

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 3540. A bill to incorporate in the District of Columbia the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 3541. A bill for the relief of Madeline B. Condon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 3542. A bill for the relief of Miss

Aldegunda Togonon Juaman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3543. A bill for the relief of Cosimo Pelegrini and his wife, Angela, and their children, Giovanna and Felecia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES V. STANTON:

H.R. 3544. A bill for the relief of Robert J. Beas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 3545. A bill for the relief of Pasquale

Di Meglio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California:

H. Res. 183. Resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 2218) entitled "A bill to clear and settle title to certain real property located in the vicinity of the Colorado River in Imperial County, California" to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENIOR CITIZENS DAY

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, Sunday has been designated in Connecticut as Senior Citizens Day.

It is customary on this occasion for Connecticut people to pay special tribute to hard-working, self-respecting men and women who after a lifetime of service to family and community have earned the honored distinction of senior citizen. It is a time, as well, to assess honestly and realistically the status and role of older Americans in our society. Too often this period is one of loneliness, illness, and incapacity, of suffering and deprivation as they endeavor to meet basic human needs for food, clothing, shelter, and medical care on depleted incomes that are further eroded by an incessant inflation that continually lessens their resources.

These people do not need the admonition of a President to ask what they can do for themselves. Their record as members of the human race testifies to their courage, their determination, and their resourcefulness. Yet, at the very time that medical costs are soaring, they are asked to assume even higher medical burdens. Like the pensioner, who finds his promises blighted by the pension that does not materialize, medicare beneficiaries find they are expected to assume larger costs and lesser services in a system where the guarantees are only temporary and the warranty usually expires.

The proposed changes in medicare would mean that elderly patients would pay total hospital charges for the first day and 10 percent of daily costs after that. Under present law the patient now pays \$72 for the first day, and has free care until the 61st day and pays \$18 per day until benefits end on the 90th day. In addition, the initial deductible for doctor's expenses under the administration's proposal would increase from \$60 to \$85 and patients would pay 25 percent of the bill instead of the 20 percent they now pay.

The promise of no new taxes becomes a hollow boast when proposals such as these are actually a new tax for older citizens, who often are least able to bear additional burdens.

Clearly, our budget efforts should be directed toward ending waste, inefficiency duplication and unnecessary expenses. However, budget decisions which deny

vital services to the elderly because they cannot afford them are a severe injustice to those who have given so much of themselves to our Nation.

It is our responsibility to extend our efforts to better meet the needs of older Americans. That is why I have cosponsored legislation to provide outpatient prescription drug coverage under medicare for those who suffer from the most common crippling or life-threatening chronic diseases of the elderly.

In addition, I will continue to work hard for passage of important legislation for the elderly which was vetoed during the last session of Congress. These bills include the comprehensive older Americans services amendments which provide for job opportunity for the elderly, inexpensive and convenient transportation services, as well as programs to help meet other vital needs of the elderly. Connecticut would have been eligible for up to \$1.4 million under the bill toward a State plan to develop a comprehensive and coordinated system of social services for older Americans.

The vetoed National Institute on Aging bill which would provide specialized programs to deal with problems of the elderly and the vetoed nutrition program for the elderly contained in the Labor-HEW appropriations bill, will also have my strongest support.

It is through the passage of programs such as these that we will enable older Americans to keep faith with the promise of America.

THE TRUE CHALLENGE OF PEACE IN VIETNAM

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, as one who has long supported and voted for legislation designed to bring an early end to American military involvement in Vietnam, President Nixon's announcement of an Indochina cease-fire brings a great sense of relief. After years of frustration, I am grateful that American involvement is about to come to an end. I only hope and pray that all parties to the agreement will cooperate openly and honestly in assuring that this cease-fire is expanded into a just and durable peace. This will be a difficult task and we should all pledge our support to this end.

President Nixon has earned our congratulations in negotiating this multifaceted accord which so objectively rec-

ognizes the harsh realities of the present political situation in Vietnam. It is precisely because these political realities are frankly confronted in the cease-fire agreement that now all the people of Vietnam have an opportunity through peaceful means to participate in determining their political future. In this regard, the President has surely fulfilled the American pledge to protect the Vietnamese right to self-determination.

The larger challenge now is to build and maintain a broader peace that will endure. With Vietnam now taking a more balanced place in our international priorities, we can turn our attention to the building of durable and equitable relations among all nations. President Nixon has already performed admirably in this regard, moving to normalize relationships with both China and the Soviet Union, as well as concluding a much-acclaimed arms agreement with the Soviets.

This is a strong foundation that President Nixon has labored intelligently and forcefully to construct, but it is only a beginning, for much remains to be done. As a Nation, we remain challenged in the pursuit of a lasting settlement in the Middle East, a broader, more comprehensive arms control agreement, stable and fair trade relationships, and strengthened international institutions. In achieving these goals, the President will need our support. Despite disagreements in other areas, past or present, I believe we can and should strongly support President Nixon in these undertakings so vital to a stable world and the hope for lasting peace.

MR. NIXON DISPLAYS BOLD LEADERSHIP

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, there have been many assessments of President Nixon's second inaugural address and the direction it spelled out for the American people for the next 4 years.

I particularly like the editorial which appeared in the Nashville, Tenn., Banner on Monday, January 22, under the title, "Mr. Nixon Displays Bold Leadership."

This editorial, it seems to me, puts the President's message in the right perspective and emphasizes those points which all of should keep in mind as we attack the problems at home where he indicated the major thrust will be made

between now and the 200th birthday in 1976.

I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues. I insert it at this point in the RECORD.

MR. NIXON DISPLAYS BOLD LEADERSHIP

"As we meet here today, we stand on the threshold of a new era of peace in the world." "Abroad and at home, the time has come to turn away from the condescending policies of paternalism—of 'Washington knows best.'"

"Above all else, the time has come for Americans to renew our faith in ourselves."

After a weekend of inaugural hoopla, President Nixon has entered his second term, voicing the hopes of Middle America, the broad-based segment of society that gave him a landslide victory.

The President's inaugural address was clear and direct, anchored to themes he stressed during last year's campaign: world peace, a smaller federal government and a new kind of self-respect for Americans.

In terms of immediate importance, the President's repeated references to the nearness of peace overshadowed all else. Mr. Nixon stopped short of saying that peace had been achieved in Vietnam, but he spoke with the confidence of a man who knew that peace now was more than a dream.

Indeed, more than a third of his speech focused on how America should enter the post-war era. This, in itself, was encouraging to those who have listened to presidents for more than a decade discuss the Vietnam war in agonizing detail.

If Mr. Nixon's speech is any indication Vietnam will no longer dominate the thoughts and actions of the President and the Congress, as it has for the last decade.

With peace in Vietnam, America will be free to look at the bigger picture, peace throughout the world, lasting peace, brought about not by American coercion, but by the self-determination of individual nations.

"The time has passed when America will make every other nation's conflict our own," the President said, "or make every other nation's future our responsibility, or presume to tell the people of other nations how to manage their own affairs."

The President was saying that there will be no more Vietnams, not for the next four years anyway. He has put the world on notice that the United States is through playing policeman.

In his first term of office, President Nixon gave special emphasis to foreign affairs. His inaugural remarks indicate that emphasis may shift to domestic matters during the next four years.

The President emphasized that he plans to work diligently for a more de-centralized federal government. The objective is fraught with difficulties, as much so as any foreign policy entanglement of his first term.

Mr. Nixon wants to trim the federal bureaucracy in numbers and in influence. In doing so, he would turn away from the old outlook of trying to meet every problem with a purely governmental solution.

His efforts are certain to spur spirited opposition, particularly in Congress. Mr. Nixon wants less government involvement in the lives of individuals; members of Congress want more. The struggle will be classic and probably bitter.

But the President has shown in his first term of office that he is willing to take the necessary heat to achieve his goals. The determination of Mr. Nixon encourages us that he will try like no President in recent history to streamline a bulky bureaucracy and to dilute the concentration of power in Washington.

Beyond that, the President thinks the stage is set for a rejuvenation of self-respect in America.

The spirit of negativism that prevailed when President Nixon took office four years

ago has subsided. If previous administrations sought to make all of society feel guilty for individual transgressions, President Nixon is determined to see that Americans share the pride for accomplishments that make America number one.

President Nixon's inauguration was the picture of a man steeped in confidence and determination, the underpinnings of decisive leadership. His outlook for the next four years offers a bold, new approach, worthy of broad-based support.

PASSING OF FRANCIS MARTIN MOURNED IN BUFFALO

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Buffalo, N.Y., area—and in particular our Polish-American community—has lost one of its most dedicated citizens in the passing of Francis L. Martin.

In the just over three decades in which he was a part of our community, he became an integral force in civic and public affairs, and a beloved leader within the Polish community.

Born in Poland 71 years ago, Mr. Martin came to the United States as a boy and first resided in the New York City area.

He came to Buffalo in 1941 and immediately immersed himself in community affairs, continuing his relationship with the Polish Falcons which he joined as a boy in Poland. He served 16 years as president of Nest 6 in Buffalo, was a national director, and held the organization's Legion of Honor Medal.

Most every Polish organization felt his influence and received the benefit of his great public spirit and enthusiasm as an American citizen of Polish descent.

Mr. Martin frequently visited Poland and was active in organizations aiding Polish immigrants to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, men of the caliber of Francis L. Martin form the nucleus of informed and progressive community endeavor and we in Buffalo can be so happy to have had him in our midst.

As a part of my remarks I include the obituary on Mr. Martin from the January 26 edition of the Buffalo Evening News:

FRANCIS L. MARTIN DEAD; LEADER IN AFFAIRS OF CITY, POLISH COMMUNITY

A life dedicated to the economic, social and cultural uplift of Buffalo's Polish community and to the betterment of Poles everywhere ended late Thursday (Jan. 25, 1973) with the death of Francis L. Martin.

Buffalo's civic leaders and the leaders of numerous Polish organizations joined in mourning the loss of "Frank" Martin who, in a 30-year period in Buffalo, was a vibrant force in moulding his fellow Poles into the community.

Mr. Martin, 71, came to the United States as a boy from his native town of Rudki, Poland, and for a number of years engaged in the import-export business and published a magazine, "The Monthly Future," in New York City.

From the time he arrived in Buffalo, in 1941, until he retired last October, he devoted his energies to every leading Polish organization and to citywide agencies, constantly winning recognition for his contributions as a citizen.

Mr. Martin served the Polish Falcons for 60 years, having joined as a boy in Poland. For 16 years he was president of Nest 6, in Buffalo. He was a national director and the holder of the organization's Legion of Honor Medal.

He was a past president of Dom Polski Association and an honorary member of the Judges & Police Executive Association and Pulaski Post 1847 and Plewacki Post 799, American Legion.

He was a director of the Board of Community Relations, a member of the Professional & Businessmen's Association, the Polish Olympic Committee and the Niagara Athletic Association.

Mr. Martin served as secretary and manager of the Buffalo Civic Orchestra and was a member of the Polish Singing Circle. He was granted honorary membership by the Polish American Veterans Association.

Mr. Martin, who lived at 145 Berkshire Ave., made frequent trips to Poland and was active in groups aiding immigrants to the U.S. from that country.

For 24 years prior to his retirement he was a salesman for the Bison Liquor Co.

Mrs. Martin, who survives, is the former Marie Ruskiewicz, who was publisher of the former Everybody's Daily, a Polish-language newspaper.

Also surviving is a stepson, Joseph C. Ruskiewicz, of Seal Beach, Calif.; two sisters, Mrs. Edward Witkowski, Brooklyn, and Mrs. Emily Cafeski, Baltimore, and a brother, Paul Martin, Baltimore.

Funeral services will be at 9:30 AM Tuesday in the Okoniewski Funeral Home, 926 Sycamore St. A Mass of Resurrection will be celebrated at 10 AM in the Church of the Transfiguration, 923 Sycamore.

INAUGURATION OF A PRESIDENT

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, every 4 years the American people look forward to the inauguration of a President; 1973 was no exception. Americans and foreign visitors poured into the Nation's Capital from every direction. Planning the inaugural festivities was a mountainous job. When you consider the dozens of activities scheduled and the thousands of people involved as participants and performers, one cannot possibly imagine how much detailed work is put into such an undertaking.

I want to particularly single out two men who I believe did a trojan job as chairman and vice chairman, respectively, of this year's inaugural events. J. Willard Marriott and Mark Evans deserve a special thanks from all Americans. I know from personal experience that these two gentlemen and their able staff went "beyond the call of duty in planning this year's events."

Mr. Speaker, just to give you some idea, I am listing some of the programs that required thousands of people and an awful lot of planning: Salute to the States; Salute to America's Heritage; American Music Concert; Youth Concert; Symphonic Concert; the Four Inaugural Balls and the Inaugural Youth Ball.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I have worked very closely with Mark Evans who also has been very active in many of the important public

buildings and projects Congress has passed for the District of Columbia. He has shown the same expertise and dedication with the inaugural events as he has for the many projects affecting our great Nation's Capital.

We thank and salute Willard and Mark.

THE CASE FOR WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

HON. JAMES R. JONES

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, in recent years there has been a growing tendency on the part of individuals and groups, both public and private, to criticize the water resources policies of Federal, State, and local governments. The building of dams for flood control, energy, and recreation purposes has come under increasing attack. Undoubtedly, some of this criticism is justified from an ecological as well as an economic point of view. Yet these critics have so dominated the public debate that we run the risk of abandoning policies which, on the whole, have been tremendously beneficial.

The State of Oklahoma is a case in point. Oklahoma has been abundantly favored by nature; yet nature has often been our greatest threat, exacting a terrible toll in floods and drought. In the last four decades, water conservation and flood control have been constant preoccupations of Oklahomans. For them, the construction of dams to provide adequate water and to prevent floods has been a necessity, not a luxury or a waste. We have abundant proof that such projects have provided important economic benefits in many areas of the State where the rising standard of living is directly related to water development projects.

Recent editorials in the Tulsa World and the Tulsa Tribune bring home these points with such force and perception that I insert these in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Tulsa World, Dec. 31, 1972]

IN PRAISE OF POLYDIPSIA

The dictionary defines polydipsia as "an abnormal thirst." Until recently, it was universally believed to be a bad condition; at worst, fatal. Now we learn from a Federal study group that polydipsia is good for you. At least, that's the way we understand some of the recommendations of the National Water Commission.

The Commission, created in 1968 to study national water policies, delivered its draft report a short time ago. It is, generally speaking, a negative document.

Its authors would end most water projects that could not be paid for directly by users and beneficiaries. There would be no more navigation projects. Tolls and user charges would be placed on existing waterways. Federal flood control and irrigation projects would be curbed or halted on the grounds that there is already sufficient land under cultivation.

Small watershed programs would also be checked or done away with.

If the philosophy espoused in the report had been popular in earlier times, much of

Eastern Oklahoma would still be a tick-infested range with a declining economy and little hope for the future.

Parts of Western and Central Oklahoma that now produce astounding amounts of food and fiber would still be a semi-desert.

The national commission's negativism is based in part, on the notion that water development projects are bad for the environment. Just what kind of environment could be worse than a dust bowl the experts did not define.

What is so wonderful about an environment in which livestock, property and even human life are periodically sacrificed to ram-paging flood waters? They didn't say.

After working four years on their anti-water development report, the staff members of the commission have given the public a month or so to express opinions.

The Arkansas Basin Development Association and other organizations devoted to the protection and conservation of water resources will express their objections to the commission's draft report at a series of public hearings, one of which will be in the Fairmont Roosevelt Hotel in New Orleans Feb. 5-6, 1973.

Private citizens can state their views in letters to the National Water Commission, Room 405, 800 North Quincy Street, Arlington, Va. 22203. The deadline is Jan. 15, 1973.

[From the Tulsa Tribune, Jan. 11, 1973]

EASTERN OKLAHOMA PROSPERITY

Dam building, river navigation and the accompanying industrial and recreational development of Eastern Oklahoma seem to be having a healthy effect on personal income in this part of the state.

Fourteen Oklahoma counties had gains of more than 100 per cent in median family income from 1959 to 1969, according to the U.S. Census Bureau. And 11 of the 14 counties are in Eastern Oklahoma.

The biggest gain, 127.7 per cent, was recorded by McIntosh County, which contains much of Lake Eufala, the state's largest, and surrounding recreational areas including Fountainhead State Lodge.

Second, at 122.2 per cent, was Wagoner County, which has a growing population of Tulsa commuters, recreational areas on Fort Gibson Lake and a potential for industrial development along the Verdigris River waterway.

Other Eastern Oklahoma counties with income gains of more than 100 per cent were Atoka, Sequoyah, Haskell, Choctaw, Adair, Pittsburg, Rogers, McCurtain and Pushmataha.

Generally, the counties showing the biggest percentage gains were those with the lowest median incomes in 1959.

But not all those low-income counties gained as fast as those 11 in Eastern Oklahoma, many of which have been known in the past primarily for their long lists of welfare recipients. Thus their big gains in personal income are particularly encouraging.

Eastern Oklahoma is just beginning to reap the dividends of industrial development resulting from river navigation. And the potential for recreational development is far from fully exploited. The region's gains in income by 1979 could be even more impressive than those just reported.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks:

"How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,925 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

THE CENSUS BUREAU AND OCCUPATIONAL STEREOTYPES

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to insert in the RECORD, a letter I have directed to the Director of the Bureau of the Census, George Hay Brown, objecting to sex-stereotyped occupational designations in Census Bureau publications. The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., January 26, 1973.

Mr. GEORGE HAY BROWN,

Director, Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BROWN: Federal statutes and Executive Orders have made it the firm policy of the United States to eliminate discrimination in employment on the basis of sex. So strong is this policy that the Government, both by statute (e.g. section 704(b) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-3(b))), and by regulations of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance (e.g., 29 CFR 1604.5; 41 CFR 60-20.2 (b)) prohibits publication of notices or advertisements concerning occupations which indicate a preference or discrimination based on sex stereotypes.

It therefore is rather shocking to see the Census Bureau issuing publications which repeatedly designate occupations with blatant sex stereotypes. For example, Table 8 in the Census publication issued in October 1972 entitled "1970 Census of Population, Subject Reports, Occupation by Industry, PC(2)-7C" at pages 241-248, lists, amongst others, the following occupations and numbers of jobholders, by sex:

Occupation	Male	Female
Clergymen.....	211,830	6,237
Draftsmen.....	262,858	22,257
Cranemen, derrickmen, and hoistmen.....	150,332	1,939
Electric power linemen and cablemen.....	100,448	1,444
Forgemen and hammermen.....	14,649	724
Locomotive firemen.....	12,869	151
Automobile body repairmen.....	106,306	1,332
Automobile mechanics and repairmen.....	793,727	11,045
Pressmen and plate printers.....	143,326	13,346
Shoe repairmen.....	24,820	6,343
Structural metal craftsmen.....	73,098	868
Telephone installers and repairmen.....	230,444	8,285
Telephone linemen and splicers.....	51,274	756
Blasters and powdermen.....	6,776	311
Chainmen, rodmen, and axmen, surveying.....	10,398	163
Furnacemen, smeltermen, and pourers.....	62,455	2,761
Stationary firemen.....	89,474	4,813
Deliverymen and routemen.....	600,609	19,691
Boatmen and canalmen.....	4,631	324
Railroad brakemen.....	46,844	537
Railroad switchmen.....	51,396	867
Fishermen and oystermen.....	25,959	1,147
Longshoremen and stevedores.....	42,349	705
Lumbermen, raftsmen, and woodchoppers.....	77,741	1,766
Busboys.....	80,884	13,528

Occupation	Male	Female
Firemen, fire protection.....	174,922	1,976
Guards and watchmen.....	302,002	16,262
Policemen and detectives.....	362,396	13,098
Dressmakers and seamstresses, except factory.....	4,706	92,114
Chambermaids and maids, except private household.....	10,107	186,660
Lay midwives.....	138	537
Airline stewardesses.....	1,364	31,290

It is apparent that large numbers of women are employed in occupations which you designate with an obvious male stereotype, and that many thousands of men are employed in occupations which you designate with an obvious female stereotype. While continuing to provide the statistical data as to the numbers of men and women engaged in each job category, I feel the occupational stereotypes are wholly unnecessary. I would suggest the following substitutes:

Your Designation and Suggested Substitute

Clergymen: Clergy.
 Draftsmen: Drafting.
 Cranemen, derrickmen and hoistmen: Crane, derrick and hoist operators.
 Electric power linemen and cablemen: Electric power line and cable workers.
 Forgemen and hammermen: Forge and hammer operators.
 Locomotive firemen: Locomotive fuelers.
 Automobile body repairmen: Automobile body repair workers.
 Automobile mechanics and repairmen: Automobile mechanics.
 Pressmen and plate printers: Press operators.
 Shoe repairmen: Shoe repair workers.
 Structural metal craftsmen: Structural metal workers.
 Telephone installers and repairmen: Telephone installers and repair workers.
 Telephone linemen and splicers: Telephone line workers and splicers.
 Blasters and powdermen: Blasters and powder workers.
 Chainmen, rodmen and axmen, surveying: Chain, rod and ax workers, surveying.
 Furnacemen, smeltermen and pourers: Furnace and smelter workers and pourers.
 Stationary firemen: Stationary fuelers.
 Deliverymen and routemen: Delivery and route workers.
 Railroad brakemen: Railroad brake operators.
 Railroad switchmen: Railroad switchers.
 Fishermen and oystermen: Fish and oyster gatherers.
 Longshoremen and stevedores: Longshore workers and stevedores.
 Lumbermen, raftsmen and woodchoppers: Lumber and raft workers and woodchoppers.
 Busboys: Restaurant table cleaners.
 Firemen, fire protection: Firefighters.
 Guards and watchmen: Guards.
 Policemen and detectives: Police officers and detectives.
 Dressmakers and seamstresses, except factory: Dressmakers and dress repair workers, except factory.
 Chambermaids and maids, except private household: Housekeeping, except private household.
 Lay midwives: Lay obstetrical workers.
 Airline stewardesses: Airline cabin attendants.

The continued use of sex-stereotyped occupational designations, particularly by an agency of Government, reinforces traditional sex prejudice in employment and tends to frustrate the objectives of fair employment laws. I request that you promptly eliminate all sex-discriminatory terms from all future Census Bureau publications.

Sincerely,

MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS,
 Member of Congress.

FLUORIDATION FAILURE IN ENGLAND

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, last October I brought to the attention of our colleagues action taken by the Swedish Parliament in repealing their compulsory water fluoridation law—"Water Fluoridation Repealed in Sweden," volume 118, part 25, pages 33547-33548.

Now we learn that an English report claiming that fluoridation is a great success in preventing tooth decay, by its own figures actually reveals the fluoridation program in England to be a failure.

Country after country that has tried to force fluoridation on the public water supply has found the practice to be non-workable.

It is for this reason that I have reintroduced legislation, H.R. 952, to prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to promote the fluoridation of public water supplies in the United States.

I insert the text of my bill, H.R. 952, and a related newsclipping from the Manchester Union Leader that follows:

H.R. 952

A bill to prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to promote the fluoridation of public water supplies

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, no part of any funds appropriated for research, or otherwise available, for expenditure by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall be expended to promote, subsidize, or propagandize for fluoridation of public water supplies. Nor shall any such funds be expended to ridicule, dissuade, or disparage opposition to fluoridation of public water supplies.

[From the Manchester Union Leader, Jan. 27, 1973]

OFFICIAL REPORT CLAIMS GREAT SUCCESS BUT ITS OWN FIGURES SHOW OTHERWISE—THE FAILURE OF FLUORIDATION IN ENGLAND

An English report, claiming that fluoridation is a "great success" in preventing tooth decay, instead by its own figures reveals it to be a failure, says Prof. Albert Schatz, Ph. D., of Philadelphia, Pa. Excerpts from his article in the magazine *Prevention* are reprinted here.

(By Prof. Albert Schatz, Ph. D.)

England now has an official report on the results of fluoridation, which concludes "that the fluoridation of water supplies at the level of 1 p.p.m., is a highly effective way of reducing dental caries." This report was put out by a special Committee on Research into Fluoridation. It was officially published as Report No. 122 by the British Department of Public Health and Social Security in London.

If you read the official report uncritically and accept it on faith, you get the impression that fluoridation reduced caries. But if you carefully analyze the statistics in the report, you quickly realize that fluoridation did not reduce caries.

The official report really proves just the

very opposite of what it claims to prove. The Committee which wrote the report was apparently unaware of Abraham Lincoln's famous saying: "You can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time."

The report unequivocally states "that fluoride... not only reduces the amount but also reduces the rate of dental caries." But the curves (on a statistical chart) conclusively prove that fluoride does not reduce the amount or rate of tooth decay.

These curves show the average DMF per child for permanent teeth in fluoridated and non-fluoridated (i.e., control) areas. DMF refers to the number of decayed, missing, and filled teeth. The data from which these curves were drawn are presented in the official report.

The fact that both curves have the same slope proves that dental caries is developing at the same rate in the fluoridated and non-fluoridated children.

The curves... also reveal that fluoridation only delays the appearance of caries. For example, 10-year-old fluoridated and 8.8-year-old control children have about the same DMF. A comparison of other corresponding age groups shows a similar delay of approximately 1.2 years in the appearance of caries in fluoridated children, compared to the controls. It is thus clear that fluoridation does not prevent or reduce tooth decay. Instead, it merely postpones the appearance of caries by about 1.2 years. Fluoridated children develop the same amount of tooth decay as their non-fluoridated counterparts. The only difference is that caries start developing and continue to develop approximately 1.2 years later in the fluoridated group.

Such curves show that there is no real protective effect.

The official report states "that fluoride has a continual preventive effect." Since fluoride, as we have shown, does not really prevent caries, there obviously cannot be a "continual preventive effect."

Let us however, carefully examine the statistics in Table 7 of the official report, and see exactly how caries was reduced.

These data reveal that 8-year-old control children appear to have 67 per cent more tooth decay than 8-year-old fluoridated children had. But by age 11, the difference was only 33 percent. There is thus a 50 per cent decrease in the alleged effectiveness of fluoridation between the ages of 8 and 11. This decrease is all the more significant because in the fluoridated areas children up to the age of 11 had been treated all their lives.

It is indeed a very strange kind of "continual protective effect" which decreases 50 per cent in three years while the children are being fluoridated.

PSEUDO-SCIENCE

The official report is in some ways unprecedented in modern science. It endeavors to prove things by wishful thinking, rather than by logic and sound research.

For example, the report states, and correctly so, that: "comparisons of the prevalence of decay should only be made between a study" (i.e., fluoridated) "and its corresponding control area." One would therefore assume that there was a control for every fluoridated area.

But, incredible as it may seem, that was not so. Holyhead was one of its fluoridated areas. The Committee's official report unequivocally states in three places in the text that there was no control for Holyhead. The official report also presents four figures and three tables which include Holyhead as a fluoridated area without any control.

We are therefore informed no less than 10 times that there was no control for Holyhead. But despite all that, the Committee unequivocally referred to "dental benefits in Holy-

head." How it could attribute the alleged "benefits" to fluoridation is beyond our comprehension. That it would seriously expect to be believed under such circumstances is an insult to our intelligence.

Without a control for Holyhead, the Committee's claim of alleged benefits in that area is no more than wishful thinking.

ALICE IN FLUORIDE-LAND

The official report is an outstanding example of pleonasm (redundancy) and tautology (needless repetition). In that sense, it reminds one of the technics discussed by Vance Packard in his book *The Hidden Persuaders*.

Let us consider the preface plus the sections. The official report repeats in one way and another and no less than 89 times that fluoride protects against caries! This is an average of 10.7 times per page, and 1.8 times per paragraph! The official report uses the word "benefit" as a verb, noun, and adjective no less than 30 times. That comes out to an average of 3.6 times per page and 0.6 times per paragraph!

The preface of the official report is particularly interesting. Its seven paragraphs tell us 13 times that fluoridation protects against caries. That is an average of 1.9 times per paragraph! It extols the alleged benefits of fluoridation an average of once in every four of its 52 lines!

The tautology and pleonasm raise serious questions about the validity of the conclusions which the British Committee arrived at. If the alleged benefits of fluoridation areas are as obvious and convincing as the British Committee would like us to believe, why does the official report tell us that 10.7 times per page for a total of 89 times?

INCREASES THE COST

The official report refers to so-called "economic advantages" of fluoridation. However, the following reasons lead us to believe that there are only economic disadvantages to fluoridation.

Since fluoridation does not reduce caries, fluoridated and control children will develop the same amount of tooth decay. Both groups will therefore require the same amount of dental treatment. However, in the fluoridated area, children will need the dental care 1.2 years later. People in fluoridated communities therefore pay for the same amount of dental treatment plus the additional cost of fluoridation. What then are the "economic advantages" which the British Committee considers important?

Actually, the only individuals who really benefit economically from fluoridation are those who make money by selling fluoride and fluoridating equipment, those whose jobs depend on fluoridation, and those who built their reputations on fluoridation.

The official report is valuable because it so clearly reveals the failure of fluoridation in Great Britain. Fluoridation merely delays the appearance of caries by about 1.2 years. Fluoride therefore provides no real protection against, no real prevention of, and no real reduction in caries. Both fluoride and non-fluoridated children develop the same amount of tooth decay. The only difference is that caries begins and appears 1.2 years later as a result of fluoridation. The alleged benefits are thus nothing more than a statistical illusion.

It is therefore not surprising that the official report of the British Committee was not very convincing to many local health authorities in England. In that country, the local health authorities are the ones who decide whether their municipalities will be fluoridated. One year after the report appeared, 81 out of 184 local health authorities were against fluoridation.

Because of their opposition; the Health Education Council planned to spend a considerable sum of money to propagandize on behalf of fluoridation. A question was also raised about amending the law in order to withdraw from the local health authorities the right to decide whether their communities should be fluoridated. This was reported in the September, 1970, issue of the *Journal of the American Dental Association*.

The official report is therefore scientifically bankrupt. Moreover, the Hidden Persuaders technic, which was used in an attempt to "sell" the report, failed to make it convincing, even to local health authorities in England.

MEMORIAL TO THE LATE PRESIDENT HARRY S TRUMAN

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1973

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for two purposes—first—to announce that within the next few days I shall introduce a concurrent resolution which will authorize the Joint Committee on Printing to collect and assemble all of those eulogies, editorials, and encomiums relating to the life and times of our very dear President, Harry S Truman, as expressed in the House of Representatives and the Senate and at the memorial services in Independence, Mo., and at the National Cathedral in Washington.

My second purpose is to read into the RECORD one of the finest tributes to both Harry S Truman and Lyndon B. Johnson contained in one encomium that has ever been written.

The fact that in 1 short month we have lost two great former Presidents of the United States is a loss to America of almost inestimable proportions. Lyndon Johnson had the greatest of affection for Harry Truman. This, I know to be a fact because it was my honor to ride with him from the municipal airport at Kansas City out to the Truman Library upon the occasion when President Johnson came out to sign the Medicare bill in the presence of Mr. Truman at the library which bears his name in Independence, Mo. President Johnson said to me on the way to the airport from the library—

History will record your friend Harry Truman as one of the great American Presidents of all time.

In turn, I know that Harry Truman loved Lyndon Johnson with an affection that was somewhat like that of a father toward a son or that of a sponsor to a protege. Mr. Truman was proud when the convention in Los Angeles chose L. B. J. as the vice-presidential candidate in 1960 and I know in conversation with

Mr. Truman that when Mr. Johnson succeeded to the Presidency he stood ready to offer advice and counsel from one who had been President any time that Lyndon Johnson called upon him.

Mr. Speaker, in Harry S Truman and Lyndon B. Johnson we had two Chief Executives who possessed many parallels—both succeeded to the Presidency, both were the products of the heart of America, both were deeply concerned not only about the good of the people but about the will of the people. Yes, within 1 short month our Nation has suffered a great loss by the passing of two great Presidents of the United States.

The eulogy follows:

[From Babson's Reports, Washington Forecast Letter, Jan. 29, 1973]

TWO WHO STOOD TALL

Our nation is today inestimably poorer with the loss, within one short month, of 2 former Presidents of the United States—Harry S Truman and Lyndon B. Johnson.

They had much in common . . . both were products of the grassroots, had close identity with the people; were thrust suddenly—and not psychologically prepared—into responsibilities of the Presidency but stretched to its demand—reach and earned the respect of a grateful nation.

Each succeeded Chief Executives of exceptional personal magnetism—Truman as World War II was nearing its climax, Johnson in the wake of an assassination that stunned the nation.

Both were lifted to world stage center from relative obscurity that had masked their unique abilities and dynamic leadership qualities.

They were men of strength, masters of the art of politics—decisive Presidents whose ideas and deeds won approval, heady plaudits. Yet both were frequently misunderstood, maligned . . . especially toward end of their terms.

For the tragedy of fame and high responsibility is that seldom are integrity, devotion to principle and duty, fully recognized—except in the light of history.

Both former Presidents cared—deeply—about the good of and the will of the people . . . they were also cognizant of the inexplicable mystique of government. And neither hesitated to discommode the immediate in face of the binding necessity of achieving the ultimate end.

As we mourn the passing of Presidents Truman and Johnson, it would honor their memory if we would grant the present incumbent a broader measure of understanding, support—faith in his intent and fervent prayer for its achievement.

Never before has a President stood alone for a term of 4 years deprived of the experience, wisdom, support, of a living predecessor.

SENSELESS ACT OF VIOLENCE

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, once again a senseless act of violence on an official of our Government has shocked the Nation.

Senator JOHN STENNIS, a highly respected Senator for over a quarter of a century, has become another victim of the increasing crime in our country. Our thoughts and our prayers are with the Stennis family and we share their vigil at this sad time.

It is ironic that we are struck with this tragic reminder of the war in our own country within a week of securing a peace abroad.

We must now turn our undivided attention to curing the ills of our society. The priorities of Government responsibility must be directed toward the basic freedoms of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"—and this responsibility is not being met when fear stalks the land.

Crime today knows no color lines or

neighborhood boundaries. From the highest to the humblest homes, citizens of the greatest Nation on earth are fearful of life and property.

Social opportunities, training and educational advantages, and improved environment are a part of the solution. Unflinching, strict, and quick justice for the criminals is a vital part.

We must give our law enforcement officials and our courts the manpower and tools to do their jobs properly—and to protect the innocent and law-abiding citizens from the vicious elements of our society.

Our peacetime "defense budget" must be concentrated on defending our people from rampant lawlessness. Congress must, and will, cure this sickness with all the means at its disposal.

OREGON FOURTH DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS, 1972

[In percent]

	Under 21	21 to 30	31 to 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Total		Under 21	21 to 30	31 to 45	46 to 65	Over 65	Total
1. What action, if any, should Congress take regarding the use of busing to end school segregation?							(c) Require each recipient able to work to accept training or employment, or lose benefits.	57	81	83	83	75	80
(a) Leave responsibility with States and courts under guidelines of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.	36	47	43	40	38	41	(d) Other.	3	4	5	5	13	4
(b) Legislatively set restrictions on busing.	14	16	11	6	10	11	4. A U.S. agreement to withdraw from Vietnam should include:						
(c) Approve a constitutional amendment prohibiting the use of busing for school desegregation.	29	22	39	47	44	38	(a) Return of POW's; accounting for MIA's.	64	78	76	65	53	70
(d) Other.	15	9	4	5	3	5	(b) Ceasefire under international supervision.	29	42	40	52	63	47
No answer.	6	6	3	2	5	5	(c) Replacement of Thieu government.	36	27	20	17	13	20
2. Do you favor a Federal law prohibiting the sale of handguns unsuitable for sporting use (Saturday night specials)?							(d) Withdrawal of North Vietnamese troops from South Vietnam.	29	41	49	40	47	43
(a) Yes.	64	54	51	49	44	51	(e) No conditions.	7	33	23	8	3	17
(b) No.	13	37	38	42	38	38	(f) Other.	4	7	6	2	8	6
(c) Undecided.	20	9	11	8	13	10	No answer.	3				3	1
No answer.	3			1	5	1	5. When phase II of the economic stabilization program ends, what should the Federal Government do?						
3. Which of the following steps do you think should be part of welfare reform?							(a) Establish voluntary wage-price guidelines.	27	27	28	26	35	28
(a) Set a minimum benefit level for all recipients.	36	41	25	15	10	24	(b) Establish mandatory wage-price controls.	55	49	45	50	43	48
(b) Have the Federal Government take over from the States a greater share of welfare costs.	21	22	23	13	10	17	(c) Take no further action.	12	17	19	17	10	17
							No answer.	6	7	8	7	12	7

6. Which 5 of the following do you consider to be the most critical problem areas facing the Nation today? Please number 1 through 5 in order of their importance.

TOTAL

- Environment.
- Vietnam.
- Crime.
- Drug abuse.
- Tax reform.
- Economy.
- National defense.
- Population control.
- Government credibility.
- Aid for elderly.
- Unemployment.
- Welfare.
- Health care.
- Education.
- Poverty.
- Anti-strike laws.
- Consumer protection.
- Foreign relations.
- Sex discrimination.
- Race relations.
- Campaign spending.
- Housing.
- Gun control.
- Aid for agriculture.

Under 21

- Environment.
- Vietnam.
- Population control.
- Education.
- Unemployment.
- Economy.
- Drug abuse.
- Government credibility.
- Crime.
- Race relations.
- Poverty.

21-30

- Environment.
- Vietnam.
- Tax reform.
- Population control.
- Crime.
- Government credibility.
- Drug abuse.
- Unemployment.
- Economy.
- Welfare.

31-46

- Vietnam.
- Environment.
- Drug abuse.
- Crime.

1972 ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, the questionnaires which I mailed throughout the Fourth Congressional District in the fall of 1972 drew the heaviest response of any I have sent since coming to Congress. Over 25,000 people responded to express their opinions on a number of issues, including welfare reform, Vietnam, and the economic stabilization program.

The results, broken down by age groups, were as follows:

- Economy.
- Tax reform.
- Government credibility.
- Welfare.
- National defense.
- Education.

46-65

- Crime.
- Drug abuse.
- Tax reform.
- Vietnam.
- Environment.
- Economy.
- Aid for elderly.
- National defense.
- Government credibility.
- Unemployment.

Over 65

- National defense.
- Crime.
- Drug abuse.
- Tax reform.
- Environment.
- Health care.
- Anti-strike laws.
- Aid for elderly.
- Vietnam.

BACK TO BLUE HEAVEN

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago this month the world of music grew less melodious with the passing of the king of the high tenor blues jazz singer, Gene Austin. He grew up in the Delta Region of Louisiana in the early 1900's and from this area of the country he learned a style of music which has since become known as "soul music." Gene Austin has a lot of firsts to his credit in the music world. He was the first one to receive a gold record for selling over a million records. He was the only one to receive the Gold Dog Award from RCA Victor. Austin's recording of "My Blue Heaven" was one of the best selling, if not the best selling, records of all time. The much loved performer not only played the piano and sang but he was also a song writer. He composed many of the old songs which we all know and love: "That Old Gang of Mine," "When My Sugar Walks Down the Street," "The Lonesome Road," et cetera.

I was privileged to see Gene Austin perform just a few years before his death at a lovely social affair in Miami. His special musical magic touched the audience and stirred many warm memories as he sang the songs he made famous. Following that great performance an article about Gene Austin by Columnist Larry Thompson appeared in the Miami Herald and I placed it in the RECORD at that time. Now on the first anniversary of the passing of Gene Austin, who left a legacy of music to the world, I again offer this article for the RECORD:

BACK TO BLUE HEAVEN

The other day I was sitting at my desk when that grandpappy of all press agents and promoters, George Maines, walked in with a sturdy redheaded gentleman and introduced Gene Austin.

"The Gene Austin?" I gulped as I floundered to my feet.

That evening when I got home I called the family around me.

"Guess who I met today," I said.

"President Johnson?"

"I will give you a hint. This is a very famous singer."

"Bobby Darin?"

"Johnny Mathis?"

"Joan Baez?"

"Roger Miller?"

"One of the Beatles?"

"One of the Rolling Stones?"

"Of course not," I said. "You aren't even warm. The one and only Gene Austin."

Silence.

Finally, from the boy: "Who's he?"

Who is Gene Austin? What a ridiculous question. Why when I was a boy, he was just the most, that's all he was. When I bought a Victor attachment to fit our old Edison so I could play thin records, Gene Austin was the hottest thing on platters. Fame, as the poet once wrote, is fleeting.

I have read somewhere that Austin's classic, "My Blue Heaven," has enjoyed greater sales than any other recording. That shows there still are many people like me who remember him.

I will admit that I was surprised to hear that "My Blue Heaven" was such a big seller,

after all these years. If I had made a guess, I would have said that Bing Crosby's "White Christmas" probably led the pack.

At least it seems to me that it is played more, year after year, than any other record.

In the days when Austin and Rudy Vallee were at the peak of their fame, it was harder to sell a million records than now.

Back in those days there weren't so many phonographs, and the adults did most of the buying. Now, if your daddy or mamma is rich and famous, success is practically rammed down your throat, and you can enjoy the same kind of instant success if you are shaggy and different.

This, presumably, is because the teenagers do most of the record buying.

Well, I have no argument with that. The young people have the money, they are entitled to their own tastes, and for all I know their idols have talent.

But I was mighty proud to meet that king of the olden times, the high tenor with the red hair, who made "My Blue Heaven" sound like a paradise enow.

CONGRESSMAN CAUTIONS ON INFLATION

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, last week the Wall Street Journal published a report pointing out the need for continued concern about inflation.

The article, in very clear and concise terms, explains the basic contributing factors to inflation—principles that I believe are all too often forgotten.

For the benefit of those of my colleagues who may have missed this illuminating report, I include it in its entirety.

APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

Inflation is the big worry for 1973. The pace of business will get much less vocal attention—because it enters the year booming on all fronts. The unemployment headlines are fading. Consumers are in a spending mood. Retailers have never pushed so much merchandise across their counters. Manufacturers, with order books bulging, are increasingly hard pressed to meet delivery demands. But the upward crawl of prices is on everybody's mind—and will likely continue to be.

This year, as in the past, the blame for inflation will be widely spread about. The farmer will be heavily scored for being behind it all. Supermarket operators, who have some of the thinnest profit margins in the country, will be pilloried as profiteers. Big business of all kinds will be ringingly denounced. And likewise big labor.

Each of these groups, of course, always tries to get for itself as much as possible of the money flowing around. But none of them can be basically blamed for inflation. The trouble, as is increasingly perceived, is—too much money. The supply of money is expanded (new money printed up) when the government year after year spends more than it collects in taxes. And the bigger money supply means less buying power for each individual dollar.

The federal government's propensity for spending more than it takes in is pretty well known by now. In each of the last fiscal years, its budget outgo was nearly \$25 billion more than the intake, and another big gush

of red ink is in the making for the current fiscal year.

Here is the record of how the money supply has been blown up since the middle of the last decade. The totals include (1) currency in circulation outside of banks plus (2) demand deposits in the banks. The figures, compiled by the Federal Reserve Board, are December daily averages for each year.

MONEY SUPPLY

[Dollars in billions]

Year	Currency	Deposits	Total
1965	\$36.3	\$130.9	\$167.2
1966	38.3	133.4	171.7
1967	40.4	142.7	183.1
1968	43.4	154.0	197.4
1969	46.0	157.7	203.7
1970	49.0	165.8	214.8
1971	52.5	175.7	228.2
1972	56.9	190.0	246.9

The total has risen some 47% since 1965.

And even this doesn't tell the whole story. While currency and demand deposits, representing the money most actively moving around, is commonly used as the money supply barometer, this gauge does not reflect the additional billions stashed away in time deposits and savings accounts at commercial banks. Now above \$311 billion, these deposits have more than doubled since 1965.

With the population of the U.S. up only 8% since 1965, it is not hard to see why there should be a lot more dollars per-pocket in the populace. And more dollars per-pocket there are indeed. They are reflected vividly in the country's steeply climbing per-capita disposable personal income—the side of inflation that few people ever talk about.

Here is the record on per-capita disposable personal income (after taxes) as recorded by the Commerce Department. This is the point where the dollar flood makes head-on contact with the supply of goods and services in the market place. (The 1972 figure is the fourth quarter annual rate.)

PER CAPITA DISPOSABLE INCOME

Year	Dollars
1965	\$2,436
1966	2,604
1967	2,749
1968	2,945
1969	3,130
1970	3,366
1971	3,595
1972	3,954

The above figures trace a climb of 62%—just since the middle of the last decade.

It is not difficult to understand how the consumer with ten dollars in his pocket is ready to bid higher for goods and services he wants than the same fellow when he only has five dollars in his pocket.

The market-place prices for good and services—despite all the hue and cry about how high they are—still lag considerably behind the growth in the money supply and the personal income. The Labor Department's index of consumer prices ("cost of living") has risen only 34% since 1965—compared with the 47% jump in the money supply and the 62% leap in personal income.

And herein lies the potential of more price inflation still to come—as the supply of goods and services strives to catch up with the flood of dollars looking for things to buy. The inflation pressure will be particularly severe in areas where the dollar flow has concentrated an especially sharp step-up in demand.

Take an outstanding example: the price of beef. It has gone "through the roof," any housewife will tell you. And yet any explanation of "why?" seldom gets beyond a vague indictment of ranchers and supermarkets. Behind the price climb, in simple fact, is a beef-buying rampage by well-heeled con-

sumers such as the nation has never before seen.

The table below traces the great leap in beef eating in the U.S. over the past decade. The 1972 and 1973 figures are estimates.

Per capita consumption of beef

Year	Pounds
1962	88.8
1963	94.5
1964	99.9
1965	99.5
1966	104.2
1967	106.5
1968	109.7
1969	110.8
1970	113.7
1971	113.3
1972	115.5
1973	118.0

Since the above figures represent per-capita eating, they do not fully reflect an even sharper leap in total tonnage of beef demanded by the American dinner table. Total consumption has jumped from around 16 billion pounds to an estimated 23 billion pounds this year. That is a lot of beef—an increase of more than 40%.

But the cattlemen are now having trouble keeping up with the dollar flood—and many less fortunate consumers are having trouble keeping up with the prices.

If still more excess dollars come from the printing presses, meat prices will go on up, and the consumption climb may well come to a halt. An increasing number of households will be switching from steak to spaghetti. This is the route of inflation.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether Richard Nixon recalls the significance of the year 1735.

It is a date of special meaning to lawyers like myself and to newspaper publishers and reporters who live by the principle of freedom of the press: 1735 was the year when the British colonial authorities placed on trial John Peter Zenger, a printer, editor, and publisher of the New York Weekly Journal. It was the first free press case in the history of our land. Zenger was accused of criminal libel. What he had really done was dare to run an article severely criticizing the Governor of the Colony of New York.

His lawyers were disbarred and he was left almost defenseless until a brilliant Philadelphia lawyer, Andrew Hamilton, came to the rescue. Hamilton argued in a powerful defense speech that Zenger had simply printed the truth and that the truth is not libelous. Zenger was found not guilty and the principle of free press took root and later became part of the first amendment, which, to me, as a civil liberties lawyer and an habitual lifelong dissenter, is the very soul of our Constitution and our democracy.

As a Member of Congress, I have done my share of complaining at how I have been treated in the newspapers. I am always convinced that I could have written the article better or more fairly, but frankly, if I had to choose between a totally noncritical press and a totally and

sometimes even painfully critical press, I would take my chances with the latter.

I am not talking about freedom of the press as an academic issue. Unfortunately, it is at this moment a very urgent issue. We are in danger of losing it, in the television and radio media as well as in the printed media. One does not lose a free press overnight nor is what is happening necessarily obvious to the uninformed. It can happen insidiously and I believe the current chill that is creeping over the media began several years ago when Vice President AGNEW launched his campaign of intimidation against TV and the press.

The self-censorship, particularly in television, that followed has been evident even though no laws were changed. There are fewer news documentaries, fewer hard-hitting discussion programs, and so-called news shows are now expected to be entertaining rather than informative. The chill turned to frost when a Nixon administration spokesman recently linked a broadcast license renewal bill with a not-too-subtle warning to network affiliates to "jump on" the networks for alleged bias in network news programs. Otherwise, they were told, affiliates would be held responsible for whatever appeared in a network program.

I believe in balanced presentation of the news, but the other night I saw it carried to absurdity on one of the major network news programs. It was the day after President Nixon had announced that a settlement had finally been worked out in Paris. This program was a retrospective on Vietnam and it showed about a minute of an antiwar demonstration that had been held in New York and it then balanced this with clips of a counterdemonstration by hard-hat construction workers who attacked some peace demonstrators. Then to complete this balanced presentation the TV reporter interviewed a student who had been beaten up and several hard hats who said they were not sorry.

I find this "on the one hand and on the other hand" presentation a shocking distortion of the reality of the peace movement in New York City. In the last decade I have participated in literally hundreds of peace meetings, picketlines, demonstrations, and rallies in this city. Hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers have been involved in peace actions. In all this time, in all the years, supporters of Administration policy in Vietnam managed to get together one prowar demonstration. Peter Brennan, who has since gone to his reward as Secretary of Labor in Mr. Nixon's new Cabinet, got his construction workers out for that one demonstration—time out from work with full pay.

On January 20, I was in Washington for Inaugural Day, but not at the ceremony installing Mr. Nixon. In fact, an extraordinary number of Members of Congress decided to stay home or go elsewhere on that day. I was at the counterinauguration peace rally held between the Washington Monument and Lincoln Memorial, along with about 100,000 other people. In fact, we had a larger turnout than there was for the formal inaugural parade, but you would

never have known it from watching TV or reading the press. And yet these 100,000 people who came on very short notice to their Capital to express their determination that this time there had to be a peace settlement were as much a part of the American political process as the officials sitting in the Inaugural stands.

Perhaps some of you read an editorial in the New York Times on January 26 called "Voices of Conscience," which said of America's "ill-fated involvement" in the war in Indochina:

Now that the official protocols at least give hope that the killing and suffering may indeed come to an end, it would be an ungrateful act of instant historical revisionism to fail to note the contribution of the peace movement. That movement gave expression to a facet of the American character which ought not to be forgotten at the very moment when its prayers appear—at least temporarily—to have been answered and its goal approached.

It continues:

Despite some excesses and abuses, for the most part the peace movement remained simply the conscience of a coalition: young and old, religious leaders and veteran politicians, idealists and pragmatists worked and marched under its banner.

And the Times concludes that recognition must be given now—

To those who doggedly kept pointing and pushing toward peace. Many—particularly the young—never faltered in their conviction that peace was too serious a matter to be left to government.

And I might add that what goes into our newspapers and into our television programs is too serious a matter to be left to Government.

I spoke earlier of a present threat to the freedom of the press which has emerged as part of what I believe is the Nixon administration's attempt to keep our voices so low that they are, indeed, silent and the eyes of the press so closed that they will be blind to such scandals as the Watergate "bugging" conspiracy. It was the Nixon administration that attempted to restrain publication in the Times and other newspapers of the Pentagon papers which dealt the final blow to any illusions about the morality of the war. It is the Nixon administration that is increasingly using grand juries as fishing expeditions to obtain evidence that can be used in conspiracy indictments.

As you know, in recent months four reporters have been sent to jail for refusing to divulge information of a confidential nature to courts or grand juries, and at least a half a dozen others face jail sentences for defying court orders that they must reveal their sources of information.

According to President Charles Perlik of the Newspaper Guild—AFL-CIO—news reporters have been flooded with demands that they disclose their information, materials and sources not only to law enforcement bodies but to defendants as well.

In the first 2½ years of the Nixon administration, in fact, 30 subpoenas were served on the Chicago Sun-Times and Daily News alone, two-thirds of them on behalf of the Government. One reporter,

Duane Hall of the Sun-Times, was served in 11 separate proceedings within 18 months.

During the same 30 months 124 subpoenas were served on NBC and CBS and their wholly owned stations, some by Federal and State prosecutors, others by defendants.

At the same time some news media managements began turning over files, containing published and unpublished photographs, verified and unverified, information, the names of sources, and so forth, to Government agencies—sometimes without any subpoena being issued—without so much as the courtesy of informing the reporters involved. Some subpoenaed reporters were also refused support by their publishers in resisting subpoenas.

In this atmosphere of growing intimidation, the U.S. Supreme Court, on June 29, 1972, held in a 5-to-4 decision that the first amendment does not provide journalists with a privilege to withhold confidential information from a grand jury. The law does recognize certain confidential relationships, such as husband and wife, attorney and client, physician and patient, priest and penitent, but in three cases on which the Court ruled the majority held that:

The Constitution does not, as it never has, exempt the newsmen from performing the citizen's normal duty of appearing and furnishing information relevant to a grand jury's task.

In his separate dissenting opinion, Justice William Douglas, who is the Court's most ardent champion of the first amendment, said:

If what the Court sanctions today becomes settled law, then the reporter's main function in American society will be to pass on to the public the press releases which the various departments of government issue.

In their dissenting opinions, Justices Stewart, Brennan, and Marshall asserted that "the right to gather news implies, in turn, a right to confidential relationship between a reporter and his source." They pointed out that uncertainty about exercise of the power will lead to self-censorship and also held:

The Court's crabbed view of the First Amendment reflects a disturbing insensitivity to the critical role of an independent press in our society. The Court . . . invites state and Federal authorities to undermine the historic independence of the press by attempting to annex the journalistic profession as an investigative arm of the government. Not only will this decision impair performance of the press' constitutionally protected functions, but it will . . . in the long run harm rather than help the administration of justice.

Although I have quoted at length from these dissenting opinions, it is the majority opinion that now reigns supreme, and it will do so until Congress enacts legislation to create an absolute newsmen's privilege. At present, 18 States have enacted some legislation that affords, in varying degrees, a testimonial privilege to newsmen. These laws are not uniform, however, and none of them guarantees absolute protection to a reporter who, if he is really to do his job, must be able to protect his sources.

So now we get back to 1735, not the

year but the number, chosen by design, of a bill I introduced at the opening of the 93d Congress and similar to a bill I introduced last June.

Called an act to protect confidential sources of the news media, it consists of one simple paragraph:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no person connected with or employed by the news media or press, or otherwise engaged in gathering material for publication or broadcast, can be required by the Congress or any court, grand jury or administrative body to disclose any information or the source of any information procured for publication or broadcast, whether or not such information is actually published or broadcast.

It is not quite as short as the first amendment, but its implications for protecting freedom of the press may be as far reaching.

This is one of two bills in Congress that would create an absolute newsmen's privilege. Hearings are to be held within a few weeks by a House Judiciary Subcommittee headed by ROBERT KASTENMEIER and a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee under SAM ERVIN.

I find it interesting that just the other day Frank Stanton, vice president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, called for enactment of an absolute privilege bill. He said he had changed his stand because of the "dismaying and very serious assault that has developed in the courts and elsewhere, against newsmen's rights and the public's right to receive an unrestricted flow of information."

The heads of NBC and ABC have taken similar positions.

Although newspapers and magazines may not always look with favor on their TV competitors, I think this is one instance in which all the media share a common interest and common purpose. I hope there will be a nationwide effort by all the media to obtain this very crucial protection.

We in Congress cannot enact a law requiring the President to hold news conferences, a practice which seems to be withering away. We cannot require the President to submit to questioning by committees of Congress so that we can fully evaluate administration policies. But we can extend to the press the full freedom to do its job—to investigate, to dig out facts, to expose, to criticize, to arm citizens with the information they need to change Government policy if that is what has to be done.

The Times spoke of "voices of conscience." We still need them, and they will not be heard unless there is a free press. There is never a time when we do not need a free press, but there are times when we need it more than ever. We are in such a time.

Whether you agree or disagree with the policies of the Nixon administration, I think you will concede that there are many Americans who will be opposing some of its policies in the next 4 years. We do have a truce in Indochina at last, but only a fragile peace. The work of the peace movement is not ended. We will continue to demand limitations on the President's unprecedented and, I believe, unconstitutional use of power to

make war and to conduct mass terror bombings. We will continue in Congress the move to reassert our authority and to cut off funds so that the President cannot send troops or planes back to Indochina if the civil war there is resumed.

And as the President continues to dismantle programs for the poor, for the ill-housed, for veterans, for child care, for medical research, for education, for antipollution measures, for human needs, while he pours money into military programs there will be voices of dissent heard all over the land.

As Jefferson said—

The people are the ultimate repository of all power.

And I would add, they cannot exercise that power without a free press.

SALUTE TO VICE ADM. GEORGE M. DAVIS, JR.

HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying a tribute to a distinguished naval officer, who today retires as Surgeon General of the U.S. Navy. I salute Vice Adm. George M. Davis, Jr., who has had an outstanding naval career, and I am also particularly delighted that he will become a resident of the Fifth Congressional District of Florida, which I represent. Admiral Davis, in addition to being an excellent internist, is also a person who is vitally interested in community affairs and his presence will undoubtedly be a tremendous asset to central Florida.

Admiral Davis' skill, initiative, and untiring interest in providing better medical support to our operating forces and better medical care to the Navy and Marine Corps family have resulted in a number of significant improvements to the Navy's health care system. He is an exemplary leader, an innovative manager, and a superb physician. As the 25th Surgeon General of the Navy, his exceptionally meritorious service to the Nation reflects great credit upon his corps and the U.S. Navy.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to include the following sketch of Admiral Davis' career and commend its reading to my colleagues:

VICE ADM. GEORGE M. DAVIS, JR., MEDICAL CORPS, U.S. NAVY

George Monroe Davis, Jr., was born in Bixby, Oklahoma, on June 6, 1916, son of George M. and Letty F. (Buchanan) Davis. He attended Northeastern State Teachers College of Oklahoma and received the Bachelor of Science Degree in Medicine and the degree of Doctor of Medicine from the University of Oklahoma School of Medicine at Oklahoma City. He was appointed Acting Assistant Surgeon in the U.S. Navy with the accompanying rank of Lieutenant (junior grade) on August 21, 1939.

Ordered first to the U.S. Naval Hospital, San Diego, California, he interned there from August 1939 until August 1940, when he joined the Second Marine Brigade, Fleet

Marine Force, Marine Corps Base, San Diego. In December of that year, he transferred to the Second Defense Battalion at San Diego, where he remained until January 1941. He was next assigned to the U.S. Marine Defense Force, Advance Detachment, Fleet Marine Force, Dutch Harbor, Alaska, and in September 1941 reported for duty at the Naval Air Station, Dutch Harbor.

During the period September 1942 until February 1943, he served at the Naval Air Station, Norman, Oklahoma, and later that month joined the Acorn Training Detachment at Port Hueneme, California. In August 1943 he was assigned to the Headquarters and Service Company, Fourth Medical Battalion, Fourth Marine Division, Fleet Marine Force. During service with the Fourth Marine Division, he received the Navy Commendation with Ribbon for his performance at the landing on Roi Namur and a second Commendation Ribbon for the landing on Iwo Jima. He is entitled to wear the Ribbon and a facsimile of the Presidential Unit Citation awarded the Fourth Marine Division, Reinforced.

Reporting to the Navy Dispensary, Washington, D.C. in August 1945, he served there until September 1946, after which he had postgraduate instruction in internal medicine at Northwestern School of Medicine, Chicago, Illinois. Completing the course there in October 1947, he next served as Chief of Medical Service at the Naval Hospital, Annapolis, Maryland. In August 1950, he reported for duty at the Naval Hospital, San Diego, and in November 1952 became Chief of Medicine in the Naval Hospital in the U.S.S. *Haven* (AH-12), which was in the Korean area during the hostilities there.

Detached from the *Haven* in May 1954, he returned to the Naval Hospital at San Diego, for a two-year tour of duty. In June 1956 he became Chief of Medical Service at the Naval Hospital, Great Lakes, Illinois, and in January 1959 reported as Chief of Medicine at the Naval Hospital, Oakland, California, and later became Executive Officer there. He assumed command of the Naval Hospital, Yokosuka, Japan, in August 1962 and in January 1965 became Commanding Officer of the Naval Hospital, Bethesda, Maryland. In June 1965 he was selected for promotion to the rank of Rear Admiral, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy and a year later was designated Commanding Officer of the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland. In March 1968 he assumed duties as Deputy Surgeon General, U.S. Navy.

Admiral Davis was appointed by the President in January 1969 to serve a four-year term as Surgeon General of the Navy and Chief, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery. He assumed the duties of that office on 1 February 1969, and was promoted to the rank of Vice Admiral. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal for his performance of duty as the 25th Surgeon General of the Navy.

Admiral Davis is certified by the American Board of Internal Medicine. He is a Fellow of the American College of Physicians, a Fellow of the American College of Chest Physicians, and a Fellow of the American College of Cardiology. He is also Governor for the American College of Physicians, and Delegate to the American Medical Association.

In addition to the Distinguished Service Medal, the Navy Commendation Medal (2 awards) and the Presidential Unit Citation Ribbon, Admiral Davis has the American Defense Service Medal with 1 Star; American Campaign Medal; Asiatic Pacific Campaign Medal with 3 Stars with USMC Device; World War II Victory Medal; National Defense Service Medal with 1 Star; Korean Service Medal with 3 Stars; Vietnam Service Medal with 1 Star; Korean Presidential Unit Citation with Clasp; Philippine Liberation

Ribbon; and the United Nations Service Medal.

Doctor Davis is married to the former Miss Helen Maria Hendershot of Mounds, Oklahoma, and they have one daughter, Carol Jean who is married to LCDR James E. Grise, USN.

PROTECT SOCIETY ASKS FBI HEAD J. PATRICK GRAY

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, a recent talk by Acting FBI Director L. Patrick Gray III, should reassure Americans that not all of our so-called judicial experts have lost their senses as to who should have priority in the eyes of the law.

The distinguished Director, who has already proven his competency as head of the FBI, has now proven himself as a straight-from-the-shoulder speaker, a man who is not afraid to tell-it-like-it-is.

In a day when the law often bends over backward in protecting the accused, Gray is forward in his thoughts on the protecting of society.

To know that this highly respected agency is now being led by a man who is as highly respected is comforting. I should like to share his views, in part, as presented to the National Conference on Criminal Justice. I submit them now for the RECORD: as they appeared in the New York Times, January 26:

The head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation said today that the object of the criminal justice system should be "the protection of society, not just the protection of the rights of the accused."

L. Patrick Gray 3d, the bureau's acting director, added that he believed that, while "rehabilitation is fine" for some convicted criminals, "it is a useless gesture for those who resist every such effort, or take advantage of such efforts to gain early release and do it all over again."

Mr. Gray, in a speech to the National Conference on Criminal Justice, said there was a need for "judges who know how to sentence" and added that in some cases it might be wiser not to attempt to rehabilitate felons but to "protect society" by keeping them in prison.

"The accused on trial is not the only person whose unalienable rights are on the line in a criminal case," he declared. "The people in whose name the prosecution is brought have a rather substantial set of rights on the line, too."

Mr. Gray, . . . addressed about 500 delegates on the second day of a three-day meeting sponsored by the Justice Department's Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

NATIONAL RENTAL INDUSTRY WEEK

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to recognize the

American Rental Association's work on behalf of the millions of citizens who rent space, equipment, and numerous other items, by means of a resolution which I am introducing today proclaiming the week of February 5, 1973, as "National Rental Industry Week."

This industry has grown immeasurably over the years and the American Rental Association and its members renders a great service—I predict a bright and optimistic future for it.

My resolution follows:

H.J. RES. 280

Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week of February 5th, 1973, as "National Rental Industry Week"

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation in 1973 designating the week of February 5th as "National Rental Industry Week," and calling the attention of the people of the United States to the rapid growing importance of the still young rental industry.

LINCOLN CONSERVATIONISTS WRITE SECRETARY BUTZ

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, my people in the Minnesota Sixth Congressional District are deeply concerned over the ending of the rural environmental assistance program. It is not only the farmers who benefit directly from this program who are complaining of its termination, but all of the people of the rural area.

They know the benefits of this program from firsthand knowledge.

Typical of the reaction of these people is a letter to Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz from the Board of Supervisors of the Lincoln Soil and Water Conservation District which was printed in the Marshall Messenger.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, and to inform my colleagues of the feeling about this program termination, I would like to insert this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The letter follows:

LINCOLN CONSERVATIONISTS WRITE SECRETARY BUTZ

To the editor: Here is a copy of our letter to Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz, mailed Friday.

"DEAR SIR: It is our understanding that the administration has stopped funding of the Rural Environment Assistance Program (REAP) for 1973. This is even after the Congress has approved authorization for the program for the coming year.

"We feel this is a great injustice to the American people who are demanding conservation of our environment.

"Many city people support this program which beautifies the country side by cost-sharing on ponds, dams, terraces, trees and feedlot pollution control systems.

"We have several watershed projects going which need numerous small check dams to stop run-off and siltation. Earth moving contractors will also be adversely effected.

"We have got in over 20 miles of terrace

each of the last six years. This reduces sediment which is a big polluter.

"We have six livestock feeders interested in pollution ponds in 1973. We might get one pollution pond and two miles of terraces without cost-sharing under this program.

"Many land owners in Lincoln County are interested in putting in terraces and feedlot manure holding ponds but do not have the funds to install projects that help others with little benefits to themselves.

"We urge you to do everything in your

power to maintain cost-sharing on conservation practices.

"Yours truly,

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
Lincoln Soil and Water Conservation
Dist., John Boulton, Secretary, Porter."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, February 1, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Trust ye in the Lord forever, for in the Lord God is everlasting strength.—Isaiah 26: 4.

O Thou who art infinite in wisdom, power, and love, we draw near to Thee to receive that uplift of spirit which enables us to meet our duties and responsibilities with courage, with confidence, and with a creative mind.

Increase our faith in Thee that we may be so clear in our thinking, so firm in our convictions, so wise in our decisions, and so sympathetic in our outreach that through us Thy spirit may be able to create among nations and cultivate among the peoples of the earth a new charter of freedom, justice, and peace.

Thy love divine hath led us in the past, In this free land by Thee our lot is cast;

Be Thou our ruler, guardian, guide, and stay,

Thy word our law, Thy paths our chosen way.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of this week, if any, and the schedule for next week. Mr. O'NEILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to respond to the distinguished gentleman.

There is no further legislative business for today, and upon announcement of the program for next week I will ask unanimous consent to go over until Monday.

The program for next week, the week of February 5, is as follows:

Monday suspensions—one bill, House Joint Resolution 123, the Highway Beautification Commission amendment.

Tuesday and the balance of the week there is no business scheduled. If there is any further business, it will be announced Monday or later in the week.

The Lincoln's Day recess will be from the conclusion of business on Friday, February 9, until noon, Monday, February 19.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 15 United States Code 1024(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Economic Committee the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. PATMAN, of Texas; Mr. BOLLING, of Missouri; Mr. REUSS, of Wisconsin; Mrs. GRIFFITHS, of Michigan; Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania; Mr. CAREY of New York; Mr. WIDNALL, of New Jersey; Mr. CONABLE, of New York; Mr. BROWN of Ohio; and Mr. BLACKBURN, of Georgia.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1973

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS NEXT WEDNESDAY

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

NO MORE GUNS

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing two bills designed to bring relief from the terror we face as a result of the widespread availability and constant misuse of guns. The first is a bill that would require the registration of all guns and licensing of all gunowners.

The second bill would flatly prohibit possession, manufacture, sale, purchase, transfer, receipt or transportation of handguns, except for or by members of the Armed Forces, law enforcement officials, licensed dealers, collectors, and pistol clubs. It is identical to the bill Senator HART has introduced and led the fight for in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced and pressed for legislation to register guns and license gunowners since I came to Congress in 1965. I have made the very

strong case I feel exists for such a measure in the pages of the RECORD and elsewhere many times before, and I will not rehearse all those arguments now.

Similarly, in the 92d Congress, I introduced and argued for legislation, originally developed by our former colleague from Illinois, Mr. Mikva, to prohibit further importation, manufacture, sale, purchase, receipt, or transportation of handguns. The effect of that bill would have been to freeze the supply and location of all handguns. It would not have required, however, anyone who currently possesses a handgun to give it up.

The bill I am introducing this year takes that critical additional step. By outlawing private possession of handguns, it requires that current owners of handguns—legal or illegal as far as current law is concerned—turn in those guns. It provides a period of 180 days after enactment of the ban for citizens to turn in their handguns for the market value, which is to be paid by the Government. After that grace period, anyone possessing a handgun would be in violation of Federal law and subject to prosecution and, if found guilty, subject to fine, imprisonment, or both.

The cry is constantly heard, Mr. Speaker, that outlawing private possession of guns will leave law-abiding citizens at the total mercy of criminals, who will hold on to their guns and always have an illegal supply. That argument, of course, is deceptive. Many law enforcement experts feel that the inherent dangers to the ordinary citizen of possessing a handgun are far greater than any benefit that might be gained in terms of self-protection. Figures on accidental shootings, as compared to instances of effective use of personal handguns for self-defense, certainly support that point of view. Police officials even advise private citizens who are particularly susceptible to gun crimes, such as shopkeepers, that they are best off not to try to resist with a gun of their own.

More importantly, private citizens who possess handguns are the major source of supply of guns for criminals. Most guns used against law-abiding citizens in crimes have been stolen—stolen from private citizens or dealers who supply private citizens. The only way to remove guns from the hands of criminals is to remove their supply, and that, in turn, means banning private possession of handguns.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal more to be said on this subject, and I intend to address myself to it frequently in the days and weeks ahead in hopes that this Congress will take prompt action on these measures. Suffice to say now that the time has come for this society to realize the madness and danger of making handguns available to anyone with as little as \$5 in his pocket and sense enough