to and be able to assess any information and evidence which assist them in the dispassionate and thorough performance of their functions in any impeachment proceedings; and

Whereas, information and evidence are presently available from various sources, including the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities, news periodicals, and individuals, but there is no central source of information and evidence which may be used by Members of the House of Representatives; and

Whereas, it is important that there be made available to Members of the House of Representatives a central source of information and evidence tending to prove or disprove any allegation made with respect to the conduct of Richard M. Nixon: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That (a) (1) the Committee on the Judiciary (hereinafter in this resolution referred to as the "committee") shall, as a whole or through any subcommittee of the committee, conduct research and prepare a report based upon such research which compiles, categorizes, and indexes information and evidence tending to prove or disprove the commission of any act by Richard M. Nixon which may amount to an impeachable offense under section 4 of article II of the Constitution of the United States.

(2) Such report shall include a reference to any provision of Federal or State law violated by any such act and the penalty imposed for violation of such provision.

(3) In conducting such research and preparing such report, the committee shall, with respect to the alleged commission of any impeachable offense, determine those allegations on which to obtain evidence and to include in the report. The committee shall provide Richard M. Nixon with an opportunity to respond to any such allegation in any manner he deems appropriate. The committee shall include any such response as part of its report, except that such inclusion shall not delay the committee in completing such report.

(b) The committee shall, as soon as practicable, furnish to Richard M. Nixon and to each Member of the House of Representatives a copy of the report prepared by the committee under subsection (a).

#### A BASIS FOR PEACE

**HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, throughout the past few years there has been fighting in the Middle East and now with the latest outbreak of war there we must look for a lasting solution to the situation between the Arabs and the Israelis. A distinguished editor in Kansas, Whitley Austin, offered his solution in an editorial in the *Salina, Kans., Journal* on October 11 and I would like to commend it to the attention of my colleagues:



## A BASIS FOR PEACE

What could be the basis of peace in the Middle East?

After listening to both sides in the past as a reporter on the spot, I am convinced there are 2 essentials. The pride of the Arabs must be restored and Israel must be secure as an established nation.

Jerusalem, the Israeli declare, is not negotiable. They have developed it as their capital to the point that the city can not be internationalized. But because it contains the Dome of the Rock, a holy place for Moslems, the right of free access and worship for Arabs must be zealously protected.

The Palestinian refugees should be compensated for their seized lands and that long-fester wound healed.

To feed themselves, the Israeli probably must keep the Jordan valley west of the river. But the Golan Heights are chiefly of military significance. Some concessions here must be made to Syria provided it is agreed boundary lines are to be respected.

As for the Sinal, the keys are the Suez canal and Sinal oil. The Egyptians should have it back. But the Israeli also should have the right to use the canal and they should be assured of a continued oil supply, not only from Iran, their present major source, but also from Saudi Arabia.

Fold this into your Book of Genesis and see if the settlement is not along these general lines, if, indeed, the rival sons of Abraham can ever reach agreement.

## THE FORD NOMINATION

## HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I noted with interest an editorial which appeared in the October 25 Washington Post, which urged rapid action on the nomination of Representative GERALD FORD as Vice President. The 25th amendment was adopted to insure continuity in the executive branch of Government, and the letter and the spirit of that amendment demand prompt action on the Ford nomination. I include the text of the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

## THE VICE-PRESIDENTIAL VACANCY

Every political crisis produces, among other things, a rash of ill-considered statements. By way of illustration, consider the suggestion, now being widely offered, that the Congress should delay action on the nomination of Rep. Gerald R. Ford to be Vice President. There have been arguments that Congress has no obligation to take up a nomination made by a President who faces possible impeachment proceedings. There has been talk of holding Mr. Ford as a hostage for better behavior by the President. There is the possibility—which some apparently find quite tantalizing—that the congressional Democrats, by failing to confirm Mr. Nixon's nominee, could engineer the elevation of one of their own, House Speaker Carl Albert, to the presidency if Mr. Nixon should be unable to complete his term—and thus sweep their party into a position of power it could not come even close to winning in last year's election.

The first point to note about this entire approach is that Speaker Albert quite properly is having none of it. Mr. Albert said Tuesday that the House should act on the Ford nomination quickly and that a new Vice President should certainly be confirmed

before formal impeachment proceedings, if any, are begun against the President. The Speaker's concern is doubly understandable because events have placed him in a very awkward spot. As long as the vice-presidential vacancy remains, Mr. Albert faces the prospect of having to play a leading role in impeachment proceedings which could put him in the White House. Similarly, as long as his nomination is pending, Mr. Ford has such an intense and involved personal stake in the proceedings that it would, in fact, be fitting for him to take himself out of any argument over impeachment—rather than lead the defense of the President in the House, as he is now doing.

The situation is doubly entangled in the House because the Judiciary Committee must deal with not only the Ford nomination, but also the impeachment investigation and the issue of a special prosecutor. In contrast, the Senate Rules Committee is not overburdened and should be able to process the nomination expeditiously. It would be useful for the Senate to take the initiative—and to take its lead from majority whip Robert C. Byrd's statement the other day that the nomination should not be held up, but should "rise or fall" on Mr. Ford's own qualifications for the vice-presidential post.

Such calls for prompt action reflect a sound understanding of the obligations imposed on Congress by both the 25th Amendment and the current low state of political affairs. In political terms, the last thing that the country wants or needs is any more distress, disunity and narrow partisanship. All this would certainly result from an attempt to hold the nomination of Mr. Ford as hostage, either to Mr. Nixon's future performance or in anticipation of the President's impeachment. Moreover, it would be profoundly wrong—and probably self-defeating as well—to try to turn impeachment into a congressional coup d'etat which would install a Democrat in the White House. That would be precisely the sort of cynical, exploitative abuse of power which the American people are now reacting so strongly against.

In contrast, there are large national benefits in the course which Speaker Albert advocates—the prompt completion of the investigations, the hearings, the committee reports, the floor debates and the votes in both houses on the nomination of Mr. Ford. Settling the issue of succession would remove one source of public uncertainty. It would also demonstrate that the Congress can perform responsibly at a time when a sense of responsibility is a precious commodity in public life.

Prompt action on the nomination also happens to be the only course which satisfies the letter and spirit of the 25th Amendment. The whole intent of Section II of that amendment is to insure that the nation will almost always have a Vice President—someone chosen specifically for that particular job, and able to bring both a reasonable degree of competence and some measure of continuity to the presidency if called on to assume that post. In other words, Section II of the amendment was approved so that the Speaker of the House would not henceforth be next in line to become President, except if an almost unthinkable disaster should remove both President and Vice President simultaneously from the scene. This reform acknowledged the fact that Speakers of the House, however able and experienced, are elected for a different job by a different, smaller constituency and sometimes, as now, by the opposition party.

Those who favor blocking the nomination of Mr. Ford, and keeping Speaker Albert next in line, are thus urging a course which Congress and the states specifically repudiated by approving the 25th Amendment. They are also pressing a course fraught with the most dangerous kind of political mischief. It is interesting to recall that the possibility of

such perilous partisan sport was discussed during the Senate floor debate on the 25th Amendment in 1956. Then-Sen. Ross Bass (D-Tenn.) suggested that a Congress controlled by the opposition "would have much more of a problem in confirming the recommendations of the President if we knew . . . that one of our own people would go to the job next." The situation, Senator Bass said, "becomes a political bomb." To this Sen. Birch Bayh (D-Ind.), floor leader for the amendment, replied:

"I have more faith in the Congress acting in an emergency in the white heat of publicity, with the American people looking on. The last thing Congress would dare to do would be to become involved in a purely political move."

It is up to Congress to show that such faith was justified.

## TIME TO CHANGE WAY WE CHOOSE OUR VEEPS

## HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, in recent days, I have been pointing out the urgent need for the major political parties to change the system of selecting Vice-Presidential nominees. Certainly the woes that befell Democrats in 1972 and Republicans this year provide ample evidence that reforms must be instituted before the 1976 Presidential election.

I recently wrote Chairman George Bush, of the Republican National Committee, to express my concern. He has informed me that the reactivated Coordinating Committee will consider the question of the nominating process for Vice President. In addition, the Democratic Party's Commission on Vice-Presidential Selection will meet in Washington on November 7 to examine ways to reform that party's method of selecting Vice-Presidential nominees.

It is time all of us take a close look at the pitfalls in the current system. Candidates for Vice President can be nominated without even a cursory check of their qualifications. The stakes are too high for that kind of arrangement since eight Presidents have died while in office.

I have provided for the RECORD some of the editorial comment given the various alternatives proposals. The following editorial from the Ann Arbor News on October 19 offers still another point of view:

## FROM OUR POINT OF VIEW: TIME TO CHANGE WAY WE CHOOSE OUR VEEPS

The Eagleton and Agnew affairs have demonstrated the haphazard way in which this country chooses the number two person in government. This makes two times in a little more than a year that the second man on the ticket has had to get off.

Theodore White, in "The Making of the President 1972," says that the way Americans choose Vice Presidents has always been absurd.

For 17 of the past 27 years, writes White, America had been governed by Presidents who made their entry to that office from the Vice Presidency. Yet the choice for that office "is the most perfunctory and generally

the most thoughtless in the entire American political system."

That's probably no exaggeration. Spiro Agnew was the foundation stone of Nixon's southern strategy in 1968. Southern leaders such as Sen. Strom Thurmond objected to Lindsay, Percy and Reagan, among others. In the end, only Agnew and Gov. Volpe of Massachusetts were acceptable.

McGovern picked Eagleton for the normal reasons (balancing the ticket, photogenic qualities) but also in fatigue at a late hour. His background wasn't properly researched, with the result that he had to step down from the ticket weeks later when it was learned that he had a history of mental illness.

And so it goes. John F. Kennedy passed by all the logical choices and picked Lyndon Johnson because Texas was vital and he needed Johnson for the election. Eisenhower picked Nixon in 1952 on the basis of staff recommendation—or so Theodore White claims.

There ought to be a more rational system of selecting a presidential running mate. This office is simply too important for an individual to be chosen on political expediency. His selection ought not be an afterthought, the anticlimactic event in a heavy schedule for tired conventioners.

He is often a sop to the presidential nominee's defeated party rivals. Americans need the chance to scrutinize vice presidential hopefuls; they don't have that chance now. Presidential nominees pick running mates not on the basis of philosophical compatibility, but to reconcile defeated party factions. The result is often a vice presidential nominee at odds with the presidential nominee himself.

It's time to change all that. One possibility would be for candidates to announce for the office of Vice President and actively campaign for that office before the conventions. That way, press and public would have a chance to look the man over. Letting Congress pick the Vice President, as some today are proposing, doesn't seem to be any improvement over the present "catch as catch can" method.

#### FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO COLLEGE STUDENTS—PART II

#### HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, despite the recommendations of the Council for Economic Development and the Carnegie Commission that tuition at institutions of higher education should be increased, the word I get from my constituents is that tuition is already high enough, and in fact, is getting out of reach for the middle income family.

Financial assistance thus becomes a necessity, and I would like to share with my colleagues a letter which I recently wrote to Commissioner Ottina, and his reply, regarding the outlook for the next school year on Federal aid to students.

The letter and reply follows:

SEPTEMBER 27, 1973.

HON. JOHN OTTINA,  
Commissioner, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER OTTINA: I am now in the process of preparing an information

package for high school seniors regarding Federal assistance programs for post-secondary education.

I have attached a list of some specific questions relative to this, and would appreciate any answers you might provide.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

WILLIAM LEHMAN,  
Member of Congress.

#### BASIC EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANTS

1. Will BOGS grants for the 1974 school year be restricted to freshmen attending school full-time, who did not attend a post-secondary institution prior to July 1, 1974?
2. When should students apply?
3. What will be the size of grants awarded, generally?

#### GUARANTEED STUDENT LOANS

1. When should students apply?
2. Who may qualify for an interest-subsidized loan?
3. What will be the size of loans awarded?
4. What is the allowable cumulative total for Florida?

#### SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANTS

1. When should first year students apply?
2. When should upper classmen apply?
3. What is the cumulative total that may be granted for four years of study? For five?
4. What percentage of these grants have gone to students with family incomes of less than \$10,000 per year? Of less than \$7000 per year?

#### COLLEGE WORK-STUDY

1. When should first year students apply? Upper classmen?
2. What is the average annual compensation?
3. What is the range of wages which may be paid?
4. What percentage of the work-study jobs have gone to students with family incomes of less than \$10,000 per year? Of less than \$7,000 per year?

#### NATIONAL DIRECT STUDENT LOANS

1. When should first year students apply? Upper classmen?
2. What is the total cumulative loan allowable?
3. What percentage of NDSL loans have gone to students with family incomes of less than \$10,000 per year? Of less than \$7,000 per year?

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,  
Washington, D.C., October 19, 1973.

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LEHMAN: Thank you for your letter of September 27, concerning the information package about the Federally sponsored student financial aid programs which you are preparing for high school seniors. In addition to responding to the questions in the attachment to your letter, I am enclosing a recently published fact sheet describing these Federal programs.

#### BASIC EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANTS

At the present time, the extent of the 1974-75 recipient population for Basic Grants and the size of the grants are dependent upon the amount ultimately appropriated for the program. Since the amount stated in the President's budget and that proposed in the House and in the Senate differ substantially, any comments on your first and third questions about Basic Grants would be highly speculative. The Basic Grant applications for the 1974-75 academic year are expected to be available in

February 1974. Students should apply as soon as the forms become available.

#### GUARANTEED STUDENT LOANS

To insure that the student has funds in hand at the appropriate time, we suggest that he initiate the application process for a Guaranteed Student Loan about three months prior to the time he will need the money to meet his educational costs. Any student who demonstrates a need for the funds to meet his educational costs according to a need analysis performed by the financial aid officer at his college and reviewed by the lending institution may qualify for interest benefits. A student may borrow up to \$2,500 per academic year from a lender in Florida if his educational costs require borrowing to that extent. Total loans outstanding may not exceed \$7,500 for undergraduate or vocational students. This maximum may be extended to \$10,000 for students who borrow for graduate study.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANTS, COLLEGE WORK-STUDY EMPLOYMENT, AND NATIONAL DIRECT STUDENT LOANS

These three Federal student financial aid programs are college-based, i.e., the participating institutions receive the Federal program funds and award them to their needy students in accordance with applicable law, regulations, and guidelines. Each institution establishes its own deadline for receipt of applications and publishes that date in its catalogue. Both first year students and upper classmen should apply to the financial aid officer at their college or university before the institution's published deadline date.

A supplementary Educational Opportunity Grant may range from \$200 to \$1,500 per year, and cannot exceed one-half of the student's financial aid package. The SEOG may be received for up to four years of undergraduate study. However, it may be received for a fifth year when the course of study requires the extra time. The total that may be awarded is \$4,000 for a four year course of study or \$5,000 for a five year course.

Wages paid under the College Work-Study Program may range from the current minimum of \$1.60 to \$3.50 per hour. The current projection of average annual compensation under the program is \$580.

The cumulative amount a student may borrow under the National Direct Student Loan Program relates to the number of years of study the student has completed:

(a) \$2,500 if the student is enrolled in a vocational program or if he has completed less than two years of a program leading to a bachelor's degree.

(b) \$5,000 if the student is an undergraduate who has already completed two years of study toward a bachelor's degree. (This total includes any amount the student borrowed under NDSL for undergraduate study.)

(c) \$10,000 for graduate study. (This total includes any amount borrowed under NDSL for undergraduate study.)

Data on the percentage of these three forms of assistance that has been awarded to students from specific family income levels are set forth below. Unfortunately, 1970 is the most recent year for which this information is available. Data for 1971 and 1972 are still being processed for computer analysis, and data for 1973 are currently being submitted by participating colleges and universities. The family income categories on the annual Institutional Fiscal Operations Report are not divided at \$7,000 and \$10,000 as would be necessary to provide the percentage distributions you requested. There are divisions, however, at \$9,000, \$7,000, \$6,000, and \$3,000. Since Fiscal Year 1974 is the first year of operation for the SEOG Program, data are shown below for its predecessor, the Educational Opportunity Grants Program.



(In percent)

	National defense student loan	College work-study	Educational opportunity grants
0 to \$2,999.....	22.2	27.4	31.0
\$3,000 to \$5,999.....	25.8	29.3	41.7
\$6,000 to \$7,499.....	13.9	14.8	15.2
\$7,500 to \$8,999.....	12.1	11.2	7.9
\$9,000 and over.....	26.0	17.3	4.2

I hope you will find this information helpful. If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

PETER P. MUIRHEAD,  
Deputy Commissioner  
for Higher Education.

## THE VICE PRESIDENT'S RESIGNATION

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit the following:

#### THE VICE PRESIDENT'S RESIGNATION

(By Congressman LEE HAMILTON)

In another stunning development in the most tumultuous year in modern American politics, Vice President Agnew's resignation, after he admitted evasion of federal income taxes, startled and saddened the nation.

My first reaction to this unprecedented personal and national tragedy was compassion for the former Vice President and his family, regardless of the actions which caused his resignation. There is no joy and no cause for celebration in seeing a man crash down from the nation's second highest political office to a convicted felon.

In my view the Vice President's action was appropriate. It avoided the peril to the nation of having a Vice President under indictment and involved in lengthy court proceedings, and as Mr. Agnew has acknowledged, the American people deserve a Vice President who commands their unimpaired confidence and trust. The 40-page summary of evidence against Mr. Agnew prepared by the Dept. of Justice described a decade of activity by Mr. Agnew, from County Executive in suburban Baltimore County to Vice President of the U.S., during which he received cash in envelopes, kickbacks and payments from engineers and businessmen who wanted government business. The settlement of the Agnew case may not be a triumph of justice, but it represents an acceptable solution to an unprecedented case, in which the claims of justice, politics, and the Constitution were inextricably mixed. The Vice President avoided jail, which the federal judge in the case acknowledged would be the ordinary sentence for the crime, but the public interest of removing a Vice President under criminal indictment was served, as was the political interest of the President.

The news of the Vice President's resignation also gave me a sense of depression. At a time when the American people have experienced so many disappointments and disillusionments that their confidence in their political leaders and institutions is at a low ebb, Mr. Agnew's resignation is yet another staggering blow to millions of decent, honest and much put-upon Americans who want desperately to believe in the integrity of their high officials. Whether you agreed with Mr.

Agnew or not, many Americans did believe in him, considered him their champion, and saw in him an extraordinary politician, purer and better than other politicians. Their cynicism and suspicion of American politics can only be reinforced by the fall of the man who was the preeminent American spokesman for law and order and attacker of permissiveness.

His resignation raises all sorts of difficult questions. Did he receive favored treatment and avoid a jail sentence because of his high office? And, if he did, will Americans believe that the law falls with equal application on the powerful and the powerless? What about the process by which Vice Presidents are selected? How is it possible that the process failed to reveal so obvious a pattern of corruption? Do all politicians, as the cynics insist, really take payoffs? How can we really remove the taint of money from the political process? Can we really believe any politician?

I am hopeful that the former Vice President's resignation will prompt further efforts in the Congress to improve campaign practices and procedures for selecting Vice Presidents, and provide all of us in government with a new determination to give the people integrity in government. It is that quality, above all others, that I think the American people now want in their government.

The immediate task of the Congress is to act with care and dispatch in confirming the President's nomination of Congressman Gerald Ford of Michigan as Vice President. Under the 25th Amendment to the Constitution, the Congress has an obligation to examine fully Mr. Ford's competence, not only for the responsibilities of the Vice Presidency, but for the more important ones he would assume if he became President.

Although I experienced some misgivings about the festive spirit surrounding the President's announcement of Mr. Ford, and thought that since it followed immediately upon the tragedy of the resignation, the occasion demanded a serious and restrained atmosphere, Mr. Ford is a popular choice in the Congress, and, barring unforeseen developments, I expect to join a majority of my colleagues in confirming his selection.

## A UNIQUE INNOVATION IN CORRECTIONS REFORM

### HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most frequent complaints I receive from inmates in both State and Federal correctional institutions, as well as from groups seeking prison reforms, is the lack of adequate or meaningful educational programs. The failure of prisons systems in general to provide proper educational programs which will prepare the offender with substantive and useful training is often one of the basic causes for various disturbances which occur from time to time. There is little question, but that some affirmative action in this critical area is long overdue and that steps must be taken at all levels in the corrections field to correct what are frequently inadequate education programs.

A very large percentage of prison inmates are uneducated and unskilled. Often they are unable to secure even a basic education or usable skills during

their confinement and, upon their release, they are frequently unable to find employment or some type of rewarding work. This is one reason why the rate of recidivism continues to remain at high levels.

In recent years there have been some very laudable and successful efforts to provide worthwhile education to prison inmates and, in a few States—Texas, Illinois, and Connecticut—full-fledged, separate school districts have been established for prisons and these institutions thereby are able to benefit from Federal and State educational assistance programs. Shortly after the Attica tragedy, I proposed that the State of New York undertake such a program and create a separate school system specifically for the corrections system. It has a number of important advantages in terms of having the ability to provide good educational services to prison inmates. Regrettably, action has never been taken on my proposal.

Nevertheless, the State of New York has launched what is probably one of the most unique corrections education programs in the country—the establishment of a new State college solely for prison inmates. The New York State Department of Correctional Services and the State University of New York are developing plans to create a college—to be located at Bedford Hills, N.Y.—in which both male and female prisoners will study on a full-time basis toward 2-year liberal arts or science degrees.

I commend both the Department of Correctional Services and the State University of New York for their efforts to undertake this very innovative and worthwhile effort and hope that the proposal can be implemented at the earliest practicable date.

In order that our colleagues may learn more about this proposal I insert, for inclusion in the RECORD, an article from yesterday's New York Times and a joint news release from SUNY and the Department of Correctional Services:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 24, 1973]  
COLLEGE FOR PRISONERS DUE IN 1974

(By Gene I. Maeroff)

The establishment of a new state college at which all of the students will be prison inmates is expected to be approved this morning by the trustees of the State University of New York.

Officials of the State University and the State Department of Correctional Services believe that the fully accredited, two-year college for men and women at Bedford Hills in Westchester County would be the first of its kind in the country.

The project is subject to the approval of the State Board of Regents and the Governor Dr. Ernest L. Boyer, chancellor of the State University, and others think there will be no obstacles to that approval.

Except for a few prisoners performing supportive services, only inmates who will be full-time students at the college are expected to be assigned to the prison. The tentative name of the institution is the State University Community College at Bedford Hills and it is to open next year, perhaps as soon as February.

COCHAIRMAN FOR TASK FORCE

Dr. Timothy S. Healy, vice chancellor for academic affairs at the City University of New

York, is taking a leave of absence to be chairman of a task force to plan the college.

Informed sources say that Dr. Healy, a Jesuit priest and former vice president of Fordham University, will become the first president of the college, though such an announcement has not been made.

The other co-chairman of the task force will be Edward W. Elwin, deputy commissioner for program services in the Correctional Services Department.

"This is an attempt to make serious the business of rehabilitation," Dr. Boyer said. "The college will have a liberal arts curriculum because the prison system already has vocational programs and the problem is not so much to prepare inmates for jobs as to educate them in the broader sense and give them a better self-image."

In a joint statement, Dr. Boyer and Peter Preiser, the Correctional Services Commissioner, said "We believe the proposed programs will make it possible for more prisoners to move back into society and lead productive lives."

The Bedford Hills Correctional Facility closed its men's division for renovation last April. It is proposed that the institution be reopened as the combination prison-college with 150 to 200 inmates.

In addition, according to spokesmen, 50 inmates at the neighboring women's division of the Bedford Hills Correctional Facility will be enrolled in the college. About 350 women are confined in the prison, which is the only one for women operated by the state.

Mr. Elwin said that the men prisoners at Bedford Hills would be selected from among the 13,000 confined at facilities throughout the state. An inmate-student will have to have a high school diploma or an equivalency certificate, which can be earned through the prison system's educational program. Classes for men and women will be separate at the beginning, Dr. Boyer said, with the professors going back and forth between the two facilities.

Prisoners who become students will have sentences ranging from a year to life and will be eligible to participate regardless of the offense for which they were convicted.

Pending approval of the State Legislature, the educational costs of running the institution will be paid by the State University and maintenance will be borne by the Department of Correctional Services.

Students will not be charged tuition, making the college the only tuition-free unit within the State University. Students will be able to earn up to an associate degree and will be guaranteed the right to transfer their credits to other colleges in the State University after their release from Bedford Hills.

"Arrangements are also being made with the City University for transfer provisions," Dr. Healy said. "This is important because the vast majority of the prisoners are from the city."

The decision to start the college apparently grew out of the studies undertaken to improve the prison system following the uprising at the correctional facility in Attica in September, 1971, in which 43 persons died.

Besides planning the college, the task force will also study educational opportunities in all 24 of the state's correctional facilities and recommend how best to build a "feeder system" for assigning students to Bedford Hills.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF A COLLEGE FOR INMATES

ALBANY, October 24.—The State University of New York and the Department of Correctional Services are exploring the establishment of a college for inmates to be located at the Department's complex at Bedford Hills.

Chancellor Ernest L. Boyer and Commissioner Peter Preiser today announced that the proposed college, the first of its kind in

the nation, would make it possible for both men and women to engage in full-time study toward a two-year degree in liberal arts or science.

In addition, the University and the Department of Correctional Services announced establishment of a joint task force to conduct a thorough study of higher educational opportunities in the 24 different correctional facilities of the State.

Co-Chairmen will be Dr. Timothy S. Healy, City University of New York's vice chancellor for academic affairs, who will join State University, and Edward Elwin, deputy commissioner for program services in the Department of Correctional Services. They will be assisted by other educators and correctional personnel.

In a joint statement, Dr. Boyer and Commissioner Preiser said:

"The time has come to introduce a bold new educational concept for qualified inmates to improve the prospects of rehabilitation in the correctional system."

"We anticipate a program of education which will lead to a degree and also provide opportunity to transfer to a baccalaureate program upon release."

"We're convinced such a college program and a carefully coordinated program of supporting educational activities at other correctional facilities will benefit society at large as well as the inmates involved. We believe the proposed programs will make it possible for more prisoners to move back into society and lead productive lives."

Chancellor Boyer emphasized that the college at Bedford Hills, about 40 miles north of New York City, would be a unique experiment—a correctional facility which also serves as a separate campus—and would supplement the wide range of credit and occupational courses currently offered by State University at seven of New York State's correctional facilities.

Initially, the college would offer Associate in Arts and Associate in Science programs to 250 inmates. The task force would develop methods of selecting qualified students from the statewide inmate population.

Classes for 200 males would be conducted in an existing but presently unoccupied facility at the Bedford Hills complex which would be refurbished to provide classroom and living space. Another 50 female inmates would receive instruction in the adjacent facility which they presently occupy.

Year-round operation is anticipated, possibly through a four-quarter calendar. Operational and facilities modification costs are being developed, and will be shared by the University and Correctional Services.

The joint task force will work toward a network of programs which would draw upon the statewide higher education resources of the University. The programs would build upon the instructional activities now offered by the State University at six New York State correctional facilities and provide a "feeder" system for new students at the college at Bedford Hills as classes graduate.

Chancellor Boyer and Commissioner Preiser anticipate a program of counseling, remedial work, and college-level instruction at other correctional facilities which would provide basic academic or technical skills and introduce the possibility of full-time collegiate study for other groups of inmates.

"The aim is not to move in one direction only or to focus on a single facility. Rather, we hope to develop a kind of master plan which will lead to a more rational and better coordinated educational program for inmates," Chancellor Boyer said. "Bedford Hills would be a key project in this educational network."

Commissioner Preiser hailed the proposed college as a "major step forward in one area that corrections has never really tried."

"We have run the gamut of varying kinds of treatment," he said. "Now," he continued, "we are in the stages of implementing a long-needed approach. I especially believe that a liberal arts education can help inmates to understand society and their places in it, improve their self-image and see themselves as a functional part of that society."

"We have concentrated on job training and vocational skills—which certainly have a place—but, if we can truly build self-image, understanding and attitude, vocational adjustment will take care of itself," the Commissioner concluded.

Chancellor Boyer said that administrative and faculty personnel for the college would be recruited from within the University itself.

Dr. Boyer pointed out that each year more than 1,000 New York State inmates qualify for high school equivalency diplomas in addition to 440 who take courses under auspices of University campuses. He said this demonstrates keen interest in education among inmates and clearly establishes that such academic work can be successfully completed.

Dr. Healy will bring vast experience in university administration and in literary, classical, and clerical scholarship to his new mission with the State University.

An ordained Jesuit priest, Dr. Healy holds three earned degrees, two magna cum laude, from Woodstock College in Maryland; an M.A. degree from Fordham University, a Ph.D. from Oxford, and other academic honors from Faculté St. Albert in Louvain, Belgium.

Since 1969 he has had chief responsibility for academic and curricular planning for the 20 units in the 259,000-student City University system.

His teaching career at Fordham began as a member of the Fordham Preparatory faculty in 1947. He was later to serve as a member of Fordham University's English Department, rising from the rank of instructor to full professor; as director of alumni relations, as academic vice president, and from 1965 to 1969 as executive vice president. Dr. Healy graduated from Regis High School in New York City and attended various parochial and public schools in Queens and Manhattan.

Mr. Elwin assumed his position with Correctional Services on March 3, 1972. He has responsibility for directing, coordinating and administering such operational programs as inmate classification and movement, correctional industries, education and guidance and counseling in all state correctional facilities. He earned his bachelor's degree from Brooklyn College and his master's degree in public administration and correctional management from New York University.

Before joining the Department of Correctional Services, Mr. Elwin was deputy chief probation officer for the Second Judicial District, Kings County, New York.

When the plans for the new college at Bedford Hills are completed, they will be submitted to the Governor for his approval and subsequent consideration by the Regents and by the Legislature at the 1974 Legislative Session.

#### "MURDER BY HANDGUN: THE CASE FOR GUN CONTROL"—NO. 38

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, a lot of people in this country are making



money from the manufacture and sale of handguns, which, in turn, are responsible for more than half of the murders in this country every year.

A recent study has estimated that the amount of handguns presently in private ownership is enough to provide "one deadly handgun for every 1.5 American families." And, consequently, a majority of the people murdered by handguns are killed by a friend or relative.

I would like to include an article by Nathan Cobb of the Boston Globe, June 3, 1973, entitled "Booming Handgun Business Soars to Record \$75 Million." And today's murder from the Baltimore Sun also follows:

#### YOUTH, 15, CHARGED IN CLASSMATE'S DEATH

A classmate of a 15-year-old boy found shot dead near the old St. Mary's Seminary on Paca street Tuesday has been arrested and charged with homicide in the death.

The dead youth was identified yesterday as Darrel J. West, of the 400 block Watty court, a student at PS 176. Arrested Tuesday at his home was James Anthony MacDougall, 15, of the 600 block West Mulberry street, a classmate.

#### BOOMING HANDGUN BUSINESS SOARS TO RECORD \$75 MILLION (By Nathan Cobb)

It's official.

The handgun—used by more murderers in the United States than all other weapons combined—is now as American as baseball.

During 1972, retail pistol and revolver sales across the country soared to a high of \$75.6 million, according to excise tax figures filed with Internal Revenue Service (IRS). Americans spent roughly an equal amount—\$76.1 million—on all types of baseball goods during the same year, the National Sporting Goods Assn. reports.

A month-long Globe study of the sale, ownership and use of America's number one criminal weapon concluded that despite Federal and Massachusetts laws passed in 1968 ostensibly to slow the massive flow of handguns into private hands, manufacturers and dealers of these deadly and concealable guns are enjoying a business boom.

In fact, becoming an economic equivalent of the "national pastime" has been only one recent accomplishment of the burgeoning handgun trade. Some others:

According to IRS figures, dollar volume of US retail handgun sales last year rose 59.4 percent over 1968, the year stiffer Federal laws governing handgun purchase were passed. During the same period, other firearm and ammunition sales rose only 14.1 percent.

American manufacturers produced 902,701 handguns during the last six months of 1972, according to newly-required reports filed with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) of the US Treasury Dept. This is approximately a 50 percent jump over figures compiled in 1968 by a special presidential commission, and it represents a four-fold increase during the past decade. Additional figures filed with ATF show that four out of 10 guns now being made for private sale in the United States are handguns.

Imported handguns, which the 1968 Federal Gun Control Act restricts to those deemed "particularly suitable" or "readily adaptable" for sporting use, are skyrocketing in number. Last year, 439,883 handguns were imported for sale in this country, a solid 23.4 percent jump over 1971. In fact, handgun imports have now reached the level of the mid-1960s, when concern over their number led to a ban on the importation of small, cheap, so-called "Saturday Night Specials."

The 1968 law has spawned a whole new domestic industry of "Saturday Night Spe-

cial" manufacturers, located primarily in New York and Florida, who are churning out tiny .22 and .25 caliber handguns which cost between \$5 and \$25. Because Federal law technically bans only the importation of frames for "non-sporting" guns, these new manufacturers have been able to apply for permits to import enough other types of parts to assemble 4,322,800 handguns since 1968.

"There's definitely been a shift in emphasis toward handguns by gun buyers," said Saul R. Arnstein, co-owner of the Ivanhoe Sports Center in Watertown during a recent interview. "Since 1968, handgun sales are up while rifle and shotgun sales are down. Our estimated percentages used to be about 50-50. Now about 70 percent of our sales are handguns, while 30 percent are rifles and shotguns."

Today, Arnstein's retail and wholesale gun dealership, which he claims is the largest in New England, sells 3000 handguns a year. In 1968, he estimates he sold about 1500.

Although a small number of handgun owners use their weapons for target shooting and hunting, the weapon's success and popularity comes primarily from its effectiveness as a killer and maimer of human beings.

"But the handgun is not only just a murder weapon," William J. Taylor, Supt.-in-Chief of the Boston Police Dept. explained recently: "There's no question that the ready availability of handguns increases all types of crime. I'm talking about robberies, rapes, everything. The handgun is definitely the most prevalent weapon in crime. And it's growing."

New England is the handgun manufacturing capital of the country. Of 68 domestic gun manufacturers listed in the 1973 issue of "Gun Digest," a gun trade directory published by the Chicago-based magazine of the same name, 17 are located in New England, far more than in any other single region. Ten of these are handgun makers, including the prestigious Smith and Wesson Inc., of Springfield and Colt Industries of Hartford, Conn.

(New England also holds two dubious handgun manufacturing distinctions. The .22 caliber pistol that Sirhan B. Sirhan used to murder Sen. Robert F. Kennedy was made by the Iver-Johnson Arms and Cycle Works, Inc. in Fitchburg, and the .38 with which Arthur H. Bremner shot Gov. George C. Wallace was manufactured by the Charter Arms Corp., of Bridgeport, Conn.)

These and other handgun manufacturers have consistently refused to release production statistics, and until ATF recently required that they file such figures dating back to July 1, 1972, no Federal agency kept track of how many guns were being stockpiled in America.

In 1968, subpoenas were required from the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence to make figures public. Then it was learned that America had legitimately produced 22.6 million handguns for private sale since 1899 to go with the 5.4 million handguns that had been legally imported. Since the commission's initial findings, the recent handgun boom has buoyed the country's private arsenal by 12 to 15 million more concealable firearms.

Says William F. Fitzgerald, director of the Firearms Record Bureau of the Massachusetts Dept. of Public Safety: "Keeping track of the growing number of handguns isn't like taking a population count. Unlike people, guns don't die off. Very, very few of them ever disappear. The total number just keeps growing."

Thus, most current estimates of handguns place the national total at somewhere between 30 and 40 million—or about one deadly handgun for every 1.5 American families.

And the total continues to mount.

Although Massachusetts has relatively

strong laws governing handgun purchase (roughly 25 percent of the state's 70,284 legal gun sales last year were handguns, and only about one out of every 135 handgun sales in the U.S. takes place in the Bay State), a Globe survey of local dealers revealed that business is brisk.

Some retailers reported sales up as much as 50 percent over 1968, when Massachusetts passed what is considered to be one of the toughest gun laws in the nation.

According to the Firearms Record Bureau, there are approximately 110,000 persons in Massachusetts with licenses to carry (and therefore purchase) handguns, as well as another 300,000 people who possess Firearms Identification Cards (F.I.D.), which allow them to keep guns in their homes. Both are issued by the local police chief in the gun owner's city or town. An F.I.D. card may also be used to purchase a handgun when accompanied by a special permit to do so which is also issued by local police.

The Massachusetts system, however, registers legal owners, not guns. As Arthur A. Montouri, special agent in charge of the ATF put it recently, "A person with an F.I.D. card or a license to carry can own 20 guns. And often does."

Further, law enforcement officials interviewed this week contend that only a portion of the state's handgun owners have licenses, and that growing legal sales represent only part of the handgun market.

"I'd guess that for every legal owner there are two illegal owners," offered Lt. Det. Jerome P. McCallum, acting head of the homicide bureau of the Boston Police Dept. "It just seems to me that everyone and his brother has a handgun around here."

Clearly, these are bonanza days for the more than 150,000 Federally licensed gun dealers across the country, whether they are handling Colt's powerful 357 Magnum or the handy Model 733 .32 caliber revolver manufactured by Harrington and Richardson Inc., Worcester.

"The handgun supply simply hasn't been able to keep up with the demand," said James F. Mahoney, a clerk at Bob Smith's Sporting Goods, a Boston retailer and wholesaler. "For instance, Smith and Wesson has cut their allocation to us in half because they have so many orders."

Some manufacturers, Smith and Wesson included, sell through wholesalers. Others, such as Colt, move guns directly to retailers. The two-stage mark-up is approximately 35 percent, with about 15 percent going to the wholesaler if he is included.

While some of the increased sales are undoubtedly for sporting purposes, dealers report that the major reason people are buying handguns is fear—generally of other people with guns.

At Bob Smith's Sporting Goods, merchandise manager Stephen Vinciguerra stated that 60 to 70 percent of the firm's handgun sales are to people who want to "protect" themselves. "I'm selling handguns to guys who've never bought a gun before and who said they'd never buy a gun," Vinciguerra said. "They're buying good quality .22s, .25s, .32s and .38s. People are scared. There isn't a merchant in downtown Boston who doesn't have a gun under his coat."

Such buyers are apparently unconcerned by warnings similar to that which came from the National Commission on the Prevention of Crime and Violence, stating that handgun owners are more likely to shoot themselves or a member of their family than stop a criminal.

This view was echoed recently by Supt. Taylor, Boston's number two cop. "If these people think a gun will do any good to prevent a robbery, they're mistaken," Taylor said. "They'll just cause a threat to the criminal and the criminal will respond with more violence. Believe me, the criminal will

make the first move. And if you move second, you're in trouble."

Meanwhile, the deadly stockpile continues to grow across America. A handgun legally crosses a sales counter every 12.6 seconds, and illegal transfers probably occur as frequently.

Handguns are in bedside tables, closets and bureaus. They're in cellars, garages and automobiles. Before the decade is out, there will be one handgun for every male in America.

"My house is a fortress," boasted one Boston gun dealer recently, taking up the cry for even more guns. "Why, I could hold off twenty guys from in there."

## THE FUTURE OF THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT

### HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, for a long time the present incumbent of the Presidential office, Richard Nixon, has disgraced that office in the eyes of the American people—and our whole country in the eyes of the world—by his arbitrary illegal acts and by his devious smokescreen of lies, evasions, and self-serving, self-pitying pleas with which he tries to cover his tracks.

Congress has been forced to sit back and take it, ever fearful of the consequences of removing him in a time of crisis and division. But the events of autumn, 1973, force us in Congress to ask ourselves whether we can avoid any turmoil by letting him stay—or whether Richard Nixon is using the powers of his office to destroy the very things that make politics in a democracy possible.

Politics in a democracy is possible only with a minimum of trust.

When the President violated a solemn commitment to the Senate and the American people to respect the independence of the special prosecutor, Richard Nixon showed that he thought that promises are not worth the paper they are written on, and are to be discarded when convenient. After the lies about the bombing in Cambodia—after the former Vice President threatened to divide the country for personal purposes—it becomes evident that the Government no longer even tried to gain men's loyalty by rational persuasion, but instead by force and trickery.

Politics in a democracy is possible only with a minimum of credibility in our judicial institutions, which provide the boundaries for political differences and conflicts. But to follow the plea bargaining of the formerly hard-hearted Mr. Agnew with a purge of the Justice Department removes from this scandal-ridden administration even the faintest sense of a commitment to fair play and self-restraint.

Politics in a democracy is possible only when there is some understanding of the difference between military discipline, based on unquestioning obedience, and civilian government, based on the

dedicated loyalty of talented professionals.

Mr. Nixon had so forgotten this elemental distinction that he was surprised when Mr. Richardson and Mr. Ruckelshaus refused to obey his dishonorable orders.

There is one more fact that must be realized. This country has not quite yet lost the habit of freedom. When democratic politics are not possible, orderly stable government is not possible. We cannot go on to solve the real problems of our society when the head of our Government has so much to hide that he cannot avoid forcing us into crisis after crisis.

For all these reasons, there is only one course of action for the liberal—for the conservative—for the radical or the reactionary—for anyone interested in real issues instead of the petty crimes of inadequate men: Impeach the President.

## HOW LIBERALS BENEFIT FROM TAXPAYER FUNDS

### HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, with all the talk we have heard this year about political dirty tricks and politicalization of the Federal Government by Nixon administration officials, it is easy to forget that a great many powerful forces in the bureaucracy are hostile to the President and on good terms with the people who lost the 1972 election. The OEO legal services program has been a horn of patronage plenty for close associates of Sargent Shriver, for example.

It is not just the idea of patronage to the "out" party that bothers me. Some of the activities being funded with tax dollars would seem improper even if they benefited members of my own party—which they do not.

For evidence of my concern I refer readers of the RECORD to a September 29 article by Howard Phillips, the former head of OEO:

## How LIBERALS BENEFIT FROM TAXPAYER FUNDS (By Howard Phillips)

Who said George McGovern and Sargent Shriver lost the last election? At the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) they seem to have all the advantages of incumbency—still able to subsidize their friends with large grants, honorific titles, comfortable consultancies and salaries, tax-paid travel, and more. Even worse, they continue to dictate policy to a Watergate-weakened White House staff, implementing policies which should be anathema to Richard Nixon and the "New American Majority" which elected him.

Witness the Urban Law Institute of Antioch College. Before the Watergate "exposé" in March, OEO funding was to have been phased out. In fact, on Nov. 2, 1972, the liberal acting director of Legal Services, Theodore Tetzlaff, wrote: "... the grant now being proposed for Antioch represents a 50% cutback in the amount of funds provided Antioch Law School last grant year. And it is the intention of the Office of Legal Services that this

amount will be reduced by 50% again during the next and final grant year. That is, by this schedule the Office of Legal Services will phase out its support for the grantee."

Now, OEO Director Alvin J. Arnett is reportedly planning to refund it.

Headed by Joan Cahn and her husband, Edgar, former special assistant to Shriver in his days at OEO, the program had been "expelled" by George Washington University only to be rescued, in 1971, by Frank Carlucci, who ran OEO before becoming No. 2 man at the Office of Management and Budget, then under secretary of HEW.

Amplified subsidized by the federal government, the co-deans Cahn have been leading their student charges in challenges to TV license renewals in Washington, D.C., Chicago, and Los Angeles, in critical studies of revenue sharing, and in efforts to facilitate the use of cable TV as a means of propagandizing on "poverty" issues.

The overall goals of the Antioch program include shaping nationwide changes in law school curricula to foster greater emphasis on "poverty" concerns, providing research support to legal services back-up centers, and awarding academic sabbaticals to preferred legal services attorneys.

That Antioch has well-placed friends high in the Nixon White House is evidenced in a July 24, 1972, letter from Mrs. Cahn to Leonard Garment, a life-long liberal Democrat who is special counsel to President Nixon. The letter says in part:

"DEAR LEN: \* \* \* A specific request. Time is of the essence. Can you help us over at Commerce to break loose some Public Works money. . . . As for the politics of it, we obviously can't turn the District Republican—but we can get strong backing from District Republicans and the School of Law can legitimately be projected nationally as a product of this Administration since its very existence is due to the untiring efforts of Frank Carlucci."

Mrs. Cahn added: "Our funding now comes from Commerce (OMBE) as HEW, Labor, and HUD, so we are no longer simply a legal services program."

A more dangerous Shriver crony who has gotten fatter on OEO dollars during the Nixon Administration is E. Clinton Bamberger Jr., and Shriver's personal pick as the first director of the OEO Legal Services program when it began in 1965. A pal of ex-Maryland U.S. Sen. Joe Tydings Jr., Bamberger has also been president of the National Legal Aid and Defenders Association, another OEO grantee.

Since taking office at the end of June, Director Arnett has given hundreds of thousands of dollars in OEO grants and contracts to projects in which Bamberger has been deeply involved.

The NLADA has not only been awarded a direct subsidy of nearly \$300,000 by Arnett, it has also had restored to it the right to collect dues from federal grants made to hundreds of other OEO-funded projects. In 1972, more than \$100,000 was raised in this manner from legal aid organizations, most of which were OEO supported.

It should give President Nixon little comfort to know that two of NLADA's vice presidents have been Terry Lenzner, now assistant chief counsel for the Senate Watergate Committee, and John Douglas, who in 1972 was national cochairman of the McGovern campaign. The executive director of NLADA is James Flug, who previously was a Senate staffer for the Hon. Edward M. Kennedy (Flug's wife, Carla, is an employee in the OEO Office of Legal Services. Flug was preceded as executive director by Frank Jones, whom Donald Rumsfeld had fired as deputy director of the OEO Legal Services Office.)

The Board of Directors is amply peopled



with legal services veterans and present officials of OEO grantees, as well as prominent liberals, like former Atty. Gen. Nicholas Katzenbach, Mrs. Lucy Benson of the League of Women Voters, and Washington, D.C., lawyer Howard Westwood. A few token Republicans are retained for their value when it is time to lobby for funds or liberal policies.

An active force for "law reform," both in landmark litigation and legislative corridors, NLADA is subsidized by OEO to "monitor" and provide "technical assistance" to legal services grantees throughout the nation. This is achieved through "training" conferences and a network of 1,200 consultants.

Bamberger has also been a prime mover behind the Micronesia Legal Services program which, at his urging, received an initial grant of \$60,000 in 1971 from then OEO Director Frank Carlucci.

This program has proven to be one of the most insidious legal services projects, fomenting anti-American sentiment, attacking Defense Department activities in the Trust Territories, even threatening action against the United States in the United Nations.

One of the project attorneys, Dennis Olsen, has actively criticized America's "institutional imperialism," urging that America "be compelled to pay for crimes" and stimulating support for "direct radical action."

Olsen is a booster of a man named Ataji, whom he compares with Che Guevara, the late Cuban Communist leader. He says that "Ataji and his people—with the help of a handful of fellow travelers from the Peace Corps and the OEO—can win significant battles to reclaim their integrity as an island nation. But alone they can never finally prevail against the brazen power of America. Only pressure from liberals and radicals and humanists within the United States can render any real change in the policy and attitude of American administrators in the Pacific." If this be legal aid for the poor, make the most of it.

In addition to whatever ideological sustenance Mr. Bamberger may derive from such sentiments, the program affords mainland members of the Micronesia Legal Services advisory board, of whom Bamberger has been one, the luxury of cost-free stopovers in Hawaii while en route to semi-annual board meetings in the Pacific islands.

Moreover, at least one OEO employee, Frank Duggan, has had a free trip to Japan financed by Uncle Sam, on the way home from an inspection tour of the Micronesia program. Duggan, by the way, who came to OEO on the patronage of Texas Democrats Ralph Yarborough and Ben Barnes, and who worked for AFL-CIO COPE, now heads the Operations Division in the OEO Office of Legal Services at a salary in excess of \$30,000 per year.

Prompted by my concerns, which were backed up by top officials at the Department of State and Interior, the White House agreed in March of this year to discontinue funding of the Micronesia program. For whatever reason, Mr. Arnett refunded it in August.

Still another Bamberger boondoggle recently funded by Arnett is a contract to Bamberger's own Law School, to provide training and technical assistance for Legal Services attorneys. More will be written of this program in a subsequent column.

The real test of whether President Nixon gets out of the Watergate syndrome will lie in the degree to which he can regain control of the executive branch and remove appointees who seek credit with his enemies for flouting the policies on which he won re-election.

Until then, the "business of the people" is being handled by those who lost in 1972.

## ADMIRAL RICKOVER'S INSPIRING COMMENTS ON THE PURPOSE OF MAN

### HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that everyone who has ever known Adm. H. G. Rickover has in some way been inspired by his contact with this remarkable man. Another sparkling facet of his mind is revealed by the following item from the editor's page of U.S. News & World Report for October 22:

#### THE PURPOSE TO LIFE

(NOTE.—Weeks before political scandals in Washington reached the headline proportions of the present, Vice Admiral Hyman G. Rickover made one of his frequent appearances before a congressional committee and discussed the moral fiber of America. The Admiral has for years let his caustic criticism range from bureaucracy to educators to ethics, to name just a few of his many targets. This time committee members asked this concept of man's purpose in life. His impromptu reply is excerpted below.—Howard Fieger, Editor.)

Man's work begins with his job, or profession. Having a vocation is always somewhat of a miracle, like falling in love. . . . But having a vocation means more than punching a timeclock. One must guard against banality, ineptitude, incompetence, and mediocrity.

We as a people seem inclined to accept average or mediocre performance. Mediocrity can destroy us just as surely as perils far more famous. It is important that we remember to distinguish between what it means to fall at a task and what it means to be mediocre. There is all the difference in the world between the life lived with dignity and style which ends up falling, and one which achieves power and glory, yet is dull, unoriginal, unreflective, and mediocre. In a real sense, what matters is not so much whether we make a lot of money, hold a prestigious job, or whether we don't; what matters is that we become people who seek out others with knowledge and enthusiasm—that we become people who can enjoy our own company.

Most of the work in the world today is done by those who work too hard; they comprise a "nucleus of martyrs." The greater part of the remaining workers' energy goes into complaining. Employees today seldom become emotional about their organization or its output; they are only interested in getting ahead. And many organizations are killing their employees with kindness, undercutting their sense of responsibility with an ever-increasing permissiveness. This is a fatal error, for where responsibility ends, performance ends also.

The sense of responsibility for doing a job right seems to be declining.

The willingness to act and to accept responsibility is a symptom of America's growing self-satisfaction with the status quo. . . .

A major reason why so large a majority is smugly docile is that it has accepted the unwritten rules of the game: Don't rock the boat as long as you get your cut. Why become worked up over corruption as long as there are enough benefits of the fallout to go around? Once the acceptance of corruption becomes sufficiently widespread, effective exposure seems threatening to too many people and interests. Clamor for closing loopholes declines in direct proportion to the

number of people who benefit from loopholes of their own. Freedom of speech seems less important when the majority persuades itself that it is not likely ever to want to speak out to complain.

For the person who strives to excel, to shoulder responsibility and to speak out, there is an enemy wherever he turns. The enemy is a man who has a total willingness to delegate his worries about the world to officialdom. He assumes that only the people in authority are in a position to know and act. He believes that if vital information essential to the making of public decisions is withheld, it can only be for a good reason. . . .

The enemy is any man whose only concern about the world is that it stay in one piece during his own lifetime. . . . Nothing to him is less important than the shape of things to come or the needs of the next generation.

To struggle against these enemies, and against apathy and mediocrity, is to find the purpose to life.

## NO BED OF ROSES

### HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that spokesmen for the administration have been tossing bouquets of flowers into the air and shouting hosannas about our Nation's dwindling deficits in international trade, I want to dispel the notion that everything is smelling like roses.

It is not. There are onions in the rose garden. We still have a trade deficit and we have a continuing deficit in one of our most important industries—steel. Admittedly, there has been a slight decline in steel imports in general. This is due directly to an almost unprecedented demand for steel throughout the world. But there has not even been a dip in the importation of key specialty steels. To the contrary, these vital products have shown a marked increase.

The latest figures from American Iron and Steel Institute clearly show our foreign steel competitors have developed a taste for the meat-and-potato market of the American steel industry. The value of imported steel exceeded the value of our steel exports by more than \$171 million in September, although our overall merchandise trade deficit was just \$16.6 million.

Through August, our steel trade deficit was nearly \$1.2 billion whereas the entire merchandise trade deficit was only \$720 million. The declared value of foreign steel shipped here during 1972 is 10.3 percent higher than during the same period last year. Why? Because of the increase in key specialty steels. Tool steel is running nearly 64 percent over last year's pace and alloy steels are up nearly 7 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will not allow the smell of roses emanating from the White House to affect their vision. I hope they will not smell roses and not see the thorns. Our steel industry still is being hurt by foreign imports.

As long as it is, our workers are being hurt. As long as they are being hurt, our Nation is being hurt. I am inserting AISI's latest steel trade announcement into the RECORD for the consideration of my colleagues:

**STEEL REMAINS TRADE PROBLEM, DESPITE IMPROVEMENTS ELSEWHERE**

WASHINGTON.—Although the overall U.S. merchandise trade balance continues to improve, the trade balance in steel mill products does not.

Preliminary government data show that the value of steel imported into this country exceeded the value of U.S. exports of steel by \$171.2 million during the month. This compares with an overall U.S. merchandise trade deficit for August of just \$16.6 million.

Through the first eight months of 1973, this country's trade deficit in steel had reached nearly \$1,282,600,000. During this same period, the entire U.S. merchandise trade deficit for all commodities was only \$720,200,000.

August's steel imports of 1,316,000 tons raised the total for the first eight months of this year to 10,436,000 tons. Although this was 3.1 percent below the total recorded during the same period of 1972, the declared value of the foreign steel entering this country through August of this year was 10.3 percent higher than it was during the comparable period of last year.

Despite the slight decline in overall steel imports, foreign shipments of key specialty steel products have increased this year. Through August, for example, imports of tool steels were running 63.8 percent ahead of their 1972 pace, while foreign shipments of other alloy steels were up 6.9 percent.

Steel imports into the Gulf Coast region were up slightly over last year, while those into the Atlantic and Pacific coastal regions had dropped slightly. Foreign steel shipments into the Great Lakes area were running more than ten percent below their comparable 1972 pace.

**THE VOLUNTEER ARMY IS WORKING**

**HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 15, Secretary of the Army Howard H. Callaway addressed the Association of the U.S. Army here in Washington.

Secretary Callaway spoke clearly and well about the progress of the volunteer Army. He pointed out that those seeking a return to the draft are not facing up to today's realities—the facts show “the volunteer Army is working.”

Two of Secretary Callaway's points bear special attention. He noted that many have a distorted picture of the volunteer Army's progress, because of the monthly open discussion of goals and quotas. He said:

But it is important to remember that our goals are akin to the salesman's goals—realistic, but difficult to meet.

Further, he emphasized that transition to a volunteer Army has made our military better, both in terms of discipline improvements and combat readiness im-

provements. He cited the 9th Infantry Division at Fort Lewis, Wash., which I recently had the opportunity to visit. This unit is made up almost entirely of volunteers—and at 102 percent strength. The Army Secretary also said:

Virtually every major indicator of discipline except drug offenses has, in fact, remained or turned positive in the volunteer army.

Discipline trends in this transitional period have shown reductions in the rates for AWOL, desertion, crimes of violence, crimes against property, courts-martial and separations under less than honorable conditions.

Such indicators are encouraging. We can be even more encouraged by this impressive statement by an official who has one of the best perspectives into the way the volunteer Army is progressing. I commend it to your attention:

**KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE H. CALLAWAY**

Ladies and Gentlemen, distinguished guests: I'm delighted to have this opportunity to be with you this afternoon. We in the Army are aware of your long-standing support for a strong National defense and we feel that the Nation owes you a debt of gratitude.

It is an exciting time for me to be Secretary of the Army. We are entering a historic time, a time of basic change, as we try to do what has never been done before. The Army has set out to provide security for this great country, to keep our global commitments, to stand ready to face an aggressor on a moment's notice—and to do all this with an Army of volunteers. No nation in history has tried to meet such massive and complex commitments without compelling people to serve, through one form of conscription or another. It is a challenge—a great challenge, one which I assure you we are doing our utmost to meet. Today I want to address this question with you—this question of meeting the need for an Army with a volunteer force.

Unfortunately, discussions of the volunteer Army are usually accompanied by emotional consideration about the value of the draft or of Universal Military Training. There are many, both in the military and out, who genuinely feel that the maintenance of a draft is important to our country, and so the debate continues. But the debate is on the wrong subject.

Those who continue to hold out the false hope that the Army can or ought to simply dodge the problems of the volunteer environment by quick return to the draft are not facing up to today's realities. The country doesn't want a draft today. The Congress doesn't want a draft today. The alternative then is a successful volunteer Army or failure for the Army. The US Army has never failed this country. It has always turned the hard challenges of history into success. So today, the challenge for all of us who support the Army is clear. We must set our minds to making the volunteer Army work.

And the volunteer Army is working. It is working because there are still young men and women in America who want to serve their country—this is “an idea whose time remains” for all Americans, young and old, of every race, color, and creed. And it is working because the Army offers to young men and women a satisfying life and solid benefits in conjunction with their service. There are those who feel we are trying to buy an Army. This is not the case. We are giving young men and women who serve in the Army a standard of living that is roughly

comparable to the standard of living they might get in the civilian community for doing a similar job. This means higher pay; paid annual leave; complete, superb medical and dental care; life in much improved barracks, and more.

All of these measures are necessary. I support them wholeheartedly. But let me emphasize that we are not trying to buy an Army. We will get the Army that the Nation needs only by appeal to sacrifice and service.

And this brings me to the second, most important way that we are making the volunteer Army work, by insuring that service to the country is a meaningful part of the young man or woman's life. We are making Army service a step forward in their lives, not an interruption. And to do this we are putting a great emphasis on education and training, and on insuring that our soldiers' jobs are important and useful.

We are doing this by making each soldier's job relate to the Army's mission, because this makes Army service mean something. Our young people want value from their lives. They want a job that matters and we've got that job. We are also working to eliminate unnecessary irritants. We think this will make the Army more attractive, and our surveys have borne this out.

We have developed a very attractive package of education and training. To the high school dropout who has the ability and motivation, we offer work toward a high school diploma, as an adjunct to training. To the high school graduate, an opportunity for college training, part of which may be as an adjunct to training. To junior college and college students, the possibility of further training, and even this may be as an adjunct to training. And to all of them, the Army offers vocational training that will be useful when the soldier returns to civilian life.

With a meaningful job, a decent standard of living, and real opportunities for continued education and training, young men and women can look upon a period of service to the country as a genuine step forward in their lives. And when they leave the Service, they will realize other very important advantages. For one thing, under the GI Bill, they are entitled to more education, provided by the government to its veterans. And they're more mature. The Army has trained them, given them each a mission, and then held them responsible for professional results. This responsibility develops maturity. Thus, both the education and experience of military service prepare them for better jobs when they leave the Army for civilian careers.

All of these benefits are pointed toward the first term volunteer. For those who choose to reenlist for the volunteer Army, however, more opportunities for education, maturity, and service accrue.

We have, today, the finest noncommissioned officer leadership training we have ever had, with progressive career steps going from the recruit right on through our top command sergeant major. Our men and women enjoy the benefits of our new Noncommissioned Officer Education System, a system which offers to the noncommissioned officer a progressive, professional military education roughly comparable to the superb system of schooling we have always offered to our officers. The system trains, educates, and motivates our NCO leaders for the progressive challenges of an Army career.

Some of our strongest supporters don't fully understand today's Army. They think the Army lost something important when we initiated, for example, the idea of hiring civilian help—KPs—to work in the kitchens and dining rooms. They think that eliminating such irritants as KP has made the Army



soft. But the Army's mission is not to peel potatoes; its mission is to fight. Peeling potatoes does not improve discipline or combat efficiency. So changes to some things held traditional in the past are in the wind, but if you look at them, you will see that each turns harder than ever on mission. We are not retreating from the Army's real business. The volunteer Army is ready to fight.

We do not have and we shall not have a permissive Army. We have and we shall have a disciplined Army, responsive to authority, and able to perform its mission in the service of the country. You expect it; the country deserves it; and I'm going to do my level best to see that it happens!

In brief, that's the program we have undertaken to attract young people, to encourage them to enter the Army. And once they're in, I know that many of them will choose to stay beyond their initial commitment, because they will see that the Army has a very fine career progression system.

I believe Americans will agree, then, that we have a package that is appealing to today's young people, appealing not only in terms of benefits, but in the opportunity for service to country. And the beauty of this is that it appeals to everyone in America. Service to country appeals equally to rich and poor, Northerner and Southerner, educated and uneducated. Pride in America and willingness to sacrifice for her is an ideal which knows no cultural or economic boundaries. In this fact lies the very strength of the Nation. I count on this appeal to give us an Army which mirrors America. It's not going to be a mercenary Army, it's going to be an all-American Army.

This then is our plan. It is not only our plan for the future, it is also a description of today's Army. For practical purposes, the draft ended for us on December 29, 1972, when the last draftee entered the Army. (Although a few deferred draftees entered later.) So we have had about 10 months' experience now in a volunteer environment, and I think it is appropriate that we review some of the results.

Because each month we openly discuss our goals and quotas, many have a distorted picture of our progress. They feel we are hopelessly short of recruiting goals, trying to make up the gap by lowering quality, and as a consequence, ending up with nothing worthwhile whatever. It is true that we have missed our goals during the past 10 months. But it is important to remember that our goals are akin to the salesman's goals—realistic, but difficult to meet.

What are the facts? During these past months, we have recruited into the volunteer Army some 124,000 young men and women; further, over 34,000 men and women have reenlisted during this period. In fact we have been running about 84 percent of our recruiting objective ever since December 29, 1972, when we abandoned the draft. And those who have come into the Army are of high quality. We have had a higher percentage of high school graduates entering the Army since the draft ended—about 10 percent higher—than we had in the 6 months before the end of the draft. As a result, we now have an Active Army of over 794,000 and this is 97 percent of our programmed strength. Total accessions, then, have fallen somewhat short of our goals, but we are still filled far above any level of concern, and quality is high.

And we have many encouraging signs. Last year we decided to reactivate the 9th Infantry Division at Fort Lewis, Washington, but the manpower was not at hand. So we told the commander, General Fulton, that if he wanted a division, to take his cadre, the Division colors, and go out and recruit a division. General Fulton and his recruiters did just that. They began a vigorous recruiting campaign and today that Division stands at 102 percent strength, essentially filled with

enlisted volunteer soldiers. Now, this is a real success story, a living example which illustrates concretely that the volunteer Army program is not an impossible dream, but a workable idea, and it is typical of many other units with similar successes.

We do not minimize our recruiting problems; we spend our time and energy working on them. We are trying many new approaches to recruiting, which stress quality together with quantity—such as increasing the number of recruiters, expanding our unit-of-choice and station-of-choice options, screening out poor soldiers in our reenlistments, administering new entrance tests, and even weeding out misfits in basic training. These efforts will continue.

Some also have expressed concern that the volunteer Army was doomed to failure because it would bring a decline in discipline. That has not been the case. If we compare discipline trends for FY 72 with FY 73, a period which includes both draft and volunteer Army experience, we find that rates for AWOL, desertion, crimes of violence, crimes against property, courts-martial, and separations under less than honorable conditions, are down.

Virtually every major indicator of discipline except drug offenses has, in fact, remained or turned positive in the volunteer Army. Whatever factors contribute to this picture, it is clear that today's volunteer soldier is not causing an increase in disciplinary problems.

Many also had expected the volunteer Army to herald the demise of our National Guard and Army Reserve as viable outfits. No such demise is in sight, although we do face problems here. We have seen modest reductions in the strengths of both our Reserve Components from the December 1972 levels, a trend in fact dating from mid-1971. But current indications give us some encouragement that we may be able to restrain this decline. We have in the past several months, for example, been successful in recruiting trained, experienced, prior-service personnel into our Reserve Components to offset some of our shortfall. As you know, Reserve Component strength remains critically important, so we are very much concerned that it continue to receive close attention. Under the total force policy any future emergency buildup will have to rely upon the National Guard and Reserve rather than a draft for initial and primary augmentation of our Active forces. I expect the improving image of the volunteer Army to have the positive effect on the health of our Reserve Component recruitment that is needed.

Finally, combat readiness, which is the heart of our business, has shown significant improvement. When the draft ended, we had 13 divisions on the books, but only 10 fully formed. Of the 13 divisions, only 4 met the Army's stringent readiness standards and were considered ready for combat. By contrast, we now have all 13 divisions fully operational and 10 ready for combat. Thus, our divisions today, judged by the stringent standards reported to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, much more nearly meet their goals in terms of authorized strength, personnel job qualification, unit training, equipment on hand, and equipment serviceability than they did at the end of the draft. Six months to a year from now, I believe our readiness posture will be even better.

These simple facts and figures point to one conclusion—The Army is better today than it was at the end of the draft. But the figures are not nearly so meaningful as the subjective feel of those in the Army. I certainly don't pretend to be an expert on this, but by the end of this month I will have visited all 13 of the Army's active divisions, as well as many other posts and stations. During every visit I have talked with new soldiers, with

senior noncommissioned officers, with junior officers, with senior officers and commanders. I can tell you that without any question, today's Army is a far better Army, far more prepared for combat than it was at the end of the draft. I can just feel it everywhere I go. It's in the air. Discipline is better, morale is better, training is better, and equipment is better. The Army's future is indeed now.

And, what is more important, all of our vital trends, with the possible exception of drug abuse (and we are working hard and effectively on that one), are in the right direction today. Let me emphasize—your Army is good now, ready to fight, and getting better with the passage of time. I foresee no doom ahead. Six months from today we will be better, and after that, better still.

This picture that I give you of today's Army is enthusiastic and optimistic, and purposely so. I am extremely proud of today's Army and what has been done to make it work in the volunteer atmosphere. But I recognize our challenges. Benjamin Franklin once said that, "the man who expects nothing . . . shall never be disappointed." I believe he would share my belief that men who do expect something worthwhile and are willing to work hard for it, are apt to achieve it, even if the task is difficult and unfamiliar.

We are daily working on new, innovative, and exciting ideas to insure that we get the right number of qualified men and women to man our Army. It will not be easy. It will perhaps be the toughest job that the U.S. Army has ever been called upon to do, but I am certain that today's Army will be equal to the challenge.

We in the Army have always needed the active support of the American people. Today, we need it even more than ever before. Even our strongest critics have recognized that the one vital element necessary for the success of the volunteer Army lies beyond the Army itself. I'm talking about public support. We need your help as we plow new ground, as we steer an uncharted course to give the country the best Army it has ever had. Without your help, we cannot succeed; with it, we cannot fail. Together, we can meet the challenges and prove worthy of the Nation's trust.

#### A TRIBUTE TO WILFRED JENKS, ILO DIRECTOR GENERAL

**HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, for the last 6 years I have had the opportunity of being a delegate to the International Labor Organization. At these sessions I was particularly impressed by the work of Wilfred Jenks, Director General of the ILO. It is therefore with deep sorrow that I note the recent passing of Mr. Jenks.

Wilfred Jenks dedicated his life to strengthening and improving the ILO. During his 42 years with the ILO, he served under every Director General in the history of that organization. His career was capped in 1970 when he himself became Director General of the ILO.

I have admired the courage, dedication, and leadership displayed at all times by Mr. Jenks. His tireless work in behalf of the working man and for human rights will long be remembered. The ILO and the peoples of the world have lost

the services of an outstanding international civil servant.

### IS JOB MARKET HEALTHY?

#### HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, last week AFL-CIO President George Meany was in Florida charging the President with "increasing unemployment" and giving the Nation "inflation without jobs."

At about the same time, the Peoria Journal Star was running an article entitled "Current Area Job Market 'Very Good.'"

The article quotes Thomas E. Barden, manager of the Peoria office of the Illinois State Employment Service as saying:

This would be considered a worker's market right now because we've got a lot of job openings and we're looking for applicants. Out of the ten and a half years I've been here, I think this has been our best year. Already this year we've helped place 4,700 people in jobs, compared to 3,600 that we placed all of last year.

He went on to say that from August to September this year his file of job applicants decreased by another 1,400 persons.

There is considerable contrast between Mr. Meany's remarks and the report given by Mr. Barden. Enough of a contrast to make one wonder just how well Mr. Meany is in touch with the employment situation in this country.

The article follows:

#### CURRENT AREA JOB MARKET "VERY GOOD"

"It's very good," said Bob Schmidt. "I don't think it's been this good in a long time."

Schmidt is a manpower analyst in the regional Illinois State Employment Service office here, and he was talking about the current job market in this area—and the low unemployment rate.

"This would be considered a worker's market right now," said Thomas E. Barden, who is manager of the Peoria office of the state employment service, "because we've got a lot of job openings and we're looking for applicants."

"Out of the 10½ years I've been here, I think this has been our best year. Already this year we've helped place 4,700 people in jobs, compared to 3,600 that we placed all of last year."

Also, he says that from August to September this year his file of job applicants decreased by another 1,400 persons.

"I don't mean that we placed that many people in jobs in that time," he says, "but that's how many found work, either with help from us, or someone else, or on their own."

"We've done a lot of placement in the factories this year," said Barden. He said there have been a number of cases where factory workers will leave one plant to take a better paying job at another, and that this then creates more job openings.

Local factories have been going full steam and have been hiring, he said.

The employment service office here, in new quarters at Jefferson and Fayette, keeps a "job bank" of work available in Peoria and 10 other nearby counties.

As of the start of this month, there were 976 "listings" in that job bank, which Barden said involved 2,663 job openings.

Out of these, Barden said 75 were for professional-type work—"all kinds of engineers, draftsmen, registered nurses, licensed practical nurses, registered pharmacists, medical technicians."

There also were 42 listings for manager trainees, either in the fast food industry, retail trade, or savings and loans.

And there were 350 listings in the file for clerical jobs, sales clerks, bookkeepers, secretaries, receptionists, or general office work.

The demand for skilled work professional workers, especially engineers, is especially good. Machinists, welders, auto mechanics and tool and diemakers are also in demand.

"Any tool and diemaker could walk into almost any town and get a job right now," says Barden.

There is also a big market now for people to work in the retail trades, as store clerks or salespeople.

The opening of two area shopping centers—Pekin Mall and Northwoods Mall—swelled the number of job openings in those fields. Some stores in the Northwoods have had trouble finding enough help, while other places in other parts of town have had trouble with people leaving to take jobs in the new centers.

And the low rate of unemployment in this area doesn't make it easier for employers to get help—at least the kind they want.

The Tri-County (Peoria, Tazewell, Woodford) unemployment rate for August was 3.3 per cent, compared to a rate of 3.7 per cent for the state and 4.7 for the nation.

Last month, the Tri-County jobless rate dropped to 2.9 per cent, or 4,650 people without work out of a total work force of 159,075 persons.

Barring any upheaval such as a strike that would idle large numbers of workers, Schmidt looks for the unemployment rate to dip to about 2.7 per cent this month.

The low unemployment rate makes it especially rough for manufacturing firms to get workers, Schmidt said, "and the people they can get they don't want. But usually, if you're at least trainable, they'll take you."

Schmidt attributes the low unemployment here now to "just the good economic climate. The demand for the type of goods we handle in this area has gone way up."

And the rate is always lower in September and October because "all your manufacturing is going strong; construction work is at high tide; canning plants are canning; bottling plants are bottling, and so forth."

The state employment service office here doesn't merely wait for jobs or job seekers, however.

There are field representatives in the office who go out and call on businesses and industries periodically, checking their needs for workers.

Also staff members are sent periodically to several area towns—such as Eureka and Chillicothe—with the list of jobs available in the 10-county area and seek out job applicants.

Barden noted that he also works with local agencies or groups, Tri-County Urban League, Illinois Central College, and others, exchanging information on jobs available and job applicants.

And just this week, the state employment service opened a new branch office in Sheridan Village shopping center.

Barden also pointed out that services offered by the office are not strictly for people who are out of work, but that help also will be given to people seeking a change of jobs, or better or higher paying jobs.

### THE CHICAGO BOARD OF TRADE TRIES TO DUCK

#### HON. JOHN MELCHER

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, for about 4 years now, I have had a bill before Congress to require commodity exchanges offering futures contracts for farm commodities to establish multiple delivery points for the commodities.

The Chicago Board of Trade has recently announced two new delivery points for corn and soybeans: St. Louis, Mo., and Toledo, Ohio.

The board has for years been telling us that they were "studying" the designation of additional points. But their study excuse had worn threadbare, so now they have come out with an inadequate number of points—just two of them, neither centrally located, instead of the 15—suggested to be necessary by an Iowa State University study to make delivery on contracts reasonably possible.

Obviously aware that the two were not sufficient to quiet the demand for enough delivery points to tie the cash and future markets closely together, the board has accompanied its designation of the two alternate points with some more bait—it is still considering designation of Des Moines, Iowa, it announces.

This whole episode is simply proof that there must be full Government regulation of the commodity markets: They have no intention of self-reform beyond the minimum absolutely necessary to get by.

It does not take years to study the freight rates, necessary discounts, and transportation patterns involved in alternate point designation. There are problems, all right. But I am increasingly convinced that the biggest problem bothering the exchange, and taking so long to settle, is the question of who owns the warehouses in the cities to be designated for delivery. Is it the big grain firms that dominate the markets, or co-ops and independents that will accept and issue warehouse receipts to all who wish to deliver grain? If independents, that would make impossible the profitable market squeezes through which the sheep are shorn of their currency at the boards of trade.

The purpose of multiple delivery points is to make it possible for producers, grain elevators and other legitimate hedgers to deliver their grain and never get caught with undeliverable contracts outstanding, on which they can be required to pay whatever the longs want to extort from them.

If the exchanges are honest about wanting to be service establishments that serve a useful purpose, they would make delivery on contracts readily possible. When they duck—as the Chicago Board of Trade is doing—and limit or avoid the designation of enough delivery points to make such delivery readily possible—they are making opportunities for squeeze plays, shear the lambs, and do a disservice.



ice to producers, legitimate marketing establishments, and the consumers of the Nation.

Congress must either create a commission with authority to take control of commodity markets out of the hands of the scalpers and speculators or forbid trading entirely in commodities that present delivery problems.

# NEW PROSECUTOR, FULL DISCLOSURE AND A VICE PRESIDENT NEEDED NOW

**HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the events of this past weekend, let me first comment that the departure of Elliot Richardson and Bill Ruckelshaus is most regrettable. Both are men of great competence and high personal integrity and have served their country well over the last 5 years.

I have long believed that an independent investigation of Watergate would not only be in the national interest but would best serve the cause of justice. I still believe that. Accordingly, if the President does not appoint a new special prosecutor with the independence to investigate and prosecute completely, the Congress should do so. The integrity of the criminal justice system is at stake and I believe that the American people should be confident in the assurance that all the truth behind Watergate will be found and those guilty of wrongdoing will be properly punished.

I have fully appreciated the President's position with respect to the confidentiality of private conversations and documents and believe that certain official acts of the President should enjoy executive privilege under the Constitution. However, at this unprecedented time in our Nation's history the President would further the national interest by granting the judicial process full access to materials relevant to criminal investigation. I am, therefore, pleased that President Nixon has decided to abide by the district and appellate court decisions and turn over the subpoenaed tapes to Judge Sirica. This action should go a long way in resolving conflicting testimony and establishing in fact what the President knew and when he knew it.

There are indeed serious questions of Government credibility and viability that must be confronted. It is critically important that reason and good judgments prevail, not the emotions of reaction. Clearly, the House of Representatives is constitutionally empowered to make certain judgments with respect to the conduct of the executive branch. However, its first responsibility now is to proceed forthwith in the consideration of confirming a new Vice President. The nomination of JERRY FORD should not be held hostage to the resolution of any other issue. The Government requires a Vice President and I believe the American

people expect the Congress to discharge its duty and approve one.

In brief then, the President should appoint a new special prosecutor as soon as possible and make available all relevant White House material to the grand jury. The Congress should move swiftly in its consideration of the nomination of GERALD FORD.

Tuesday's Washington Star-News and today's Washington Post carried editorials stating that the Congress has a constitutional responsibility to confirm a new Vice President under the 25th amendment. At this point I enter the full texts of these editorials:

## FORD AND THE "FIRESTORM"

The nomination of Gerald R. Ford to be vice president is in danger of becoming a casualty of the "firestorm" over the Watergate tapes. Predictions are being heard on Capitol Hill and elsewhere that his confirmation will be held hostage to the outcome of the tapes controversy, or perhaps even to the ultimate determination by Congress on whether it will or will not move for impeachment of President Nixon.

We think that would be a mistake. It would be in the best interests of the nation for the Congress to proceed with all deliberate speed to hearings on the Ford nomination and to his confirmation.

In this time of turmoil, the needs of the country demand that some order and stability be brought to the political and governmental scene. If Congress refuses to fill the vice presidential vacancy, we believe it can only add to the tension abroad in the land and to the bewilderment people feel over the events that have shaken the foundations of the republic.

A compelling reason for filling the vacancy is that last November the people, by an overwhelming margin, voted in a Republican administration. It would be a travesty if, by a quirk of fate or an action of Congress, the voters were to find themselves with a Democratic president.

No doubt many people believe that a major reason for Mr. Nixon's continued troubles over Watergate and related matters is that some Democrats, and perhaps a few Republicans, have never accepted the result of the 1972 election and are doing their best to get Mr. Nixon removed from office. Confirmation of Ford by the Democrat-controlled Congress would do much to dispel that notion, for it would put a Republican in line to succeed Mr. Nixon.

Without a vice president, the next in line of succession is House Speaker Carl Albert, a Democrat. We believe that House Minority Leader Ford has the professional, political, moral and physical qualifications for the office of vice president and to succeed to the presidency if necessary. There is less certainty in our mind concerning Albert.

Moreover, the Congress, having put in motion the 25th Amendment to the Constitution providing for presidential succession and for filling vice presidential vacancies, and having seen it approved by the states, has no right to capriciously disregard or delay unduly the procedures established in that amendment. It has no right to withhold confirmation of a vice presidential nominee because it may not like what a President is doing on another matter.

Another argument in favor of prompt action on Ford is that Congress would be in a better position to deal with its confrontation with Mr. Nixon. Having provided a presidential successor of Mr. Nixon's party, it could then stand back and look at the tapes controversy and Mr. Nixon more dispassionately.

Many scenarios can be written about what

might happen as a result of Mr. Nixon's ill-considered actions of last Saturday. But we do not believe that should interfere with the confirmation of Ford, and we hope the Congress will get on with it.

## THE VICE-PRESIDENTIAL VACANCY

Every political crisis produces, among other things, a rash of ill-considered statements. By way of illustration, consider the suggestion, now being widely offered, that the Congress should delay action on the nomination of Rep. Gerald R. Ford to be Vice President. There have been arguments that Congress has no obligation to take up a nomination made by a President who faces possible impeachment proceedings. There has been talk of holding Mr. Ford as a hostage for better behavior by the President. There is the possibility—which some apparently find quite tantalizing—that the congressional Democrats, by failing to confirm Mr. Nixon's nominee, could engineer the elevation of one of their own, House Speaker Carl Albert, to the presidency if Mr. Nixon should be unable to complete his term—and thus sweep their party into a position of power it could not come even close to winning in last year's election.

The first point to note about this entire approach is that Speaker Albert quite properly is having none of it. Mr. Albert said Tuesday that the House should act on the Ford nomination quickly and that a new Vice President should certainly be confirmed before formal impeachment proceedings, if any, are begun against the President. The Speaker's concern is doubly understandable because events have placed him in a very awkward spot. As long as the vice-presidential vacancy remains, Mr. Albert faces the prospect of having to play a leading role in impeachment proceedings which could put him in the White House. Similarly, as long as his nomination is pending, Mr. Ford has such an intense and involved personal stake in the proceedings that it would, in fact, be fitting for him to take himself out of any argument over impeachment—rather than lead the defense of the President in the House, as he is now doing.

The situation is doubly entangled in the House because the Judiciary Committee must deal with not only the Ford nomination, but also the impeachment investigation and the issue of a special prosecutor. In contrast, the Senate Rules Committee is not overburdened and should be able to process the nomination expeditiously. It would be useful for the Senate to take the initiative—and to take its lead from majority whip Robert C. Byrd's statement the other day that the nomination should not be held up, but should "rise or fall" on Mr. Ford's own qualifications for the vice-presidential post.

Such calls for prompt action reflect a sound understanding of the obligations imposed on Congress by both the 25th Amendment and the current low state of political affairs. In political terms, the last thing that the country wants or needs is any more distress, disunity and narrow partisanship. All this would certainly result from an attempt to hold the nomination of Mr. Ford as hostage, either to Mr. Nixon's future performance or in anticipation of the President's impeachment. Moreover, it would be profoundly wrong—and probably self-defeating as well—to try to turn impeachment into a congressional coup d'etat which would install a Democrat in the White House. That would be precisely the sort of cynical, exploitative abuse of power which the American people are now reacting so strongly against.

In contrast, there are large national benefits in the course which Speaker Albert advocates—the prompt completion of the investigations, the hearings, the committee reports, the floor debates and the votes in both houses on the nomination of Mr. Ford.

Settling the issue of succession would remove one source of public uncertainty. It would also demonstrate that the Congress can perform responsibly at a time when a sense of responsibility is a precious commodity in public life.

Prompt action on the nomination also happens to be the only course which satisfies the letter and spirit of the 25th Amendment. The whole intent of Section II of that amendment is to insure that the nation will almost always have a Vice President—some one chosen specifically for that particular job, and able to bring both a reasonable degree of competence and some measure of continuity to the presidency if called on to assume that post. In other words, Section II of the amendment was approved so that the Speaker of the House would not henceforth be next in line to become President, except if an almost unthinkable disaster should remove both President and Vice President simultaneously from the scene. This reform acknowledged the fact that Speakers of the House, however able and experienced, are elected for a different job by a different, smaller constituency and sometimes as now, by the opposition party.

Those who favor blocking the nomination of Mr. Ford, and keeping Speaker Albert next in line, are thus urging a course which Congress and the states specifically repudiated by approving the 25th Amendment. They are also pressing a course fraught with the most dangerous kind of political mischief. It is interesting to recall that the possibility of such perilous partisan sport was discussed during the Senate floor debate on the 25th Amendment in 1965. Then Sen. Ross Bass (D-Tenn.) suggested that a Congress controlled by the opposition "would have much more of a problem in confirming the recommendations of the President if we knew . . . that one of our own people would go to the job next." The situation, Senator Bass said, "becomes a political bomb." To this Sen. Birch Bayh (D-Ind.), floor leader for the amendment, replied:

"I have more faith in the Congress acting in an emergency in the white heat of publicity, with the American people looking on. The last thing Congress would dare to do would be to become involved in a purely political move."

It is up to Congress to show that such faith was justified.

## U.S. ECONOMY AND TRUCKING INDUSTRY

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, because we so often see trucks as individual units of freight movement, we sometimes tend to overlook the impact and importance of trucking as an industry.

Likewise, some of the remedies proposed for our Nation's economic and transportation problems are not viewed from the standpoint of how they would affect that industry and its ability to continue to provide vital service. This is particularly true in the case of some of the simplistic solutions offered, such as those which would measure the value of transportation service only on a basis of ton-miles.

Illuminating comments on this subject were made recently by a gentleman I have known for many years and for

whose credentials in the transportation field I have great respect—Mr. Allan C. Flott, director of the department of research and transport economics of the American Trucking Associations, of Washington, D.C. Mr. Flott delivered his remarks before the symposium on truck marketing trends at Houston, Tex., on October 2, under the title, "The Trucking Industry and the U.S. Economy—A Look Ahead."

The remarks are as follows:

### THE TRUCKING INDUSTRY AND THE U.S. ECONOMY—A LOOK AHEAD (Remarks of Allan C. Flott)

By any reasonable method of measurement, trucking is the principal means of distributing the output of our complex economy to consumers.

Trucking is virtually the only means of moving goods about our cities, and it also handles the biggest part of the job of transporting them between cities.

Trucking has become the number one mover of goods in the United States because it can produce better transportation service—the kind of transportation service our economy must have if it is to maintain its position in this increasingly competitive world—for most of our economy at the lowest expenditure of resources.

Despite its efficiency—and it could be more productive were it not for certain artificial and unjustified restraints imposed upon it—it is under concerted attack from many quarters, including high government officials, as inefficient and wasteful. And there are in progress right now in Washington, plans designed not merely to stifle the growth of truck service but actually to shrink it by diverting freight from truck to railroads.

These misguided proposals are based upon the erroneous, yet deeply-rooted, belief on the part of some of our most influential planners that the task of transportation in our economy is to move tons—not goods—and that the distance they are moved somehow adds to their importance.

This is similar to the concept that the job of our farmers is to produce tons—not apples, potatoes and milk—and that our manufacturers should produce not clothing, television sets and steel—but tons. Thus, using the ton-mile or the movement of one ton—no matter what it consists of—one mile as the criterion, it is argued that truck service costs more than rail service, uses more fuel than rail service, and creates more pollution and highway congestion among other things to perform the same task as rail service. All of these conclusions are based upon invalid comparisons of truck and rail service.

Let me cite a few examples to illustrate what I am talking about. Here are some statements by Federal government spokesmen and from official government publications which illustrate the problem.

Here is one from the Office of Emergency Preparedness which appeared in its publication, "The Potential For Energy Conservation," released about a year ago:

"Enormous differences exist in the energy efficiency of the transportation modes. Airplanes are less energy-efficient than automobiles which are in turn less energy-efficient than buses and railroads for passenger movement. For freight movement, airplanes are less energy-efficient than trucks and considerably less efficient than pipelines, waterways, and railroads."

Here is another from a recent press release from the Environmental Protection Agency, which listed these "facts" and "remedies":

"Railroads carry one half of intercity freight tonnage at one tenth of the total fuel consumption . . . promote shifting of intercity freight from highway to rail."

One final quote: In its 1972 National

Transportation Report—Present Status-Future Alternative, The U.S. Department of Transportation said:

"The Nation's railroads hauled an estimated 760 billion ton-miles of cargo in 1970—37 percent of all intercity ton-miles, 35 percent of total ton-miles—to make them by far the Nation's largest freight carrier in terms of ton-miles carried. All trucking, intercity and local, for hire and private combined, carried just over 400 billion ton-miles. . . . In terms of impact on the economy, railroads are the Nation's most important intercity carrier."

I could go on and on citing similar statements from DOT, as well as Congressional staff sources, but I'm sure you are aware of the situation.

So that I am not misunderstood, I want to make it clear that I am not attacking the railroads. They are an efficient and necessary means of moving certain goods vital to the American economy. What I am attacking is the method of measuring freight transportation which suggests—actually claims—that rail and truck service can be properly compared and the role of transportation in our economy equated in terms of the number of tons moved multiplied by the number of miles they are moved.

This is similar to saying that the output of our Nation's farms can be properly measured in tons and that the way to insure the most efficient use of our agricultural land, labor etc. is to favor production of crops that yield high tons per acre, man-hour, fuel and so forth. Thus, if sugar beets yield high productivity levels in tons, their production should be encouraged at the expense of producing lettuce or apples, which might yield fewer tons per acre, man-hour etc.

In order to put things into perspective, let's look at our National Transportation System as a whole and then separate it into its components. The figures I am going to use to do this are not mine. They come from a Department of Transportation publication entitled "Transportation Projections 1970-1980." I have not reviewed them critically, so don't attribute them to me. They differ from most of the statistics in this area since they presumably cover only goods moving in "commerce" and the revenue or expenditure figures are expressed in constant (1958) dollars. I use them primarily because they are all from the same source and should be comparable.

Based on this source, we find that in 1970, all forms of transportation—airway, pipeline, railway, waterway and highway—moved 8.5 billion tons of goods in commerce. Of this total, 3.2 billion tons moved in local commerce by trucks. "Commerce" is stressed because trucks perform many services in our economy which are not counted as transportation. Thus, the use of trucks in construction and trade as well as in servicing our cities—trash removal and highway maintenance, for example—are not included in these data; yet, they are responsible for many of the trucks that are on the roads.

There are several other ways in which freight transportation output is measured. The most widely used unit (misused would be a better term) of freight transportation production is the ton-mile about which I talked earlier. This is defined as the movement of one ton the distance of one mile. Using this criterion, we find that all forms of transport performed—or produced—2,063 billion ton-miles of freight service in 1970. Of this total 35 percent was performed by rails, 28 percent by water, 21 percent by pipeline, 15 percent by truck and less than 1 percent by air. Local trucking, which handled more than 37 percent of the tons, performed only 2 percent of the ton-miles. Thus, intercity transport, responsible for 63 percent of tons, produced 98 percent of ton-miles.

Transportation service is also measured in terms of revenues of carriers or, more broad-



ly, in the amount spent to move goods. When this criterion is used we find that about 40 billion dollars was spent (in 1958 dollars) to move goods in commerce in 1970. (Remember, these are all DOT figures.) Of this total 63 percent was spent for truck service, 28 percent for rail, 4 percent for pipeline, 4 percent for water, and 1 percent for air. Thus, it can be seen that a larger portion of our national transportation expenditure is made for truck service than for that of all other modes combined.

This brings us to the nub of the question. What is the proper way to measure transportation service?

Let's take a look at what happens to the relative size of the several modes when we use ton-miles on the one hand and revenues or expenditures on the other.

As I pointed out earlier, trucks produced only about 15 percent of total ton-miles, but accounted for 63 percent of the expenditures for the movement of goods in commerce. Obviously, truck service costs a lot more per ton-mile than does that provided by other forms of transport. Does this mean that truck transport is inefficient? Not on your life. What it means is that the concept of comparing different kinds of transportation in terms of ton-miles is wrong.

Let's take another look at the question of relative efficiency. If we take the total ton-miles of transportation service reported by DOT for 1970, which is 2 trillion 63 billion, and divide that figure into the \$40 billion of expenditures, we find an average of 1.93 cents per ton-mile. For local trucking we find that expenditures were 26.23 cents per ton-mile. For air, it was 23.19 cents; for all intercity trucking, the rate per ton-mile was 5.46 cents; for rails, 1.54 cents; for pipeline, 0.39 cents; and for water, 0.25.

What does all this mean? Does it mean that railroads can move goods for one-fourth of truck costs or that water carriers can move freight for one-sixth of rail costs? Of course not. If it did, the answer to all our transportation problems would be simple: Just ship everything by water. The impracticality of this suggestion is readily seen. Yet those who suggest that great savings—in resources, cost, manpower, energy etc.—could be achieved by shifting freight from trucks to rail fail to recognize that for the kinds of goods they move and the kinds of service they provide, trucks are the low cost mode of transportation in every sense.

I've dwelt on this matter of the ton-mile because, as was pointed out earlier, this inappropriate measure is being widely used to "prove" that trucks are "inefficient". Unfortunately, the public generally doesn't have the technical background to see through the erroneous nature of such claims.

That means that you and I must tell the story like it is. We must point out that transportation is not a homogeneous undertaking in which a single product is involved. We must make people aware of the fact that transportation is just as widely diversified as is agriculture and manufacturing. For example, movement of iron ore cannot be properly compared with the movement of furniture in terms of cost per ton-mile.

Fortunately for the country, and for trucking, shippers know this. Demand for truck service is at an all-time high despite the campaign to impede its growth. And the demand for truck service is going to continue to increase relatively as well as absolutely for the foreseeable future.

Evidence of the strong demand for truck service is everywhere. In the first half of this year, for example, the gross revenues of the trucking companies regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission were up about 16 percent; tons carried up about 11 percent; miles operated about the same above the levels achieved in the first half of 1972.

At this rate, the gross revenues of inter-

state regulated portion of the industry will reach about \$21.5 billion for the year. This compares to about \$15 billion for the railroads.

With so large a portion of our total transportation dollar being spent for trucking, one would expect that responsible government officials would be looking for ways in which they could help to improve the efficiency of the industry rather than foolishly seeking ways to discourage its growth.

One means of improving the efficiency of trucking, particularly intercity trucking, is readily at hand. This is to upgrade our outmoded size and weight laws. As many of you know, the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads (now the Federal Highway Administration) conducted a study at Congressional direction. This showed that our highways can accommodate—safely and economically—larger and heavier vehicles than are currently permitted under Federal and, in many cases, state laws. Lifting existing standards could go a long way toward alleviating both highway congestion and the cost crunch.

As I've said earlier, I have brought along some numbers that you might like to look at. Included in these numbers are DOT projections to 1980 for the various transport measures I've cited for 1970. You'll see from those data that even DOT expects trucking to increase its share of the total transportation market at least through 1980. Don't be confused by the differences between those figures and others I've given you. The DOT 1970 and 1980 projected figures are in 1958 dollars, whereas the others are in current dollars.

Let me sum up by saying that trucking is far and away the most important and efficient means of moving goods in this Nation and is becoming the chief means of moving goods throughout the world. Just look at our principal competitors in the world markets—Germany, Japan and even Russia. Yet, the future of trucking in America is being seriously threatened by misguided policies based upon an erroneous concept of measuring transportation service and efficiency.

If this same method, using physical standards only (weight and distance) were applied in any other segment of our economy—for example, if an attempt were made to compare the output and efficiency of a steel mill with that of a clothing manufacturer in terms of tons or cost per ton—the fallacy would be apparent to all. Yet, in transportation we find comparison of the output and cost of moving steel and clothing measured in the number of tons moved times the miles that they moved. We even compound this error by including the weight of packing material and using the miles moved rather than the distance between the points between which the goods are moved. Thus, heavier packing required to permit a shipment to withstand the rigors of movement by one mode, and wasteful circuitous miles are added to the productivity of the movement.

Remember: The United States has the best and most efficient transportation system the world has ever known. It is the only system in the world where the companies which provide the services are almost all privately owned. It achieved this level by allowing the shippers to choose the way they want to move their goods.

The trucking industry has played a significant role in the development of our system. It must be allowed to continue to contribute to our overall economic growth.

It isn't easy to dislodge long-held ideas, no matter how erroneous. It is going to take a lot of effort to overcome the idea that the ton-mile is a meaningful unit of transportation output. If intelligent decisions about our transportation system for the future are to be made, however, this must be done.

Each of us in the industry, and that includes all of you, must tell our story. We

must point out the fallacious basis for the efforts to impede our growth. We and our Nation can't be allowed to adopt second best solutions to critical problems.

# HOUSE SHOULD CONTINUE IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY: SEEK APPOINTMENT OF NEW SPECIAL PROSECUTOR

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on October 23, I introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution which provides that:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary shall, as a whole or by any of its subcommittees, inquire into and investigate the official conduct of Richard M. Nixon to determine whether in the opinion of said committee he has been guilty of any high crime or misdemeanor which in the contemplation of the Constitution requires the interposition of the powers of the House of Representatives under the Constitution. The Committee on the Judiciary shall report its findings to the House of Representatives, together with such resolutions, articles of impeachment, or other recommendations as it deems proper.

The delivery of the tapes to Judge Sirica in no way should deter the House from continuing its investigation into whether the President has engaged in impeachable offenses.

Further I believe—and I told this to the Speaker—the Judiciary Committee should hire Archibald Cox as a special counsel and then immediately subpoena all of Cox's records and files at the Justice Department and employ them in the committee's own investigation.

In addition, I feel strongly that a new special prosecutor should quickly be appointed by Judge Sirica or the Congress through legislative mandate, should name a new special prosecutor to continue the investigative work of the task force which was headed by Cox.

In my mind, the President still faces serious charges involving the obstruction of justice and criminal investigations, wiretapping, bribery—Vesco, the wheat and milk deals—failure to report the break-in of Ellsberg's psychiatrist office, use of CIA to cripple FBI investigations, and the submission of false reports to Congress relating to the bombing of Cambodia.

If proven, these and other charges fit with the "high crimes and misdemeanors" impeachment clause of the Constitution.

A final determination by the Judiciary Committee should be made on all charges before we can and should quiet the voices seeking impeachment of Richard Nixon.

The committee also must expeditiously consider GERALD FORD's nomination as Vice President.

I do not believe his nomination should be tied to the committee's newest—most critical—responsibility, the inquiry into possible criminal actions by the President.

# PROTECTION OF OUR FOREST LANDS IS PROTECTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT

**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is appropriate, during National Forest Products Week, that the Forests Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture has conducted hearings to determine what legislative measures Congress can take to preserve and protect large areas of forests in this country from the ravages of insects.

Though the subcommittee was primarily concerned with the insect infestation problem on our Nation's forest lands, we were also interested in how this problem affects other agricultural crops.

The bill we considered, H.R. 10796, which has been authored by our colleague the Honorable MIKE MCCORMACK and cosponsored by 13 other Members, would authorize and direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency "to accept and approve registration applications filed with him pursuant to section 3(c) (1) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a (c) (1)) by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for the application of DDT to forest or other agricultural lands as are, in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, required for the control of and the protection against insect infestations of such lands."

The bill is designed to restore to the Secretary of Agriculture discretionary powers to provide the American farmer and forester with the best available tools to combat insect infestation and thus insure maximum production and an adequate supply of timber and other agricultural crops to meet the needs of all Americans.

We recognize that a problem of major proportions does indeed exist. We are concerned over this and wonder if we can afford to wait while alternative solutions are proposed and examined. We feel that it is not only tragic but costly that we stand by and see hundreds and thousands of acres of beautiful and valuable timberland devastated annually by insect infestation such as that facing the Nation from the ravages of the gypsy and tussock moth when we know that these pests can be controlled through the effective application of DDT. If the use of this pesticide is not made available soon, entire forests may be wiped out, with extensive secondary environmental damage.

It appears to us that we had better take a long hard look at all the alternatives, including the controlled use of DDT, before our environment is "protected" into extinction. We are concerned with excessive environmental rhetoric and believe that our concern for our environment must be balanced with a recognition of human and economic needs that must be met if we are to progress toward our goal of more and better housing for all Americans.

We clearly have a problem which must be solved.

It was gratifying to see the President's concern, expressed in his proclamation of National Forest Products Week, for "the protection and renewal of our forest resources." This is precisely the aims of the Forests Subcommittee during these hearings.

Our forests lose more timber each year through devastation by insects than is lost through forest fires. The bill considered by my subcommittee would give the Department of Agriculture, and thus the Forest Service, another tool needed to protect the forest environment from further degradation by insect epidemics. When vast areas of our national forests are destroyed by insect infestation, it is clear that secondary environmental damage will occur. If we do not use the safe, effective weapons, we have to combat the destructive army of insects in our forests, the overall environment of the forests, and ultimately the entire country will suffer.

We must not allow this to happen.

I include in the RECORD the text of the President's Proclamation 4252:

PROCLAMATION 4252: NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS WEEK, 1973

As a Nation, we have grown increasingly dependent upon the resources of our forest lands, especially wood and wood products. As the 1970's have brought record worldwide demands for housing, pulp, paper, building materials, and furniture, Americans have become more keenly aware of the need for careful management and development of our timber resources so as to ensure a continuous supply of timber and other forest products. As Theodore Roosevelt put it many years ago, forest protection does not limit our resources but "on the contrary, gives the assurance of larger and more certain supplies."

We have also come to recognize the importance of the forest products industry to the vitality of the Nation's economy and the maintenance of our high standard of living. For example, the thousands of products that are manufactured from wood each year represent one-fifth of the industrial raw materials in the Nation. Forest products industries provide five percent of the Nation's employment, and five percent of our gross national product originates in timber based activities.

Projections for future demands of wood and wood products, both at home and abroad, indicate that consumers will want and need even more forest products in the 1980's and beyond. This means that we must give even greater attention to the protection and renewal of our forest resources. We must find better and more efficient ways to use our timber supply, ways which are consistent with our environmental values. And we must improve the technology for reclaiming and recycling forest products.

In order to give further recognition and emphasis to the importance of forest resources and forest products to the Nation, the Congress has by joint resolution of September 13, 1960 (74 Stat. 898) designated the seven-day period beginning on the third Sunday of October in each year as National Forest Products Week and has requested the President to issue an annual proclamation calling for the observance of that week.

Now, therefore, I, Richard Nixon, President of the United States of America, do hereby call upon the people of the United States to observe the week beginning October 21, 1973, as National Forest Products Week. I ask that public attention be directed through appropriate activities and cere-

monies to the importance of forest products in American life and to the responsibility we have for protecting and using them in the most intelligent manner possible.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this eighteenth day of October, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred seventy-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred ninety-eighth.

RICHARD NIXON.

GENE KRUPA

**HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, American jazz is a music form unique to our country. It began here, in New Orleans and Chicago, expressing the peculiarly American rhythm and drive that has made us a great nation. It became a symbol of the United States abroad, reflecting European views about our vitality.

The musicians who played this jazz are unique to our country, too. They developed the sound and the beat because they lived it. They also lived the American dream, rags to riches stories that are part of our heritage, rising from poor families to become famous and respected musicians.

American jazz has lost a man who was part of this unique set of men, a man whose drums beat out the tempo of his times. Gene Krupa, as much as any other American musician, drew people to jazz with his style; the audience not only heard the music of Gene Krupa's drums, it saw the music. From the early 1920's when he began playing in Al Gale's band and with Joe Kayser, through his work with Red Nichols, Irving Aaronson, and Buddy Rogers in the early 1930's, during his starring appearances with Benny Goodman and while leading his own bands, Gene Krupa made music on the drums, sounds with substance and continuity. His blurred hands style and chewing gum were as world famous as his Drum Boogie solo with matches on a match-box and his work on the 1936 hit, "Sing, Sing, Sing."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the many fans and friends of Gene Krupa in offering deepest sympathy to his children, Gene Michael and Mary Grace, and to his brother Julius. Gene Krupa's drums made America listen to itself, and we liked what we heard. Our music will miss him.

I include several news articles and the "Who's Who of Jazz" biography on Mr. Krupa's life and accomplishments:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 17, 1973]

GENE KRUPA, REVOLUTIONARY DRUMMER, DIES

(By John S. Wilson)

Gene Krupa, who changed the drummer in jazz bands from a timekeeper to a soloist through his flamboyant performances in Benny Goodman's orchestra in the nineteen-thirties, died yesterday at his home in Yonkers. He was 64 years old.

The cause of death was not announced immediately, but Mr. Krupa had been suffering from benign leukemia for the last 10



years. He had entered a hospital in Yonkers last week for treatment of a heart problem connected with his leukemia.

Mr. Krupa, whose success was due at least as much to the eye-catching image he created as it was to the sounds he produced on his drums, declared a few years ago:

"I've succeeded in doing two things. I made the drummer a high-priced guy and I was able to project enough so that people were drawn to jazz."

#### APPLAUSE-ROUSING STYLE

As a young man with the Goodman band, Mr. Krupa was lean, wiry and handsome. He hunched over his drums, chewing gum in vigorous tempo with the beat, a dangling lock of black hair waving back and forth in front of his eyes, which filled with an almost fiendish zest as he flailed away at his snare drum, tom-toms and cymbals. Suddenly he would rear back, holding both arms in the air as he pounded his bass drum with a foot pedal. And then, perspiration dripping from him like a tropical rainfall, his arms and drumsticks became a blur of motion as he built his solo to a crashing climax.

The cheers that filled the dance halls, nightclubs and theaters when he had finished sounded more like the response to an athletic event than a musical performance. As a result, the long drum solo quickly became a sure-fire applause rouser in jazz and has continued on through the rock era.

Despite the frenzied, flashy showmanship of his solos, Mr. Krupa tried to give them substance and continuity.

"Before I begin a solo," he told George Simon, a jazz historian who is a drummer himself, "I try to have a good idea of what I'm going to play. Then, while I'm playing, I'll hum some sort of thing to myself, something maybe like 'boom-bid-bee, boom-bid-bee, boom' and follow that with another phrase that relates to the one I just played."

#### FROM CHICAGO GROUP

"At the same time I keep humming to myself, so that each syllable becomes not only a separate beat, but also a separate sound. That's very important because drums, if they're to be musical, must produce sounds, not just noise. So a 'boom' could be a deep-sounding tom-tom and a 'dang' a rim shot on the snare drum and a 'paah' could be a thin cymbal."

Mr. Krupa, who was born in Chicago on Jan. 15, 1909, came into jazz as part of a group of young musicians who were identified with "Chicago style" in the late nineteen-twenties—a group that included Benny Goodman, Eddie Condon, Bud Freeman and Jimmy McPartland, among others.

He was drumming with a band of youngsters called the Frivolians on a summer job at Wisconsin Beach near Madison, Wis., when he was 12. At 16, he entered St. Joseph's College, a preparatory seminary in Indiana to study for the priesthood, but dropped out after a year.

During the next 2 years he played in a band led by Thelma Perry, a girl bass player, in the Benson Orchestra of Chicago and in Leo Shukin's orchestra, which included Joe Sullivan, pianist, Mezz Mezzrow, saxophonist, and Frank Teschemacher, clarinetist, all destined to become well-known jazz figures. He jammed with other young jazz-minded musicians at the Three Deuces and began to study drums with a variety of teachers.

He made his first record on Dec. 9, 1927, with the McKenzle-Condon Chicagoans, a group organized by Red McKenzle, a singer, and Mr. Condon. The Chicagoans also included Mr. Freeman, Mr. McPartland, Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Teschemacher, all of them making their recording debuts.

#### BROKE RECORDING TRADITION

This was one of the first recording sessions on which a bass drum had been used. Normally drummers used only small drums and

wood blocks on records, because it was feared that the vibrations caused by a bass drum would cause the recording needle to jump. When Mr. Krupa innocently set up his usual equipment, including the bass drum, the recording manager rushed into the studio shouting, "You can't use those drums. Throw those drums out!"

But the musicians protested, and a compromise was reached when rugs were put down to absorb the vibrations.

"Gene beat the heck out of the drums all the way through the set," Mr. McPartland recalled, "which was fine for us because he gave us a good solid background."

During the next eight years, Mr. Krupa played in Chicago and New York, sometimes with his jazz friends in Red Nichols's or Mal Hallett's bands, more often in dance bands such as Irving Aaronson's, Russ Columbo's or Buddy Rogers. He was playing with Mr. Rogers in Chicago when he got the call to join Benny Goodman's new band in February, 1935.

#### DUBIOUS ABOUT CHANGE

Mr. Krupa was dubious about making the switch, because Buddy Rogers' band worked steadily, while the Goodman band, less than a year old, was a very shaky proposition that had already lost jobs at Billy Rose's Music Hall and at the Roosevelt Grill in New York. The drummer finally decided to take a chance with Mr. Goodman.

"From the time he joined us," Mr. Goodman recalled several years later, "Gene gave the band a solidity and firmness, as far as rhythm was concerned, that it never had before."

With the Goodman band, Mr. Krupa was able to put into practice some of the drummer's showmanship that he had been learning from watching Cuba Austin of McKinney's Cotton Pickers and from Chick Webb ("the most luminous of all drum stars," Mr. Krupa called Mr. Webb. "The master, the little giant of the big noise!").

His showmanship reached full flower with "Sing, Sing, Sing," a tune by Louis Prima that the Goodman band began playing early in 1936. At first this was a relatively standard Goodman-type arrangement by Jimmy Mundy, including a vocal by Helen Ward. But it was gradually extended as, midway through the performance, the band switched to Chu Berry's "Christopher Columbus" and Gene Krupa went to work on his tom-toms to create the first extended jazz drum solo.

A few months after he joined the Goodman band in 1935, Mr. Krupa took part in the first recording by the Goodman Trio, an experiment that had first been tried at a party at the home of Mildred Bailey, the singer, when Mr. Goodman, Teddy Wilson, the pianist, and Miss Bailey's nephew, a drummer, extemporized a few pieces.

Mr. Goodman liked the results so much that he decided to make some trio records, using Mr. Krupa. The success of these records not only set a style for big bands to draw small groups from the full band but pointed toward a small-group format that Mr. Krupa used in the last two decades of his career.

By early 1938, Mr. Krupa, who had become as celebrated as a drummer as Mr. Goodman was as "King of Swing," was at odds with the bandleader. Shortly after the precedent-setting concert by the Goodman band at Carnegie Hall in January, 1938, Mr. Krupa left the band and formed one of his own.

His band quickly developed a popularity that rivaled that of the Goodman band, particularly after Anita O'Day came on as vocalist and Mr. Krupa hired Roy Eldridge, a trumpet star who had been leading his own band.

#### SERVED JAIL TERM

Mr. Krupa's career was threatened in 1942 when he was arrested in San Francisco on a charge of possession of marijuana and served an 84-day sentence. He was released

only after the chief witness against him, a valet Mr. Krupa had recently hired, recanted his testimony and the charges were dropped.

On his release, he joined Benny Goodman's band for several weeks in 1943, testing public reaction to his arrest. It seemed to be favorable to him—so favorable, in fact, that he was voted the country's outstanding drummer in January 1944. For the next six months he toured with Tommy Dorsey's orchestra and then formed a new big band of his own that, like the Dorsey band of the period, included a large string section.

The band was a disappointment to most Krupa fans, but, as he cut away the strings, it got back in a swinging groove but with new accents to accommodate the new sounds that were coming into jazz in the nineteen-forties, including arrangements by such young newcomers as Gerry Mulligan.

Mr. Krupa continued to lead his big band until 1951, when he began three years of touring with the Jazz at the Philharmonic troupe. From then on he led trios of quartets, at first featuring Charlie Ventura, a saxophonist who had been with the second of his big bands, and, from 1954 on, Eddie Shu, another saxophonist.

#### TEMPORARILY RETIRED

In 1960, he suffered a heart attack, and, on physician's orders, reduced his performances to six months a year. More than half of his time (18 weeks a year) was spent at the Metropole, just off Times Square. In 1967 he announced his retirement—"because I felt too lousy to play and I was sure I sounded lousy."

But three years later, chafing at his idleness, he was back at work again on a limited schedule. Last spring and summer, he made several appearances with the other members of the original Benny Goodman quartet—Mr. Goodman, Teddy Wilson and Lionel Hampton on vibraphone. They played at Carnegie Hall on the opening night of the Newport Jazz Festival in New York last June. His last appearance was with the quartet in August at Saratoga Springs, N.Y.

Mr. Krupa's first wife, Ethel, whom he married in 1933, died in 1955. He was divorced from his second wife, the former Patricia Bowler, whom he married in 1959. Survivors include two adopted children and a brother, Jules of Chicago.

A requiem mass will be held tomorrow at St. Denis Roman Catholic Church in Yonkers. The body will be flown to Chicago for burial.

[From the Washington Star-News, Oct. 17, 1973]

#### GENE KRUPA DIES AT 64; WAS SWING ERA DRUMMER

YONKERS, N.Y.—Jazz drummer Gene Krupa died yesterday at his home here. He was 64.

Mr. Krupa had been released from Yonkers General Hospital a week ago after undergoing treatment for heart problems associated with leukemia. Mr. Krupa had suffered from benign leukemia, for which he required periodic blood transfusions.

His last public appearance was Aug. 18 in Saratoga, N.Y., with Benny Goodman, whose band he joined in 1934.

Survivors include two adopted children and a brother, Jules, of Chicago.

Mr. Krupa suffered a heart attack in 1960, which kept him inactive for a time. He retired in 1967, but came back in 1970, leading a quartet at New York's Plaza Hotel.

Last summer, during the Newport Jazz Festival in New York, he played with the reunited Goodman quartet, including clarinetist Goodman, pianist Teddy Wilson and Lionel Hampton on the vibes.

Mr. Krupa also appeared July 4 at the renaming of the Singer Bowl in New York at Louis Armstrong Stadium. Later in the summer, Mr. Krupa gave a eulogy at the funeral of jazz banjoist Eddie Condon.

After graduation from high school in his

native Chicago in 1925. Mr. Krupa got a summer job as a soda jerk at a Wisconsin Beach "dime-a-dance" hall. When the drummer in the dance band fainted across the soda fountain, Krupa substituted for him and played the rest of the season.

After the summer, his family sent him off to a seminary in Rensselaer, Ind., where he studied for the priesthood. The following year, after his father's death, he left the seminary to play drums in Chicago. His first records were made in 1928 with a Chicago group.

In 1929 he went to New York to play in the orchestra of George Gershwin's show "Strike Up The Band." The orchestra, said to be the first white swing band on Broadway, included Goodman, Condon and trombonist Glenn Miller, and was led by Red Nichols.

After stints with bands led by Buddy Rogers and Goodman, Mr. Krupa formed his own orchestra in 1938. He remained a band leader thereafter, except for one year—1943, when he served a six-month prison term for a narcotics conviction. After his release he was briefly with Goodman and Tommy Dorsey before reforming his own band.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 17, 1973]  
GENE KRUPA, FAMED DRUMMER, DIES AT 64  
(By Jean R. Halley)

Gene Krupa, whose frenetic drumbeat sent teenagers jitterbugging in the aisles during the swinging 1930s and 1940s, died yesterday at his home in Yonkers, N.Y. He was 64.

Mr. Krupa, one of the most famous drummers of his time, had been suffering from leukemia for the last 10 years, his agent said. He had been released about a week ago from Yonkers General Hospital after undergoing treatment for a heart condition associated with the disease.

Mr. Krupa had performed infrequently in recent years because of his illness. This summer, however, he had appeared three times with the original Benny Goodman quartet. There was Mr. Krupa on drums, Goodman on clarinet, Lionel Hampton on vibes and Teddy Wilson on piano.

They were seen and heard in Chicago and Saratoga, N.Y., and at the Newport Jazz Festival in New York's Carnegie Hall.

It was in Carnegie Hall in 1937 that the quartet introduced "Sing, Sing, Sing," a number that featured Mr. Krupa on the drums and brought him world fame. The recording of it blared for years from juke boxes across the country.

Mr. Krupa, whose hands moved so swiftly that cameras had to be speeded up to record the action, was the idol of the bobby-soxers, not only because of his rhythm that sent young people into gyrations but also because of his handsome face.

As his tempo increased, the black wavy hair fell into his eyes, his head twisted from side to side, his jaw worked at a rapid pace on the chewing gum that seemed an integral part of him.

The audience not only heard the music of Gene Krupa. It saw it.

He had personal problems. There was a marijuana conviction in the 1940s that sent him to jail.

He was both loved as a person and respected as an artist by his associates in the field of music.

"Gene was really a gentleman, a real human being and just about one of the nicest people that ever lived. He never had a bad word for anybody . . . He'll be missed and he'll certainly be remembered," Goodman, himself a gentle man, said after learning of Mr. Krupa's death.

"One of the finest persons I've ever known, as friend and in every other capacity. He was the man who popularized the drum as a solo instrument," said Wilson, one of the jazz greats on the piano.

One of Mr. Krupa's toughest rivals, drummer Buddy Rich, said:

"I feel all cracked up—really bad. Gene was very gentle, very helpful, a very understanding man. I love the guy and I think he felt the same way about me. I don't think that Gene and I ever thought of each other as being competition to each other—he played the way he played it and I play the way I play it and we tried to do the best thing we could for the art of jazz and the art of drumming."

Mr. Krupa's heyday began when he joined Benny Goodman in 1934. It was the era of the big bands, swing music and one-night ballroom stands across the country.

Goodman had many stars, Eddie Condon, Glenn Miller, Red Nichols to name a few, but Mr. Krupa was the soloist who shone the brightest at that time. In addition to "Sing, Sing, Sing," he cut such memorable discs as "Dinah" and "Tea for Two."

By 1938, he was ready to branch out with his own band and it was an immediate success. With such sidemen as Charlie Ventura, Teddy Napoleon, Roy Eldridge and Gerry Mulligan, he toured the world.

"Sing, Sing, Sing" was still going strong, but now there were other songs, "Dark Eyes," "Drum Boogie" and "Let Me Off Uptown."

He was riding high until 1943 when he was charged and found guilty of contributing to the delinquency of a minor by using his valet to transport marijuana cigarettes. He served a six-month prison term.

The enormous publicity given his case pictured him as a dope addict and he lost much of his following.

After his release, Mr. Krupa worked briefly with Goodman and then with Tommy Dorsey before again forming his own band.

Once again he toured the country on one-night stands, but the successes of the past evaded him, although he announced his own personal war against marijuana, noting that his earlier trouble had "taught me the hard way that marijuana or any drug can ruin a musician."

In the early 1950s, with the advent of rock and roll, he quit the big band business to work with small combos. His name was no longer a headliner.

In 1960, Mr. Krupa suffered a heart attack that kept him inactive for awhile and he retired in 1967. He tried a comeback in 1970 with a quartet, but that, too, went nowhere when it came to headlines.

This past summer, in addition to appearing with the Goodman quartet, he was at the renaming of the Singer Bowl in New York as Louis Armstrong Stadium, and he gave a eulogy at the funeral of Eddie Condon.

Born Eugene Bertram Krupa in Chicago, Mr. Krupa started playing drums at the age of nine. From then on and throughout his career, if he wasn't working out on actual drums, he was practicing on a pad.

After graduating from high school in Chicago, Mr. Krupa got a job as a soda jerk at a local dance hall. When the band drummer fainted, he stepped in as a substitute and was on the way.

He played with Joe Kayser's band in Chicago and then in 1928 headed for New York, where he joined Red Nichols and met Benny Goodman. The rest is history.

Besides personal appearances with other bands as well as his own, he played drums on radio and TV and in a number of films, including "Some Like It Hot," "Ball of Fire," and "Syncopation." He also played in the Broadway musicals, "Strike Up the Band" and "Girl Crazy."

A film was made of his life, with Sal Mineo playing Mr. Krupa.

He is survived by two adopted children, Gene Michael and Mary Grace, and a brother, Julius Krupa, of Chicago.

[From Who's Who of Jazz]

KRUPA, GENE (DRUMS)

Born: Chicago, Illinois, 15th January 1909. Attended Bowen High School, later studied at St. Joseph's College in Indiana—during summer vacations played a season with 'The Frivolians' in Madison, Wisconsin. In 1925 began studying percussion with teachers Al Silverman, Ed Straight, and Roy Knapp. During that year worked with Al Gale's Band and Joe Kayser, subsequently with Leo Shukin, Thelma Terry, Mezz Mezzrow, the Benson Orchestra, Eddie Neilbauer's Seattle Harmony Kings, etc. Moved to New York (1929), began working for Red Nichols, and during next two years worked mainly in theatre bands directed by Nichols.

During the early 1930s played in various commercial bands including Irving Aaronson's Russ Columbo (1932), Mal Hallett (1933), and Buddy Rogers (1934). Starred with Benny Goodman from December 1934 until February 1938, then formed own big band for debut at Steel Pier, Atlantic City, in April 1938. Continued to lead own successful band until May 1943 when circumstances outside of music forced him to disband.

In San Francisco for a short while, then returned to New York and studied harmony and composition. Rejoined Benny Goodman in September 1943 until mid-December 1943, then joined Tommy Dorsey in New York, remaining with that band until following July. Left to organize own big band which got underway late in 1944—initially it proved to be an enormous band hovering between the 30- and 40-piece mark—it settled down to a more usual formal and enjoyed wide success until 1951.

From September 1951 began to tour regularly in 'Jazz At the Philharmonic' shows—usually featured with own trio. Toured with own trio/quartet in the 1950s (including trips overseas), also appeared regularly at the Metropole, New York. Temporarily inactive in late 1960 through heart strain, then resumed leading. In June 1963 led specially formed big band in Hollywood, a year later made second visit to Japan with own quartet. From 1954 Gene and Cozy Cole ran a drum-tuition school in New York. Continued leading own small groups during the 1960s. A supposedly biographical film 'The Gene Krupa Story' (retitled 'Drum Crazy' in some countries) was released in 1959, the role of Gene Krupa was played by actor Sal Mineo—Gene recorded the soundtrack. Semi-retirement from October 1967 until leading own quartet at Hotel Plaza, N.Y. (1970). Has resumed regular playing, occasionally touring.

Film appearances include: 'George White's Scandals', 'Some Like It Hot', 'Beat The Band', 'The Benny Goodman Story', etc.

## RESOLUTION DIRECTS INQUIRY INTO ACTIONS OF PRESIDENT

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this week a resolution which directs the House Judiciary Committee to undertake an immediate inquiry into various actions which have been taken by President Nixon, and to report back to the House within 30 days with its specific recommendations, including whether or not there exists probable cause for the House to commence formal impeachment proceedings against the President.



I think it vital that the Judiciary Committee act on these issues of importance with deliberate speed; while their consideration should not, of course, be precipitous, neither should it be protracted. The 30-day period I have proposed would, I believe, afford reasonable opportunity for a preliminary investigation.

Mr. Speaker, our country looks now to the House of Representatives for thoughtful leadership and for appropriate action. Although the President has decided to respond at least in part to the district court mandate and turn the tapes in question over to Judge Sirica, there remains the question of other related documents and memoranda which, as of this moment, the President does not plan to release. Clearly, the withholding of these documents not only could preclude prosecution of present and potential defendants of alleged crimes relating to the Watergate matter, but also could deprive present and potential defendants of access to evidence tending to establish their innocence.

The Judiciary Committee should not, of course, limit itself to the matter of the tapes or documents; in addition, I would hope that it would investigate possible invasions of civil liberties and rights of American citizens by the so-called Plumbers unit, the significance of the Huston memorandum, questions involving the personal finances of the President, and other matters which could be construed to be in violation of laws of the United States and may indeed constitute "high crimes and misdemeanors" for which the President may be subject to impeachment and conviction.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the full text of the resolution I have introduced. The resolution follows:

#### RESOLUTION

Whereas the President of the United States, Richard M. Nixon, has been ordered by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to produce to said Court certain tapes and documents pursuant to a subpoena *duces tecum* of the Federal grand jury investigating the so-called Watergate matter; and

Whereas the order of the District Court has been affirmed by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit; and

Whereas a temporary stay of the mandate of the Court of Appeals and the order of the District Court has expired; and

Whereas since the expiration of the temporary stay, the order of the District Court has been, and continues to be, in full force and effect; and

Whereas the President has not produced the tapes and documents specified in the subpoena *duces tecum* to the District Court since the expiration of the temporary stay of the order of the District Court; and

Whereas the President ordered the Special Prosecutor, Watergate Special Prosecution Force, to desist from efforts to obtain for the Federal grand jury the tapes and documents in question, and ordered the Special Prosecutor dismissed after the Special Prosecutor announced his intention not to desist therefrom; and

Whereas the withholding of the specified tapes and documents by the President could result directly in the prevention of due prosecution of present and potential defendants for alleged crimes relating to the so-called Watergate matter; and

Whereas the President's withholding of the specified tapes and documents could,

alternatively, deprive present and potential defendants of access to evidence tending to establish their innocence; and

Whereas the actions of the President recited herein above may constitute contempt of a Court of the United States, refusal by the President to "take care that the Laws be faithfully executed" as he is commanded by Article II, Section 3 of the Constitution of the United States, and obstruction of criminal investigations and of justice in violation of the laws of the United States; and

Whereas these actions may, therefore, constitute "high Crimes and Misdemeanors" within the meaning of Article II, Section 4 of the Constitution for which the President may be subject to impeachment and conviction: Now, therefore, be it

**Resolved**, That the Committee on the Judiciary is hereby directed immediately to undertake an inquiry to determine whether, as a result of the matters recited herein above, or of any other matters not recited herein, there exists probable cause for the House of Representatives to commence formal consideration of impeachment of the President, and, further, at the conclusion of its inquiry, but not later than thirty (30) days following enacting of this Resolution to transmit its judgment to the House, together with whatever specific recommendations it may deem appropriate.

#### ABOUT KILLING THE UNBORN

#### HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, recently an excellent essay has come to my attention on the subject of abortion written by Dr. Medford Evans, who was chief of security for the atom bomb project. The article appeared in the magazine the Review of the News about a month after the Supreme Court announced its decision in the Roe against Wade case last January. I enter the article in an abridged form in the RECORD:

#### ABOUT KILLING THE UNBORN

(By Medford Evans)

The Supreme Court January 22, 1973, ruled that state laws forbidding abortion are unconstitutional because they interfere with the right of privacy. Not only did seven of the nine men decide to absolve women of the first duty of motherhood—to keep the child alive—they also absolved physicians of the oath of Hippocrates which had previously, for some twenty-four centuries, guided the profession. Supreme Court decisions are supposed to end controversy, but this decision will deepen, if possible, the controversy over legalizing abortion.

For the Court did not merely legalize abortion. It prohibited laws intended to prevent abortion. A woman and her physician are not simply permitted to agree upon disposing of the unborn child, states are forbidden to interfere with the right of the two of them to kill the unborn child. Such an agreement, says the Court, is a private matter, and any interference by law unconstitutional. Whether the woman's husband has any right to object is a point the Court avoided. He is plainly enough of less importance than her physician.

It will be said that I have already begged the question on the main point at issue—which is whether an embryo or fetus prior to the seventh month of gestation is a human being, a person susceptible of being "killed." The Court avoided deciding when life begins

(a question which is difficult only for those who do not like the obvious answer), contenting itself with the observation that "the unborn have never been recognized in the law as persons in the whole sense." Neither have minor children long out of the womb. Webster defines *majority* as "the age at which full civil rights are accorded"; yet the right to life—being accorded not by the state but by God—is, or has been, in our society recognized as belonging to infants. Indeed, if there is a difference, the infant's right to life is felt to be superior to that of the adult, certainly to that of the adult male. "Women and children first" into the lifeboats. The right to life has also been accorded to unborn children. That is why the states have had anti-abortion laws. The denial of the unborn's right to life is what makes the Court's decision so hideously revolutionary.

It will be objected that I am guilty of some kind of anthropomorphic fallacy when I refer to an embryo or a fetus as "an unborn child," or speak of the right to life of "unborn children." Children, I shall be told, are little darlings playing joyfully on the grass, or at worst little monsters smearing crayons on the wallpaper. A *fetus* (unpleasant word, don't you think?—but so scientific!) is not a child, for heaven's sake!

You are entitled to your opinion, but Webster's Third New International Dictionary (the unabridged) gives the following definition:

child . . . 1 a: an unborn or recently born human being: Fetus, infant, baby . . .

Webster's Seventh New Collegiate is briefer, but almost equally embarrassing to Mr. Justice Blackmun: "child . . . 1 a: an unborn or recently born person." According to Webster, then, the unborn are not only "human beings," but also "persons." And a fetus is a child, is a baby.

According to the Associated Press, the Court's opinion was "supported with medical, religious, and philosophical as well as legal references." We should expect that—except for "religious" references. The Court has a well-established precedent for relying on social science rather than the law; yet one wonders how it reconciles religious references with its recent interpretations of the doctrine of the separation of church and state. I for one am glad to hear that the Court will now consider religious authority. I call its attention to a Biblical passage which it may possibly have overlooked, since its attention seems to be only recently turned to such considerations. The first chapter of the Gospel according to Saint Luke gives the story of the Annunciation of Jesus preceded by the annunciation and conception of John the Baptist. We read how the angel Gabriel, having foretold to Mary the most blessed event which awaited her, continued:

And, behold, thy cousin Elisabeth, she hath also conceived a son in her old age; and this is the sixth month with her, who was called barren.

And Mary arose in those days, and . . . entered into the house of Zacharias, and saluted Elisabeth.

And it came to pass, that, when Elisabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb. . . .

Saint Elizabeth certainly had no doubt that the child she was carrying was a live person. She told the Virgin Mary, "As soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in mine ears, the babe leaped in my womb for joy." The unborn child not only leaped, but felt the motion of joy.

The question whether an unborn child is a person within the meaning of the law is the crux of the decision in the anti-abortion case. The Court correctly recognized this fact, but incorrectly reasoned regarding the legal meaning of *person*, and thus answered the question wrong. I speak as a friend of the court of public opinion. If it be asked how I, a nonlawyer, can dispute the correctness

of the reasoning of the Supreme Court regarding a constitutional matter, my reply is:

First, the Constitution is not what the Supreme Court says it is, the Supreme Court is what the Constitution says it is. Second, the Constitution itself is the basic law of the land, and the Constitution is a document written in the English language. It is too important a law to be left to the lawyers. Third, the final word on the meaning of such a document is not to be left to any small group of persons, but is to be approached (possibly never achieved) by the serious consideration of all reasonable men who understand English and are loyal to the United States. Fourth and finally, I am a Ph.D. in English from a reputable university (Yale) and a loyal citizen of the United States.

Here is the Court's opinion as to what constitutes the crux of the case:

*The appellee [State of Texas] and certain amici [friends of the court] argue that the fetus is a "person" within the language and meaning of the 14th Amendment. In support of this they outline at length and in detail the well-known facts of fetal development. If this suggestion of personhood is established, the appellant's case, of course, collapses, for the fetus' right to life is then guaranteed specifically by the Amendment.*

Exactly. We shall return to emphasize what the Court here admits, that if personhood is established the easy-abortion case collapses, and to reinforce the argument that the right to life is guaranteed, by reference other than that to the Fourteenth Amendment. But because the matter is so important, and because we do not wish to be too far out of context, let me quote further from the Court's opinion, as excerpted in the *New York Times* of January 23, 1973:

*The Constitution does not define "person" in so many words. The use of the word is such that it has application only postnatally.*

*All this, together with our observation that throughout the major portion of the 19th century prevailing legal abortion practices were far freer than they are today, persuades us that the word "person," as used in the 14th Amendment, does not include unborn.*

I suppose the *New York Times* excerpt must here be incomplete. Surely Mr. Justice Blackmun, speaking for the majority, would not say "All this," referring to the two brief sentences of the preceding paragraph. Yet if he did actually go through the Constitution accumulating instances of the use of the word *person*, the paragraph would be less, not more, impressive. Mr. Justice Blackmun's sentence, "The [constitutional] use of the word [person] is such that it has application only postnatally," actually is, if it was not intended to be, equivocation. The word *person* is used in the Constitution only to specify who is not eligible to hold specified offices, or to define immunities, such as the provision that no person shall be convicted of treason without the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act or confession in open court, and the provision that the migration of persons whom the states at the time thought proper to admit (euphemism for slaves) should not be prohibited before 1808. There is no use of the word *person* in the Constitution which has any relevance to the question of whether an unborn child is a person when abortion of the unborn child is at issue. Yet the question can be resolved logically, as follows:

The primary meaning of the word *person* in English is a *human being*, as distinguished from an animal, plant, or thing. A person is observable, or capable of acting or being acted upon. *Person* is plainly not a synonym for any human being who has full civil rights and liberties. The original Constitution twice refers to slaves as persons (Article I, Section 9, Clause 1, and Article IV, Section 2, Clause 3). The Fourteenth Amendment itself indeed begins with the statement "All persons born or naturalized in the United States . . . are

citizens." *Born and naturalized* are both restrictive modifiers, and do not mean that aliens not naturalized, or children not born, are not persons—simply that they are not citizens. But the Constitution nowhere provides that noncitizens may be freely deprived of life.

A person is a human being considered in external relations. That is why the baby in the womb seems to its mother to be a person, but hardly seems so to others until after it is born. Yet when other people deal with an unborn child, it becomes a person. It becomes a person to the physician, which is doubtless why Hippocrates proscribed abortion.

The Constitution does not enumerate all individual rights, but it assumes at least those of the Declaration of Independence, and covers, as does the Declaration, a multitude of rights with the general terms *life* and *liberty*. The Declaration speaks of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"; the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of the Constitution restore the earlier Lockean formula of *life, liberty, and property*. Liberty, being a political term, has little or no relevance to the case of an unborn child. As for pursuit of happiness, who can say? That is indeed a private, not to say a subjective, matter; the unborn child may or may not have resources of his own. So many people want to retreat to the womb, they must believe they were happy there. (But they should be careful; they might get killed.)

Regarding *property*, I should suppose (not being a lawyer, I do not know, and language and logic alone will not solve this one) that a posthumous child can inherit property, which would seem to imply rights as a person at the time of his father's death, when the child itself was yet unborn. I have heard, too, that welfare mothers have claimed benefits for unborn children.

*Life* and the right to *life* are another matter entirely. The child in the womb cannot have civil liberty, and cannot be deprived of it; he may or may not have property rights and may or may not be deprived of them; but he certainly does have life and can be deprived of it. Let us consider that for just a moment.

No one has a right to what in the nature of things he cannot possess, and not possessing cannot lose. No one has a right to that which belongs to another, or to no human being. A right is a just claim to possession, which may or may not be enforced, either by him whose right it is, or by his protector. Rights may in general be conferred or taken away by higher authority. Certain rights are unalienable as rights, but unfortunately quite alienable by usurpation of authority in a wicked world. It has never been said better than in the Declaration of Independence:

*We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, . . .*

With regard to other rights the status of the unborn child may be moot or ambiguous. But to life he has the unalienable right with which his Creator endowed him. He has this right more perfectly than he will ever have it again, for so long as he is unborn he will not be able to forfeit it through crime or other error of his own.

That the unborn child may be deprived of life by other persons puts him into relationship with these persons, and it is this relationship which makes him not only a human being, but also a person. If the unborn child were not in society, his mother and her physician could not remove him from society. Fetal death is not possible without fetal life, but if the fetus has life he has a right to it.

The Constitution is the supreme law of the

land; the Declaration of Independence, ratified by the Treaty of Paris of 1783, is the basis of the Constitution. There would have been no "We, the people of the United States" without the Declaration. The Constitution itself was ordained and established to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." Thus, Constitutional rights belong to the unborn, and become real as soon as the unborn can be identified. (If a woman knows that she is pregnant—and she would have to know this to want an abortion—she knows that she ought not to have an abortion, she knows that the duty of motherhood has already begun, that someone is alive within her body, someone who has a right to life—no greater than her own, but the same. As a rule, the two rights are not irreconcilable; if they were, the human race wouldn't be here.)

"All men are created equal." If they are created equal, they are equal when they are created. When is that? The Supreme Court pretends that this is a difficult question. Difficult indeed if you expect to know in a particular case the precise microsecond when the particular life began—though even here husbands and wives who think back can in some cases figure out pretty well when it must have been.

In general terms, there is no other rational answer to the question when men are created than: *at the time the sperm fertilizes the ovum*. When else? Mr. Justice Blackmun, writing for the majority of the Court, assumes a curious know-nothing position:

*We need not resolve the difficult question of when life begins. When those trained in the respective disciplines of medicine, philosophy and theology are unable to arrive at any consensus, the judiciary, at this point in the development of man's knowledge, is not in a position to speculate as to the answer.*

If that phony-sounding intellectual modesty were genuine, the judiciary would not be revolutionizing laws of the states of the Union, suborning violation of the Hippocratic oath, treating fatherhood with scarcely disguised contempt (the Texas case didn't raise the question of the rights of fathers, said the Court), and inciting mothers—rightfully the most revered of human beings—revered because they sacrifice themselves for their children—to quasi infanticide.

Actually, "those trained in the respective disciplines" mentioned have a pretty practical consensus regarding "when life begins." I hold no great brief for the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, but it is not exactly eccentric in such matters, and its article "Pregnancy" reads in part as follows:

*Life has its beginning in the egg cell or ovum. . . . During healthy reproductive life one ovum is shed each month from one or the other ovary (ovulation). . . . there is only a short critical interval in the cycle during which fertilization is possible. . . . If the ovum is not fertilized, it escapes in the next monthly loss of blood. If it is fertilized by a sperm cell (spermatozoon), pregnancy has begun.*

Dr. Henry E. Garrett, former head of the psychology department at Columbia and president of the American Psychological Association, says in his book *Psychology And Life*: "When the egg of the female parent has been fertilized by the sperm of the male parent, life of the new individual begins." He then describes the contribution of chromosomes from each parent. When the genetic composition of an individual is determined, his life begins. Do we have to assume a know-nothing attitude about that?

It follows that every person from the time of conception has the right of equal protection of the laws, which includes the right not to be deprived of life without due process of law. Such due process might logically enough hinge upon a determination whether continuing the life of the embryo will critically endanger the life of the mother. Killing in self-



defense or in defense of another is justifiable. It is difficult to imagine any other legitimate reason for abortion. If illegitimacy were a reason, it would follow that illegitimate children not aborted before birth should be destroyed after birth. Similarly with deformed children. Indeed, infanticide for these or lesser reasons has been practiced in the history of mankind, but seldom if ever in the civilized world in the Christian Era.

"Spontaneous abortion," says the *Columbia Encyclopedia*, "may occur after the death of the fetus and hemorrhage in the uterus." According to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, the World Health Organization in 1950 established the following classification to account for events less precisely known as stillbirth or abortion:

... group I, early fetal death—pregnancy of less than 20 weeks; group II, intermediate fetal death—pregnancy from 20 to 28 weeks; group III, late fetal death—pregnancy of more than 28 weeks; group IV, fetal death with length of pregnancy unknown.

Consider the simple but powerful significance of the expressions "death of the fetus" and "fetal death" which are precise medical and legal language. The noun *death* is defined as, the end of life, the intransitive verb *die* as, to end life. The transitive verb *kill* is defined as, to cause the end of life, to deprive of life.

Accident or disease may cause death, may kill. Human action may cause death, or kill. When fetal death occurs as a result of human action, killing occurs. Killing is not necessarily murder, not necessarily manslaughter, but it is killing. If a fetus is a human being, causing the death of a fetus is homicide.

Is a fetus a human being? It is a being, it is real. If the mother is human, the fetus is human. To cause the death of a human fetus is homicide. There is no basis for asserting the contrary.

What is generally called abortion is, then, homicide. That is not to say that abortion must never be performed. Sometimes homicide is justified. But it is not justified unless it is recognized for what it is, and the action taken only under the most severe circumstances.

#### SPECIAL AMERICAN SYSTEM TO KEEP ISRAELIS SUPPLIED WITH JETS

#### HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, for years we have been told that the military assistance we supply and the bases we maintain in Spain and Greece are essential to protect our interests in the Middle East and especially our policy of supporting Israel. Because of the Arab-Israeli war and the U.S. decision to resupply Israel with the munitions necessary to replace losses we have found once again that our Government was not telling the truth. Far from supporting our efforts, Greece and Spain have hindered them, even going so far as to deny our aircraft carrying supplies, refueling, or even overflight rights. Consequently, we must bypass direct routes and rely on midair refueling, thereby raising costs and no doubt causing delays.

Meanwhile we continue to pump more and more arms into those dictatorships which, probably for the sake of Arab oil, are willing to disregard the interests of

the United States and Israel. How can we be sure they would assist us in more serious situations such as a war in Central Europe? The answer is plain that we cannot rely on bought allies and should certainly reexamine our military assistance policies and the justification for vast U.S. overseas military bases. It seems so far that our enormous expenditures are worthless when we need the facilities and the cooperation that we thought we were buying.

I include in the RECORD an article on this subject from the New York Times of October 25, 1973:

#### U.S. JETS FOR ISRAEL TOOK ROUTE AROUND SOME ALLIES

(By Leslie H. Gelb)

WASHINGTON, October 24.—Diplomatic sources said today that the United States was forced to set up a special system to rush supplies to the Israelis because some of its North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies, along with Spain, balked at any cooperation.

The sources said that the refusal was based on a fear that the Arab countries would cut off Europe's oil supplies.

The resupply effort from bases in the United States, involved aircraft carriers and Air Force tanker planes, military officials disclosed.

The Navy and the Air Force had to adopt this roundabout system, the diplomats said, because—with the exception of Portugal and, to some extent, West Germany—some key Western European countries along the supply route made it clear that aircraft bound for Israel could neither land on nor fly over their territory.

A main reason cited by Washington over the years for American military aid to Greece and Turkey has been to make it possible to use bases on their territory in Middle East crises. Air Force contingency plans, according to knowledgeable sources, have looked to at least tacit Greek Government cooperation in an Arab-Israeli conflict.

The Turkish Foreign Ministry announced Oct. 11 that American military installations "are for the security and defense of the North Atlantic Treaty area and have been set up solely for defense cooperative purposes of Turkey." Nevertheless, a number of American officials report, Soviet resupply aircraft heading for Egypt and Syria have flown over Turkey and the Turkish Government has not publicly protested.

The Greek Government also ruled out any role in the supply flow to Israel.

#### NAVY PLAN FOR PLANES

The United States Navy had a plan for the urgent supply of A-4 Skyhawks to Israel. According to informed Congressional and Government officials, it worked in the following manner:

The Skyhawks, piloted by Navy men, took off from the East Coast and landed in the Azores to refuel. They then flew to the carrier John F. Kennedy, stationed near Gibraltar, and were refueled by tanker aircraft.

The next leg took them into the Mediterranean, where they landed on the carrier Franklin Delano Roosevelt and stayed overnight. The last leg took the Skyhawks into the eastern Mediterranean, where they refueled in the air near the carrier Independence.

Twenty to 30 Skyhawks were ferried to Israel, and 30 to 50 were sent on Navy transport ships.

The Air Force had worked out an alternative plan for the use of Greek airfields for the delivery of F-2 Phantom fighter-bombers. Government sources sketched the plan this way: The Phantoms, piloted by Air Force men, went via the Azores to the eastern Medi-

terranean, where they were refueled in the air by Air Force tanker planes.

About 40 have followed this route, officials say, and eight more are on the way.

The Skyhawks and the Phantoms retained their United States markings until they landed in Israel, where Israeli markings were applied. The American pilots returned home on transport planes.

Not a single incident involving these aircraft has been reported, the officials said.

The home base of the Air Force tankers used to refuel the Phantoms could not immediately be determined. Some sources asserted that during the first days they flew from the American bases in Spain. This stopped, the sources said, when the Spaniards objected. Another source, without denying that Spanish bases were used initially, said the tankers had been flying from the Azores, which are Portuguese.

Another resupply issue that remains somewhat clouded concerns West Germany. Government officials concede that in the first days of the Arab-Israeli fighting Air Force cargo planes flew from the American base at Ramstein, carrying small arms and munitions. Aviation Week, an authoritative source on such matters, says that these aircraft flew over Austria, Yugoslavia and Greece, all prohibited territory. Officials here deny this but will not suggest other possible routes.

The diplomatic effort became quite complicated, according to the diplomatic sources, with Washington and other NATO capitals jockeying to avoid open confrontation. At first it was said Washington simply decided not to raise the question of landing and flight rights, hoping its allies would look the other way.

However, the Governments of Greece, Turkey, Spain and Italy publicly forbade their territory to American aircraft. Other Governments, including that of Britain, made their positions clear privately. Portugal, was under pressure from the United States, the sources asserted, and agreed to use of the Azores base.

The sources asserted that the United States representative at NATO, Donald Rumsfeld, was asked to win support for American policy in the Middle East but was unable to do so, for the oil issue outweighed unity.

Two factors were at work in United States governmental discussions, a number of officials said:

One was that while the bulk of Soviet supplies to the Arabs were moving by sea, Hungary and Bulgaria, allies of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, a nonaligned nation, admitted Soviet cargo aircraft. Other airborne supplies, the sources asserted, were moved over Turkish territory either in regularly scheduled civilian aircraft or in military transport vessels.

The other factor, the sources relate, was the history of American aid to Greece, Turkey and Spain in the expectation that they would cooperate against the Russians in the Middle East.

From 1946 to 1972, according to Senate Foreign Relations Committee records, United States military aid to Greece totaled \$2.3-billion, to Turkey \$3.6-billion and to Spain \$843-million, the figures do not take account of surplus stocks.

This year, the Nixon Administration has requested about \$6-million in grant aid and support for Spain, over \$250-million in various forms of military and economic aid to Turkey, and \$65-million in credit sales to Greece. The requests were made, at least in part, in expectation of assistance in the Middle East.

President Nixon, responding in July, 1972 to George McGovern's criticism of aid to Greece, said that without aid to Greece and aid to Turkey you have no viable policy to save Israel.

The United States Ambassador to Greece,

Henry J. Tasca, testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on the role of Greece in a Middle Eastern crisis, said in August, 1971, that Greece had been and would continue to be "very cooperative in all of our security problems."

Particularly irksome, officials say, is the Spanish Government's position, since it will not allow the United States to use the \$500-million chain of American-built bases.

# CONGRESSMAN KEMP HAILS 1973 PULASKI PARADE IN BUFFALO

## HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, October 11 marked the 194th anniversary of the death of Count Casimir Pulaski, the Polish nobleman and patriot of our American Revolution.

In 1777, Benjamin Franklin wrote to George Washington from Paris concerning General Pulaski praising him as: "an officer famous throughout Europe for his bravery and conduct in defense of the liberties of his country."

At General Washington's request, Pulaski formed the first American cavalry unit and because of his heroic actions, which resulted in saving Washington's army, he was commissioned a brigadier general in charge of the Continental Army's horsemen.

Pulaski fought bravely and brilliantly in many more battles to help gain our Nation's freedom and once again saved Washington's army from near destruction near Philadelphia. On October 11, 1779, General Pulaski finally succumbed to wounds he had suffered in a particularly gallant episode at the Battle of Savannah.

Mr. Speaker, the life of General Pulaski, one of the greatest patriots and military strategists of all time, stands as an inspiration and symbol of hope to freedom-loving people everywhere—and especially to his native land of Poland which today, as in Pulaski's time, suffers under the yoke of Russian repression.

In 1971, I visited Poland along with other members of my Education and Labor Committee and during my visit I was constantly reminded of the close ties we in America have with freedom-loving people of that nation. The words of one Polish worker with whom I spoke will always stay with me: "We have rebuilt Warsaw in spite of communism." The spirit of Pulaski lives on today in Poland and that proud spirit will never be conquered.

Mr. Speaker, each year in western New York, we honor General Pulaski by having a Pulaski Day Parade in Buffalo. And each year I am sure that the parade is the best ever and cannot be excelled.

Mr. Speaker, again this year the Pulaski Day Parade was better than ever, with my distinguished colleague, Mr. DULSKI of New York, as grand marshal. It has been described as one of the largest and most successful parades of any kind ever to be held in Buffalo.

There were more units, more floats, more bands, than ever before. Even facing the stiff competition of a televised Buffalo Bills football game, the parade had a record crowd of some 80,000 persons lining the streets along Broadway between Bailey and Fillmore Avenues.

My good friend, THAD DULSKI, led the parade along with our special guest Navy Capt. Paul Weitz of the Skylab I space mission. It was due to the efforts of THAD DULSKI that Captain Weitz was able to attend the parade and meet personally with many of our leading citizens.

The selection of the astronaut, Captain Weitz, as parade guest of honor, was tied in with the parade theme, "The Year of Copernicus," in honor of the celebration of the 500th birthday of Nicolaus Copernicus, the Polish genius, who boldly challenged the prevailing scientific theories of his day and through his studies provided the foundation for modern astronomy and our present day explorations of space.

The General Pulaski Association of the Niagara Frontier, Parade Chairman Eugene R. Mruk, and the Honorable THADDEUS J. DULSKI, are all to be commended for their dedicated work which made the 1973 Pulaski Day Parade one of the most memorable in the history of western New York.

Mr. Speaker, our fellow citizens of Polish heritage have made countless contributions to our Nation. I am proud that so many Polish Americans reside in my district and serve with me in Congress. Although I was unfortunately unable to attend the 1973 Pulaski Day Parade, I would like to pay tribute at this time to that great patriot and to Copernicus as we commemorate Pulaski Day and the Year of Copernicus.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the information of my colleagues, an editorial and article describing the Buffalo Pulaski Day Parade from the October 4 Am-Pol Eagle, the leading Polish-American publication of the Niagara frontier.

### The material follows:

#### A JOB WELL DONE

The bright, sunny day helped. So did the presence of Skylab astronaut Paul J. Weitz. But when all things are considered, it was the dedicated efforts of members of the General Pulaski Association of the Niagara Frontier that made last Sunday's Pulaski Day Parade one of the most successful in memory.

Everything went perfectly during the parade. There was perfect balance between musical units, marching units and floats. There were remainders of the contributions made to mankind by parade namesake Casimir Pulaski and Polish astronomer Nicolaus Copernicus, whose quinquacentennial was the theme of this year's parade. Also much in evidence in both marchers and spectators was a pride in being Polish Americans, a feeling that seems to be renewed each year through the parade.

Much of the credit for the success of this year's parade must be given to Parade Chairman Eugene R. Mruk. Mr. Mruk devoted countless hours over the past six months making sure that Polonia's largest single annual event would be successful. Praise must also be given to Congressman Thaddeus J. Dulski, Parade Grand Marshal, whose efforts in having Capt. Weitz attend the parade contributed much to the Copernican theme of the event.

Polonia can be proud of its tribute to

Casimir Pulaski and Nicolaus Copernicus. It was an event that will be remembered for many years to come. Its success will be difficult to duplicate.

### PULASKI DAY PARADE HAILED AS MOST SUCCESSFUL IN MEMORY

Last Sunday's Pulaski Day Parade, blessed by sunny skies and warm temperatures, was hailed by veteran observers of Polonia's annual tribute to Revolutionary War hero Casimir Pulaski as the best and most successful in memory. Despite competition from a locally televised Buffalo Bills football game, Buffalo Police Department officials estimated that some 80,000 persons lined Broadway between Bailey and Fillmore Aves., to view the various floats and marching units participating in the parade.

Eliciting the greatest response from parade watchers were floats depicting the heroics of Gen. Pulaski and the scientific contributions of Nicolaus Copernicus, to whom this year's parade was dedicated. The "Year of Copernicus" was chosen as the theme for this Thirty-Seventh edition of the Pulaski Parade because 1973 is the 500th Anniversary of the birth of the famed Polish astronomer.

Leading the parade's line of march as it moved down Broadway were Congressman Thaddeus J. Dulski, Grand Marshal, and Navy Capt. Paul Weitz, a member of the Skylab I space mission who was a special guest at the parade in keeping with its Copernican theme.

Also in the first division were Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis X. Wlodarczyk, Honorary Grand Marshal, Parade Chairman Eugene R. Mruk, Gen. Pulaski Association President Arthur F. Kilichowski, Erie County Executive Edward V. Regan, and Lackawanna Mayor Joseph Bala.

After completing the parade's line of march, dignitaries viewed the remainder of the parade from a reviewing stand located in front of the Franczak Branch Library. Included among the guests were three bishops: Most Rev. Daniel F. Cyganowski, Bishop of the Buffalo-Pittsburgh Diocese of the Polish National Catholic Church; Most Rev. Edward Head, DD, Bishop of the Diocese of Buffalo; and Most Rev. Bernard McLaughlin, Auxiliary Bishop of Buffalo. Also on the reviewing stand were parade chaplain Rev. Edward Kauskus, and Mayor Stanley Makowski. Edward Reska served as parade marshal.

Judges from the New York Penn Parade Judging Association selected the following units as best in their classifications:

Sr. Drum Corps—1st prize—Kingsmen Drum Corps.

Sr. Bands—1st prize—Sanborn Fire Co.; 2nd prize—Royal Canadian Legion Polish Veterans Branch 418, St. Catharines.

School and Jr. Bands—1st prize—Hinsdale Central School Band; 2nd prize—Depew H.S. Marching Band.

Pipe Bands—1st prize—Gordon Highlanders.

Uniformed Marching Units—1st prize—Hinsdale Fire Dept.; 2nd prize—Canisius College R.O.T.C.

Floats—1st prize—Holy Mother of the Rosary Cathedral—Man on the Moon Thanks to Copernicus; 2nd prize—Polish Union of America—PUA Youth Association; 3rd prize—Lechici Assoc.

Unattached Color Guard—1st prize—Baker Victory Guys and Gals; 2nd prize—Royal Rhythm Steppers; 3rd prize—Boston Amvets Post 209.

Jr. Drum Corps—1st prize—71st Lancers of Cheektowaga & Sloan; 2nd prize—Commodore Drum & Bugle Corps; 3rd prize—Polish National Alliance Youth Band; 4th prize—Mavericks Drum & Bugle Corps.

Sr. Twirling Corps—1st prize—Welland Rosettes.

Jr. Twirling Corps—2nd prize—Welland Rosettes.



Men's Drill Team—1st prize—Baker Victory.

Women's Drill Team—1st prize—Baker Victory; 2nd prize—Royal Rhythm Steppers.

Unique Units—1st prize—Erie County Parks and Recreation Sr., Citizens Unit—Kazoo Band; 2nd prize—Sacred Heart Academy—Kazoo Band.

## CASE FOR IMPEACHMENT STILL STRONG AS EVER

**HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 25, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, now that the President suddenly has reversed his public position and agreed to comply with the law—at least in part—by turning over his tapes to the court, many administration apologists are saying that the case for impeachment existed until Mr. Nixon agreed to turn over the tapes, but that his decision of Tuesday returned him to his previous status of law-abiding, unimpeachable President.

As I pointed out Tuesday, however, Richard Nixon's most recent actions—the firing of Special Prosecutor Cox and all that went with it—merely constitute a continuation of policies and attitudes that have characterized his handling of the entire Watergate affair, and, in fact, his entire administration; indeed, his

entire political career. This was no isolated incident, to be forgiven and forgotten. From his first year in office, when he secretly ordered the illegal bombing of the sovereign nation of Cambodia—a country with which the United States was at peace—President Nixon has consistently violated the laws and the Constitution that he is sworn to protect.

When one thinks of the Oval Office today, one thinks of ITT entanglements, dairy industry payoffs, public financing of personal real estate improvements, illegal campaign donations, possible extortion, illegal fund impoundments, secret invasions, personal income tax difficulties, Cabinet members and high-ranking executive office staff members who have been indicted or convicted or who have resigned under fire—I could go on, but the list seems endless.

Let us keep in mind Edmund Burke's often-quoted remark that—

"The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing."

Too many of us did nothing in 1946, when Richard Nixon smeared the Honorable Jerry Voorhis and entered this body. Too many of us did nothing when Richard Nixon 4 years later was elected to the Senate by the same tactics. Too many of us did nothing in 1952 when the Checkers scandal gave us our first evidence of Nixon's willingness to bend the law for his personal political advantage.

And too many of us did nothing 10 years later when gubernatorial candidate

Nixon was found by the courts to have personally reviewed, amended, and finally approved an illegal phony mailing sent out during the campaign to California's Democratic voters—a smear piece against the incumbent Democratic Governor, soliciting financial support which supposedly would go to a "Committee for the Preservation of the Democratic Party," but which in fact was designed by members of his own Republican campaign staff, which included such men as Dwight L. Chapin, Herbert Kalmbach, Ronald Ziegler, Maurice Stans, John Ehrlichman, Murray Chotiner, and, as campaign manager, H. R. Haldemann. The money these Democrats donated to what they believed was a Democratic Party organization was actually used by the Nixon campaign, of course.

Too many times, too many good men and women have done nothing. Mr. Speaker, we must not stand aside and let evil triumph once again. The fate of our beloved Nation rests in the hands of the Congress in this dark hour. We have the power to determine whether this "noble experiment" shall continue, or shall end in a Fascist dictatorship through the inaction of the people's elected representatives.

I implore every Member of this House to respond to the massive outpouring of sentiment which has erupted throughout the Nation, to respond to our own consciences, and to move forward with all necessary steps to impeach Richard Nixon before it is too late.

## SENATE—Friday, October 26, 1973

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our help in ages past, our hope for years to come, we come to Thee this day with thankful hearts for diminished violence, for the reprieve from larger wars, and for the promise of peace. Keep the warlike spirit from infecting our personal lives, the Congress, our Nation, or its leaders. Make us kindly but firm, compassionate but resolute, possessed of quiet hearts, clear minds, and sound judgment. Keep us ever sensitive to our local, our global, and our humane responsibilities. Grant to the President, his counselors, to all our leaders, and to the leaders of other nations that higher wisdom which Thou dost give to those who trust Thee and whose allegiance to Thee transcends all lesser loyalties. Once more from the depths of our being, we pray, "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on Earth as it is in Heaven."

We pray in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the read-

ing of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 23, 1973, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 607) to amend the Lead Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 386) to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize certain grants to assure adequate commuter service in urban areas and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; had agreed to the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and that Mr. PATMAN, Mr. MINISH, Mr. GETTYS, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. KOCH, Mr. COTTER, Mr. YOUNG of Georgia, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. McKINNEY were appointed managers of the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that

the House had passed the bill (S. 2410) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance and encouragement for the development of comprehensive area emergency medical services systems with an amendment in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to the bill (H.R. 9639) to amend the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts for the purpose of providing additional Federal financial assistance to the school lunch and school breakfast programs.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3927. An act to extend the Environmental Education Act for 3 years; and

H.R. 10586. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the use of health maintenance organizations in providing health care.

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 5943. An act to amend the law authorizing the President to extend certain privileges to representatives of member states