

of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Kenneth Rush, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of State.

William J. Porter, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service Officer of the class of career minister, to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

William J. Casey, of New York, to be

Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

Donald Rumsfeld, of Illinois, to be the U.S. Permanent Representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

John N. Irwin II, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to France.

John A. Volpe, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipoten-

tiary of the United States of America to Italy.

U. Alexis Johnson, of California, a Foreign Service Officer of the Class of Career Ambassador, to be Ambassador at Large.

(The above nominations were approved subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### DEATH OF RALPH J. MENCONI

#### HON. MARK O. HATFIELD

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, in November 1972 a man who I have admired for his distinctive creative ability died of a heart attack, and in memory of his friendship and in tribute to his work, I ask unanimous consent that the press release by the Medallic Art Co., of Connecticut, which was issued following Mr. Ralph J. Menconi's death be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

RALPH J. MENCONI "SCULPTOR OF PRESIDENTS" DIES AT 57

(By D. Wayne Johnson)

Ralph J. Menconi, who had been called the "sculptor of presidents" for his medallic work bearing the portraits of all the United States presidents and for the official presidential medals including the Nixon Inaugural Medal, died of a heart attack in his home town of Pleasantville, New York, November 18. He was 57 years old.

Mr. Menconi, who was a prolific medallist, was also a noted sculptor and active in the National Sculpture Society. He was first vice-president of that group of professional artists, a position he had held since 1968, and had been active in its educational activities among others.

It was his medals issued in uniform succession, beginning with a series on U.S. presidents, which had brought him his most public acclaim, particularly among the collecting fraternity of America. He had begun—and had completed—the series of 36 presidents and a series of 50 statehood medals. He had come within ten medals of completing a series on all 56 Signers of the Declaration of Independence; and he created, within the last year, 16 of a projected 25 medals on the Great Religions of the World, a theme which particularly held his interest.

In all, Mr. Menconi must have produced in the last 20 years over 600 medallic models resulting in nearly 300 fine art medals—a record unsurpassed by any contemporary artist in America.

While his knowledge varied over wide areas he had taken a specific interest in the coming celebrations of the bicentennial of American Independence, undoubtedly spurred by his researches for his series on the Signers of the Declaration.

He was a panel member of the coins and medals committee of the national American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. He had also produced the first medal for the Commission, one recently struck by the U.S. Mint and released to the public early in October.

The bicentennial medal, with a portrayal of Houdon's bust of Washington on the ob-

verse and the famous Liberty Tree on the reverse, proved extremely popular with the public and 547,322 orders were received for the 1½-inch bronze memento the first month alone.

His Men in Space series, commemorating the flights of Apollo, were also popular. Apollo 11 through 16 each had been memorialized on a fine art medal by Menconi, with portraits of the astronauts and scenes from their walks on the moon, lift off, splash down, and support teams.

In fact, Mr. Menconi had completed a week before his death, the models on the Apollo 17 medal, the launching of which had been announced for December 6 and a planned walk on the lunar surface December 11 through 13.

He often worked ahead of schedule, and for him a deadline in the production of an art medal was something to beat. He was always cooperative according to the employees of Medallic Art Company, which had produced all his medals other than the mint medal. He worked well with clients, other artists and associates.

The tasks he had set for himself over the last decade would have been gruelling for a lesser man. Since 1962 he had produced a minimum of a pair of models a month for his various series (all issued by Presidential Art Medals of Vandalla, Ohio), plus accepting single commissions for medals, plus other sculptural commissions, often of heroic proportions, plus he was active in civic, professional, numismatic and cultural affairs.

His most recent commissions prior to his death were a medal for the United States Capitol Historical Society—to be released later this year—and a fountain for Pace College on Park Row in New York City. Previously this year he had also prepared portrait models of Senator Mark O. Hatfield (he had donated the models to him, the two are close friends), J. Edgar Hoover, as a memorial medal, W. Clement Stone for the Combined Insurance Company of America, V. M. Goldschmidt for the Geochemical Society and Judson B. Branch.

He had maintained memberships in the National Sculpture Society since 1950, The Century Association since 1955, the Municipal Art Society of New York (where he was a director 1954-60) since 1950, the American Numismatic Association since 1962 and the Collectors of Art Medals since its inception, 1970.

For the American Numismatic Society he had served on their standing committee on medals for two years, 1967-68.

Awards had recently been conferred upon him, particularly in the last two years, recognizing his sculptural and medallic accomplishments. He received a Doctor of Fine Arts from Hamilton College, where he once attended, the Michelangelo Award from the Sons of Columbus, and the Sculptor of the Year from the American Numismatic Association, all in 1971.

In 1972 he had received the Freedoms Foundation Award for Historic Medals and the Golden Plate Award from the American Academy of Achievement. Previously he had received the Speyer Award from the National

Academy of Design in 1941, a grant from the Louis Comfort Tiffany Foundation in 1947, and a won a competition for the National Jefferson Expansion Memorial, 1947-48.

His funeral service was conducted November 21 at the Emanuel Lutheran Church in Pleasantville beneath a pair of reredos he had designed and donated.

For Ralph Joseph Menconi his works will live on for a long time for his admirers to remember.

### BICYCLE TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1973

#### HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a bill I introduced today, H.R. 692, with 28 cosponsors, entitled the Bicycle Transportation Act of 1973.

This bill would allow States and communities to use highway trust fund moneys for the development of bicycle lanes or paths. It also provides that such funds can be used for the construction of bicycle shelters and parking facilities, and for bicycle traffic control devices. The concept of this bill is essentially the same as that underlying the development of preferential bus lanes in our highway system. Federally aided bicycle lanes would be constructed so as to be part of an interstate system, an ABC road, or a designated urban system.

Bicycles are an important transportation resource and can make a definite contribution to municipal transportation—they should not simply be regarded as only recreation vehicles. Many commuters, when given the option of safe bicycle travel, will choose to pedal to work rather than ride by car or bus.

One of the nice things about bicycling is that it has benefits in addition to the transportation it provides; these include its contribution to mental and physical health and the lessening of air pollution and crowding. It is remarkable that we have a vehicle that emits no pollution, makes no noise, takes up little room, and even contributes to the physical fitness of the rider. And when provided with their own bicycle lanes, bicycles have a very low accident rate.

There is a danger, however, for cyclists who are forced to use roads heavily congested with automobiles. And thus, if bicycle transportation is to be encouraged, we need to develop bicycle lanes and paths.

Perhaps the most famous bicycle city in this country is Davis, Calif. This city of 24,000 persons and approximately 18,000 bicycles has undergone a concentrated effort to develop bicycle transportation, and it has become an important part of the city's transportation system. Bicycles represent 40 percent of all traffic, and, during rush hour, 90 percent of all riders are adults. In Davis City the development of bicycle paths was welcomed by both cyclists and automobile drivers, and they are almost unanimously regarded as desirable safety features.

The bicycle phenomena of Davis City should be our goal for every city in this country. Passage of H.R. 692 will help us to accomplish this goal. I hope, therefore, that final action will be taken on this bill in the 93d Congress.

#### NEVER AGAIN

### HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, included in the various items having to do with the sharp increase in American living costs is the long expected boost in the retail prices of baked goods.

A recent checkup by my office in my congressional district showed pennies being added daily to products all over the bakery counters from the popular pound loaf of bread to the fancy frosted doughnuts. In other words, the rising price of wheat, brought on by the heavy Russian purchases here, finally is having impact on the food budgets of our people.

This is of particular significance to me because it brings to bear the very situation I warned of on the floor of the House of Representatives last September as the wheat sales to the Soviet Union got under way. I pointed out then that, through the generosity of our Government, the Russian buyers were getting supposedly surplus U.S. wheat at approximately 50 cents a bushel less than it cost the U.S. taxpayers.

Federal subsidies, plus interest and storage charges paid by our taxpayers, made possible this bargain for the Russians. By agreement, they bought our wheat at the world price which prevailed at the time the deal was made and thus became protected from the increases which their purchases inevitably generated. Meanwhile, our bakers found their costs of flour soaring and now, despite earlier efforts of the Cost of Living Council to prevent it, are passing the increase on to the public. Thus, we Americans are paying at the check-out counters for this favoritism shown our former Cold War enemies.

I bring this to attention today for a purpose. The Wall Street Journal, in a recent issue, reported that rumors are rife in the U.S. commodities markets

concerning further large Russian purchases of wheat and other U.S. farm products. If these purchases come about, I feel that the Government should make certain the full competitive prices are charged—that never again will the U.S. taxpayers and housewives be placed in the position of subsidizing the food production failures of the Soviet economic and agricultural system. We are seeing the effects of this kind of business in the past in today's markups in the bakeries and supermarkets.

#### REAFFIRMATION

### HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, a recent edition of the New York Times carried an excerpt from an address by Jeno F. Paulucci, a Minnesota businessman. With the expectation that some of my colleagues may be interested in this forward-thinking presentation, I have inserted the Times article as follows:

#### REAFFIRMATION

By JENO F. PAULUCCI

DULUTH, MINN.—We say no industry achieves excellence in employment practices if it does not fulfill its responsibility, its obligation, to help the people who make its business possible. Not only the people who work from the company, but the people who buy what it produces.

We say that industry must work—constantly, tirelessly, stubbornly—to make its area a better place to live and to earn a living. Industry must spend. Spend money, spend time, spend talent, spend energy. And we must go beyond our own areas. We must look at industry as a whole. We must see what is happening to industry in America, and if we see evils in what is happening, we must fight against them.

Let's skip the pious talk about "people's capitalism," about the orphans and widows and wounded war veterans who live off a share of America's profits. We know better, don't we, you and I? We know that corporate profits go to stockholders. We know that 82.4 per cent of the publicly held shares in our nation's corporations are owned by about 1.6 per cent of our adult population.

And with this knowledge and sense of obligation to our country and its people and its future, what can we do about it? We in industry, large and small, can get busy rather than just waiting for Government to do that which must be done if we are to survive as a nation of free enterprise.

Industry has the economic strength, the ability, the know-how and the influence to become involved in helping to solve our social problems before government doles to those who refuse to contribute to our society turn us into a total socialistic state. Our only insurance against that end is by industry becoming involved.

We all know what we must do.

We can first recognize and admit that profit is not our only responsibility of business. We can work to revive our stagnant cities by becoming involved. We can press our legislators until they see that the growing evil of welfare abuse is stopped so that all who can work do work.

It isn't easy to try to change a sick society.

You meet selfishness and stupidity and hypocrisy. You feel frustration and disgust, and you want to say "the hell with it." But if we speak out, if we become involved, believe me, we will find no greater joy or satisfaction than knowing that we are working to make a contribution to our fellow man. To our city. Our state. And, as a result, to our nation and what we will again call, proudly, the American way of life.

#### A PLEA FOR HIGHWAY FUNDS

### HON. JAMES R. JONES

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every Member of Congress will agree that the failure of the last Congress to give final approval to the highway bill has created a situation that must not be allowed to continue. This failure has created consternation among officials in the State of Oklahoma and has thrown a cloak of uncertainty about the entire highway program. Coherent planning of future construction is impossible.

Recently, the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma passed a concurrent resolution expressing its dismay at this situation and its hope for immediate relief. As a reminder to the Members of the urgency of the situation, I insert this resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR PASSAGE OF THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT BY THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, AND URGING THE OKLAHOMA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION TO TAKE ALL STEPS TO INSURE ITS PASSAGE

Whereas, the continuation of the highway program in the State of Oklahoma is heavily dependent upon the availability of Federal-aid Highway Funds; and

Whereas, the funding provisions of the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1970 expire upon June 30, 1973; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States was unable to enact a Federal-aid Highway Act of 1972 during its 92d Session; and

Whereas, due to the failure of Congress to pass such an act, after June 30, 1973, no Federal-aid Highway Funds shall be available for apportionment from the Highway Trust Fund to the states unless the Congress takes immediate steps to enact a Federal-aid Highway Act.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the 1st session of the 34th Oklahoma Legislature, the House of Representatives concurring therein:

Section 1. The State of Oklahoma is in urgent and critical need of the continuation of Federal funds to assist in its highway program, and that without such funds it will be impossible to continue same, except at a greatly reduced pace.

Section 2. The Oklahoma Delegation to the Congress of the United States of America is respectfully urged and requested to take every available step to insure the passage of a Federal-aid Highway Act at the earliest possible time.

Section 3. A copy of this Resolution shall be given to each member of the Oklahoma Congressional Delegation.

Adopted by the Senate the 10th day of January, 1973.



FOR THIS LITTLE PEACE SAY,  
"THANKS BE TO GOD"

# HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, as one who welcomed so enthusiastically—and with true feelings of thanksgiving—the end, at last, of the American involvement in former Indochina, I confess I have been a bit puzzled by certain aspects of the public reaction.

Perhaps the puzzling aspects of that reaction are centered here in the Washington community—making us more aware of them. For this is a special community, as those of us who have lived here a time should know, as well as one not necessarily representative of the country-at-large. Last weekend, for instance, my wife, and I, having read in the newspapers we get from "up home" that there were to be local church services to mark the event of the cease-fire with thankfulness, if not rejoicing, felt we, too, should attend such a service here. We wanted to do so because, quite sincerely, our hearts were full with the joy and relief that came, as far as we were concerned, with the end of our Nation's longest and, in so many ways, costliest war.

The logical place to go, it seemed to us in many ways, was to the Washington Cathedral where the service we felt sure would be held would have certain national overtones we could not catch elsewhere. So, at 7 p.m. last Saturday evening, there we were—along with some other disappointed people—but standing outside the cathedral which was dark, and with all doors shut tight although the cathedral bells were pealing. Given Dean Sayre's activities—so well publicized in recent years—against American involvement in Indochina, we found this puzzling. But, in lieu of further comment along such lines on my part, I will let Vermont Royster's thoughtful column in today's Wall Street Journal—as now set forth—say the rest of it for me.

The article follows:

## THE MOOD OF PEACE

So it is over. Or let us hope so. The American fighting in that long, tragic war in Vietnam.

The bombing has stopped. Our soldiers are on their way home from the battleground. Our prisoners of war are being released. For a little time, anyway, the guns of war are silenced.

And yet the rejoicing has been muted. More strangely, in some places among some people, even grudging.

We have heard the rejoicing among those who but for the cease-fire would have seen their sons going off to Vietnam, among those who these long years have waited for husbands and fathers to come home from prison camps; theirs the pent-up tears of relief and joy. But less rejoicing, curiously, from many who clamored loudest for the war to end on any terms whatever.

After President Nixon spoke to us that evening telling us that at long last a peace agreement had been reached, I flipped my television dial from network to network. I

thought to find somewhere a commentator who would cry "Hallelujah!" If there was such, I somehow missed him.

On one network the newsmen were so stunned they seemed unable to come up with that instant analysis for which they are so famous although they had known the whole day long the substance of what the President would say. On another, the gloom was so thick you could cut it with a knife; long drawn faces suggesting they did not know now what terrible things portended after the peace. So it went; the calling up of the difficulties, the doubts, the problems unresolved, as if the future looked darker than the day before.

Then I listened to the questions fired at Henry Kissinger in that remarkable press conference. When he had finished his hour's detailed accounting of what had been accomplished and what had not, some questioners seemed almost desperately searching for Catch 22. That is, some place where Mr. Kissinger or the President had blundered, some weak spot in the agreement to bolster prophecies that it would all fall apart.

Next, to the newspaper editorialists and commentators. Here I did find more variety among those I was able to read, a more widespread mingling of relief and gratitude.

The Washington Post hailed the peace as a "time for giving thanks," and though a critic of President Nixon gave him generous credit for that day of thanksgiving, in Tulsa, in Birmingham, in Minneapolis, in Los Angeles the peace was welcomed even among newspapers thinking the war itself a tragedy. Some, like the Boston Globe, were moved to thank the President for his "perseverance in getting us out."

But neither thankfulness nor gratitude was the universal welcome to the peace. The New York Times, a critic of the President, was a critic still; it offered an editorial of praise for Henry Kissinger, none for Mr. Nixon, as if the one were independent of the other.

For the St. Louis Post-Dispatch the moment of peace was marred by recalling "Mr. Nixon's shameful act," his "monstrous deed" of bombing North Vietnam, whether or not it contributed to Hanoi's final agreement. That paper found no merit in the chance South Vietnam may now have of preserving its independence; "the honorable course would have been to let the Vietnamese alone; saving that, to have withdrawn years ago."

Meanwhile, the hosannas from the Fulbrights and the McGoverns over the arrival of peace were—well, let us say restrained. They were among those wanting the war ended long ago, unilaterally, at whatever price. That in the end the settlement was a little better than that, achieving some concessions from Hanoi we never thought we'd get, all that seems to have brought no joy to their hearts.

Elsewhere I listened for but heard of no gathering of the once noisy war-protesters having their joyous, swinging celebrations that the peace they sought has come at last. They seem to have slipped quietly away with the mood of those suddenly bereft of a cause.

It's sad to say, but the impression is left—unjustly, I fervently hope—that there are those who would be happier with a shattered peace than a peace that lasts. A peace that lasts would have to be credited to Richard Nixon, to the slow, patient, tough policy of those past four years. A peace that crumbles would put him once again in the dock for pillorying.

A peace that crumbles would also show the perception of those who, rising above such simple emotions as relief, warn us now of that hidden dangers in this provision or that in the agreement, who remind us that all of Indochina is still unstable, that Saigon is weak, that Hanoi is determined, that

all is fragile. A failed peace would prove them prescient.

Anyway, a strange mood indeed. I suppose some of it inevitable. World War I ended with the illusion that the world had been made safe for democracy. Even World War II, ending with a bang, could spur riotous celebration, for that time surely with all our enemies confounded, it seemed a peace that could last. This time the ten, long, weary years of war dribble to an end and there are no illusions left.

This time, too, there is the difference that the whole nation was not involved in the suffering of war. Those who died in Vietnam seemed chosen by a capricious fate; at home most of the nation went its way in undisturbed prosperity. The horrors of war were there but abstract, fleeting pictures on a TV tube. For most Americans their lives this week are no different from last week.

Yet for all that, some of the reaction was strange indeed. Not merely subdued, as befits the occasion. Not merely one of caution against euphoria. From some of what I read and heard I might have supposed—had I not known otherwise—that the peace that comes was thought as bad as the war that was.

As for myself, I too know that this is a peace without victory. I know well that it is a fragile peace. But after four wars in my lifetime I know that every peace is fragile and yet a little peace is better than none. So I, for one, rejoice. And for this little peace say, "Thanks be to God."

## SALUTE TO SOUTHERN COUNCIL OF OPTOMETRISTS

### Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, the golden anniversary of the Southern Educational Congress of Optometry begins February 2, 1973, in Atlanta, Ga. This is a special event which deserves recognition by the House of Representatives and everyone who values the joy of seeing.

A constituent of mine, Dr. L. B. Adkins of Union, Miss., is president of the Southern Council of Optometrists, the sponsoring organization of this annual program which has now completed a half century of service to its members and to the visual welfare of citizens throughout 12 Southern and Southeastern States.

The real significance of this 50th anniversary lies in the fact that the Southern Educational Congress is one of the Nation's earliest and most successful continuing education programs for health professionals. Through this yearly event, optometrists from all over the South have an opportunity to hear top-flight lecturers on every aspect of optometric practice, including pathology, contact lenses, low vision, and children's learning disabilities, to mention only a few. They learn of new techniques and instrumentation designed to help them do an increasingly better job of caring for their patients.

At a time when our Nation is undergoing a serious crisis in health care, it is gratifying to see America's third largest independent health profession mov-

ing forward with new plans, new ideas, and new approaches to solving the problems which are elements of their crisis: underutilization of manpower, maldistribution of health professionals, and inefficiencies in the health care delivery system. The Southern Council of Optometrists is doing a praiseworthy job of helping to overcome these concerns through its annual Southern Educational Congress and by dedicated work throughout the year.

I congratulate the Southern Council of Optometrists, its president, officers and members on the occasion of the organization's 50th anniversary. I know they look forward to another half century of professional progress, and I wish them well.

#### CORRECTIONAL MANPOWER AND EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1973

**HON. MARVIN L. ESCH**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS) in introducing the Correctional Manpower and Employment Act of 1973. This bill is essentially the same as H.R. 13690 which we co-sponsored last Congress.

As I have pointed out in previous remarks, the annual cost of crime in America is staggering. The retail industry is spending approximately \$1.5 billion a year for prevention equipment and services to combat shoplifting. Cargo and baggage losses in interstate transportation costs Americans millions of dollars in losses each year, while drug-related crimes cost the public another \$5 billion annually. In addition to these direct costs of crime, there is the loss of wages, medical, and related expenses for the victim of crime, and other hidden costs to the economy.

It is estimated that Federal, State, and local criminal justice systems require approximately \$6 billion a year just to provide crime prevention services and to process the staggering volume of criminal cases in the courts and social agencies. I believe that in order to prevent this type of inordinate expenditure, and to prevent the waste of precious human resources, that it is necessary to stop the revolving doors of crime. Our penal institutions should not be regarded as higher institutions of crime where offenders are schooled in criminal skills.

I have joined in introducing the Correctional Manpower and Employment Act of 1973 in order to: first, increase the employment skills of offenders; and second, to upgrade the quality and number of correctional personnel. The correctional manpower bill is designed to develop new methods and approaches for aiding criminal offenders and to break the revolving doors of crime through adequate skill training, supportive services, and employment assistance.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr.

DANIELS), chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Labor and I anticipate hearings on this bill and urge our colleagues to join us in helping to develop a positive approach toward dealing with this critical problem within our society.

#### AFRO-AMERICAN HISTORY

**HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, the week of February 11-17 has been set aside for study and reflection on Afro-American history.

To commemorate this occurrence, the St. Louis American newspaper is carrying a special feature on a famous black American each week until February 15.

I would like to join in this commemoration by including this highlight of Afro-American history in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I begin with the first in the series—a spotlight of Frederick Douglass. The article follows:

#### MAN OF DESTINY: DOUGLASS

In February, 1817, a little black boy was born at Tuckahoe, on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. He was the child of a white father whom he never knew, and a black slave mother, so he was born a slave.

The black child, whose last name was Bailey, changed it to Douglass after he had grown up and run away to Massachusetts. We know him as Frederick Douglass, an important writer, editor, lecturer, Marshal of the District of Columbia, Recorder of Deeds, and diplomat. We also point with pride to the fact that he helped to free the slaves, then worked to get civil rights and voting rights for black people. He is often called the greatest black leader of the United States until he died in 1895.

But let us go back to Frederick's childhood. He lived with his grandparents until he was 7 or 8. Then it was time for him to start his life as a slave. He wore only a little dirty dress for clothing, and the little black slaves were forced to eat scraps of food from a pig trough. He slept on the floor in a closet to keep warm.

Of course Frederick was not sent to school. He did have one mistress who taught him the letters of the alphabet, and he studied hard himself. He would ask questions of several white boys who would pronounce a word for him or tell him what it meant.

If you had known this man I think you would have liked him. He was more resourceful than most of the other slaves that he knew because he was the only one who learned to read and write. He was brave enough to fight back when the beatings of slavery became unbearable. And he was fortunate enough to fall in love with a free black girl named Anna Murray, who helped him escape from slavery. He was brilliant and militant, but he had a warm heart.

His free life began in 1838 when he was about 21 years of age. He and Anna married the same year and lived together until her death in 1882. They had five children, Rosetta, Lewis Henry, Frederick, Jr., Charles, and Annie. Little Annie died when she was 10 years old but the others grew up to be useful citizens in Washington, D.C.

In 1841 Frederick Douglass was 24. He joined the abolitionists, the band of men and women who were speaking out against slavery. He became a great public speaker but he

still was not free. Remember he had run away from his master, so even though he now lived in New Bedford, Massachusetts, he was still a fugitive.

He spoke with so much intelligence that people who heard him doubted that he had even been a slave; they said he was too well educated. So Frederick wrote his experiences as a slave and they were published in a book. Then he was in more danger than ever of being recaptured. Therefore his friends of the Anti-Slavery Society sent him to Europe to lecture. In England he met many educated people and the people came in large crowds to hear him speak. One group raised money and sent it to the United States to buy his freedom. Then Frederick Douglass was really free at last.

The year 1847 found Douglass and his family living in Rochester, New York. In that year he started publishing an anti-slavery newspaper called "The North Star," later changed to "Frederick Douglass' Paper." Rochester is located on the southern border of Lake Ontario, very near to Canada. So the Douglass home became a part of a secret movement to help runaway slaves escape to freedom in Canada. This process was called Underground Railroad.

#### THE B-1—DOES THE UNITED STATES NEED IT?

**HON. DONALD M. FRASER**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, volume No. 1 of the Center for Defense Information's "The Defense Monitor" analyzes the need for the B-1 manned bomber. This January 22 newsletter will be a useful tool for Members for the CDI does its usual fine job of presenting accurate information and sound analysis.

While the complete newsletter text follows my remarks, the first four graphic charts are not reproduced. These charts are quite useful and Members who have not received a copy of the newsletter should be able to get one from the CDI at 201 Massachusetts Avenue NE.

[From the Defense Monitor, volume 2, No. 1, Jan. 22, 1973]

#### DEFENSE MONITOR IN BRIEF

The U.S. Air Force is forecasting the expenditure of \$11 billion to buy 244 new B-1 bombers over the next ten years.

The Center for Defense Information analysis of the proposed B-1 bomber indicates:

The Air Force has not proved a need for the B-1, nor has it proved the urgency of 1980 deployment.

Bombers are no longer the primary element of U.S. strategic forces because of missile improvements. Furthermore, the ABM treaty limited missile defense, making the bomber less important as a "hedge" against ICBM-SLBM failure.

Modernization of 300 B-52 G/H series aircraft makes them as useful as the B-1 through the 1980's.

Late model B-52 bombers can penetrate Soviet air defenses. With improvements underway, the B-52 will nearly equal the proposed B-1's penetration capability.

Under present programs, the nuclear weapon capability of the B-52 will double by the 1980's.

The proposed B-1 would fly faster with



better overall performance than the B-52 aircraft, but this improvement in performance is not significant because both bombers would carry the same stand-off weapons.

B-1 performance advantages over the B-52 G/H are not compelling reasons for production of the new aircraft.

Air Force plans for future use of B-52s are in doubt. The B-1 may be added to the B-52 G/H force, increasing the number of bombers available in the 1980's.

Replacing all B-52 bombers with the B-1 bomber would add only 1140 nuclear weapons in the 1980's.

The proposed supersonic B-1 bomber is designed to accomplish the same strategic mission as the subsonic B-52.

Each B-1 bomber would cost \$45,000,000. Each B-52 bomber cost \$8,000,000.

The proposed B-1 bomber design shows a swing wing. (Both the FB-111 fighter bomber and the Navy F-14 fighter have the innovative swing wing; the new Air Force F-15 fighter has a fixed wing.)

The number of weapons in the U.S. strategic force is increasing at a rapid rate and can be predicted to continue this trend into the 1980's.

The resultant slight increase in overall U.S. strategic offensive capability which would be provided by the B-1 bomber would cost at least \$11 billion.

While the U.S. has 531 heavy bombers, the Soviet Union has only 140.

#### THE B-1—DOES UNITED STATES NEED IT?

If the programs Pentagon spokesmen have requested are all approved, the United States could have 18,600 nuclear weapons in the strategic force of the 1980's. These could include 6,500 in submarines, 2,500 in land-based missiles, and 9,600 in bombers. (See Charts 1, 2 and 3) (Charts not printed in the Record). The United States will decide in the near future how much it wishes to increase its nuclear strategic forces.

#### PROPOSED NEW BOMBER

The Air Force has received \$1.3 billion for R&D on an entirely new bomber, to be called the B-1. The Air Force program calls for B-1's at a cost of \$11,000,000,000 for deployment in the 1980's. The Congress has not approved funds for the construction of the proposed B-1 bomber. If built, the B-1 force could carry 5,280 nuclear weapons, 1,140 more weapons than the modernized B-52's.

These additional 1,140 nuclear weapons could increase the total U.S. nuclear weapons to 18,600 in the 1980's. This would be nearly triple the number now possessed by the U.S. The basic question is: "Does the U.S. need 18,600 strategic nuclear weapons in the 1980's?"

#### FORTY-SEVEN PERCENT OF ALL SOVIETS

Assuming the U.S. is building only a second strike deterrent capability, the destruction of the urban/industrial area of Russia would be the logical target. There are in Russia today 1,000 cities and towns of over 20,000 people. Based on empirical evidence and published test results, it is reasonable to assume that an average of two nuclear weapons are required to destroy each of these Soviet cities and kill 47% of the people in Russia. This will require about 2,000 nuclear weapons. Without the B-1 bomber, the U.S. would have over 13,000 nuclear weapons, or six times the number needed to destroy the urban/industrial area of Russia and nearly half of all the Russian people. With the B-1 bomber, the U.S. would have over 18,000 nuclear weapons, or nine times the number needed.

#### EIGHTY-EIGHT MILLION CHINESE

By the 1980's, China may also present a threat to the U.S. based on an analysis of

population and industrial concentrations, approximately 2,500 nuclear weapons would be required for destruction of about 90% of the urban/industrial capability of China and 88,000,000 people. Therefore, if both Russia and China were to be struck simultaneously, the U.S. would require a maximum of 4,500 nuclear weapons. Without the additional capability provided by the B-1, the U.S. could have three times enough weapons to destroy both China and Russia. With the additional capability of the B-1 bomber, the U.S. would have four times the nuclear weapons needed to destroy both China and Russia.

#### CURRENT BOMBER FORCE

In the U.S. strategic force, there are about 450 B-52 bombers. Of this number, less than 150 bombers are the older D series used in bombing Vietnam. There are approximately 300 modernized B-52 G/H bombers. In addition, there are more than 70 new FB-111 bombers. The strategic bomber force currently can carry nearly 2,000 nuclear weapons. The Air Force is modifying 300 of the B-52 bombers to carry 1,000 more nuclear weapons. Under another proposed Air Force program to build the new SCAD missile, an additional 1,000 nuclear weapons would be carried by the B-52 bombers for a total of 4,060. FB-111 bombers can carry an additional 200 nuclear weapons.

#### BOMBER CAPABILITIES

On a typical strategic mission, a B-52 would require 11 hours to travel the 5,000 miles from base to target. Intercontinental missiles need but 30 minutes from launch point to target. Sea-based missiles on station require 15 minutes to hit the same Soviet targets. (See Chart 4.)

The proposed B-1 would require 8 hours on the same strategic mission and, like the B-52, would arrive over target hours after U.S. missile-borne weapons have struck. If all programs asked for by Pentagon spokesmen are approved, 9,000 missile weapons could be in the strategic arsenal in the mid-1980's. Rapid expansion of the missile force has converted the bomber from the main weapon of strategic war to a "hedge" against possible failure of the sea-based and land-based missile systems.

As a direct result of the ABM treaty with Russia signed in 1972, all but 200 of the 9,000 U.S. land and sea-based missile weapons that may be in service in the 1980's could attack targets in the USSR and China without interception. Since missiles will arrive on target first, they will have the capability to destroy the Soviet Union. Therefore, the U.S. strategic bomber force is substantially less necessary since the ABM treaty was signed.

#### BOMBERS ARE VULNERABLE

Strategic bombers will remain vulnerable to SAM attack in the 1980's. While missiles speed along at a maximum speed of 11,000 nautical miles per hour, the maximum speed of the proposed new B-1 bomber will be 1,200 nautical miles per hour. Attempts to penetrate Soviet air space require installation of costly defensive devices in the B-52 and B-1 aircraft which may or may not be effective when needed. The ability of North Vietnam, using the older SAM 2, to shoot down B-52's dramatizes the vulnerability of aircraft in a strategic bomber force. The Soviets have other more modern air defenses, including the SAM 3, which have not appeared yet in North Vietnam.

While missiles cannot easily be destroyed in flight because of available countermeasures and the technical complexity of effective interception, bombers, whether the B-52 or the proposed B-1, are more vulnerable. To penetrate Soviet air space, an aircraft can use evasive tactics and get some protection from

equipment that is only theoretically effective. Relatively high losses of B-52's flying against North Vietnam's concentrated air defenses in December 1972 have raised questions about the ability of bombers to survive the even more sophisticated surface-to-air missile and interceptor nets of the Soviet Union. But the aircraft tactics for a nuclear war are far different from the tactics used to carpet bomb North Vietnam with "conventional" ordnance delivered by a formation of aircraft. Single strategic bombers, arriving over the USSR long after U.S. missile forces have completed their destructive tasks and after defenses have been weakened, probably would be relatively safe from interception. The question remains whether the bombers' added nuclear weapons would be needed to insure the destruction of the Soviet Union.

CHART V.—AVERAGE HOURS OF FLIGHT TIME FOR B-52 BOMBERS

Series	1972 (actual) <sup>1</sup>	1980 (predicted) <sup>2</sup>	1990 (predicted) <sup>2</sup>
D.....	9,000	12,150	.....
F.....	9,000	12,150	.....
G.....	5,400	8,850	13,050
H.....	4,600	7,750	12,250

<sup>1</sup>USAF data.

<sup>2</sup>USAF average annual flight times used for predictions.

Note: The B-52/G/H series have thousands of flying hours remaining before they must be retired.

#### ABOUT \$6 BILLION FOR B-52 MODERNIZATION

About 300 of the B-52's in the U.S. Strategic Air Command are the more modern G/H series equipped to penetrate Soviet air defenses.

These newer G/H series are different in several important ways from the older D/F aircraft. The G/H bombers have received major structural, armament, and electronic modifications in an effort to counter the latest Soviet radars, fighters, and air defense missiles. The earlier, less modern D/F aircraft cannot penetrate the more complex Soviet defenses. Over \$3 billion has already been spent improving the B-52 bomber force.

An equal amount—\$3 billion more—is being requested in an attempt to ensure the G/H aircraft retains the capability to penetrate Soviet air defenses. These modernization programs will in effect produce 300 new bombers, able to operate into the late 1980's. (See Chart 5) In short, all B-52's are not alike nor do their capabilities remain static.

#### STAND-OFF WEAPONS

The most important change in bomber warfare has been the development of air-borne weapons to attack targets at great range. By the time of the proposed B-1 deployment, neither the B-1 nor the modified B-52 will need to approach most targets closer than 50 miles. The B-52 and the proposed B-1 would be able to carry 12 to 24 "stand-off" missiles, each with a nuclear weapon. Half of these airborne missiles could have a range of more than 500 miles. (See Chart 6.) By the 1980's, neither the proposed B-1 nor the B-52 would need to carry bombs.

#### LOW-LEVEL MISSION

Bomber design evolved in response to new developments in air defenses. For 20 years, the outstanding trend in U.S. bomber design was the steady increase in high-altitude capability.

Meanwhile, Soviet air defense never lagged far behind the bomber. While the U.S. Air Force was developing the B-70 Valkyrie to operate at 70,000 feet, major advances in Soviet rocketry shot the project down. The Soviets began deploying surface-to-air missiles (SAM) capable of destroying aircraft

flying at 70,000 feet. Since then, bomber design has concentrated on the ground-hugging mission in an attempt to fly below most Soviet air defenses.

The proposed B-1 would incorporate a new electro-optical viewing system (EVS) which uses low-light level television and infrared sensors designed to permit the bomber to proceed to target less than 300 feet above the ground. The EVS is also being installed on the B-52 G/H series at a cost of \$209 million. With EVS, both the B-52 G/H series and the proposed B-1 could fly at low-level over land en route to targets.

## COMPARATIVE PERFORMANCE CHARACTERISTICS

	B-52G/H	B-1
Speed at high altitude.....	550 knots (average).	1,200 knots (maximum).
Speed at low altitude.....	390 knots (average).	550 knots (average).
Maximum payload per aircraft:		
Internal.....	31,000 lbs.	75,000 lbs.
External (wing racks).....	20,000 lbs.	40,000 lbs.
Electro-optical viewing system.....	Yes.	Yes.
Radar cross section.....	Smaller.	Smaller.
Infrared signature.....	Less.	Less.
Standoff weapons.....	Yes.	Yes.

CHART VI.—STRATEGIC BOMBER ARMAMENT

Weapon	Range (miles)	Speed (m.p.h.)	Nuclear yield	Weight (lbs.)	Decoy
Quail.....	95	400	Not armed.....	1,500	Yes.
Hound Dog.....	700	1,200	Low megaton range.....	10,000	No.
SRAM.....	70	1,200	Medium kiloton range.....	2,200	No.
Scad.....	500	650	Low kiloton range.....	2,000	Yes.
Bomb.....			Medium to high megaton range.....		

Note: This shows the variety and capability of stand off weapons for strategic bombers.

## THE B-1

Wing span.....	136.7 Ft.
Wings forward.....	78.2 Ft.
Wings swept.....	143.3 Ft.
Length.....	33.6 Ft.
Height.....	350-400,000 Lb.
Gross weight.....	

## Speed

Low level penetration, almost mach 1.  
High altitude, above mach 2.

## CHART VII.—INCREASES IN TYPICAL BOMBER NUCLEAR WEAPONS LOAD

(Assumes equal range mission).	
B-52 G&H (4 Weapons & 4 Decoys)	
1971—2 Bombs, 4 Quail, 2 Hound dog.	
B-52 G&H (12 Weapons)	
1974—2 Bombs, 2 Hound dog, 8 SRAM.	
B-52 G (12 Weapons)	
6 SRAM, 6 SCAD.	
B-52 H (24 Weapons)	
1981—12 SRAM, 12 SCAD.	
B-1 (24 Weapons)	
12 SRAM, 12 SCAD.	
The average weapon load of the proposed B-1 bomber is no greater than the load of the B-52-H series.	

## NOTE

The Center's research study on which this edition of the *Defense Monitor* was based is available at the Center.

## ARCHBISHOP THOMAS J. McDONOUGH'S REMARKS ON THE VIETNAM CEASE-FIRE

## HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed the privilege last Sunday of attending a very moving, ecumenical, religious service held at the Adath Israel Temple, Louisville, Ky., in observation of the truce in Vietnam.

I was particularly impressed by the words of the Most Reverend Thomas J. McDonough, Catholic archbishop of Louisville, who eloquently reminded us that, "War is man's greatest and cruelist act of futility."

I commend Archbishop McDonough's message to the attention of my colleagues.

## REMARKS BY ARCHBISHOP THOMAS J. McDONOUGH

The bells of peace which sounded throughout our City and County last evening, ushered in an era of hope and great expectation.

Peace, thank God, has been achieved but the price was awesome and staggering.

With the cessation of hostilities and the signing of the peace treaty there still remains so much to be accomplished on a national and international level among all people and nations.

Unfortunately there could emerge the regretful tendency, in the midst of our heightened enthusiasm and unrestrained joy, to forget that we must begin now to seek a way of life that will preempt forever from the fabric of mankind wanton war, ignored and excessive poverty and a lack of concern, love and interest for our fellow men.

War is never the answer because it breaks down families and tears apart nations. War inexorably destroys and kills, separates loved ones, foments discord and breeds discontent. War is man's greatest and cruelist act of futility.

We, as Americans, who traditionally take great pride in our inheritance which was bequeathed to us by men and women of great faith and indomitable courage, must never become isolated within ourselves. We must accord to others the privileges of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness which we cherish. The gifts of this country, which are so many and so varied, must be shared willingly and thankfully with the rest of the world. What war has broken down we must build up as reflected in the people and the nations who participated in the war in Vietnam.

Particularly today and in the immediacy of this gathering, our hearts and hands go out in understanding to the front line soldiers who will soon begin to return to us. Our patience must be paramount because they have suffered so much for you and for me. With unbound gratitude we reflect a constant loyalty for the prisoners of war, begging God to bring them home safely and to eradicate the nightmare of imprisonment and the mental anguish which have harassed them. To the families who have their own missing in action, we beg a redoubling of spiritual efforts in their behalf.

Only when men and nations are motivated by high ideals and spiritual commitments to avoid the pitfalls of war; only when men and nations deplore bombing and implore praying; only when men and nations behold in God the fount of love, the hope of peace and the promise of a future life; only when

all these things happen and become a reality will we, together with the people of the world, be able to rise as one and cry out for the whole world to hear, WAR—no, no! War, please God, never again.

In thanksgiving to God we wish also to acknowledge with sincerest gratitude and in a spirit of prayer all who have worked so hard and so perseveringly in behalf of peace.

May you, they and all of us accept in the presence of our oneness today the blessing of God as found in Sacred Scripture in the Book of Numbers:

"May the Lord bless you and keep you.

The Lord show his face to you and have mercy on you.

The Lord turn his countenance to you and give you peace."

## NEW MATH DOES NOT WORK

## HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, last Friday, January 26, 1973, Mr. William Loeb, the publisher of the *Manchester Union Leader*, spoke out in a front-page editorial about the new-math controversy. Mr. Loeb, and an accompanying article by Mr. W. A. Leavell, cite the inability of Dr. James M. Shackelford, of nearby Arlington, Va., who holds a Ph. D. in chemistry, and his associates in the Environmental Protection Agency, to solve the problems in the fourth-grade math-book assigned Dr. Shackelford's daughter, Leslie. I know firsthand, from the experiences of my own assistant who was a Commerce Department budget officer and mastered the intricate mathematics of the Federal budget, and has a child in this same class, that there is considerable reason for concern about the direction that the mathematics curriculum has taken.

I commend the editorial and article to the Senate. As the ranking minority member of the Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee, I am asking the Office of Education for a report on the progress of the new math.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the *Record*.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

TO HELL WITH NEW MATH!

(By William Loeb, Publisher)

Probably there is not one parent reading the paper today who has not been subjected to the nonsense of the so-called "new math," and who has been told by the educators that he is just old-fashioned and doesn't know any better and that this is the "new thing."

Many parents, at that point, become intimidated and relapse into unhappy silence.

Therefore, be sure to read the column by W. A. Leavell at the top of our back page today, in which he points out that a very distinguished doctor of philosophy, James M. Shackelford, affiliated with the Environmental Protection Agency in Washington, D.C., has come out in open revolt against the new math and what it did not teach his bright daughter, Leslie, in the fourth grade.

It seems that Dr. Shackelford, who lives in Arlington, came home one day purposely to participate in his daughter's birthday party. At one point, he held up a coin and



offered to give it to the first youngster who could tell him what 8 times 9 is. He thought that any fourth grader, by all means including his own daughter, would be able to give him the correct answer. He was shocked when none of the youngsters could tell him how much 8 times 9 is.

So that night he got out his daughter's math book and took a look at it—and that's all he needed. From then on he has been crusading against the new math.

The next day, he took the book in to the famous scientists who work with him—and they had the same reaction. Then and there, he decided that it was time that parents revolted against this nonsense, which is just one more ridiculous educational theory that has gone wild. Dr. Shackelford would like parents all across the country to demand from their school boards that the new math be thrown out and that students be taught basic arithmetic, so they can function efficiently in the life they will have to face when they get out of school.

This newspaper says three cheers for Dr. Shackelford, and good luck to him and all the other parents who want to bring about the end of the new math.

#### "NEW MATH" SYSTEM JUST DOESN'T ADD UP (By W. A. Leavell)

"To hell with new mathematics!"

Now I have done it. I have busted my britches forever with the "modern" type educator. I don't care. I would say it again but I don't like to use naughty words.

I am not the first to say bad words over the foolish experiment in education that has failed. In fact, it looks like this expensive mistake will leave us with a generation of people who can't do simple mathematics.

While most parents grumble and shake their heads at "new math," they don't do anything. Some assume the educators know what they are doing and this is a serious mistake. Some don't understand it and don't want to look stupid. Others just don't care.

We now have a new knight on a white horse who is taking up the cause of doing in "new math." He knows the fight will be long and hard but he is going to give it a try.

A product of the academic community himself, he knows the system makes mistakes and he thinks "new math" comes second only to the current failure to teach our students how to read.

The new champion of getting rid of "new math" is James M. Shackelford, Ph.D. I think the American people should listen to Dr. Shackelford. In fact, I think we should give him a national hero award just for having the nerve to stand up and tell the truth about "new math," or "no math," as some call it.

Dr. Shackelford is a chemist with a Ph.D. in his field. He lives in Arlington, Va., and works for the Environmental Protection Agency in Washington, D.C. Dr. Shackelford is not an old fuddy-duddy nor is he a know-nothing that has to take off his shoes and use his toes to count past 10.

It all started with his daughter, Leslie, who is a bright fourth grade student at Barcroft elementary school in Arlington, Va. When Leslie had her last birthday party her father was home and he joined in helping make the party a fun time.

At one point he held up a coin and offered to give it to the first youngster who told him what 8 times 9 was. He felt sure that this would be simple for a fourth grader.

To his shock, none of the students knew what 8 times 9 was. That night he got Leslie's math book and found that like most of its type today, it went into math theory but gave little to old fashion arithmetic. He felt that this might be of some use to computer specialists or geneticists but little help to

anyone trying to learn how to make change or do simple math.

Thinking his own education might have been lacking in some way, Dr. Shackelford took the fourth grade "new math" book to his office. He tried it on his learned colleagues, who included highly trained scientists. Not one of them could understand the problems in the book and not one of them could see any value in "new math."

To start his campaign Dr. Shackelford wrote the local school board. He now plans to take the matter up with state educational officials. He told his school board chairman:

"I have copied some of the most ridiculous problems and ask you to try to work them . . . then after the exasperation subsidies, ask the same questions to those state officials who have approved these books. And so on, problems and ask you to try to work them."

In reply the school board chairman said: "I grumbled about it (new math) like I think most parents did. But I guess it's something that people kind of accepted and educators got sort of carried away."

It seems that the idea of "new math" is that it is necessary to teach math theory to youngsters rather than routine arithmetic. Dr. Shackelford compared with this with the great postwar departure from the old fashioned but eminently successful phonics method of teaching reading. The new reading methods of teaching have resulted in millions of American students being unable to read properly.

Dr. Shackelford feels that the educational experimenters have had a field day and the textbook publishers have made a killing at the taxpayer's expense.

Three cheers for Dr. Shackelford!

It is time someone stood up and said "new math" is not working and that we should junk it in favor of good basic arithmetic.

Change is good when it is an improvement but when it doesn't work we should stick to what works.

"New math" doesn't work!

#### UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

#### HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 23, 1973

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 55th Anniversary of Ukraine's Independence. Just as I am sure that few people are aware of this fact, I am sure that most Americans are unaware that this independence lasted only 3 brief years. Ever since 1920 the Ukrainians have waged a continual struggle to regain their freedom.

We commemorate not merely the importance of January 22, 1918, to the Ukrainian people, but more importantly, the significance of their struggle for independence to other freedom-loving people of the world. Certainly, their efforts serve as a source of inspiration for oppressed people everywhere.

All too often in a nation which has long known independence, citizens take for granted freedoms which other people do not enjoy. Thus, our celebration of the 55th Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day hopefully will also serve as a time of reflection for us who live in freedom. In addition, this should be a time in which we reaffirm our desires to continue to secure these blessings for "ourselves and our posterity."

#### CUTBACK OF FARM PROGRAMS

#### HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, the decision of the administration to cut back numerous farm programs is a matter of deep concern to Congress. It is matter of concern not only because of the value of these programs in maintaining a strong, stable, healthy, rural America, but also because these decisions constitute a challenge to the powers of Congress itself.

As a result of a meeting recently held in Huron, S. Dak., Senator McGovern and I were given an opportunity to develop some of our thoughts on this issue at greater length. This took the form of a letter to the editor of the Argus-Leader, the largest newspaper in my State. I should like to share those thoughts with the Senate and ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

ANSWER ARGUS-LEADER EDITORIAL: MCGOVERN, ABOUREZK GIVE SPENDING CUT SPECIFICS—TERM U.S. PRIORITIES "UPSIDE DOWN"

To The Editor Of The Argus-Leader:

We read with great interest and concern the Argus-Leader editorial of Jan. 16, commenting on our meeting in Huron on Saturday, Jan. 13.

The purpose of the meeting was to protest and to lay plans for attempts to reverse the blitz of program cutbacks and terminations recently unleashed on rural America by the Nixon administration. Your editorial agreed that the administration actions will be harmful to the Great Plains, but argued that we in the Congress must "also come up with some specifics" if we are unwilling to let the President use his "executive prerogatives" to hold down spending.

We would be happy to provide specifics. We believe the manned space program should be cut before the rural electric system. We believe arms aid to foreign governments should be trimmed before emergency aid to American disaster victims. We believe tax subsidies for corporate polluters should be terminated before programs to protect the rural environment.

Across the board we believe that programs for working Americans of modest income should be generally maintained or expanded. We believe the money for this effort should come from swollen budgets in the military-space sector and from the swollen treasuries of tax-sheltered corporations.

Our view that tax dollars should be spent on programs that benefit the families who paid taxes is not new and it is not the view of only a tiny minority in the Congress.

It is the President who has carefully promoted the idea that Congress has helped create today's economic problems with its policies of what your editorial called "spend, spend, spend." But the truth is that over the last four years, the Congress has in fact cut \$16 billion from Mr. Nixon's spending requests. We cut \$4.4 billion in the current fiscal year. The real source of unbalanced budgets and enormous Nixon administration deficits has been not the Congress but the administration itself—its record corporate tax cuts, granted in some cases without even bothering to obtain congressional consent, plus a deliberate high unemployment

policy which inevitably reduced federal tax collections and increased Federal costs. People who have no jobs pay no taxes; instead, they draw unemployment compensation, food stamps and welfare.

It is just as incorrect to say that congressional criticism is wholly negative. We have come up with alternatives and we will continue to do so.

Members of Congress, including the South Dakota delegation, have demonstrated time and time again where waste in the arms budget and other programs could be reduced without damaging our national security.

We question, for example, why the administration finds it more important to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars for the Navy to study a children's toy—the frisbee—than to invest in low-cost power for rural consumers.

On a larger scale, the two weeks of pre-Christmas bombing in Indochina cost \$500 million—two and one-half times as much as the Rural Environmental Assistance Program, (REAP) which has just been cut off.

And the tragic irony is that while our own resources will receive less protection because REAP is ended, the agreement ultimately signed in Paris will doubtless commit the United States to pay for repairing the damage those bombs inflicted—a REAP Program for North Vietnam, but none for South Dakota.

On the tax side, both of us have developed, sponsored and supported tax reform programs which would add billions to federal revenues while reducing the burden on ordinary taxpayers. We expect to make a vigorous fight on this issue in the 93rd Congress. We also expect that any progress we make in reforming the tax structure will have to be made, unfortunately over the all-out opposition of the Nixon administration, which seems more interested in advantages for the privileged few than in a fair break for all the people or in a balanced national budget.

But all of this really relates to a larger issue which we discussed in Huron on Jan. 13.

The current cuts in farm, rural development and conservation programs reflect upside down national priorities. It is shortsighted and unjust to make farmers—who are among the most helpless and hard-hit victims of the disease of inflation—suffer most from the cure as well. We object strenuously to that.

But we are also gravely concerned about what has become a sustained assault on Congress that goes beyond the current crisis to the very future of our constitutional system.

We have searched the Constitution in vain for any reference to an "executive prerogative" to impound and withhold funds appropriated by the Congress in legislation signed by the President, to violate the clear intent of the Congress in conducting the nation's business, or to repeal unilaterally the law of the land.

Instead, we find that it is to the Congress, and not to some bureaucrat, that the Constitution grants the power to create new programs when they are needed, or to abolish old programs when the need is at an end. It is to the Congress, and not to the Executive, that our founding fathers assigned the responsibility of determining how national revenues will be raised and spent.

Yet the Nixon administration did not come to the Congress when they decided to slash these rural programs. They made no formal finding that these were bad activities. They did not conduct public hearings. They did not consult with the people who have been hurt. And they certainly did not tell anyone before the election last fall that they had these steps in mind, so they could now claim a mandate to carry them out. Instead, they laid their plans in secret and then implemented them by surprise.

The Argus-Leader editorial said you "would like to see the guidelines or priorities the administration followed in making these reductions." But part of the problem is that it is futile to ask for such information—futile for the Argus-Leader and futile for the Congress. Even if the administration would comply with a request of that kind, which they see no obligation to do, they would still claim the power to carry out the cuts without Congressional consent or participation. Under such circumstances, setting for a chance to look at the guidelines of priorities is a little like being grateful to a burglar who tells you why he is robbing your house, while he disputes your right to call the police.

Congress has consistently refused, by denying "item veto" authority to let the President choose which parts of the law he wants to implement and which he wants to discard. When a bill reaches his desk, he must either sign it all or veto it all; he cannot pick and choose. Yet today we see that power assumed even though it has always been denied.

Last year, the Congress specifically refused to give Mr. Nixon the authority to establish national priorities all by himself, within a \$250 billion overall ceiling. He asked for that authority, but he refused even to tell us where the cuts would be made. It would have been an abandonment of Congressional responsibilities to grant what the President asked. Now he has just taken it. One wonders why he even bothered to ask.

What the administration has done is a radical departure from the Constitution. If these actions go unchallenged, then the Congress will have yielded one of its most important responsibilities, and the American people will have lost a precious and hard-won source of control over their government and their lives.

This is not the way to respect the Constitution or to protect the American system. Nor, given the record of the past four years—the towering deficits congressional spending cuts of \$16 billion—is it the way to bring the federal budget under control.

So we intend to continue the struggle started in Huron through every available channel. In this effort, we hope for the support, not only of those who identify with the needs of rural America, but of all those who believe in the Constitution and in the great traditions of a free America.

GEORGE MCGOVERN,  
JAMES ABUREK,  
U.S. Senators.

WASHINGTON.

#### PAY COMMISSION SHOULD BE ABOLISHED

#### HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to abolish the Commission on Executive, Legislative and Judicial Salaries. I would also like congressional colleagues to be aware that unless Congress acts affirmatively on this bill to put the Commission out of business, there is every likelihood that it will recommend salary increases for Congressmen, Senators, and other top Government officials to become effective in March of 1974.

If we desire to check inflation, then we in good conscience should not go along

with this scheme that seems certain to mean pay increases for ourselves.

Congress should face up to the fact that this Commission represents an unethical, backdoor method of raising the pay of National Government officials. If a pay increase is truly justified, then Members of Congress should clearly have no public fear of casting a recorded vote on the issue.

For the public's information, all nine members of the Commission have now been named and are preparing to review the salary scales of Members of Congress, Justices, and judges in the judicial branch and top executives in the executive branch except for President and Vice President.

This Commission is due to make its report to the President on June 30, 1973. The President will then take these recommendations into consideration in submitting the 1975 budget to Congress in early 1974. Unless Congress specifically acts to disapprove the pay adjustments, they will go into effect about March of 1974.

When this same method was employed in early 1969, I well recall, it was impossible for us even to get a recorded vote on the pay hike package in the House of Representatives. Hence, everybody in Congress got their salary raised without having to be accountable to the voters. It is a wrong way to do business.

#### AIR FORCE SERGEANTS ASSOCIATION OPPOSES GENERAL AMNESTY

#### HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to bring to the attention of the House a resolution adopted by the delegates at the most recent convention of the Air Force Sergeants Association held in Sacramento, Calif., this past fall.

The resolution concerns the question of granting amnesty to draft dodgers and deserters who have fled the country to avoid serving in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam war. Because it states the case against a general amnesty so well and because it is so timely in its message on the subject, I am going to ask that the resolution be printed in the Record in its entirety, so that all Members of Congress will have an opportunity to read it:

#### OPPOSES GENERAL AMNESTY

Whereas, approximately 55,000 Americans have died from all causes during the course of the war in Indochina and scores of thousands have been wounded, many seriously; and,

Whereas, over 1,600 Americans are either prisoners of war or are unaccounted for by the enemy are still carried as missing in action; and,

Whereas, the President of the United States has stated that he would not grant any form of "Amnesty" while American Servicemen were fighting in Vietnam nor while prisoners of war were being held in North Vietnam; and,



Whereas, nearly 5,400 Americans are, as members of the immediate families of our POW/MIA's, tragically touched by the inhumanity of our Communist foes;

Be it resolved: the AFSA recommends that no form of general or selective amnesty be granted to all or any of the draft dodgers or deserters until the U.S. Combat role in Indochina has drawn completely to a close, and our prisoners have been returned to our shores, with a valid accounting of our missing in action; and,

Be it further resolved, that when the foregoing conditions have been fully met, then and only then, should a deliberate case by case review be undertaken by those who, having turned their backs on their country in her hour of need, now seek the full rights of citizenship when boastfully they chose to evade its accompanying responsibilities.

#### LET'S NOT KID OURSELVES ABOUT WHO WON THE WAR

### HON. DAWSON MATHIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, while I join with all Americans in welcoming the cease-fire in Vietnam, I do feel that the conditions agreed upon do need to be placed in perspective.

The following editorial, which I feel reflects a realistic analysis, appeared in the Birmingham Post-Herald on January 29, and I am pleased to insert it in the RECORD for the consideration of the House:

LET'S NOT KID OURSELVES ABOUT WHO WON THE WAR

(By Ted Knap)

WASHINGTON.—President Nixon and Dr. Henry A. Kissinger did their best, but let's not kid ourselves about who won and who did not. Le Duc Tho's claim of "victory" for the Communist side has considerable validity.

Unpleasant though it may be, consider these facts:

—The agreement states (Ch. I, Art. 1) that the United States and all other countries respect the "sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of Vietnam," as set out in the 1954 Geneva accords. That's one Vietnam, not two.

—The agreement accepts the continued presence of North Vietnamese troops in the south, estimated by the United States at 145,000.

—Kissinger refers to the long conflict as "civil war."

Those concessions seem to conflict with the constantly repeated contention of Nixon and former President Lyndon B. Johnson that Americans intervened to defend South Vietnam against "outside aggression" by North Vietnam.

The agreement requires the withdrawal of and the dismantling of the bases of "the United States and those other foreign countries" allied with the Saigon government. It is perfectly clear that "foreign countries" does not apply to North Vietnam, which is allowed to retain troops and whatever bases it has in the south.

Kissinger says our side has not accepted the presence of North Vietnamese troops as a "legal right." But it is a well-established principle of law that what is not prohibited is permitted.

Loud and clear, the agreements say the United States failed to get what Johnson

and Nixon until recently said they would insist upon—a mutual withdrawal of Hanoi's troops along with ours.

Kissinger did manage to get some of what he had called "allusive" reference to the "sovereignty" of South Vietnam pending reunification.

But considering the agreements as a whole, as Kissinger recommends, Saigon's sovereignty is limited by these factors:

—The DMZ is "only" a "provisional military demarcation line . . . and not a political or territorial boundary," the agreements state.

—The agreements—and Kissinger himself—state that the DMZ separates "two zones," not two countries.

—The agreement refers to the opposing South Vietnamese forces "two parties," not the government of South Vietnam on one side and guerrillas on the other. The agreements attribute "equality" to the two parties, and pledges them to "mutual non-elimination."

How much sovereignty is there in a government that pledges not to eliminate guerrillas seeking its overthrow?

Four years ago the Communists proposed a 10-point peace plan whose provisions are remarkably similar to the present cease-fire agreement with one major exception. The 1969 Communist plan called for establishing a coalition government in the south; the 1973 agreement does not. It would instead establish a Council of National Reconciliation comprised of "three equal segments"—Saigon, Viet Cong and neutralists—to organize general elections.

Much concern has been expressed lately about the excessive and growing power of the presidency. Vietnam proved the limits of that power.

I am not contending that four years made no difference in the deal we got, or in the military readiness of the government forces in South Vietnam, or that we could have been sure four years ago that it would take so long to get so little more. The point is that we should look honestly at what we did and did not get out of the war and in the cease-fire agreements.

#### VIOLENCE IN NEWS

### Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, there are so many incidents of violence in the news these days that most seem to make only the briefest of headlines. Nonetheless, one cannot help but be shocked and saddened, with the frequency of the incidents.

The callous gunning down of Senator STENNIS before his own house here in Washington is the latest—but unfortunately probably not the last—of these incidents. We all pray for his early and complete recovery.

I would like also to express my abhorrence, Mr. Speaker, of the killing a few days ago of two distinguished diplomats from Turkey. You will recall, I am sure, the details of the brutal slayings in Santa Barbara, Calif., of the Turkish Consul General at Los Angeles, Mehmet Baydar, and his Vice Consul, Bahadır Demir. Regrettably, this is another in a series of attacks on foreign diplomats which have occurred, and which regrettably seem impossible to prevent.

I was pleased to see that President Nixon had sent a telegram to President Sunay of Turkey about the shocking event. The following is the text of that telegram:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I was shocked and saddened to learn of the killing in California of Turkish Consul General Baydar and Vice Consul Demir.

As you know, our government has been deeply concerned with the prevention of acts of violence directed against foreign diplomats and officials and has worked closely with other governments, including yours, in the United Nations and elsewhere to coordinate international action in this regard. You can be sure this deplorable act of violence is being investigated with a sense of great urgency.

Please accept my sincere condolences and deep regret for this tragic incident resulting in the death of two fine Turkish diplomats.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

#### PRICE INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO COPE WITH ENERGY CRISIS

### HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the time has already passed for the Congress of the United States to face up to its responsibilities to assure an adequate and reliable supply of natural gas for the consumers of the United States. Natural gas, the cleanest burning, cheapest fuel we have in this country has been discriminated against by repressive legislation. Our other primary fuels—coal and oil—are regulated by the laws of supply and demand, subject only to national security considerations. Gas is regulated by the Congress through delegation to the FPC.

In the last 4 years, the FPC has recognized the repressive nature of the decisions of the 1960's, which resulted in lower and lower prices at the wellhead until exploration and development of new reserves was dangerously discouraged—discouraged not only by the prices set, but, more important, discouraged by the absolute uncertainty that faces a person who sells gas in interstate commerce. In only three areas of the country—Permian and Hugoton-Anadarko (and Appalachian, Ill., does that person know how much of his contract price he can keep, and, even then, the FPC can lower his price for the future. In the other areas of the country—vital areas of production like southern Louisiana, including the Federal domain, Texas gulf coast, other Southwest, and Rocky Mountain, the producer has no assurance as to what price he is selling his gas, because the FPC or the courts can order refunds of past moneys collected and reduce the price for the future. FPC rate cases sometimes take 12 years to process—and the clock is still running on court review. How Congress, with its plenary power over interstate commerce, can permit a system which requires a person to deliver a commodity without knowing what he will be paid for delivering it for years and years which have

come and gone and which are yet to come, is a mystery, and is probably the result of the lack of a crisis. We have a crisis now, as many of us have predicted, which commands the attention of the Congress. More than a dozen major interstate natural gas pipelines are curtailing service to consumers this winter.

"Curtailing service" is a nice way of saying that consumers are being cut off from gas supplies because there is not enough gas to meet current requirements, much less to add new customers. As factories and schools are closed down, as crops are rotting for lack of process gas, as homeowners are being turned away from coast to coast, we, the Congress, cannot stand idly by and say that the policies of the Natural Gas Act, adopted in 1938 and first applied judicially to producers in 1954, are adequate. Congress must recognize its own failures and those of its chosen instrument, the FPC, and remove the cloud over the sale of natural gas in interstate commerce. Yesterday, I introduced legislation, H.R. 3299, that would take the FPC out of the business of regulating the sale of natural gas in interstate commerce—directly or, as Federal agencies sometimes do, indirectly. Market forces would control the sale of gas by producers—both independent producers and affiliates of pipelines who, in desperation, are competing for leases so new supplies can be attached for use by consumers. For gas now being sold in interstate commerce the existing contracts could, for the first time, be honored as the parties negotiated them in the first place, but which have been overridden by the FPC. Gas sold in the future would be regulated by the contracts, not by the FPC's judgment as to what a contract should contain. Thus, the disincentives of regulation would be removed, and there would be no regulatory impediment to exploration and development of reserves. The consumer would benefit in expanded gas supplies from assured domestic sources and at a price far cheaper than the exotic alternatives of freezing gas in Algeria or Russia and transporting it by tanker to our shores at a cost of \$1.30 an mcf up as compared to the current average price under regulation of about 0.20 per mcf. The FPC has already approved a base load project of Algerian LNG for our east coast, and that is not all. Also at a cost of \$1.30 an mcf and up, pipelines are turning to manufacturing synthetic gas from naphtha and natural gas liquids, thereby threatening to increase the shortages of vital feedstocks for manufacturing. How the FPC can hold the wellhead price on an area rate bases to 26 cents in south Louisiana and, at the same time permit gas to be sold at \$1.30 an mcf from a plant is explained by the way the Natural Gas Act has been construed, but the result is intolerable to the American consumer. I urge the Congress to join me in enacting this vital legislation which will do no more than allow natural gas to compete on equal terms with oil and coal in the interstate market.

## CONGRESS MUST ACT TO HELP PRESERVE TRADITION OF FREE PRESS

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today the News Media Source Protection Act to assert the Congress authority in its legislative capacity to contribute actively to the continued preservation of a free press as we have come to know it for almost 200 years. Eleven of my colleagues have joined me in sponsoring this legislation.

In introducing this bill, I considered the overall philosophy of a free press and the narrower issue of drafting legislation that is effective and just.

I think we cannot underestimate the importance of maintaining the integrity of the news media—newspapers, periodicals, radio and television, newsletters and other forms of the media which we have come to take for granted as being unfettered and free from Government intrusion.

Because there has been so much rhetoric and so much misunderstanding about the press' constitutional rights, I think everyone could benefit from a reading of the first amendment—ratified in earlier and less complex days—which forbids the Congress from making any law to abridge the freedom of the press. That simple and explicit prohibition cannot meet the requirements of a free press in these times.

There is no Federal law that bestows special privileges upon the people who publish or own the news media or who work for it. These people are earning their living under the private enterprise system and owe their wages to the profit-making employer for whom they work. Balanced against this very business-like view of the news media industry is the realization of the people involved that they work not for profit alone, but are employed in a trade or profession which through the years has become an integral part of our functioning democratic Republic.

I cite these points, because responsibility is a two-edged sword. Implicit in any bill introduced to help protect the freedom of press, I feel, is the tacit understanding that the news media must exercise responsibility in fulfilling its unwritten obligations.

While publicity has highlighted the problems of news source protection in big cities such as New York and Los Angeles, this is an issue that is every bit as important in small towns throughout the country from the vantage point of both news media integrity and responsibility. The publisher and employees of a small town weekly must exercise their unique responsibility as much as the publisher and employees of the New York Times if the concept of press freedom is to retain its credibility as a great but unwritten tradition of this Nation.

A subpoena issued to a newsman to try to get him to reveal his news source may be damaging to the freedom of the press. But so is the action of a publisher who maintains a "black list" of people whose names cannot be printed in his newspaper. So is the editor or reporter who fails in seeking out opposing views for a story that can tarnish the reputation of a public official or a private citizen. So is the decision of a TV correspondent to fake a scene for his cameras to heighten the impact or drama of an event.

There is nothing written in the law or in newspaper ethics about these little foibles of the press. And, as a member of the most-criticized institution in this country—the U.S. Congress—I feel I can speak of these failures of the news media as a friend who is concerned with providing the legislative protection necessary to enable it to carry out its duties free of Government harassment.

If the rash of court decisions and subpoenas aimed at newsmen are threatening freedom of the press, then, too, are these instances of press failure and thousands of others that take place throughout the country. Just as the Congress is looking to its legislative responsibility in the press field, I think the press should reassess its obligations and responsibilities.

The erosion of press freedoms takes all forms—from within and from without. The news media itself bears a heavy responsibility.

In proposing this legislation, I acknowledge that the time has come for the Congress to play an active, rather than a passive role, in exercising its responsibility for preserving freedom of the press. This best can be accomplished in the case of news sources which has been the area in which courts and prosecutors have felt constrained to encroach.

Forcing newsmen to reveal sources may be the easy way for courts and prosecutors, but its effects are extremely damaging to the gathering of news for publication or broadcast by the news media. I know from personal conversations with reporters in my Congressional District that they are finding an increasing reluctance on the part of sources to reveal information. Regardless of what the courts may tell us, there is no written or implied intent for reporters to become investigators or informers for the Government.

I need not cite countries where the news media, which are allowed to operate, enjoy that incestual relationship. The results, unfortunately, speak for themselves.

Balanced against this need to protect news sources is the other constitutional right of accused persons to their sixth amendment rights including the right to be confronted by the witnesses against them.

I feel the "News Media Source Protection Act" meets these tests, because it is reasonable and fair legislation. It avoids extremes and attempts to institute the application of common sense and good judgment to a sensitive and vital issue.



This bill provides two levels of protection for news sources.

At the first level, there is absolute protection. A newsman cannot be forced to reveal his sources to a Federal Grand Jury, Agency, Commission, Department or both Houses of Congress and their committees. This prohibits the "fishing expeditions" that have been launched throughout the country since the 5 to 4 Supreme Court ruling that holds newsmen possess no first amendment rights to protection of their sources.

At the second level, there is qualified protection. This means where a specified crime is being tried in Federal Court, strict tests must be met to compel a newsman to reveal his source. These qualifications require, first, there be independent evidence that material sought is substantial evidence, direct evidence and essential evidence as to the central issue being tried. Second, that with reasonable effort there was not or is not any other way to obtain the evidence. Third, the trial must be for the crime of murder, forcible rape, aggravated assault, kidnapping, hijacking or, once a national security breach has been proven, there is a central issue as to breach of classified national security documents or a breach of a court order of a national security statute.

A judge would make his determination in chambers so the source would not be revealed during the course of arguments.

This bill specifically designates what constitutes sources. These include written, oral and pictorial communications, and written notes, tapes, outtakes and news film. Persons and information thus are effectively granted protection.

A full and detailed definition of newsmen to be covered by this act is included. Language is detailed on whom is a bona fide newsman with the suggestion that one who is regularly engaged in as a profession or earns his principal income from his news activities fits the definition.

Of particular importance is the provision which provides for immediate appeal rights at the Federal court level for newsmen ordered to reveal testimony after the strict tests of the act have been met and the judge rules against him. This will prevent the deplorable practice of judges throwing newsmen into jail even when they have announced an immediate intension to appeal.

This is a long and detailed bill that is not designed as a throwaway to the boys in the pressroom. Rather, it is a carefully drafted and fair measure that recognizes the American people are entitled to access to a free press operating without fear of government intrusion. It recognizes that the Congress can act within the province of its legislative authority. And, hopefully, it spells out that the news media, Government and the people all have a stake in preserving and perpetuating the concept of a free press.

In my earlier remarks, I alluded to what I feel is the responsibility of the news media in exercising its role in an

open and democratic society. I underscore these remarks, but want it understood that I firmly believe that a modicum of irresponsibility by the press is far healthier for the Nation than any measure of irresponsibility by the Government.

For almost 200 years, the tradition that began with John Peter Zenger has served this Nation and its people well. No matter how each of us individually defines freedom of the press, the fact that we attempt to define it shows how ingrained is this principle to us.

James Madison, in a letter dated August 4, 1822, wrote:

A popular Government, without popular information, or the means of acquiring it, is but a Prologue to a farce or a tragedy; or, perhaps both. Knowledge will forever govern ignorance; and a people who mean to be their own governors, must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives.

Knowledge, as well as the freedom to acquire knowledge, has served us well for almost 200 years. I believe enactment of the "News Source Protection Act" would uphold and perpetuate this tradition.

#### COME HOME, DEMOCRATS

#### HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, as many Americans are aware, there is now a major movement underway to return the Democratic Party to traditional party principles. The recently announced formation of the Coalition for a Democratic Majority is part of that movement.

The coalition's efforts will be based upon the premise that a majority of Americans will support a national political party which is progressive, internationalist, and firmly committed to equal opportunity for all Americans if that party nominates candidates who can appeal to voters of every region and economic class and if that party's programs are perceived as promoting economic and social justice in a rational and equitable fashion.

In the interest of giving the broadest possible exposure to the aims and aspirations of the Coalition for a Democratic Party, I am inserting in the Record the following statement, entitled "Come Home, Democrats," which sums up how we, in coalition, feel:

#### COME HOME, DEMOCRATS

The 1972 Presidential election has provided the Democratic Party with a stern lesson—and we believe with an historic opportunity as well.

As Democrats we naturally cannot find it in our hearts to applaud the fact that the American electorate has turned its back on our party's candidate for the Presidency. Nevertheless, we do not view the results of this election as the expression of some sweeping new shift to the Republicans.

We see the 1972 election, rather, as a clear signal to the Democratic Party to return to

the great tradition through which it had come to represent the wishes and hopes of a majority of the American people—the tradition of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Adlai Stevenson, John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson and Hubert H. Humphrey.

In nominating these men for the Presidency, the Democratic Party repeatedly proclaimed its earnest intention to build a better nation and a better world along the lines of certain principles. And in electing Democratic Presidents for twenty-eight of the last forty years, the American people repeatedly endorsed these Democratic concepts of progress, which were keyed to six driving ideas:

An ever expanding opportunity for individuals without regard to race, class, sex, or ethnic origin;

An ever fairer distribution of the fruits of the country's vast wealth and productivity;

A sustained effort, through compensatory action, to give those who have by birth and background been disadvantaged a full opportunity to compete as equals in American life;

A sober but spirited assumption of America's share of responsibility for the establishment of a more secure international community;

A knowledge that without democratic order there can be no justice and without justice there can be no democratic order;

A belief that democracy works and that it works because American voters are wisely and prudently aware of their own self-interest.

#### THE "NEW POLITICS" HAS FAILED

In the turbulence and confusion of the past years, the national Democratic Party has come to be unduly influenced by forces and ideas both unrepresentative of and hostile to traditional Democratic principles.

The belief that the security of the United States depends upon a stable and progressive world community has been challenged by the idea that the United States must withdraw from its international responsibilities and effect a serious diminution of its own power.

The belief that America is a great nation seeking to correct major inequities has been challenged by the idea that American society is sick and guilty, morally bankrupt and inherently corrupt.

The idea that social progress is best served by a balancing of the conflicting rights, needs, and demands of many different kinds of people has been challenged by the claim of an elite faction that it knows what is best for others.

The principle of individual merit without regard to inherited status has been challenged by the idea of proportionalism in accordance with birth and group origin.

The belief that order is essential to justice has been diluted by an attitude of cavalier disregard for the tens of millions of Americans who are genuinely concerned about public safety and respect for law.

In the service of such new forces and ideas a "New Politics" has developed—a politics new in its contempt for the very people and institutions on which the Democratic Party has built its electoral strength. It is a "New Politics" that has derided the organized labor movement, driving it from its traditional place in the vanguard of the Democratic coalition. It is a "New Politics" that has sneered at the greatness of America. It is a "New Politics" that has dismissed as morally unworthy the long-range values and daily concerns of tens of millions of ordinary people. And finally, and tragically, it is a "New Politics" that has allowed the Republican Party—a party so long and so accurately known as the party of privilege—to represent itself for the first time as the champion of such values and concerns.

The fact is, however, that it has always been the Democratic Party—not the Repub-

ican—that is the natural home of people concerned with the expansion of individual opportunity in America. It is the Democratic Party—not the Republican—that has always been deeply concerned with the basic freedoms of expression and association. It has always been the Democratic Party—not the Republican—that has been the most deeply concerned with responsible action abroad in the interests of world peace and security. And it is the Republican Party—as has recently been revealed—that has acquiesced in a cynical and criminal undermining of the essential decency of the American political process.

#### REAL PROGRESS STILL CAN BE ACHIEVED

Now the voters have spoken. In the weeks and months ahead many interpretations will be offered as to what they have said. There will be talk of a "realignment" of political forces, of a large-scale shift in political sentiment. It will be argued that the American people have been "moving to the right". Or the defeat will be attributed to the ineptitude of the candidate rather than to a rejection of the ideas and forces he was thought to represent.

We do not believe that these alibis are valid. We believe that in repudiating the Democratic/"New Politics" presidential candidacy in this election while re-electing a Democratic Congress, the voters were speaking with precision and sophistication. What they said was that American society should continue on in that very Democratic tradition which, abandoned by the forces temporarily in control of the national Democratic Party in 1972, was usurped in some measure by the Republicans.

Accordingly, we founding sponsors of the Coalition for a Democratic Majority issue this call:

To all who believe this society must end all forms of discrimination against some without recourse to discrimination against others;

To all who believe in a pluralistic political process in which no single group or class enjoys a special moral status;

To all who believe that, regardless of past miscalculations or failures of policy, United States involvement in international affairs continues to be necessary to the establishment of a stable and viable international order;

To all who believe that while our society must be vastly improved, it has not failed—

Join with us in the Coalition for Democratic Majority, a new organization dedicated to returning the Democratic Party to its rightful role as spokesman for the majority of the American people, as the party of progress, freedom, and security for all.

#### PART OF THE FAULT HAS BEEN OURS

In recent years the American public discourse has been flooded by expressions of the "New Politics" point of view. In part, this happened because people who disagreed spoke up only as single private voices or didn't speak up at all.

It is the intention of the Coalition for a Democratic Majority to speak out forcefully and frequently as a public voice—in the hope of redressing the intellectual balance in America. In this way, among others, we believe we can contribute to restoring the Democratic Party to its rightful place of leadership.

So if you believe, as we do, that the time-honored and progressive principles of the Democratic Party are still essentially sound principles, if you believe that they have been violated, if you believe that thinking men and women acting together in common cause can make a better society, then join with us in The Coalition for a Democratic Majority.

(The Coalition for a Democratic Majority is a dues-paying, membership organization

chartered in Washington, D.C. It will be active in policy formulation and political organization aimed at revitalizing the Democratic Party, and in general encouraging and contributing to all those forces working toward the re-formation of a Democratic majority in America.)

Joseph Bishop, Professor, Yale Law School; author, *Obiter Dicta*.

Honorable Richard Bolling, Congressman (D), 5th Congressional District, Missouri.

Bill Cornwell, President, Concept Films; former Executive Assistant to Vice President Hubert Humphrey.

Midge Decter, Literary Editor, *World Magazine*; former Executive Editor, *Harper's Magazine*; author, *The New Chastity*.

Honorable Thomas S. Foley, Congressman (D), 5th Congressional District, Washington.

Nathan Glazer, Professor of Sociology, Harvard University; co-author, *Beyond the Melting Pot*.

Patricia Roberts Harris, former Ambassador to Luxembourg; Chairman, Credentials Committee, 1972 Democratic National Convention; attorney.

Max Kampelman, attorney. Legislative Counsel, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey; author, *The Communist Party Versus the CIO*.

Robert Keefe, political consultant; former campaign aide to Senator Hubert H. Humphrey; former administrative assistant to Senator Birch Bayh.

Penn Kemble, Chairman, *Frontlash*; contributor *Commentary* magazine; former staff member, League for Industrial Democracy.

Jeanne (Mrs. Evron M.) Kirkpatrick, Associate Professor Political Science, Georgetown University; author, *Leader & Vanguard* in *Mass Society*.

Seymour Martin Lipset, Professor of Government, Harvard; author, *The First New Nation*, *Political Man*.

Honorable James G. O'Hara, Congressman (D), 12th Congressional District, Michigan; former Chairman, Democratic Study Group.

Norman Podhoretz, editor, *Commentary* magazine; author, *Making It*.

Austin Ranney, Professor of Political Science, University of Wisconsin. member, McGovern-Fraser Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection; author, *Paths to Parliament*.

Richard Ravitch, business executive, construction.

John P. Roche, columnist; Professor of Politics, Brandeis University; former National Chairman, Americans for Democratic Action; former Special Assistant to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Peter Rosenblatt, attorney; former Special Consultant to Senator Edmund S. Muskie; former aide to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Bayard Rustin, Director, A. Philip Randolph Institute; author, *Down the Line*.

Richard Schifter, attorney; Vice President, Maryland State Board of Education; Chairman, Montgomery County Democratic Policy Association.

Ben Wattenberg, co-author, *The Real Majority*, former campaign aide to Senator Henry M. Jackson, former aide to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The Coalition for a Democratic Majority, Box 28181, Central Station, Washington, D.C. 20005.

#### THE LATE HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

#### HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, many Members in this Chamber will remember Congressman Alfred J. Elliott from Tulare, Calif.

I personally was saddened by his death this January 18, for he had been a friend of mine for many years.

Al Elliott was a Member of the House from 1937 to 1949. He was elected as a Democrat to the 75th Congress to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Henry E. Stubbs. He was reelected to the 76th Congress and to the four succeeding Congresses. He chose not to run for re-nomination in 1948, but instead decided to remain in Tulare.

Al was a resident of Tulare from 1910 where he attended the public schools. He was also engaged in farming and livestock raising, and served as secretary-manager of the Tulare County Fair, beginning in 1929. His other duties included the chairmanship of the Tulare County Board of Supervisors from 1933 to 1937.

Al retired from public life in 1965 and lived at his home close to the fairgrounds.

He made many friends in and around Tulare and he will be remembered not only for his outstanding work as a Congressman, but for his leadership in his community for so many years.

I have had the opportunity of his counsel during the last few years when I would visit him at his home. In December of 1972, I sat with him in his living room and I remember his words to me. He said, "Don't give up trying—do your best."

We will remember Alfred Elliott, for he always did his best.

#### THE FREE PRESS CONTROVERSY—WHAT IT MEANS

#### HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of this session, I introduced legislation providing unqualified protection to newsmen from compulsion to reveal their sources by the courts or other governmental agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to two articles which appeared in the January 14 issue of the *Los Angeles Times*. The articles deal with the value of confidentiality as a tool of the reporter in major news stories and an editorial concerning the power to suffocate.

I hope my colleagues will take the time to read these articles with the end result being the passage of a no-qualification newsmen's privilege bill.

The articles follow:

THE NEED FOR CONFIDENTIAL SOURCES—SOME PRIZE EXAMPLES

"Listen to an informant whom we'll call Joe," reported Malcolm Johnson in the old *New York Sun*, "because that's not his name and Joe feels that he's marked for death for having crossed the Bowers mob."

With the help of Joe and other unnamed sources, Johnson wrote a Pulitzer Prize winning series of articles in 1948 that touched off official investigations and exposed New York's waterfront gangs.

Digging reporters such as Johnson have



always found the use of "Joes" a necessary tool.

The combination of the Joes and the journalists of America has produced some of the nation's greatest exposes, including such modern day disclosures as the Pentagon Papers, the My Lai massacre and the Watergate bugging scandal. In fact, because confidential sources usually help uncover information other people try to conceal from the public, the stories they produce generally are considered public-service journalism.

"Every Pulitzer Prize won for coverage of the Vietnam war, beginning with those won by Malcolm Browne of the AP and David Halberstam of the New York Times in 1964, depended on confidential sources," John Hohenberg, secretary of the Pulitzer Prize Advisory Board, said in an interview.

"Browne and Halberstam were challenging the truthfulness of the United States government in saying the war was being won in 1963 and that the strategic hamlet program was a success in beating back the Viet Cong," Hohenberg said. "Their reports showed the program was a failure and a farce and they certainly didn't get such information from official government sources. They had to get out and get it firsthand from people in the lower echelons."

Today, with reporters being jailed for refusing to disclose the names of confidential sources, Hohenberg believes "we are heading into a period as bad as the time of the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798 when newspapermen were thrown into jail for some of the things they published."

Until recent instances, the only case this century of a reporter's jailing that "really stirred up the nation's newspapermen," Hohenberg said, was the jailing of Martin Mooney of the old New York American in 1935. Mooney was fined \$250 and sentenced to 30 days for refusing to reveal sources of a gambling story to a New York Grand Jury.

"Nobody really ever bothered us much about our sources before or after the Mooney case until now," Hohenberg said.

Two other less celebrated cases involved Marie Torre of the old New York Herald-Tribune, who served 10 days in jail rather than reveal the source of a controversial column on singer Judy Garland, and Annette Leasley Buchanan, a student at the University of Oregon, who was threatened with a jail sentence in 1968 for refusing to reveal the source for an article on campus marijuana use to a Lane County Grand Jury in Eugene, Oreg.

Since last year when the Supreme Court ruled 5 to 4 (with all four of the Nixon appointees on the majority side) that journalists had no First Amendment rights to withhold confidential sources from grand juries, more than a dozen reporters have been jailed for refusing to reveal sources of information obtained in confidence.

Reporter William Farr of the Los Angeles Times spent 46 days in jail before being released Thursday by order of Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas pending an appeal now before the U.S. 9th Circuit Court of Appeals.

Although some sources simply dislike the limelight, especially in a controversial matter, a major reason that sources often insist on confidentiality is that they fear retaliation from persons they help expose.

Depending on the case, the retaliation feared could include the loss of a job and friends, unfair prosecution, physical punishment or even murder.

What can happen when a source is identified was indicated by the Ku Klux Klan's treatment of a man it thought was Malcolm Johnson's informant for his expose of the Klan. Johnson, now a New York public relations consultant, said he never revealed the source, but the Klan picked the wrong man "and beat him badly and left him for dead."

Neil Sheehan of the New York Times also refused to divulge the source of his award-winning stories on the Pentagon Papers. But the government, acting on information obtained independently of the New York paper, charged Daniel Ellsberg and Anthony Russo with leaking the documents, and the two are now being tried in a federal court in Los Angeles.

The articles, based on a secret Defense Department study of the Vietnam war, showed that U.S. officials had repeatedly lied or distorted facts in public pronouncements on the war over a period of years.

Seymour M. Hersh, who won a Pulitzer for breaking the My Lai massacre story for Dispatch News Service in 1969, says his confidential sources for the story included three Army officers, a congressman and two congressional aides.

"At that time we still had the weight of 200 years of freedom on our side," says Hersh, now a New York Times reporter. "And we weren't concerned about pressure to reveal sources. Things have certainly shifted."

The Washington Post, Newsweek, Time and the Los Angeles Times all relied extensively on confidential sources in exclusive investigative stories on the Watergate case.

The Times, the only newspaper to have two of its staff members jailed over the question of confidentiality, has used such sources for many of its major stories.

Editor William F. Thomas, in an affidavit filed in federal court in Washington, said confidentiality was a major factor in Times' stories in 1965 and 1968 that won Pulitzer Prizes. The first involved coverage of the Watts riot and its aftermath and the second described city government operations and resulted in indictments and convictions of public officials.

Thomas' affidavit listed several other Times stories that depended on confidential sources for information and involved the potential of civil or criminal litigation. They included:

A massive study of the Queen Mary conversion, involving millions of dollars in tidelands oil monies; stories on the California Legislature which brought changes in legislative operations; a study of the Black Panthers in Southern California; an article detailing important aspects of the Son Tay prison raid in Vietnam; an expose of Ku Klux Klan terrorists in the South; an article on the controversy over oil imports, and a story concerning the relationship between Abe Fortas, then Supreme Court justice, and the Wolfson Foundation.

Thomas' affidavit was filed in connection with a case last month in which defense attorneys subpoenaed the tapes of a 5½-hour recorded interview which was the basis for a first-person story by Alfred C. Baldwin III, the government's key witness in the Watergate case.

In this case the source was known: John F. Lawrence. The Times' Washington bureau chief, was jailed briefly for refusing to relinquish the tapes. The Times resisted the subpoena on grounds that the reporters had promised Baldwin that the interview itself would be confidential and that only material he approved for an article under his byline would be released.

The matter in this case, but not the issue, was resolved, however, when The Times, at the request of Baldwin and his attorneys, relinquished the tapes to U.S. District Judge John J. Sirica. Baldwin said he was voluntarily waiving the confidentiality agreement because there was nothing contradictory between the interview and his first-person story and he wanted to eliminate any question the continued withholding of the tapes might raise about his credibility as a witness.

The atmosphere created by subpoenas of newsmen and government attempts to suppress publication of the Pentagon Papers had

a direct effect on the handling of the Baldwin story by Times' reporters.

Two reporters, concerned that the government might attempt to suppress publication of the story, stayed up until 4:20 a.m. on Oct. 4 dictating the story from New Haven, Conn., near Baldwin's home, to a recorder in The Times' editorial offices in Los Angeles.

Several hours later attorneys for Baldwin who had approved the interview and the story telephoned the reporters and asked that the story not be published. They said government attorneys, upon learning from them that the story was about to be published, had threatened to withdraw the immunity from prosecution Baldwin had been promised in return for his testimony at the Watergate trial. Baldwin, the government attorneys warned, might be indicted or held in contempt if the story were published.

Several hours later a government attorney telephoned Baldwin's attorneys again to say that Judge Sirica had signed a court order prohibiting any witnesses from commenting on the case and that Baldwin could be held in contempt if the story were printed.

Times editors, however, decided to publish the story, which ran Oct. 5. The reasoning was that it was in the public interest and that Baldwin had withdrawn his approval only because of government intimidation.

The Times' reporters, concerned that the government would attempt to seize the tapes, mailed them to an editor in Los Angeles for security purposes. Five days later Earl J. Silbert, chief prosecutor in the Watergate case, warned one of the reporters that the tapes would be subpoenaed. "If we don't subpoena them, the defense will," Silbert said. The defense subsequently did, of course.

Although congressmen say their mail on the subject is light, Congress now has before it about two dozen bills that would protect newsmen from subpoenas that would violate confidences. Meanwhile, some investigative reporters have talked of destroying notes or tapes of sensitive interviews, much as FBI agents destroy their notes of interviews after preparing a statement for a witness.

#### THE POWER TO SUFFOCATE

The first freedom of a free man is freedom of the mind, but that freedom is of little value without access to information and the opinions of others.

This freedom is always under attack from many directions and many influences, subtle and otherwise; private organizations and powerful individuals assiduously promote their views of the world, while trying to limit that same right for others.

Fear of these influences and pressures can cause self-censorship, yet they can be resisted; this demands some courage, but without a modicum of courage people can never gain or preserve their liberty.

But the chief threat to freedom in the modern world, as indeed it always has been, stems from the power of government. Justice William O. Douglas noted this recently. "As the years pass, the power of government," he said, "becomes more and more pervasive. It is the power to suffocate both people and causes."

He warned against this power in his dissent from the Supreme Court's decision last June in the cases of three newsmen who were denied the right to protect their sources of confidential information from the inquiry of a grand jury.

That decision, which whittled down First Amendment protections of the press, revealed, in the dissenting words of Justice Potter Stewart, "a disturbing insensitivity to the critical role of an independent press in our society."

However, Justice Byron R. White, who wrote the majority opinion, granted that Congress could provide statutory protection

of newsmen against the compelled disclosure of information and its confidential sources.

Today, it has become evident that Congress must act to protect the confidential relationship between reporters and their sources. That relationship is essential. Without it, the news media will be effectively barred from conveying information to the public that has a vital bearing on the public's welfare.

The privilege must be unqualified. It is not in actuality, as it has so often been described, a "newsmen's privilege." Rather, it is the public's right to be informed by the news media free from government interference, whether that interference comes from a court, a legislature or any other agency of government.

Sen. Alan Cranston (D-Calif.) has introduced a bill (SB 158) to provide this protection, and a companion measure will be introduced Monday in the House of Representatives by Rep. Jerome R. Waldie (D-Calif.).

These bills would protect newsmen from the forced disclosure of the source of any published or unpublished information or the compelled revelation of any unpublished information. They would cover both the federal government and the state government.

While the passage of these bills would make state legislation unnecessary, Assemblymen Walter Karabian (D-Monterey Park) and William T. Bagley (R-San Rafael) have introduced similar bills (AB 1 and AB 4, respectively) to strengthen the existing protections in California.

This legislation, federal and state, deserves support from the public, for it is the public's right to be informed that is at stake.

#### SERMON BY REV. W. GRAHAM SMITH

#### HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the 92d Congress, one of our visiting Chaplains who opened the House included in his prayer the words, "grant us peace, but not peace at any price." His hope for peace was in the example of the Prince of Peace.

Similarly, the sermon preached by Rev. W. Graham Smith of Fairlington Presbyterian Church last Sunday is a profound lesson for us all, offering guidelines to true tranquillity.

The sermon follows:

SERMON PREACHED AT FAIRLINGTON PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, ALEXANDRIA, VA., ON JANUARY 28, 1973, BY THE REVEREND W. GRAHAM SMITH

St. Matthew 11:29-30

"Take My yoke upon you, and learn from Me; for I am gentle and lowly in heart, and you will find rest for your souls. For My yoke is easy, and My burden is light."

GOD DOES GUIDE US (3) THE RESULTS

Overstrain; hypertension; nervous breakdown; mental disorder; neuroses. These are the commonplace words of modern vocabulary. In spite of the advances in medical science, we hear of alarming increases in nervous, mental and cardiac cases. Fear, in one form or another, lays its icy hand on multitudes of people. The world has accelerated so amazingly during the past fifty years that almost everyone shares in the strain; for the human body, in many cases, just can't keep pace with modern living.

As one writer, Dr. David Read, puts it: "You will notice how nearly all the really interesting people you meet are a prey to some kind of nervous habit. Only the stupid, the dull, or the saints who have achieved supreme detachment have remained unaffected. All the rest are betraying signs of jumpiness and overstrain."

So often people cannot get along with each other because they cannot get along with themselves; and they cannot get along with themselves because they have never really submitted themselves to God.

"Why are we so faded?" a young fellow asked his mother. People are "faded" because they haven't the red blood of an inner certainty coursing through them. The colours in which they have dyed life have "run." They were not "fast" colours to begin with. And in the downpour of calamity, and the stress of human living the colours of life have become faded. The plain truth is that if people are to get power and poise, sparkle and buoyancy back into life, they can get these priceless things only as they submit to the will of God, and are dead sure of the guidance of God.

I heard of a canary once that would never sing until after it had its bath. Our souls are like that. Until we get a bath that cleanses away all fears, all uncertainties, all guilt, all sense of not being in the Will of God, the soul will not sing. But a tremendous thing happens to you when you honestly seek God's guidance, and obey the conditions and employ the methods whereby guidance comes, and it is this—there comes an inner peace at the very core of your being, even though all the world is in tumult.

As the old gospel hymn has it—  
"Peace, perfect peace, by thronging duties pressed? To do the will of Jesus, this is rest!"

If we obey God's will we get results; if we don't, we get consequences!

What are some of the results of obeying God's Will?

1. We lose the fear of getting lost.

Every one knows the terror of the little child who gets lost and can't find his way home.

There is a good illustration for us here in the way the pilot of an aeroplane finds his way to his destination. A radio beam is sent out from his home airport, and once he is in that beam, he has only to follow it to find his way. But if the aircraft veers off course, and the pilot gets out of that directing beam, a buzzer sounds in his earphones as if to say—"You are going wrong! Get back on the beam!" I think it is not stretching the illustration to say that God sends out, as it were, a beam of direction, namely, His Will for us in those circumstances in which we find ourselves. And so long as we remain obedient to His guiding we have no fear of getting lost, or of having our peace of mind destroyed. It is only when we deliberately get out of line with God, get off the beam, that real trouble ensues.

Naturalists tell us what happens, mechanically, in the brain of a bird. In the late spring, a swallow away in Africa, will take off on a journey of thousands of miles, and come back to the eaves of the same little village church in England where she built her nest last year. She will not be deflected from her course; she will not lose her way. She will find a path through storms and driving winds, across seas, and over mountains, because, even though mechanically, she is on the right "beam."

It is an awful thing not to know where you're going in life—to have no compelling purpose—no shining goal of endeavour. Far too many people simply drift through life, and they miss life's choicest treasures because, by failing to obey God's Will, they are failing to fulfil the splendid purpose for which God caused them to be born. Let us remember, then, that by keeping within the Will of God, by keeping "on the beam," we

find our way even through apparently overwhelming storms.

We will never get lost!

2. The dread of carrying the responsibility of what happens is removed.

What a dreadful moment it was on that Good Friday morning long ago, when the Jerusalem mob, spurred on by the cunning, ruthless, religious leaders, shouted out—"His blood be upon us and upon our children!" What they were saying was this—"We are quite ready to take complete responsibility for our actions!" But it is often this sense of crushing, personal responsibility which gets us down. But I believe God says to each one of us—"As long as you try to do My Will, I will accept responsibility for whatever happens. I will carry that burden for you. I will direct you, and the consequences are My responsibility, not yours!"

I heard recently of a little girl whose mother was obliged to be away from the home for a time, and the child had the task of housekeeping for her father and several smaller brothers and sisters. One can imagine the burden of responsibility which the child carried. But she bore up bravely, and carried out her duties splendidly. But, when her mother returned home, one can realize the relief of the little girl as she exclaimed—"Oh Mother, I'm so glad that you have come home!" Remember, the child would probably still perform most of the duties she had been doing before, but the difference was this—her mother now bore the responsibility! I feel that the illustration does at least point up this truth—that when we submit our will to the Will of God, in a real sense we can say to God—"I'm so glad you have come!" We are now no longer carrying out a set of duties in loneliness, and bearing the responsibility of life alone. We are trying to do the Will of One Who is all the time beside us, and Who says to us—"All you have to do is to follow the plan I make clear to you day by day, and the responsibility for what happens I will carry for you!"

Herein lies one of the great benefits of the morning "Quiet Time" of prayer and meditation; for if, in the morning hour, you commit each part of the day, and each event of the day to God, then, when a difficulty arises during the day, you can derive strength and courage and stability from the very thought—"Well, Lord, this morning I committed the day into your keeping. I am trying to do what You would have me do—and You are responsible for seeing me through this problem; and I trust You to show me the path I am to take!"

If you think that this is a glib or superficial or naive way of coping with daily problems—I simply challenge you with this question—"Do you spend fifteen minutes with God each morning before you step out to meet the duties of the day?" If you do, then you will not think me naive at all; and if you don't, then try my prescription and see how it works!

3. When we do God's Will, our basic conflicts are resolved.

Of course, a certain amount of conflict is essential for the strength and progress of the soul. Each temptation fought and conquered makes us stronger to face the next temptation. The person who has to battle to keep his faith in God when tragedy strikes his life, is the proper person to send to comfort another man who has lost his wife in an automobile accident.

Nevertheless, needless conflict can play havoc with our lives. Indecision is an enemy of the soul. If a man when faced with a moral issue hesitates, wondering what he should do, wondering whether he should play it safe by taking the line of least resistance, then that man is an irresolute character. But, if we make this our guiding principle: "God helping me, I will do His Will as far as I can see it, regardless of the consequences," then that will answer most if not all of our



basic conflicts, and so bring us inner peace and spiritual strength.

Some people, of course, try to end their moral conflicts simply by giving in to temptation, by opening the tap and letting their emotions and instincts gurge. But the plain fact is that doing wrong always sets up a dozen conflicts where formerly there had been only one. And the person who allows evil in any shape or form to master him is really wading ever more deeply into the morass of spiritual death.

Bishop Gerald Kennedy of the Methodist Church says in his folksy way that the Will of God is like after-shave lotion; you know it's going to sting your face, but you know also that it is good for you. So often doing God's will does sting; but we know that no other way can bring peace.

Again and again inner moral conflicts weaken and exhaust us, and so debilitate us that our vital energies are wasted. Dr. J. A. Hadfield, the eminent psychologist, in one of his books, tells how, in the mind of a soldier during World War I, the sense of duty was so much in conflict with the desire to run away, promoted by the self-preservation instinct, that a condition of paralysis of the legs was produced, which solved the immediate problem but, of course, disabled the patient. Hadfield wisely says—"By facing our conflicts and deliberately making our choice, by directing all our endeavours to one great purpose, confidently, and fearlessly, the soul is restored to harmony and strength."

As we close this morning, I would ask you to think about the lovely picture Christ painted in the words of our text—"Take My yoke upon you, and learn from Me; for I am gentle and lowly in heart, and you will find rest for your soul." It is the picture of the strong, trained ox yoked with the weaker, untried animal. The weaker has only to pull his own weight and keep level with the stronger. The stronger carries the heavy end of the yoke. The stronger is responsible for the straight furrow, and for reaching the end of it. If the weaker pulls out into a direction of his own, the yoke chafes his shoulders and the burden becomes heavy.

"Take My yoke upon you," says Jesus. "Don't be proud, and self-assertive, and say 'I'm going my own way.' By doing that, you only make the yoke chaff your shoulders. Walk with Me and it becomes easy. The responsibility is taken from you, and the burden becomes light!"

We all remember from our school days the lovely poem by our own American poet, William Cullen Bryant, written as he watched the figure of a wild bird, flying, as it seemed, into the very heart of the sunset. The last verse long ago laid its spell upon me—

"He Who, from zone to zone,  
Guides through the boundless sky thy  
certain flight,

In the long way that I must tread alone,  
Will lead my steps aright."

And it was a greater than Bryant who said—

"In all thy ways acknowledge Him, and  
He will direct thy paths." Amen.

#### SALUTE TO SCOUTING

### HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Hans Becken, editor of the *Hanska Herald* in my congressional district, recently wrote an editorial pointing out the great value to America of the fine youth organiza-

tion, the Boy Scouts of America. With the 63d anniversary of the founding of U.S. Scouting coming up on February 8, it is appropriate to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mr. Becken's editorial tribute:

#### ANNIVERSARY OF SCOUTING

Sometimes we shudder at the thought of today's youth becoming tomorrow's leaders. However, it is reassuring to recall that youth organizations such as the Boy Scouts of America are working to develop future leaders of strong moral character and sound convictions, capable of carrying forward in strength and freedom the traditions of the United States.

It is appropriate that we give special recognition to the Boy Scouts of America this February 8, as they celebrate the 63rd Anniversary of the founding of Scouting in America. During the month of February, the over 6 million Boy Scouts will be exhibiting for the public the many Scouting skills which lead to the development of good character traits, attitudes and self-reliance. Their theme this Anniversary is: "Scouting Today Is More Than You Think," and truly it is just that because Scouting is engaged in an assortment of programs and projects which make the organization more relevant than ever before to the needs and concerns of today's youth. One example is Operation Reach, an action plan to help curb drug abuse.

This Anniversary Celebration of the Boy Scouts of America should remind us that with organizations such as the Boy Scouts we can, indeed, entrust tomorrow's well-being of our great nation to a well-qualified and responsible younger generation.

#### INEQUITIES IN REVENUE-SHARING PROGRAM

### HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, on December 29, 1972, I wrote the Secretary of the Treasury to bring to his attention certain inequities which have developed in the revenue-sharing program.

In my area of New Jersey, the formula employed to distribute Federal funds to localities has resulted in great disparities in payments among similarly situated communities. The only apparent reason for these inequities is the different designations borne by the localities.

In New Jersey, within each county, there exist "towns," "cities," "villages," "boroughs," "townships," and so forth. Yet all these localities perform virtually the same services and possess virtually the same jurisdiction. Until the revenue-sharing program was launched, the only real difference between a township and a borough, for example, was in the designation itself. Now these localities have found, some fortunately, others unfortunately, that their individual designation has a great impact upon the amount of revenue-sharing money they are to receive.

Thus far, I have received only an acknowledgment from the Treasury Department. In the interest of fairness and in order to preserve the confidence of my constituents in the equity of the revenue-sharing program, I trust the Secretary

will give prompt attention to this matter.

I include my letter to Secretary Shultz at this point in the RECORD:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., December 29, 1972.

HON. GEORGE SCHULTZ,  
Secretary of the Treasury,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to urge an immediate reevaluation of the effect of revenue sharing on communities in my area of New Jersey.

After examining the schedule of initial payments to localities in my congressional district, it is apparent to me and to numerous elected officials as well as to ordinary taxpayers, that gross inequities have occurred in the revenue sharing program by virtue of the distribution formula employed by the Treasury Department. These inequities must be promptly corrected in order to restore public confidence in your Department and in the entire revenue sharing program.

Municipalities are quite naturally disappointed that actual payments, in most cases, have fallen far below earlier published estimates. For example, Bloomfield was told to expect \$606,000, yet Bloomfield is now informed it will be receiving less than \$300,000. Similarly, West Orange had been led to believe it would receive \$350,000, yet its entitlement has been reduced to approximately \$237,000. Irvington's payment has dropped from \$660,000 to \$444,000 and Orange's from \$590,000 to \$336,000.

Moreover, in many instances, communities in the same area, with virtually the same population level, identical local problems, similar income levels and similar tax efforts, are receiving greatly divergent revenue sharing payments.

For example, the communities of Verona and Cedar Grove border each other, differ in population by only a few hundred, cover almost identical land areas, and have similar concerns, taxes, and income levels. Yet, Cedar Grove has been granted nearly six times the amount of money as Verona.

To cite just two more examples, Montclair and South Orange are scheduled to receive much less per capita than nearby communities despite the fact that the problems, taxes, and incomes of all these localities do not differ to the extent reflected in their revenue sharing payments.

These inequities, apparently, have resulted in large part from the different designations borne by these localities. Townships are treated differently than towns, villages, cities, and other types of local governments. Yet, in my area, there is no significant difference between these localities in terms of the type or functions of their governments. The only difference is in the designation itself. Is the Treasury Department, therefore, suggesting that, in order to gain more federal revenue sharing funds, communities should change their designations? Surely, this is absurd!

Congress intended revenue sharing to be administered in a fair and impartial manner, yet this is not the case in my area of New Jersey. Thus far, the program has made a mockery of the Congress' genuine desire to assist hard-pressed local governments.

I demand that you act promptly to correct these obvious inequities by immediately invoking section 108d6 of the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972, which permits you to alter the effect of the Act in circumstances where its original purposes are not being met.

To do less would leave numerous communities with a feeling of cynicism and bitterness towards a program which had originally held such great promise as an innovative step in Federal relations with the States and their localities.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH G. MINISH,  
Member of Congress.

## RECENT AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT ACTIONS

## HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed over the Nixon administration's recent termination of several vital programs of the Department of Agriculture. All of these actions have been made in the name of fighting inflation. No one can argue with the administration's desire to stem the rise of inflation, particularly in view of the rather mixed record of the President in this area since he imposed wage and price controls over 18 months ago. To the extent that Government spending contributes to inflation, unnecessary spending should be cut. But I find it difficult to believe that among the very first to be cut should be programs that have been of significant assistance to rural Americans.

For every rural program that is cut, urban America suffers, too, for the tremendous outmigration from rural to urban areas continues to contribute mightily to the health, safety, and welfare problems we are faced with in our metropolitan areas. For the administration to single out rural America for "benign neglect" is, without a doubt, a major step backward in sound social policy.

In the past 6 weeks, the administration has terminated—without giving the shred of legal or constitutional justification for its actions—the following programs in the Department of Agriculture:

Rural environmental assistance program—REAP: \$225.5 million was appropriated for the current fiscal year by the Congress. This program, and its predecessor, the agricultural conservation program, have contributed greatly to the farmer's ability to minimize erosion, conserve water, conserve woodland and wildlife areas, and lessen rural pollution. This was a cost-sharing program, with every Government dollar requiring investment by a farmer or rancher, with a \$2,500 limit on payments to any individual. Without the availability of Government funds, the Government admits that the small farmer and rancher will find it very difficult to pay for conservation protection. In fiscal year 1972, farmers and ranchers in our Third Congressional District received over \$1.5 million in REAP funds, and since the administration announced the termination of REAP, I have received many letters from farmers and ranchers who have benefited from REAP cost-sharing funds, and need those funds to continue this vital work.

The agriculture conservation program, now known as REAP, has been responsible for curing many of the problems of the Dust Bowl, and for the creation of fallback water facilities for livestock areas. The many new requirements placed on farmers and ranchers by the Environmental Protection Agency and other antipollution agencies will place a heavy, if not impossible, burden on those farmers and ranchers without the assistance of REAP cost-sharing payments.

Thus, it was highly disingenuous for

the Agriculture Department, when announcing the termination of REAP, to state in its "fact sheet" that—

Farmers are better able to pay for conservation practices than ever before.

When, last year, the Department told the House Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Agriculture—Environmental and Consumer Protection, on which I sit, that—

There is usually a loss of immediate income when a conservation system of farming is adopted. Expected returns from some types of needed conservation measures (for example, terrace systems, erosion control structures, and forestry practices) will not equal their cost for a long time. . . . There are greater risks in some types of needed conservation work than farmers and lenders are generally willing or able to assume. Many of these, in the long run, may provide more benefits to the public than to the farmer. (Italics added.)

The loss of REAP will be measured in the inability of whole counties to pay for bulldozing work, for example, because no individual farmer can afford to pay for the work himself.

Farmers Home Administration emergency loans: This program provides for emergency loans where a natural disaster has caused a general need for agricultural credit. Third District citizens received over \$200,000 in emergency loans in fiscal year 1972. Recently, in the Third District, fruitgrowers suffered a freeze in their orchards. The freeze was declared a disaster area back in October, giving some growers a chance to apply for disaster loans by December 27. The growers had been told that they had until June 1, 1973, to apply for the loans, but on December 27, the administration, without any warning, announced they were accepting no more loan applications as of that date. Many growers in our area have apparently been left out in the cold because of this sudden action. The administration "fact sheet" treats the termination of the emergency loan program—which included a 1-percent interest rate and a \$5,000 "forgiveness"—as an "expansion" of its operating loan program, despite the fact that farmers and growers struck by a natural disaster will be forced to bear a 587-percent interest rate increase over the level established by law last year.

What about farmers and ranchers whose crops or livestock are imperiled by natural disasters from now on? The operating loan program may be available to them, but at a greatly increased interest rate, as I have noted above.

Does the administration propose to aid the victims of natural disasters in foreign countries—like Nicaragua—in a more liberal fashion than its own citizens? Unfortunately, if the answer is yes, many marginal operators may be forced to leave the land when and if they are struck by devastating weather conditions. And additional inequity facing farmers who got their applications into FHA on time—before December 27—is that FHA ran out of operating funds around December 1, and is still awaiting the receipt of more funds from the President's Office of Management and Budget. Unfortunately, an OMB official has told me that this process may take several more weeks.

I have asked OMB Director Roy Ash to investigate this matter and expedite release of funds to FHA.

REA 2-percent loans: Since 1935, the Rural Electrification Administration has made it possible for millions of rural Americans who otherwise would not be served to receive electric service. Since 1949, REA has been providing telephone service under the same low-interest loan arrangement. These self-liquidating loans have been set at 2 percent since 1944, which is a fair price for the American people to pay for the electrification of sparsely populated rural areas. Now the administration has proposed, in lieu of REA's 2-percent loans, the provision of guaranteed—7½ percent—and insured—5 percent—loans—at an increased cost of at least 250 percent to those cooperatives solely dependent on REA's 2-percent loans for their continued needs.

Member co-ops in Colorado currently have nearly \$40 million in applications pending in Washington, D.C., and anticipate that nearly \$220 million in loan applications would have been made in the next 6 to 8 months. Three systems in Colorado—all in the Third District, which I represent—are solely dependent on the 2-percent loans for their credit. In fact, in fiscal year 1972, member co-ops in the Third District received over \$13 million in REA loans, and over \$2 million in rural telephone loans. I am told that eight or nine co-ops in the State are out of money now, making their member-customers particularly susceptible to power "brownouts" in the months ahead. New subscribers will simply have to wait unserved.

The vital need in the REA situation is for the administration to move rapidly to make some Federal credit available to those co-ops which are currently facing a cash shortage. Five-percent loans are better than no loans at all, although, of course, the increase in interest rates will undoubtedly result in higher utility rates for member-customers. In the long run, however, we must restore the 2-percent loans. Since the demand for power among REA co-ops is 33 percent faster than in the industry as a whole, according to Government figures, the urgency for restoration of continuity in REA financing is evident.

FHA rural housing subsidies: Two-thirds of our substandard housing lies outside our cities, and the need for adequate housing in rural areas is obvious if we are ever going to be able to make a reality of the rhetoric of rural development. The administration has now announced that three programs in the area of rural housing will be discontinued during an 18-month evaluation study: Housing loans to poor families involving an interest subsidy, rental and cooperative housing loans, and farm labor housing grants and loans. The administration has made across-the-board cuts in housing programs, in the name of fighting inflation by cutting Government spending, but officials of the Farmers Home Administration were unable to supply me with figures as to the amount of money to be saved by terminating these programs. In Colorado's Third District,



over \$4.6 million in rural housing loans were made available in fiscal year 1972. How are we going to maintain any semblance of rural development if we continue to cut into those programs aimed at making rural life more attractive?

FHA water and waste disposal programs: The water and waste disposal program of the FHA provided \$100 million to associations and municipal agencies to develop water storage and waste disposal programs on a 50-50 matching basis with the localities. While the administration claims that the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972 and revenue-sharing funds are sufficient to meet these needs, this is clearly not the case, what with the administration's already having impounded nearly half of the authorized funds under the Water Pollution Control Act for the next 2 years.

The question is, What to do about it? The short answer is that no one knows exactly what will or can be done. The administration has acted, in my opinion, unconstitutionally, for it has abrogated the Congress' right to set national policy in terms of what programs will or will not be carried out. But limiting the Executive's right to act illegally has proved an elusive goal over the years. Perhaps the best opportunity for restoring these programs will come not in the courtroom but in the Halls of Congress. As a member of the House Appropriations Committee's Agriculture—Environmental and Consumer Protection Subcommittee, I shall fight to see to it that these programs are restored to the fiscal 1974 budget. I am also exploring whatever legal means are available to prevent the executive branch from terminating whole programs voted upon and approved by the legislative branch.

In the meantime, an effort must be made to speed through approval of those applications that the administration promises to continue funding, such as 5-percent insured REA loans and those emergency FHA loans that were filed in time to beat the administration's sudden December 27 cutoff. I shall do everything within my power to pressure the administration to move quickly in these areas.

In addition, I have introduced legislation to direct the Agriculture Department to continue the REAP program and the 2-percent REA electricity and telephone loans at the levels of funding prescribed by the Congress. I am currently studying legislative means whereby the Department may be directed by Congress to continue funding of the FHA's emergency loan and rural housing programs.

#### WHY THE OCAW IS STRIKING AND ASKING A BOYCOTT OF SHELL

**HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, the Oil Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union is currently on strike

against the Shell Oil Co. and Shell Chemical Co. which have refused to bargain with it on issues of health and safety and an employee pension plan. It is noteworthy that all other major oil companies have already agreed with the union on these matters. It is only Shell that has not.

The OCAW considers the companies' present refusal to negotiate on these key issues to be so serious as to call for a national boycott of Shell products.

So that my colleagues may have the benefit of the union's reasons for its actions I am including the OCAW's letter in the RECORD at this point:

#### WHY OCAW IS STRIKING AND ASKING A BOYCOTT OF SHELL

OIL CHEMICAL AND ATOMIC

WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION,

Denver, Colo., January 24, 1973.

Shell Oil Company and Shell Chemical Company have refused to agree to terms with the union which have been agreed to by almost the entire U.S. oil industry.

New contracts have been signed with American Oil, Atlantic Richfield, Gulf, Texaco, Mobil, Exxon, Union, Standard of Ohio, Cities Service, Continental and Phillips, as well as many smaller companies with which OCAW has bargaining relationships.

Shell and Standard Oil of California (Chevron) have refused to even negotiate seriously on key issues of principle. OCAW represents relatively few Standard of California employees, but represents more than 5,000 Shell employees in five of the company's U.S. refineries, several Shell Chemical plants, and some other operations.

OCAW believes that it cannot permit Shell, which is one of the two largest oil companies in the world, to impose on its employees treatment inferior to that granted by most of the American oil industry to its workers. To do so would be unfair to Shell's U.S. employees, would endanger the integrity of the union in its dealings with other companies and would endanger the future of coordinated national bargaining with the industry.

The basic issues in dispute are:

#### HEALTH AND SAFETY

The new contracts with the other companies provide a new clause establishing joint union-management health and safety committees with power to police the work environment conditions in their plants. This replaces the old system under which management was the sole judge of the healthfulness and safety of work assignments.

Health concerns are important to oil workers. They are subjected to exposures to toxic fumes, vapors, gases, liquids and acids. Some of these substances can do slow, insidious damage to the human body. Policing of a healthful work environment is more difficult than the policing of safety hazards which are more visible to the eye and simpler to understand.

Significantly, the OCAW/Oil Industry health and safety clauses, which are virtually verbatim in all the contracts negotiated, provide for some key methods of measuring the health environment in the work place:

1. There is provision for employment by the company of independent industrial health consultants, approved by the union, from time to time to make health surveys of the plants and to relate their findings to recognized standards of safe exposure to toxic or injurious substances. This will provide objective, non-partisan measurements of the true environmental situation.

2. There are to be periodic physical examinations, of workers, scope of which will be determined by the joint labor-management committees. Such examinations can

reveal whether employees are or are not suffering health damages due to exposures in the work place.

3. The company agrees to provide to the union annually full statistics on morbidity and mortality of employees. This is information that will be of great value to occupational health researchers as it will reveal whether there is undue incidence of any particular ailment which might be related to work exposures.

#### EMPLOYEE PENSIONS

Shell has consistently refused to bargain on employee pensions and it confuses the issue in its propaganda to employees by interlocking its substandard pension plan with an employee savings plan known as the "Provident Fund."

This year, the other oil companies have granted various pension improvements and, more importantly, they have agreed to establish top-level labor-management committees to review and study existing pension plans. Such committees will be at the corporate and international union level and will have full access to necessary information.

This top-level review arrangement is of particular importance in the oil industry. OCAW has been obliged to negotiate at the plant level, while obviously company pension plans must be designed at top corporate level. The various companies pension plans have grown up separately over the years, have been amended from time to time, differ from company to company, and are complex to analyze. Only through top-level review of the plans, company by company, can basic and rational improvements be made.

Shell refuses to permit any employee or union participation in pension planning. It refuses at this time to grant either modest immediate improvements or the top-level review to prepare for future improvements.

The other oil companies have demonstrated considerable statesmanship in agreeing this year to the breakthrough agreements for union participation in health and safety and in pension review.

OCAW believes that it cannot permit Shell, controlling interest in which is owned by Royal Dutch Petroleum Company of the Netherlands and Shell Transport and Trading Company of Great Britain, to do less for its American employees.

#### THE ADVERTISING INDUSTRY'S NEW PROGRAM OF SELF-REGULATION

**HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, the public is increasingly calling for an end to false and misleading advertising. Today I met with representatives of the American Advertising Federation who told me about the advertising industry's new program of self-regulation.

The objective of this new program is to receive and act upon consumer complaints, and work with both Government and industry to maintain high standards of truth in advertising. Because of the deep concern my colleagues have shown for the accuracy of advertising, I am inserting the American Advertising Federation's description of this program in the RECORD.

## THE SELF-REGULATORY PROGRAM

The advertising industry joined forces last year to initiate a voluntary program of self-regulation to be headed by the newly formed National Advertising Review Board. The NARB acts on consumer and industry complaints regarding truth and accuracy in national advertising. It is dedicated to providing a vehicle for continual improvement of advertising practices.

## THE NARB—ITS LEADERSHIP

Charles W. Yost, former ambassador to the United Nations, was selected chairman of the NARB. Also elected to the board were 30 members representing national advertisers, 10 representing advertising agencies and 10 representing public or non-industry fields.

Emphasis on advertiser representation stems from the fact that he bears the ultimate responsibility for the advertising that is produced. At the same time, it must be recognized that the inclusion of public representatives in an industry program of self-regulation at the policy making level is unique. Few, if any, other industries or professions provide for involvement of the consumer on other than a complainant level.

## SPONSORING GROUPS

The associations sponsoring the NARB are the American Advertising Federation, the American Association of Advertising Agencies, the Association of National Advertisers and the Council of Better Business Bureaus.

## COMPLAINT PROCEDURES AND ENFORCEMENT

NARB is organized so that complaints are initially handled by an investigating staff, the National Advertising Division (NAD) of the Council of Better Business Bureaus, and any appeals are forwarded to the NARB. Complaints regarding truth and accuracy—the content of an ad and whether it has the capacity to mislead or deceive—may be initiated by individual consumers, representatives of consumer organizations or through the industry's own internal monitoring.

NAD evaluates the merits of the issues raised in the complaints. In most cases, this means checking the representations made in the advertising with the available information on the performance of the product under accepted standards of truth and accuracy.

In addition to handling complaints, the NAD monitors the various advertising media seeking to uncover any possible abuses before they attract broad public concern. It also renders advisory opinions in advance to advertisers and/or agencies as a way of averting future problems.

If a complaint is considered justified, the NAD works with the advertiser and/or agency to seek an appropriate change in the advertising. The emphasis is on a constructive resolution of the problem. It is up to the advertiser to establish the truth of the claims.

If, however, there is an impasse and the questioned advertising is neither altered nor withdrawn, the complaint is appealed to the NARB. To expedite this appeals process, the chairman of the NARB appoints a five-man panel to hear each specific case and reach a decision on behalf of the entire board. Each panel includes three advertisers, one agency and one public member.

The NARB panel reviews the complaint and the NAD staff findings and provides an opportunity for the advertiser or his representative to present his side of the case in a full evidentiary hearing. NARB panels normally are able to arrive at a decision within a few hours. The decision is transmitted to the advertiser at the highest corporate level.

If the advertiser still refuses to cooperate with the NARB panel or does not agree with the decision of the panel that the advertising is in violation of NARB standards, the chairman of the NARB, after exhausting all procedures, informs the appropriate government agency.

NARB publicly discloses all decisions and monthly reports are released on the status of all cases before NAD or on appeal to NARB. Advertisers in disagreement with the decision of NARB or its investigative staff are given the opportunity to submit their own statements to be incorporated in NARB's public announcements.

The party initiating the complaint is informed of the outcome of the NAD investigation and/or resolution of the NARB panel. If the complainant is dissatisfied with the outcome of the NAD investigation, he too may appeal for a hearing by an NARB panel, again evidencing the functioning role the consumer has in NARB procedures.

## THE FIRST YEAR OF OPERATION—PROGRESS REPORT

The workability of the NARB self-regulatory program may be evaluated by reviewing some of the statistics issued after one year of performance. The National Advertising Division reported it had received or initiated 444 complaints against national advertising (as of December 1972). Of the total:

131 complaints were dismissed as without merit. These were cases in which, in the opinion of NAD, the advertiser provided adequate substantiation of claims.

84 complaints were found to be justified, and in all cases the advertiser agreed either to withdraw the ad or to modify it.

227 complaints were still under investigation.

Nine cases dismissed by NAD were appealed by the complainants to NARB for panel adjudication with the following results:

four complaints were not sustained, two complaints were upheld, assured by the advertisers that the challenged ads would not be used in the future.

three more are in the process of being adjudicated.

It is significant to the self-regulatory program that:

In all cases so far the complaint was resolved before notification of a governmental enforcement agency was necessary.

The individual consumer, as a group, accounted for the largest share of the total complaints.

Virtually every NAD request to an advertiser for substantiation of claims was complied with.

NARB panel judgments are added to the extensive body of precedents dealing with advertising acceptability already developed by the Council of Better Business Bureaus and are available to assist NAD with its staff role of initial evaluation and review.

Panel rulings also serve as precedents for future panels convened to review related cases and constitute a body of information and opinion that will serve as guidelines for advertisers.

## RESPONDING TO CHANGE

In evaluating the year-old program, Chairman Yost noted that NARB and NAD are providing self-regulatory machinery that did not exist previously. Further, he said that it was to be expected that procedural problems would be encountered during the program's developmental stages.

Ambassador Yost asserted that "neither NARB nor its investigative staff can be considered an apologist for questionable advertising practices nor a 'defender' of the advertising industry. They act judiciously and fairly on all matters that come before them."

To seek continual improvement of the self-regulatory machinery, the procedures of NARB/NAD have been amended to provide for public disclosure of decisions, despite the earlier judgment that confidentiality was desirable except where compliance with NARB panel findings was not voluntarily forthcoming. The over-riding public involvement and interest resulted in the adoption of the full public disclosure policy.

Also, to help decrease the amount of time

between issuance of complaint and its resolution, NAD's investigative procedures are being more closely tied to the Council of Better Business Bureau's trade practices division in Washington, which has experts in a number of advertising areas giving NAD greater research capability. New personnel have been added.

## ISSUES OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Although NARB and its investigative staff, the NAD, are primarily concerned with truth and accuracy in national advertising, the NARB chairman also is empowered to appoint five-member consultative panels to review the broader questions of taste, morality and social responsibility.

NAD has received only a limited number of complaints deemed to be concerned with such matters. Procedures call for the convening of an NARB panel to review these more subjective advertising questions when the volume of such complaints warrants such action.

As opposed to truth and accuracy questions which are dealt with on a case by case basis, issues of taste and social responsibility will involve the use of "white papers" to caution against a given practice of concern.

## LOCAL ADAPTATION

The development of local advertising review boards, based on the national model, is being undertaken in several cities through the efforts of the American Advertising Federation and its local ad clubs and the Better Business Bureaus.

It should be emphasized that this program is not designed to be a panacea for whatever ills exist in the marketplace. It is a conscientious and honest effort on behalf of the advertising industry to respond constructively to public complaints about specific advertising and to elevate further advertising performance.

For further information, write or call: William Ewen, Executive Director, National Advertising Review Board, 850 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10022, (212) 832-1320. Roger Purdon, Vice President, National Advertising Division, Council of Better Business Bureaus, 845 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10022, (212) 832-3131.

## A BILL TO BAN SECRET MEETINGS WITHIN THE CONGRESSIONAL AND EXECUTIVE BRANCHES

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, as government has grown, it has become distant, out of reach of the people. A vast, impersonal bureaucracy appears to rule, not by the consent of the governed, but by edict—with the help of a computer printout that cannot be bent, folded, mutilated, or changed.

The electorate responds to this situation in two principal ways: first, people are frustrated and alienated by governmental action that they do not understand and seemingly cannot control or second, citizens do not feel that they are qualified to assess the performance of their elected representatives because the individual does not have "all the information" available to him. Either way, the democratic process loses.

How do governmental bodies come to their policy decisions? More importantly, why do they take certain actions? What happens behind those closed doors?



The people have a right to know.

Therefore, I am introducing legislation which would, in effect, ban secret meetings within the congressional and executive branches of our Federal Government.

Limited exceptions to this rule would be provided for matters relating to national security and defense, certain disciplinary proceedings that might adversely affect an individual's reputation and meetings strictly and solely related to a Government agency's internal management.

But the purpose and effect of this legislation is clear—to open up the decision-making process of government to the public. Citizens will have the right to attend meetings in which they have an interest, and news media and other interested groups will have access which will insure a broader dissemination of information on public affairs.

By bringing the full force of public scrutiny into our deliberations, I am sure that we will substantially improve government. Moreover, we will be taking steps to dispel the understandable cynicism, suspicion and loss of confidence that currently underlies the public's attitude toward its government.

No one can seriously maintain that wholesale reform in this area is not needed—and needed immediately.

Passage of the Freedom of Information Act in 1966 was a welcome first step. But in seeking to place records of past events in the public realm, the public was only provided with a retrospective view of what had already befallen them. Even so, it has been disheartening to witness the extent to which the Federal bureaucracy has gone in circumventing and subverting the act's policy of full disclosure by using "exemptions" for purposes which were never intended by Congress.

This attitude that the people should be left in the dark; that what they do not know will not hurt them—or the Government; and that Government knows best, is personally abhorrent to me. Most importantly, it is ultimately destructive to the very essence of self-government.

A recent study of the executive branch indicates its present practice in this area: "The agencies have either misinterpreted or chosen to ignore existing law enacted to provide the public with greater access to information. The agencies have failed to adequately document their procedures, findings, and conclusions. There appears to be, if not a deliberate attempt to restrict disseminating information, no concentrated effort on the part of the agencies to insure public participation in their activities. This is evident from the lack of adequate procedures to inform the public of these meetings, and the closing of many of these meetings."

This is particularly true of regulatory agencies which have such tremendous impact upon our daily lives, and yet oftentimes act as if they are powers unto themselves.

Meanwhile, the public is expected to

CXIX—196—Part 3

content itself with the ever growing disease of self-serving "off the record" statements by public officials which are designed to give less than all the truth.

Congress, it is sorry to relate, is not much better in this regard. Despite the passage of the Legislative Reform Act of 1970, most "business" sessions of committees are still closed to the public.

A Congressional Quarterly report of February 1972, reveals that for 1971, 97 percent of those Senate Committee meetings specifically designated as "business sessions"—organizing, marking up, voting, briefing sessions—were closed to the public. The House was not much better with almost 80 percent of its business conducted behind closed doors.

And the question is, Why? Is such secrecy necessary? Does it serve any legitimate purpose?

The answer is, "No." Government has shown time and again that it does not need this "backroom" atmosphere to conduct its business.

As early as 1953, the California Assembly enacted the Brown Act which made provision for open public meetings for all local government agencies. More expansive legislation to assure open government meetings has been since passed in New Mexico, Arkansas, New Jersey, Indiana, and most recently, Florida—all with good results.

I have insisted that the House Subcommittee of which I am chairman, conduct all its business in open session.

Throughout my years in public service I have been disturbed by the great amount of public business that is conducted in secrecy. What do we have to hide?

It is not at all surprising that people are suspicious of our motives and have lost confidence in our system's capacity to be responsive to the people's needs.

It is time—well past time—for this type of legislation. If it can get out from behind the closed doors and survive committee action, I am confident that on the floor—in full view of the public—it will pass.

It is time to bring the unseen hands of power to the light of public scrutiny.

Mr. Speaker, I include the full text of this bill to be printed in the RECORD at this point:

A bill to provide that meetings of Government agencies and of congressional committees shall be open to the public, and for other purposes

H.R. 3519

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) except as provided in subsection (b), all meetings (including meetings to conduct hearings) of any Government agency at which any official action is considered or discussed shall be open to the public.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to that portion of any meetings in which the action or proposed action to be taken, considered, or discussed by an agency—

(1) relates to a matter affecting the national security,

(2) relates solely to the internal management of such agency,

(3) might tend to reflect adversely on the

character or reputation of any individual who is subject to any proposed or potential sanction by such agency, or

(4) might divulge matters required to be kept confidential under (specified statutory provisions):

Provided, That this subsection does not authorize closed meetings or the withholding of information from the public except as specifically stated in this subsection, and is not authority to withhold information from Congress.

Each agency subject to the requirements of this section shall, within one hundred and eighty days after the effective date of this Act, establish through publication in the Federal Register procedures for providing public notice of meetings required by this section to be open to the public. Such notice shall be given as far in advance of such meetings as is practicable, in order to facilitate attendance of such meetings by persons desirous of doing so.

Sec. 2. (a) Section 133(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 as amended by section 103(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 is amended as follows:

"(1) Each meeting (including meetings to conduct hearings) of each standing, select, special, or conference committee of the Senate shall be open to the public, except when the committee determines that the matters to be discussed, or the testimony to be taken, relates to a matter of national security, relates solely to the internal management of such committee, may tend to reflect adversely on the character or reputation of the witness or any other individual, or may divulge matters required to be kept confidential under other provisions of law."

(2) Clause 27(f) (2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows: "Each meeting (including meetings to conduct hearings) of each standing, select, special, or conference committee shall be open to the public, except when the committee determines that the matters to be discussed, or the testimony to be taken, relates to a matter of national security, relates solely to the internal management of such committee, may tend to reflect adversely on the character or reputation of the witness or any other individual, or may divulge matters required to be kept confidential under other provisions of law."

Sec. 3. A transcript shall promptly be made of each meeting which is open to the public pursuant to the provisions of this Act and copies of such transcript shall promptly be made available for public inspections and copying.

Sec. 4. The district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction of actions to render declaratory judgments or to enforce, by injunction or otherwise, the first section of this Act and section 3 insofar as it relates to that section. Such actions may be brought by any person in the district where such person resides, or has his principal place of business, or where the agency whose action is complained of resides.

Sec. 5. DEFINITIONS.—For the purpose of this Act—

(1) "Government agency" means each authority of the Government of the United States (whether or not it is within or subject to review by another Government agency) having more than one member, but does not include—

- (a) the Congress
- (b) the courts of the United States
- (c) military authorities.

(2) "person" includes an individual, partnership, corporation, association, a public or private organization other than an agency.

Sec. 6. This Act shall take effect on the ninetieth day after the date of its enactment.

# THE LEGACY OF LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON—A TRIBUTE

## HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

### THE LEGACY OF LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON—A TRIBUTE

(By John M. Murphy)

"He was a man, take him for all in all,  
I shall not look upon his like again."  
—Hamlet, Act 1 Scene 2

With a heart crippled by the ravages of disease, until his dying moments Lyndon Baines Johnson was battling for the haven of society. His last major public appearance was as a mediator at a civil rights dispute in Austin, Texas. When the program was threatened by a violent outbreak, Johnson "obviously sick and tired," took command and according to the President of the University of Texas, his "chest expanded and his eyes flashed, and he calmed the situation down. He said exactly the right thing, extemporaneously. You could see a great man at the top of his power."

The President told the ominous and troubled audience:

"To be black—to one who is black—is to be proud, to be worthy, to be honorable. But to be black in a white society is not to stand on level ground."

"While the races may stand side by side, whites stand on history's mountain and blacks stand in history's hollow."

"Unless we overcome unequal history, we cannot overcome unequal opportunity. That is not—nor will it ever be—an easy goal to achieve."

Within days of his death in what must have been moments of acute pain, Lyndon Johnson rose with one last burst of his rapidly failing energy and spoke as eloquently as he ever had on the meaning of being a minority American.

President Johnson brought the same fire, the same drive and the same love of the American people to everything he did. Forged in the desperate poverty and spirit-killing depression that engulfed his beloved Texas during the 1930's he projected his burning desire to change things for the better from the banks of his rural Perdenales to the ghettos of America's cities.

Heeding the call of the deprived, the disadvantaged and the disenfranchised, he spread his philosophy of a great society for all to his foreign policy thinking. And believing in the right of weaker people to self-determination and a place in the sun, Lyndon Johnson applied his philosophy to the people of South Viet Nam. But between the journey from the banks of the Perdenales to the banks of the Mekong River, President Johnson's dream—for a time—turned into his own personal nightmare.

So, despite his unprecedented success in putting through Congress and into operation the new frontier program of the slain John F. Kennedy, and despite the sometimes tenuous, but always progressing, successes of his own programs—his own domestic wars against discrimination, against poverty and against the corruptors of our environment—he was to reach a point where he was haunted by the spectre of the Vietnam War that bedeviled him like Banquo's ghost.

His torment was not so much the result of defeats on the field or in the sputtering true negotiations which he initiated. His torment was largely attributable to his anguish

over and devotion to the "grunts" in that tragic effort, the G.I.'s who were bearing the brunt of the battle in the face of what seemed at time futile efforts to end the war. From General Westmoreland to the lowliest private, Lyndon Johnson could not conceal from friends and reporters a compassion that betrayed his innermost turmoil over the lives—and deaths—of the American fighting men. While he was concerned for the victims of that war-torn nation, his concern for the American soldier was so great that he gave up the Presidency he had gotten by the most incredible vote of confidence from the people in American history so that their chances for survival might be increased.

It was perhaps symbolic that the news of the success of the peace negotiations that he so fervently sought should come to him hours before he left us.

The wounds of war will heal and the perspective of history will, I am certain, record Lyndon Johnson's role in it with compassion for the people of Vietnam, North and South, and his desire to rebuild both nations, that was the real goal of the 36th President of the United States.

And while the Vietnam controversy swirled around his head, President Johnson's domestic programs of change were not without their attendant disruptions. When Americans of the future remember Lyndon Johnson, they will think about his revolutionary ideas—and that revolutionary ideas sometimes bring about revolutions of a sort. I remember the ashes of Watts, Newark, Detroit—and Washington, D.C. But out of these ashes this country and the world have witnessed the rebirth of a new America, an America where the oppressed people President Johnson loved so much are finding new freedom, new dignity, new life and a rebirth of the human spirit. Observing the turbulent mid-sixties, Lyndon Johnson did not view it as America coming apart at the seams. He described it as:

"The old . . . not coming down. Rather the troubling and torment of these days stems from the new trying to rise into place."

When Lyndon Johnson was thrust into the presidency by that fatal burst of gunfire in Dallas, one of his first major moves was to begin what was to be the passage of the most sweeping civil rights legislation in America's history. Of this achievement President Johnson was to say, "It's going to make democracy real. It is going to correct an injustice of decades and centuries."

If he had done nothing else, Lyndon Johnson had begun to make his great society available to everyone. And for this all Americans could be grateful. But he wanted more for the needy of America so he designed and put into operation the Office of Economic Opportunity to eliminate poverty; he developed plans to cope with our urban crisis; and, President Johnson's Administration gave greater support to the educational needs of our people than any government in history.

This record of achievement is the real legacy of Lyndon Johnson. It wasn't easy, but he had the courage to see that the die was cast for freedom and this country—and the world—are bearing the fruits of his labors.

The legacy of Lyndon Johnson will not be the memory of the nightmare of Vietnam, but the renewed dedication to his dream of a great society which I am convinced will inspire Democrats and Republicans alike.

His legacy will herald a renewed commitment to an America where he worked to guarantee no second-class citizenship, no second quality opportunity, no secondhand justice at home, and no second-place status in the world for our ideals and benefits.

While he was untimely ripped from our midst, all Americans can rejoice in the fact that he was here; in the fact that, as a close friend eulogized, in the seventh decade of

the 20th Century, this country had Lyndon Baines Johnson.

This country will not look upon his like again.

## NATIONAL PLUMBING INDUSTRY WEEK

### HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors is the largest and oldest trade association in the construction industry. The association will celebrate April 15 through 22, 1973 as "National Plumbing Industry Week."

National Plumbing Industry Week will focus attention on the vital role that plumbing, heating, cooling, and piping play in the health, comfort, and convenience of our citizens in homes and other buildings. Over 2 million men and women will join the national association in celebrating this event.

Plumbing and piping contractors are the original ecologists. They have engaged in this field for nearly a century. These contractors have taken the lead in the development and application of today's newer and more sophisticated measures to insure environmental control and preservation.

The products and services of this industry also play a vital part in our Nation's economic strength, industrial productivity, national defense, space exploration, transportation, food processing, and mineral development—in fact, everything that depends for its existence on the movement of air, gas, water, and other liquids through pipes, valves, fittings, and fixtures.

The officers, directors, and members of the National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors represent every city and State of our great Nation. They are engaged in their own businesses in the finest traditions of private enterprise. Without their products and services, civilization as we know it today would not be possible.

The association's officers are Robert K. Wark, president, of Houston, Tex.; Samuel M. Bloom, first vice president, of Miami, Fla.; Merlin Geddes, second vice president, of Arcadia, Calif.; Cecil E. Self, secretary, of Dallas, Tex.; Roland E. Carlson, treasurer, of Rockford, Ill.; and Harry G. McComas, executive director, of Washington, D.C. Director of National Plumbing Industry Week is John B. Kelly.

For my colleagues' information, the new president, Robert K. Wark, is not only a good friend, but also an outstanding citizen and civic leader of Houston.

The association's 15-man board of directors includes Paul LaMott of Haverhill, N.H.; Leon Novak of Brooklyn, N.Y.; William M. Robertshaw of West Orange, N.J.; Harry Hutchinson, Jr., of Philadelphia, Pa.; Elwood Evans of Wilmington, Del.; Wesley Styers of Gastonia, N.C.; Howell Switzer of New Orleans, La.; Keith Clotz of Toledo, Ohio; George



Connelly of Chicago, Ill.; Fred Drews of Houston, Tex.; Robert McCraig of Topeka, Kans.; Jeffrey Haverly of Britton, S. Dak.; William Botting of Seattle, Wash.; George Neiderhauser of Salt Lake City, Utah; and Beryl Notthoff of Los Angeles, Calif.

I have today introduced a resolution calling on the President to declare the week of April 15 through April 22, 1973, as National Plumbing Industry Week. The National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors and the total plumbing, heating, cooling, and piping industry of 2 million men and women have rendered an outstanding service to our Nation through their efforts in contracting, manufacturing, marketing, distribution, and installation of the industry's products. I am sure my colleagues will agree with me and support my resolution and thus support the industry in its celebration of "National Plumbing Industry Week," April 15 through 22, 1973.

**REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE  
JAMES ABDNOR AT THE HURON  
FARM MEETING, SATURDAY, JANUARY  
13, 1973**

**HON. JAMES ABDNOR**

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

**REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE JAMES ABDNOR  
AT THE HURON FARM MEETING, SATURDAY,  
JANUARY 13, 1973**

I certainly welcome this opportunity to be here this afternoon and to have the privilege of testifying and also hearing from the citizens of South Dakota as to their views on the ramifications and feeling toward the budget cuts that have recently come about in the agricultural budget in Washington. I think we should recognize, though, that the President is determined to hold Federal spending down to \$250 billion in this present fiscal year, which actually means that \$6 billion or more will have to be trimmed out of the budget to do so. When you are cutting at the rate of \$6 billion for a six-month period, you are referring to a pro-rated cut of \$12 billion over a fiscal year.

Now, I want it understood that I don't go along with all the cuts that the President has made, and I question whether or not the President has the right to withhold funds like he is doing. Of course, I want to point out that I also questioned the President's right to withhold funds in the days of President Johnson, who set the precedent for this by withholding highway funds from the various States, and many thought it was wrong for him to do that at that time.

I do feel that this present situation we find ourselves in has been brought about because of the fiscal irresponsibility of past Congresses. The fiscal truth is that you cannot go on forever spending far more money in Federal funds than you are actually taking in in taxes. I think we must recognize this, and, of course, when Congress doesn't, the President has done so by coming in with these present cuts. There is no question in anyone's mind that Federal deficit spending is one of the greatest contributors to inflation, and inflation has probably hurt the farming business more than any other sin-

gle occupation that I know of. There is just no way to pass rising costs on to the consumer like there is in other businesses. I do want to say that I feel that agriculture has been unduly singled out for cuts.

I feel that in the percentage of overall cuts, agriculture is carrying far too much of the brunt of the cuts. The thing I really object to most of all is the manner in which the cuts were made. I feel that they were made by the Office of Management and Budget. Although Mr. Butz is accepting the responsibility for them, I feel that he really didn't have much say in it. I am convinced that those people with the knife, who are doing the cutting in the Office of Management and Budget, could not tell you the difference between the front end of a tractor and the back. They have no conception of how they are undermining the economy of rural America and the very existence of agriculture, itself.

I am really concerned about the recent ruling that will allow diverted acres to be pastured. I am convinced this is for the sole purpose of increasing cattle production and dropping down the cost. I am concerned about taking off restrictions on planting and doing away with the diverted acres and what that might do to the overall crop situation. It doesn't take very long to amass surpluses. We learned our lessons under Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman back in the days when President Johnson encouraged increased plantings of wheat and other agriculture products because they thought food costs were going too high. The result of it was huge surpluses the following year, which caused prices to be driven down. I am afraid that this is exactly the same situation that could happen here.

I am strongly opposed to doing away with the REAP program. At this time of concern for pollution and environmental protection, here we have a program that has been leading the way in this direction for many, many years. We know, some of us, the purpose of the program for soil conservation, pollution control, and the like, and I feel that the government has been getting a tremendous bargain under this program. Although it started out years ago at 100% reimbursement on the farm practices, many farmers today in many areas are being paid by the government as little as 30% up to maybe 50%, and I say to you I don't know of a pollution control program today that has given the government and the taxpayers of this country as much for their money as they are getting under the REAP program. I certainly hope that we can prevail upon the President and the Administration to reinstate this program.

I also question the wisdom of the action taken on the part of the Budget Office in relation to the Rural Electrification Program. To me, REA is just as important to our rural segment of the United States as urban renewal programs and the like are to the city people. Here, the program, which is helping everyone in the rural areas, is a business transaction, and I think that this is the point that the government misses in doing what they are doing. It is not a subsidy. If there is any subsidy at all, it is simply that the subsidy exists in the area of the interest rates. I am concerned that, under this new program of turning the REA Associations out into the public markets for money and sharing with them interest rates at 5%, it is going to cost the government almost as much money as it is costing today to go along with the 2% loans.

Finally, may I say there are in this audience today both Republicans and Democrats alike. We are all here to express our concern over what is happening to the Department of Agriculture budget. I know that rural Congressmen, Democrats and Republicans alike, and believe me, there are not many of us any more—I think I heard

there are something less than 40 Congressional Districts in this country with 20% or more rural area—are equally concerned, and we are working together in Washington in an attempt to reinstate some of these programs. I think we should not forget that. It is terribly important that we, whether it be in South Dakota or in Congress, or anywhere else, must speak as one voice, not as Republicans and Democrats, because we are all concerned about this situation, and we must speak out for rural America in a single voice.

I want you folks here to know that my first concern as a Congressman is for my country and especially the people I serve. I will not hesitate to oppose the President or his Administration whenever I disagree with them, and I may say publicly, I would not hesitate one moment to co-sponsor legislation with Frank Denholm or any other Democratic Congressman whenever I think it is in the best interests of South Dakota. I know that by working together, we will make a better rural America.

Thank you very much.

**TRIBUTE TO RICH GRANZELLA**

**HON. JEROME R. WALDIE**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to one of the outstanding citizens of my district. Rich Granzella, an active civic leader in West Contra Costa County for many years, is being honored as the 1972 West Contra Costa County businessman of the year.

In addition to being director of the Richmond Chamber of Commerce, Rich is chairman of the Salesian High School athletic field fund drive which raised \$100,000 for the development of an athletic field for the community. He is director of the Richmond Boy's Club and the San Pablo-Salesian Boy's Club. Twice president of the Western Disposal Operator's Association, he has also been president of the Richmond Sanitary Services for the past 13 years.

Rich began working at age 13, and by the time he was 18, he had bought into the Richmond Sanitary.

I offer my heartfelt congratulations to Rich Granzella for this well-deserved honor and wish him many more years of service to the community.

**A BILL TO DECLARE THAT THE  
UNITED STATES HOLDS IN TRUST  
FOR THE BRIDGEPORT INDIAN  
COLONY CERTAIN LANDS IN  
MONO COUNTY, CALIF.**

**HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today a bill that will declare that the United States holds in trust 40 acres of land in Mono County, Calif., for members of the Bridgeport Indian Colony.

I am pleased to be joined in sponsoring this bill by my friend and colleague from California (Mr. JOHNSON). Mr. JOHNSON initiated this bill in the 92d Congress when, at that time, Mono County was in his district. In addition, Senators CRANSTON and TUNNEY have introduced S. 283 in the Senate.

The land to be held in trust is an unoccupied 40-acre tract of federally owned property adjacent to the town of Bridgeport in Mono County, Calif., set aside for the Bridgeport Indian Colony in lieu of a tract of land wrongfully taken from them in 1914.

The land on which the Indians presently reside, and which has been their home even before the coming of the white man, was wrongfully patented to a non-Indian in 1914 under the Desert Land Act. While the land is now owned by several non-Indian heirs to the original patentee, the Indians were allowed to occupy the site.

However, early in 1968 one of the owners demanded that the Indians vacate the site and initiated eviction proceedings against them. Legal intervention kept the eviction proceedings in abeyance for some time. Later, when the owner learned that an attempt to solve the difficulty was pending in the Congress, he agreed to cease the eviction proceedings so long as Congress worked toward a solution for the Indian colony.

In view of the present situation, I find that the best solution for all concerned is my proposal to provide the Indians with a new land base. Since their land base was wrongfully taken from them, it certainly seems only fair to provide them with a new one.

With a secure trust land base, the colony will be in a better position to improve their living conditions. Currently, 12 of the 19 Indian families in the Bridgeport area live in totally substandard housing. Eleven of the families, including all of the families that now reside on the disputed land, have no sanitation facilities and no inside running water. Five of the homes are heated solely by wood-burning stoves, and three have no refrigerator. Only three of the 19 families can claim a member with full-time employment. All the rest are unemployed. A secure trust land base will enable these Indian people to overcome the severe obstacles of unemployment and chronic poverty, and to utilize Federal resources to improve their standard of living.

It is my understanding that the townspeople of nearby Bridgeport are in full support of this legislative proposal. I recently received a resolution adopted by the Mono County Board of Supervisors in full support of the Bridgeport Indian colony's efforts to obtain an unoccupied 40-acre tract of federally owned land adjacent to the town of Bridgeport as a homesite.

I am hopeful that Congress will support this measure to correct the one of so many injustices that have been inflicted upon the Indian people of California.

## REPRESENTATIVE EDWARD R. ROYBAL'S STATEMENT ON THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED BUDGET

### HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, stripped of all of its rhetoric and arithmetic, the President's budget is nothing less than an abdication of Federal responsibility to serve the American people. Two years ago Mr. Nixon called for a "New American Revolution." I can only conclude that this slogan as reflected in the budget is but another name for benign neglect of the poor, elderly, sick, and unemployed.

It is impossible to build a "lasting structure of peace" by enlarging the war budget to over \$80 billion while slashing funds for housing, health, education, public employment, and economic development for low-income communities.

While I agree that we must constantly reevaluate the effectiveness of all Federal programs, freezes, moratoriums, and cutbacks for appropriated programs do not represent a positive, sound approach but a regressive one. It is totally misguided to propose to cure program shortcomings with a sledge hammer. Revisions, modifications, and discussions with congressional and community leaders is the proper approach.

The administration's phaseout of the Office of Economic Opportunity is not the way to improve government, as the administration would have us believe. Instead it means the strangulation of the only visible and responsive advocate for low-income Americans.

On housing, we are told that since some housing programs may be ineffective, we should scrap our current housing and community development effort and reconsider it at some future date. Ironically, this approach violates the President's own objective of strengthening the capacity of local governments to respond to the needs of the people. Certainly one of the most pressing local problems today is better housing.

Further, high unemployment cannot be solved by killing our public service employment program which has already created jobs for some 140,000 unemployed.

This budget is intended to create the illusion not the reality of a revitalized budget, of a positive thrust. For example, in his message to Congress Mr. Nixon asserts that the Community Relations Service, created in 1964 to ease racial and police-community tensions, would expand its crisis prevention function, but fails to mention that CRS is about to suffer a 60-percent budget cut which would, in fact, wipe out its crisis prevention role.

The budget message justifies these reductions and reversals in social service programs as the only way to prevent inflation and tax increases. But not once do we hear a commitment to offer a tax

reform package which would end special tax breaks to large corporations and the privileged few and thereby increase Federal revenues by billions of dollars.

Instead of a unifying and peace-oriented budget, we are confronted with a divisive and militaristic one. The proposed budget is but a further example of this administration's social and political philosophy of benign neglect and indifference to the needs of the people.

## CRIME COMMITTEE TV BAN BACKED BY LOS ANGELES COUNTY GRAND JURY

### HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to the County of Los Angeles Grand Jury's recent recommendation for Federal action on the banning of drug commercials on television and on barbiturate production quotas.

While studying the problem of drug abuse in my county, the narcotics and dangerous drugs committee of the grand jury became concerned with the larger issue of the American "drug-oriented society" as a causal factor in the use of illegal drugs by young people. Although a county agency without power to make recommendations to the Congress, the grand jury represents over 7 million people in my State and believes it is important to bring this message to all the people.

My distinguished colleague, the Honorable CLAUDE PEPPER of Florida, as chairman of the Select Committee on Crime, has recently completed a series of hearings on the subject of drug abuse in our Nation's schools. As a result of those hearings, held in six cities, and concluding in Los Angeles, the committee staff is preparing legislation designed to ban drug commercials on television during the time when children are presumably watching.

The committee, which has an admirable record in bringing to the attention of the American public the flagrant abuse of amphetamines, is also preparing recommendations to reduce the overproduction and overprescribing of barbiturates, drugs the committee found to be more life-threatening than heroin.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I insert the following items in the RECORD:

#### DRUGS AND TELEVISION

The social problems of this country which include racism, war and poverty, are said to be underlying factors in drug abuse. Some feel that television has contributed significantly to the cause of drug usage. This Committee wishes to add its voice to the brave few who have attacked television as "the biggest pusher of them all".

Senator Frank Moss has observed that "the drug culture finds its fullest flowering in the portrait of American Society which can be pieced together out of the hundreds of thou-



sands of commercials. It is advertising which mounts so graphically the message that pills turn rain to sunshine, gloom to joy, depression to euphoria, solve problems and dispel doubt."

A T.V. commercial states, "Leave your feeling of tension behind and slip into a quiet world. You feel calm, more relaxed with . . . the new modern calmativ". T.V. ran almost \$20 million worth of ads for sleeping aids alone in 1969.

Television teaches, with continuous air-hammer effectiveness, the dangerous and debilitating lie that the solution to all life's problems and nagging anxieties can be found in a product, preferably one that is applied to the skin or taken into the body. It has educated our children to go for the quick solution and urged us all to seek "better living through chemistry". John Ingersoll, of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, has called it the "take something" philosophy. We feel that the targets of this philosophy are our children from age three.

A lone voice on the FCC is Commissioner Nicholas Johnson who has stated that T.V. is intimately involved in selling drugs and urges that we put a stop to the "grey flannel pusher". When Johnson suggested that drug advertising be banned from television and reminded the industry that it might be contributing to the 300,000 drug deaths each year, he was told by other members that the Commission must not act too hastily because the drug industry produces \$100 million a year for the broadcasters!

The government did act this year in regard to the manufacture of pharmaceuticals. In the previous year, some 8 billion amphetamine pills had found their way into the black market. This year the production quota of such pills was cut to 82% below last year's level. On November 1, 1972, the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs proposed changing the status of barbiturate drugs into a higher category. This would forbid telephonic prescriptions and refilling without a new prescription. The possibility of lowering production quotas was mentioned but not specifically spelled out.

#### THE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS

Federal action on barbiturate production quotas and on the banning of drug commercials.

Letters have been written to prominent members of the government who will hopefully use their influence to bring about meaningful change.

#### PEPPER GUNS FOR TV PILL ADS

(By Jack Anderson)

WASHINGTON.—A TV advertising ban on pills similar to that on liquor and cigarettes is being drafted by the House crime chairman, Rep. Claude Pepper (D-Fla.).

The legislation is aimed at the drug firms and TV industry which condition children to "pill popping" through commercials showing over-the-counter drugs solving all of life's problems. Small wonder, reasons Pepper, that young people turn to illegal amphetamines, barbiturates, LSD and worse as they confront the problems of their teens.

The Pepper Plan, if enacted, would cost the TV industry more than \$250 million a year. From 8 A. M. to 9 P. M., it would bar all TV ads for painkillers, sleeping pills, sedatives, cold tablets, antacids, laxatives, vitamins, reducing pills and other nostrums. This is the period when children are most often glued to the TV screen.

Pepper's proposed advertising ban has grown out of two years of hearings into drug abuse. His old crusader's heart has been torn by the stories of young people describing their living death from drugs.

To protect coming generations from TV drug-conditioning, Pepper has ordered the

committee staff to prepare a detailed report before the end of the year so Pepper can begin his crusade early in 1973.

"The pharmaceutical companies are not only proliferating this country with pills, but they are also contaminating our airways with unnecessary and deleterious advertising," says a confidential draft.

"The proliferation of televised drug advertising is contributing to our national drug crisis. . . . It conditions (children) to the unnecessary use of drugs. Many advertisements give the false impression that taking drugs—'pill-popping'—is good for you, that it will improve your mind, make you happier by reducing tension. . . ."

"These advertisements are especially harmful to a child and impressionable teen-agers whose understanding of the use of drugs is at best cursory. . . . Undoing the initial impact of these television commercials will take a lifetime of education," the report warns.

Pepper feels the TV industry and pharmaceutical firms should get out of the business of giving medical advice on the airwaves. Far from genuinely trying to help sufferers, they "induce people to take drugs indiscriminately."

We reported on Oct. 24 that President Nixon, contrary to what the newspapers were saying, preferred to hold off a Vietnam cease-fire until after the election. "Politically speaking," we wrote, "the President believes it is better to keep the settlement terms vague until after the election."

He, therefore, deliberately sought to extend the secret negotiations past Election Day to prevent Hanoi from exploiting the election-eve cease-fire and to avoid charges that he rushed into an unsafe settlement for political purposes.

The President, however, is now optimistic that he can get a cease-fire on terms which will leave South Vietnam reasonably safe from a Communist takeover. His optimism is based on intelligence reports which depict Hanoi as being under intense diplomatic and military pressure.

Both Moscow and Peking are reported to be pressing the North Vietnamese to end the war. This has been accompanied, according to the intelligence reports, by a slight but significant slowdown in military support. At the same time, Hanoi is beginning to feel the pinch from the U. S. blockade of North Vietnamese ports and bombing of the supply lines.

Perhaps even more significant, the intelligence reports claim that North Vietnam's military leaders have been jolted by the failure of their spring offensive to reach its objectives. The South Vietnamese army was not the pushover that Hanoi expected. The leaders also miscalculated the ferocity of the U. S. air and naval assault which has been more punishing than the firepower ex-President Lyndon Johnson turned against them.

In the past, the intelligence reports misled Mr. Johnson to predict privately that the war would be over in 1967. But the military reporting and intelligence techniques have improved. President Nixon has faith that this time the reports are right.

#### DRUG FIRMS SAID TO CAUSE ABUSES

(By Jack Anderson)

A secret House crime committee report charges that the pharmaceutical industry, while professing concern for the nation's health, has actually "caused more drug abuse in this country than organized crime."

The document's findings are based on two years of committee hearings in major cities throughout the United States. Prepared by the staff on orders of chairman Claude Pepper (D-Fla.), the report angrily details how the drug industry lobbied to keep addicts supplied with pills.

"By over-production and promotion of amphetamines, barbiturates and other drugs, the pharmaceutical companies have had a direct causal effect on the drug abuse epidemic currently infecting the youth of this nation," charges the document.

"The committee finds it unconscionable and inexcusable that about 90 percent of the drugs in the illicit market are manufactured by legitimate pharmaceutical companies."

The drugs reach the illicit market when they are prescribed for peddlers in wholesale lots by crooked doctors. In other cases, peddlers use phony pharmacies or middlemen firms to buy the drugs for resale to users. And some drugs are simply hijacked.

"This committee discovered that there were more than 3 billion amphetamines being produced each year. The only desirable medical uses for amphetamines are for the treatment of narcolepsy and hyperkinesis in children. One million doses of amphetamine . . . would have been more than adequate to supply the medical needs for treating those diseases."

Yet, the report goes on, when the committee tried to stem amphetamine abuse, the pharmaceutical companies "strenuously resisted these efforts." They successfully lobbied against Pepper's bill in the House, and in the secret House-Senate conferences.

When Pepper and his colleagues on the committee tried later to get the Justice Department to curtail amphetamine production, "the pharmaceutical companies again resisted. . . ."

"When production quotas were finally required for amphetamines, the drug companies asked for quotas substantially in excess of their prior year's production figures," the committee report contends.

Now finally, pep pill production has been cut by 82 percent, still far less than Pepper feels it should be. But "more than two years have been wasted . . . In that period young people have . . . become 'strung out' on 'speed' and (other) amphetamines."

"This unwarranted delay . . . has been caused solely by pharmaceutical company intransigence—a compulsion to make a profit at the expense of the national health."

Currently, three major and numerous minor clandestine labs are manufacturing pills by the millions, helping to supply the addict market created by legitimate drug companies' over-production, the report asserts.

"Without the action of (the) pharmaceutical companies, drug abuse with amphetamines would never have gotten a foothold in this country. If it had not been for their unscrupulous action, our nation's youth would not now be entangled in amphetamine abuse," concludes the staff report.

#### TV: A MAJOR DRUG PUSHER

American pharmaceutical manufacturers spend more than \$1 billion a year—one-fourth of their total sales revenue—to advertise and promote prescription drugs. Nobody knows how much more is spent on the huckstering of over-the-counter medications—the quick fixes that are supposed to provide instant relief for what ails us, be it the common cold or a case of profound depression. The television industry alone expects to earn between \$250 million and \$300 million this year from commercials peddling pills and panaceas.

"We've got a drug problem in America," says Federal Communications Commissioner Nicholas Johnson. "It's called television." The television networks have become "the principal pusher to a junkie nation," Johnson told a recent conference on drug advertising sponsored by the National Council of Churches.

There is more at stake here than monstrous economic waste—though that is certainly

part of the problem. As Senator Gaylord Nelson, Wisconsin Democrat, testified at the same conference, drug manufacturers spend four times as much on advertising as they do on research and development. In consequence, a Federal task force has pointed out, most of the new drugs on the market are minor modifications or combinations of existing medications—or are simply "duplicative, noncontributory products."

The larger part of the problem is the fostering of a pernicious—but quite respectable—drug culture in the United States. Commissioner Johnson sees "a danger that our growing reliance on drugs may pose serious national health problems . . . even the possibility that our hedonistic reliance on drugs may be a debilitating social phenomenon." Some experts perceive a direct link between the ubiquitous promotion of patent cure-alls and the growing problem of narcotics addiction. Dr. Henry Simmons, director of the Bureau of Drugs in the Food and Drug Administration, told the NCC conference: "Common sense tells us that the massive amounts of money spent on promotion of drug use must have some influence on the way in which our society regards the use of drugs of all types." Some two billion prescriptions a year are written by U.S. physicians, he noted—a per capita rate two to four times greater than that of other countries that seem to have the same general level of health among their citizens as among people in the United States.

In Madison, Wisconsin, County Judge Ervin M. Bruner, who has had many years of experience dealing with youth, called on the city's three national network outlets to "stop showing, or tone down" commercials which suggest the use of drugs by adults to solve their mental and physical problems. Speaking as president of the Madison Mental Health Association, Judge Bruner said the Association felt strongly "that the incessant display on television of problem-solving by adults through tranquilizers, sleeping pills, and pep pills was encouraging the kids to experiment with 'their drugs.'"

"The constant suggestion in the television commercials advertising products for adults gives the kids a perfect excuse to defend their sampling of illegal drugs when they have problems," Bruner said.

"Since almost all young people are impressionable and greatly inclined to follow patterns practiced by their parents and other adults," Bruner continued, "the MHA is also convinced that a considerable amount of drug abuse problems, particularly experimenting by kids, stems from strong suggestions in many television commercials that adult problems, both physical and emotional, can be erased by the use of some drug."

Senator Nelson has proposed comprehensive drug legislation which would establish stringent new standards for the testing, marketing, and promotion of prescription and over-the-counter drugs. In the House of Representatives, Claude Pepper, chairman of the Select Committee on Crime, has drafted a bill that would bar all television commercials for pain-killers, sleeping pills, sedatives, cold tablets, antacids, laxatives, vitamins, reducing pills, and other nostrums from being broadcast during daytime and evening prime-time hours. If Congress is genuinely interested in coping with the drug problem in America, it will push these measures to speedy passage.

**MANY FAVOR BAN ON TV ADS OF OVER-THE-COUNTER DRUGS**  
(By Clark Hoyt)

WASHINGTON.—Rep. Claude Pepper (D., Fla.) appears to have hit a responsive chord around the country with a proposed ban on TV advertising of over-the-counter drugs.

After conducting a series of hearings in big cities on drug abuse in the schools, Pepper, chairman of the House Select Committee on

Crime, put his staff to work drafting legislation that would bar drug commercials on TV from 8 a.m. to 9 p.m., the hours when most children presumably are watching television.

News reports of Pepper's proposed bill, which cannot be formally introduced until the 93d Congress convenes in January, have prompted a heavy flow of approving mail from as far away as Honolulu.

Some letters come from worried parents who express with simple but eloquent examples their fears that TV promises of magic relief from tension, headaches, sleeplessness and a variety of other ills lead youngsters to experiment with drugs.

A Boca Raton, Fla., woman, Mrs. Cathy Lucas, wrote Pepper that her daughter "came home from school and said, very dramatically, 'Mommy, I need an aspirin—I had such a bad day at school today.'"

"Needless to say," Mrs. Lucas said, "I was startled by this announcement from my seven-year-old. She sounded just like one of the many commercials for 'instant' relief that are constantly on the television screen."

"There is little doubt in my mind as to why we are becoming such a drug-oriented society."

Mrs. Carol J. Wilson, a Madison, Wis., registered nurse, recounted a similar episode in a letter to Pepper.

"For the past six months, this type of advertising has been particularly troubling to me," she said. "My daughter, who is three years old, has begun to develop an attitude relating to the 'quick cure' effects of drug use."

"She began at two-and-a-half to ask, 'What is pain relief?' Now, she is beginning to be impressed by an ad for St. Joseph's aspirin which has a small child saying, 'Mommy, I feel bad'—and the mother solves her problem by giving her an aspirin."

Many letters to Pepper have come from nurses, doctors and teachers, who echo Mrs. Wilson's concern that drug commercials foster "a Pollyanna attitude" about pills.

## BLESSED ARE THE PEACEMAKERS

### HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently a former Member of the House, at the weekly prayer breakfast, said that perhaps the greatest of the Beatitudes is the one proclaiming, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God." He said:

What could possibly be greater than being, in the words of a beautiful song, "a child of the King"?

He distinguished peacemakers from peacetalkers or peacemongers and pointed out that the issue never seems to be one of war or peace but war or injustice, war or subjugation, war or surrender, war or slavery.

In this connection, the words of Rev. W. Graham Smith, the pastor of Fairlington Presbyterian Church, seem to have a special significance which I wanted to share with this body:

ALEXANDRIA, VA.

January 28, 1973.

REMARKS MADE DURING THE SERVICE OF THANKSGIVING, BY REV. W. GRAHAM SMITH

My friends, this is a great and memorable day for our country. I'm sure it is a satis-

fying day for President Nixon and his colleagues who have worked with him so diligently throughout his administration.

And yet how sad it is to note that as he made his way to his inauguration, at the corner of Fifteenth St. and Pennsylvania Avenue, objects were hurled at him by an unthinking and defiant rabble; and that along the course of the procession flags of our country were burned.

This makes me angry. I am not like many of you. I was not born an American citizen. I lived for eleven years in this country before I applied for citizenship, and when that citizenship was graciously granted to me, I vowed in my heart that I would always be proud to be an American; that I would always honor my President and my country as I had sought to honor my Queen in days gone by. And to me it is utterly distasteful that these mistaken, misguided people in our midst, these political radicals should perform so disgracefully as they have done in these past years. I believe in the right of public protest—this is one of the many American freedoms we enjoy—but I also believe that the radicals of the so-called "Peace movement", by their vicious opposition to the administration's prosecution of the war, have been the element in our nation more than any others who have hindered the advent of peace because they, by their very actions, have given comfort and encouragement to our enemies. And I hope and pray that as our Presidents Johnson and Nixon have held firm to a courageous and often unpopular course, that the nation will realize more and more what it must mean to be in a position of responsibility such as the Presidency demands in our day.

President Johnson, after his retirement, gave President Nixon his definition of the job of Chief Executive. Rather indelicately but most eloquently he said, "Being President of the United States is like being a jackass in a hallstom; you've just got to stand there and take it!" Now I think our President has taken far too much already. And I think it is high time that those of us who believe in our country, who love our country, who honor "the powers that be" whom God has placed in authority over us, should stand up and allow ourselves to be counted and should cause our voices to be heard above the dissident cacophony of the radical minority. Let us thank and praise God for the fortitude of our leaders in times of great stress when they must often have been tempted to capitulate to what seemed to be popular opinion. We are profoundly grateful that they stood firm to their high resolve.

It is my earnest prayer that you will constantly uphold the President and his colleagues by your prayers and practical support and encouragement. Let us pray for a continuing and permanent peace in South East Asia, and for the establishment of peace in those other areas of the world where hostilities still prevail, that God in His mercy may grant a just and enduring peace to all mankind.

Let us praise the Name of God as did our noble forebears in this country, and let us live in the days to come as those who are proud to live in a good land like the United States of America.

I am proud to be an American—and I hope you are too.

Almighty God, Ruler of Thy vast universe; Who hast brought all things into being by the word of Thy power, and Who dost govern all things according to Thy gracious providence; we, a grateful nation, thank Thee this day for the cease-fire which has been effected in Vietnam, and we praise Thy holy name that after a decade of deadly conflict, we have now reached, in Thy mercy, the time when man shall not lift up his hand against his brother man, and peace, we believe with honor, is established.



O God, we give Thee thanks for our President and his counsellors and envoys who, through the years, in face of bitter and often unjust criticism and opposition, have held to a determined and courageous course, and have sought, by Thy help, to honor a pledge made to a small and defenseless nation faced with the impending onslaught of a cruel foe. May Thine abundant blessing be upon the President and upon all who, under him, have toiled and sacrificed that we might enjoy, under Thy providence, a just and honorable peace.

We remember today all who have suffered because of this war. We pray for the people of Vietnam, the families that have lost loved ones, the homes that have been demolished, the refugees who abound in such numbers in that pathetic little country. We know, O God, that with Thy Spirit leading us, we will do all within our power to help them now that the war is over, for that is what American people love to do. We pray that we may bring to them spiritual strength and an abundance of material aid in their time of dire need.

We pray for our prisoners of war who will soon be returning home, many of whom bear physical and emotional scars which it may take years to erase. Grant, O God, that they may realize when they come home that a grateful nation knows their efforts were not unavailing. We honor them for what they did, and for their courage amidst imprisonment. Grant that they may be assimilated into the life they once knew, and that in their homes and wherever they go they may receive love and encouragement and good cheer.

Heavenly Father, we pray especially today for the homes of those missing in action who will not come home. Thou knowest, O Lord, how many homes there are in our land where agony will well up afresh as word is received that a loved one does not answer the roll call. What a blow this will be to loving hearts and how much strength and comfort these dear relatives will need in their time of awful trial. Bestow upon them Thy blessing in abundant measure.

We pray for all our military forces as they return home. Help them to know that the great bulk of the nation honors them for what they have done, and may suitable employment be provided for them all.

We remember with pride the thousands who laid down their lives in this conflict. We believe that their sacrifice has not been in vain. Comfort continually the loved ones who mourn their passing, and may they derive great comfort from the knowledge that the brave ones who gave their lives did so for a great cause.

We pray for the family of President Johnson in their bereavement. We think wistfully of this great-hearted servant of Thine who passed away one day before the announcement of a cease-fire was made to a thankful nation. Like Moses, President Johnson stood and looked upon the Promised Land which he himself was not permitted to enter. We thank Thee for his patriotic and courageous labors.

May the peace which has come be a lasting peace, O God. May the forces of evil be restrained and put into confusion. And may there be no blood bath which would again wreak havoc upon an already ravaged people.

Grant that we may be humble before Thee, O God, in the consciousness of our own shortcomings, for we have many. Remove from our hearts the sins that create strife, and enable our nation to be an example to the nations of the world of what a nation "under God" can be and can accomplish. Grant us Thy grace in abundant measure for the living of these days, and let the years to come be the most blessed and the most productive of God that our beloved land has ever experienced. May we all

take our place as men and women of God, to do Thy will as we understand it, to the glory of Thy great and holy name, through Jesus Christ our Lord.  
Amen.

#### AIR TRAVEL SAFETY

### HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, John Leyden, president of the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Association—PATCO—has just commented upon the three most recent major air crashes. As the president of an organization consisting of 16,000 air traffic controllers of the United States, John Leyden's comments are of particular interest to us in the Government who have a responsibility for the safety of the citizens who travel in the air.

Sometimes it takes shock waves to motivate action and perhaps John Leyden's forceful remarks will provide such impetus.

Mr. Leyden's remarks are herewith published in an effort to alert my colleagues and the general public to an extremely hazardous situation:

#### REMARKS BY JOHN LEYDEN

The 154 people killed in three recent major air crashes may be only the beginning of a bloodbath in the skies, unless the government improves its safety operations, according to John Leyden, President of the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization (PATCO). Leyden, who represents 16,000 air traffic controllers of the United States, said, "As things stand, similar or worse air accidents can occur. The principal reason is that the staffs of air control facilities—which carry the lives of every air passenger in their hands—have become dangerously, if not criminally, shorthanded.

"Once before," Leyden continued, "we were forced to alert the public to the unsafe conditions under which many aircraft operated in the air traffic control system. Recently, public attention has been alerted by three air accidents involving scheduled airliners: the crash of a United Airlines 737 at Midway Airport, Chicago killing 43 aboard and two on the ground; the collision at Chicago O'Hare Airport between a North Central Airlines DC-9 and a Delta Airlines 880, leaving 10 passengers dead; and the first crash of a superjet—a Lockheed L-1011 outside of Miami International for a death toll of 99.

"Three years ago President Nixon," Leyden continued, "responded to our pleas for help and per his request, Congress authorized the hiring of over 1,000 air traffic controllers to temporarily relieve the air traffic control system and make it safe.

"Now, however, the staffing of many of the major terminal facilities, which have the responsibility for protecting the lives of airline passengers, has reached a dangerous low. Chicago O'Hare, the nation's and the world's busiest airport, is just one example of the controller shortage. It has less than 50 percent of the essential complement necessary to safely handle the highest volume of traffic in the world. Although the government has been alerted to these facts, they have to date been hidden from the public because of the recent stress on economy and the hiring freeze which has been imposed on all federal employees, which unfortunately includes controllers. It appears as though

there is more stress on saving dollars than human lives."

Leyden also said, "the level of air safety was decreased by lack of implementation of a newly passed Bill which encouraged retirement of air traffic controllers. This legislation gave controllers the option to move on to other occupations when they no longer felt capable or competent to handle live aircraft. The increase in air traffic in the last six months only further points out the lack of sufficiently trained air traffic personnel to cope with further increases in the future. There has not been one new air traffic controller hired in the last seven months. The situation is so desperate," Leyden said, "that I have taken the issue to President Nixon himself in the hope that he might intervene now to prevent further air calamities which might result from these shortages. Our problem at present lies at the office of the Manpower and Budget. This group is playing Russian Roulette with the lives of air passengers in the interest of saving dollars. They must be put on notice now that the aviation industry is not willing to allow them to blindly pursue a deadly course which is the obvious result of their shortsighted tactics. The Federal Aviation Administration/Department of Transportation cannot hire new controllers nor can it openly criticize OMB for its shortsightedness. They must follow explicitly Manpower directives which cover all categories of federal employees. It is my fervent hope that a directive from the President will rectify this situation."

#### THE MYTH OF THE IDEAL MINORITY

### HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, America has accepted what one writer has called, the myth of the ideal minority. That is, Americans are convinced that the Asian minority of this country has none of the problems which beset, for example, the black or Chicano communities. We have accepted the myth, Mr. Speaker, that the industrious, well-adjusted Asian population in America has been successfully assimilated into the mainstream of American life, and is thus immune to the racial discrimination, the economic inequities which beset other minority groups in America.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the myth of the ideal minority represents a dangerous misconception on the part of the American people and their representatives at all levels of Government. Americans must be willing to recognize the realities of life in this country for thousands of Asian-Americans who are confronted with precisely the sort of situations which impose such hardships upon blacks and Chicanos.

Employment statistics for San Francisco, Calif., reveal the extent of job discrimination as it affects America's Asian minority. Asians comprise 8 percent of the population in this city, Mr. Speaker, yet they hold a tiny fraction of municipal jobs and fill only 4.3 percent of the jobs in San Francisco's city government. In Oakland, Calif., the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights revealed that there was not a single Asian-American occupying

a managerial level position in that city's government. In San Francisco, less than 0.5 percent of those holding management jobs in the municipal government were Asians. In light of such statistics, Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder that the U.S. Civil Service Report of 1969 concluded, "Oriental Americans have not obtained full access to managerial positions."

The fact that many Asian Americans are unable to obtain the education and technical training necessary to secure employment is unquestionably a factor in the above statistics and is, itself, a statistical disproving the myth. However, Mr. Speaker, even when members of America's Asian community succeed in securing sophisticated technical or professional training, overt racial discrimination often times prevents these Asian Americans from getting jobs commensurate with their abilities and training. In Los Angeles, where the Filipino population has increased from 20,000 in 1965 to some 50,000 at present, the New York Times points out the following:

Today a majority of the Filipino immigrants are doctors, lawyers, engineers, teachers, nurses and other professionally trained persons.

Yet the life that most of them accept here is one that most native Americans would shun.

Lawyers work as clerks, teachers as secretaries, dentists as aids, engineers as mechanics, and in some instances as common laborers.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the creation of a Cabinet Committee on Asian American Affairs would make a significant contribution toward solving the serious problems which are currently keeping Asians from realizing their full potential. The Cabinet Committee on Asian American Affairs which I am proposing would focus national attention on the plight of this sorely neglected minority group, as well as providing a means of conducting studies and establishing programs which will enable Americans to meet the needs of her Asian community in a variety of areas.

I might add at this point, Mr. Speaker, that one of my major areas of concern in calling for the creation of this committee lies in the development of relevant educational programs for Asian Americans of all ages. The critical need for such programs, which would place particular emphasis on language training, is best demonstrated by the fact that there are some 650,000 Asians in America today who were either born in Asia or whose parents were born in Asia. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this fact alone is indicative of the Asian communities' strong need for a Cabinet committee responsible not only for safeguarding their fundamental rights, but further, for implementing the types of programs which this long ignored minority so badly needs.

#### WHEAT CENTENNIAL RESOLUTION

**HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I am joining with my fellow Kansan, KEITH

SEBELIUS, in introducing legislation to provide for a 1974 centennial celebration in Kansas to commemorate the introduction of Hard Red Winter wheat into the United States.

In the early 1870's, a contingent of German-Russian Mennonites emigrated from southern Russia to five counties in central Kansas: Harvey, McPherson, Marion, Reno, and Sedgwick, all of which are in the Fourth Congressional District I represent. Seeking to escape religious persecution, the immigrants were encouraged to come to Kansas by the Santa Fe Railroad, which paid for all transportation costs.

With them, they brought work habits and dedication which had enabled them to prosper in the Crimea. Equally important, they brought seed stock of Turkey Hard Red Winter wheat. Their immediate success with this seed on the Kansas prairie led to its rapid adoption by neighboring farmers.

The resulting harvests made our country the "Breadbasket of the World." During years of large surpluses, this accomplishment is taken for granted, or even cursed. Its importance is more evident in times of world shortages such as we have witnessed this year. The introduction of this hardy crop has enabled Kansans to justly claim, that if necessary, they can feed the world.

Congressman SEBELIUS and I, along with several colleagues, first introduced this resolution in 1971. The response from my constituents in the five counties has been very encouraging. They are well aware of the economic significance of this crop at the local, national, and international levels. A major key to our Kansas economy is still the wheat crop.

Citizens of several towns in my district have started local efforts to hold special observances of this centennial. Congressional passage of this resolution will encourage these and similar celebrations throughout our State and the Great Plains area.

It is also our intention to ask the Postmaster General to issue an appropriate commemorative stamp for this occasion. In designing the stamp, consultation with wheat growers, flour millers, and bakers in our State will be initiated.

The centennial year is drawing near, and I urge prompt and favorable action on this resolution by the House Judiciary Committee.

#### IMPOUNDMENT OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUNDS

**HON. RICHARD G. SHOUP**

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, OMB serves to assert the will of the Executive over congressional appropriations. I do not quarrel with our basic system of checks and balances that has served us so well over the years. I do quarrel, however, with the impoundment by OMB of moneys that have been collected as user taxes.

I am speaking specifically of highway trust moneys, collected from highway

users for the purpose of improving our highways. These are not appropriations and should not be considered as such. This is a rare governmental pay-as-you-go program.

Highway users continue to pay taxes as OMB impounds their funds. The taxpayer is being taken and I offer a simple and effective answer. This legislation will cancel Federal taxes on gasoline at such times as all or any part of the highway trust moneys are being impounded by OMB.

Mr. Speaker, I include the bill in its entirety at this point in the RECORD:

H.R. 3573

A bill to provide that the imposition of taxes the proceeds of which are appropriated to the Highway Trust Fund shall be suspended during any period when amounts in the fund are impounded or otherwise withheld from expenditure

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) except as provided by subsection (b), if—

(1) any part of the sums authorized to be appropriated for expenditure for Federal-aid highways are not fully apportioned as required by title 23 of the United States Code, or

(2) any part of the sums available in the Highway Trust Fund to defray expenditures required to be made from such fund are impounded or withheld from obligation, then the taxes referred to in section 209(c) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (23 U.S.C. 120 note, relating to transfer to trust fund of amounts equivalent to certain taxes) shall not be imposed during any period of failure to fully apportion such sums and during any period when such sums are impounded or withheld from obligation.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to such specific sums as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, are necessary to be withheld from obligation for specific periods of time to assure that sufficient amounts will be available in the Highway Trust Fund to defray the expenditures which will be required to be made from such fund.

#### VIETNAM CEASE-FIRE: AFTER-THOUGHT

**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans continue to ponder our cease-fire and withdrawal policy in South Vietnam which we have adopted without having ended the conflict or fulfilled our mission in Southeast Asia.

The confusion may well result from the public's lack of being informed as to our role in Indochina and which Communist aggressor our leaders were committed to halt.

The significance of the President's trips to Peking and Moscow and our new cooperation with Red China and the Soviets, the cease-fire may be better understood by my remarks from 1971, "United States-Soviet Policy in Southeast Asia." I insert them in the RECORD at this point, along with other relevant material:



[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 10, 1971]

# U.S.-SOVIET POLICY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, our policy in Southeast Asia has been based on containing Red Chinese expansionism. The doctrine of containment has been advanced time and time again by policy-makers in the Johnson administration, by international affairs analysts, by members of the intellectual community, and by Richard Nixon himself in justifying U.S. military presence in Southeast Asia.

Dean Rusk, who was Secretary of State under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, in reviewing U.S. foreign policy in 1966 stated: "We must remain firm in our determination to help those allied nations which seek our help to resist the direct and indirect use of threat of force against their territory by Peiping."

The seriousness of our determination to stand firm and oppose Red China's expansion efforts was brought to light in testimony by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 3, 1966 in which he hinted that war with Red China was possible:

"Given this history of militant aggressive actions by Communist China, it would be irresponsible for me to say that we run no risk of war with China arising from our efforts to defend South Vietnam from aggression."

Again in July of 1966, McNamara said:

"China is building more military power than she needs to protect herself against their neighbors—there is at least the presumption, if not the certainty, that she may use that military power to try to advance beyond her borders, probing and taking advantage of weakness on her periphery . . . and therefore, . . . I think it is important that the weak nations of the periphery of Red China be assisted to grow economically, to grow politically and to receive military assistance when required to throw back potential aggression from Red China."

McNamara held to his view that Red Chinese supported aggression dictated U.S. military presence in South Vietnam. On January 22, 1966, at the height of the war in Vietnam, McNamara in a prepared statement before the Senate Armed Services Committee stated:

"We can assume that Red China will continue to support North Vietnam's aggression against South Vietnam and Laos as well as the present low keyed but continuing insurrections against Thailand and Burma . . . In its dealings with the Peking regime, the United States will be concerned to stress the common interest we share in avoiding war, . . . while we continue to try to deter direct or indirect Chinese aggressions against her neighbors."

Walt Whitman Rostow, a National Security Advisor to both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, has defended U.S. involvement in Vietnam inasmuch as it prevented Communist China from dominating Asia.

This same position was taken by Johnson's Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, Eugene Rostow, in an interview with William Whitworth of the New Yorker magazine which appeared in the New Yorker of July 4, 1970 in a lengthy article entitled "A Reporter at Large, Some Questions About the War."

The containment doctrine has also been expounded by Mr. Nixon. In a speech to the Executive Club of New York on January 26, 1965 wherein he called for stepped-up military activities by the United States in Vietnam, Nixon stated:

"It is dangerous and foolhardy to try to gloss over the truth as to what the war in Vietnam really involves:

"First, the war in Vietnam is not about Vietnam but about Southeast Asia."

"Second, the confrontation in Vietnam is, in the final analysis, not between the Vietnamese and the Viet Cong nor between the United States and the Viet Cong, but between the United States and communist China. If communist China were not investigating and supporting the Viet Cong, there would be no war in Vietnam today. (Italic for emphasis)"

"Third, a U.S. defeat in Vietnam means a Chinese communist victory which could decide the fate of Asia for generations to come."

William P. Bundy, presently visiting professor, Center of International Studies, MIT; former Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, 1964-69 and Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, 1963-64, wrote in Foreign Affairs for January 1971:

"The picture [in Southeast Asia] is wholly different from what it was in the spring and summer of 1965, when the culminating series of major American decisions in Vietnam was taken."

"Then, the great power forces within the area were seen in starkly bipolar terms: the 'East Wind' of China was blowing strongly and thrustingly versus a 'West Wind' which was pretty much American alone. . . . Then, if ever, a Hanoi takeover of South Vietnam seemed likely, in conjunction with other trends, to make probable not only North Vietnamese domination in the Indochina area but a wave of Chinese expansion into the rest of Southeast Asia."

"The United States, with these wider stakes much in mind, decided, with the support of others, to stand in defense of South Vietnam."

In an article appearing in the October 1967 issue of Foreign Affairs entitled "Asia After Viet Nam" Nixon, justifying U.S. involvement in Vietnam, said:

"The U.S. presence has provided . . . a shield behind which the anti-communist forces found the courage and the capacity to stage their counter-coup and, at the final moment, to rescue their country from the Chinese orbit."

Another member of the Johnson cabinet, John Gardner, warned in an interview published in the Christian Science Monitor of June 8, 1970 that:

"The withdrawal of American commitment from Southeast Asia would change the terms of the debate going forward within mainland China. Powerful forces are at work there to move post-Mao China toward a long delayed concentration of its energies and talents on the modernization of its life. American withdrawal would, in my view, inevitably lead Peking to exploit its new opportunities to the south."

One of France's top economists and political scientists, Prof. Raymond Aron, has maintained that the United States involved itself in Vietnam under the containment doctrine. In an interview with U.S. News & World Report in 1969, Aron stated that:

"The U.S. intervened in South Vietnam—rightly or wrongly—in the name of a policy of containment, which was perhaps meaningless but it was the official policy. It was not done in order to establish any sovereignty in South Vietnam."

If containment of Communist China is our present policy vis-a-vis Southeast Asia, the question naturally arises: "How is military victory over North Vietnam—a policy which three administrations have refused to pursue—incompatible with our overall policy of containing Chinese communist expansion?"

A review of other statements by persons who make or influence U.S. foreign policy might be helpful in providing some of the answer.

Henry Kissinger, who formulates foreign policy for Nixon, and is the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs, discussed the Soviet's stake in Vietnam:

"The same is true of the Soviet Union, whose large-scale aid to Hanoi makes it a semi-participant in the war. Moscow must be torn by contradictory inclinations. A complete victory for Hanoi would tend to benefit Peking in the struggle for influence among the communist parties of the world; it would support the Chinese argument that intransigence toward the United States is, if not without risk, at least relatively manageable. But a defeat of Hanoi would demonstrate Soviet inability to protect 'fraternal' communist countries against the United States. It would also weaken a potential barrier to Chinese influence in Southeast Asia and enable Peking to turn its full fury on Moscow."

Kissinger apparently believes that the Soviets are caught in a dilemma in Vietnam whereby they stand to lose a great deal if Hanoi should either win or lose the war. They would wish neither.

Nixon said in 1964 that Russia and Red China were:

"Bitter enemies."

And that:

"Moscow does not want to see Peking grow strong and expand in Southeast Asia."

He also stated in 1965 that:

"The Soviet Union is not now interested in the Chinese gaining success in Asia, or any place else."

This same view of wanting to "contain" Red China as a policy of the Soviet Union has been expressed by others. Nationally syndicated columnist David Lawrence in an editorial wrote about Soviet intentions in Vietnam in this way:

"It is acknowledged that the Soviet Union has spent an average of a billion dollars a year on the Vietnam war. The objective has been to gain friends in Southeast Asia and also to prevent Red China from acquiring a dominant position on the continent by setting up its own puppet states."

Bundy has had this to say about the Soviet interests in Southeast Asia:

"As for the Soviet Union's own behavior, there has been a slowly emerging trend to treat Southeast Asia in the same manner as it deals with India and Pakistan and with the same basic fear of Chinese expansion as a major factor. In addition to their need for rubber, the Soviets have a natural interest in the free movement of their commercial shipping through the southern seas, and as time goes on this interest is bound to be reflected in sound naval activity."

According to Bundy, the Soviet Union not only fears the political implications of Chinese expansion in Southeast Asia, it is also concerned that it might lose a potential source of raw materials and endanger its commercial trade in that area.

President Nixon has also recognized the Soviets' concern about Red China as related to the problem of Vietnam. When asked at a news conference on March 4, 1969, about whether he had been able to enlist the Soviet Union's help in getting out of Vietnam, a position he had taken during his candidacy for the Presidency, Nixon replied:

"As you know, the Soviet Union is in a very delicate and sensitive position as far as Vietnam is concerned. I do not divulge any confidence from the Soviet Ambassador in indicating that is the case . . . here you have Communist China aiding North Vietnam. You also have the Soviet Union aiding North Vietnam. Each is vying for power in the Communist world and, therefore what the Soviet Union does in the Vietnamese conflict is a very difficult decision for them as related to that objective—the objective of leadership in the Communist world."

Apparently our appreciation for the Soviet Union's difficult situation in Vietnam goes further than one would think at first glance. Eugene Rostow has provided us with an interesting insight into the thinking of

U.S. policymakers on the subject of Vietnam as related to Soviet objectives there:

"When I came into the State Department in 1966, Rusk asked me to try to think of alternatives in Vietnam, and I thought of the way the Korean war was unwound. And I told the Russians, with full backing from my bosses, that this was the best way to solve the Vietnam problem—the way the Korean problem was solved. Namely, by Russian-American collaboration. They said, 'That's very interesting, and it hasn't been rejected, but it's very difficult for us.' And I said, 'Yes, we understand, we're not trying to push you out of there and turn it over to the Chinese at all. Quite the contrary.' And they said, 'We never reject this approach.' But they didn't act on it, either . . . They are very much concerned about leadership of the world Communist movement, or movements, and their rivalry with China in that regard. They really seem to care quite a lot about that."

While Moscow is not anxious to accept the American presence in Asia, it is more afraid that Asia will be dominated by Red China.

"Although a united Vietnam under Communist leadership would seem to be theoretically desirable from the Soviet point of view, an ominous background presence of Red China would almost suggest in practice that a divided Vietnam may not [thwart] the long-range policy planners of the USSR."

"The Soviets share with the United States and local nations in Asia—including North Vietnam—an interest in preventing Red China's domination of the Asian mainland. This provides the main basis for Soviet-North Vietnamese relations in Southeast Asia vis-a-vis Red China. Although the Soviets are equally concerned with United States policy and actions in the area, their immediate concern is centered more on the short-run threat that the United States poses to the survival of a Communist state—North Vietnam—which the Soviets are committed to defend against her overthrow by the United States. The Soviets are concerned less that in the long run the United States will be able to dominate the Asian mainland than that Red China may . . . in this context . . . Soviet interests would be best served by a stalemate in Vietnam. . . ."

Although the Soviet Union dismisses it as propaganda, the Red Chinese talk of United States-Soviet collusion on Vietnam. In an interview with Simon Malley of the Washington Evening Star in 1967, Red Chinese Foreign Minister Chen Yi said that Khrushchev and Eisenhower had made a deal at their 1959 meetings at Camp David, Md., wherein he said:

"They agreed to work together to maintain a political status quo in the world. By the terms of the deal, the Soviet Union was committed to discourage wars of national liberation directed against governments friendly to the United States."

Premier Chou En-lai added further: "What the Russian revisionists aimed at was to develop further the recognition by the U.S.A. and Russia of areas of vital interest, which they divided between themselves."

One would be willing to agree with the Soviets that this is nothing but mainland China propaganda if it were not for the persistence with which the leaders in the United States adhere to our all-out no-win policy in Vietnam.

Three administrations have agreed that we should commit the lives of American men to the Asian continent to fight a war of attrition to contain communism, yet for some mysterious reason the question of military victory cannot even be considered. McNamara had said that:

"U.S. policy in Vietnam is bottomed upon a disavowal of any intention to destroy the Hanoi regime, to seize its territory."

And in the first official statement on Viet-

nam from the Nixon administration, Secretary of State William P. Rogers told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that:

"We are not seeking a military victory nor do we want military escalation in Vietnam."

Why not an end to the war by victory in Southeast Asia? It is certainly not because victory is not possible. Gen. William Westmoreland, Army Chief of Staff and former commander of U.S. Armed Forces in Southeast Asia said in 1969 that the United States could win a military victory in Vietnam:

"Absolutely, if it were the policy of this country to seek one, and if we were given the resources."

The late Senator Richard B. Russell who was privy to much inside information on Vietnam as chairman of the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees and as a close personal friend of President Johnson, said in 1969 that:

"We could've brought the war to a conclusion in three months, up to two years ago." Criticizing Johnson for his handling of the war, Russell said in January of 1970:

"My complaint with him [Johnson] was not for sending others in, but because we didn't go on and win the day by closing up the ports of North Vietnam. He let the timid souls in the State Department talk him out of that. He could have ended that war in six months any time."

Even Kissinger admits that victory is now possible but he is apparently concerned, for some undetermined reason, that the South Vietnamese might carry the war to the north in an attempt to achieve that objective. Peregrine Worsthorne, a political columnist for the London Sunday Telegraph, who interviewed both Nixon and Kissinger on the subject of Vietnam, had this to say about Kissinger's views on Vietnam:

"Henry Kissinger is engagingly frank on this point. He admits that on first coming into the White House his assumption was that the Nixon policy of combining American withdrawal with rapid Vietnamization was in effect little more than a face-saving formula. The Vietnamization program was seen as a bluff designed to build up a slightly more favorable negotiating position from which to reach a settlement that would in effect be a North Vietnamese victory, only delayed long enough to save America's face. The last two years, however, have drastically altered his judgment. Vietnamization has succeeded beyond his wildest expectation."

" . . . Kissinger believes it to be the task of the realist today to prick the defeatist bubble. He is no longer worried by the possibility of the North Vietnamese pulling off some catastrophic surprise. Much more dangerous and possible in the long run, in his view, is the possibility of the South Vietnamese doing something untoward. One almost got the impression from Kissinger that he is more worried today that the South Vietnamese will invade the North than vice versa."

Since victory over the enemy in Southeast Asia is possible, why will not this administration, as the two that passed before, allow it? A victory now, over communism, would do more to benefit the United States and the rest of the free world, particularly the free Asian world, than any other present course of action. It would bind up the internal wounds of divisiveness here in the United States caused by our present no-win policy; it would give hope to those millions of people now enslaved under Communist regimes elsewhere; and it would show those millions of people in the free world, some of whom face the threat of communism daily that Communist totalitarianism is a thing of the past. What could be more in the American interest than ending the war through victory?

Could it be, as has been suggested by Nixon, Kissinger, Rostow and others, that our overriding consideration in Vietnam is

the present Soviet policy there? Or is it that the United States does in fact share with the Soviet Union a common economic interest in that area? But, even so, it is only the Soviet Union who benefits by the continued stalemate. In the short run it keeps Asia out of the hands of the Soviet's Communist enemy, Red China, and in the long run weakens internally by divisiveness among its people caused by a no win policy its only real barrier to world domination, the United States, who is also forced to furnish the arms, money, and support troops with which to fight the war.

If our involvement in Indochina is to help keep this area out of the hands of the Chinese Communists for later exploitation by the Russian Communists, or if U.S. policy is tailored so as not to embarrass the Soviet Union, we should withdraw our forces from Vietnam forthwith.

Kissinger said in a background briefing on U.S. foreign policy at San Clemente, Calif., June 26, 1970, that:

"It is very hard to see what we could do in Southeast Asia that would produce a direct confrontation with the Soviet Union."

If what Kissinger says is true, either the Soviet Union is not as interested in Southeast Asia as has been noted, or the Soviets have been assured in advance that what we do in Vietnam will not be damaging to them.

[From an interview of South Vietnamese President Thieu by Oriana Fallaci as reported in The New Republic, January 20, 1973]

We read as follows:

Q. I wonder what Dr. Kissinger answered or, at least, what he thought.

A. Mademoiselle . . . his strategic conception of the world is very smart: a Southeast Asia controlled by the Russians, or an Indochina controlled by the Russians, in order to control and contain China. Russians are less dangerous than the Chinese, so it's necessary to ask the Russians to contain the Chinese and to pose Indochina as a threat to the south of China . . . *Très bon, très bon!* Very good! It's like a general who observes the map and marks the map here and there with his pen. But the poor captain who leads his men through rivers and woods, and goes up the hills, comes down the hills, shoots and is shot . . . no, for him it's no good. A little Vietnamese doesn't play with a strategic map of the world. He has no group-interest on this planet. He has nothing to exchange, no Middle East to exchange with Vietnam, no Germany to exchange with Japan; he has nothing but life and death for 17 million inhabitants! And his danger is to fall under the sway of Hanoi, or of Moscow and Peking, because it is the same thing. *Voilà le problème, Messieurs les Américains!* You look very far, too far. We cannot.

The distinguished British journalist, Henry Brandon, has written a provocative book on contemporary U.S. foreign policy, "Retreat of American Power." It has not as yet been published but an excerpt from it was printed in last Sunday's New York Times Magazine, entitled "Mr. Nixon's Way With the Russians."

An interesting passage interprets American action in Vietnam:

"Dean Rusk, L.B.J.'s Secretary of State, was dovish toward Moscow, but felt hawkish toward the Government in Peking; he favored a policy of containing China in collusion with the Soviet Union. Nixon rejected this approach because he thought it would be interpreted in Asia as a racist-influenced policy, and from the start prepared for an evenhanded policy, though one based on a belief that the Russians were the more dangerous because they were more likely to take military risks. Nevertheless, his Vietnamese policy decisions risked Russian defiance."



## THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

## HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, various newspaper articles have questioned the success of the U.S. Postal Service since its inception over a year ago. We are all aware of the scope of this organization's undertaking; the current National Association of Manufacturers report offers encouraging evidence that the Postal Service will succeed.

Postmaster General Klassen discusses in detail the service standards which have been established and the programs which will enable the Postal Service to meet them. Of special interest is the new national bulk mail system which will improve service provided packages, magazines, books, catalogs, and advertising material.

Postmaster General Klassen points out that while progress is being made, really substantial, noticeable improvement may take more time. But the Postal Service commitment seems to be genuine, and their efforts should prove successful.

I have included the Postmaster General's article for the information of my colleagues. The article follows:

## POSTAL SERVICE MEANS BUSINESS

(By E. T. Klassen)

Since July 1, 1971, when the old Post Office Department became the independent U.S. Postal Service, we have pursued two major goals: to improve the quality and reliability of mail services, and to reduce costs.

If our first annual report has a businesslike look, it is because we mean business. In tackling problems that were decades in the making, we have taken a businesslike approach to the awesome task of delivering more than 87 billion pieces of mail a year.

Our first goal was service improvement. While our service performance is still uneven—our tests indicate the mail service overall continues to improve.

Most of the mail is first-class—49 billion pieces out of the 87 billion delivered last year. Ninety-four percent of the first-class mail deposited by 5 p.m. and destined for local delivery is being delivered the next day. In smaller communities, the percentage is usually even higher.

We believe that another indicator of improved service was a reduction in the time for delivery. Without regard to the time of day when the letter was deposited or to the distance sent, the average time for delivering each of the 49 billion first-class letters decreased from 1.7 to 1.6 days.

In the important parcel post category, the average time for delivery decreased from 4.9 days during the final quarter of 1971 to 4.3 days in the final quarter of this year.

Postal management is directing priority attention to improving the consistency of postal service. Service standards, first introduced for airmail, were extended last year to first-class mail. Additional service standards, covering all other mail categories, were being tested as the fiscal year ended.

What does this mean to American business which, as our largest customer, generates about 80 percent of all mail handled?

We trust it means more business for us and better and more dependable service for the business sector at reasonable prices.

It was American business, perhaps better than any other group, that understood the

urgent need for postal reform of the old system.

What does our balance sheet look like after a full year's operation? In fiscal year 1972, postal revenues, fees and income provided 84 percent of our total costs. This is an increase from an average 80 percent for the three-year period 1969-71.

It meant that the Postal Service—in its first full year of reorganization—required \$1.3 billion in a direct congressional appropriation, down 34.8 percent from a high of \$2.08 billion in 1971.

Our revenues totaled \$7.8 billion, up 18.3 percent from 1971 while operating expenses amounted to \$9.5 billion, up 6.3 percent.

We handled a record 87.2 billion pieces of mail last year, or 419 per capita, up from 87 billion pieces in 1971.

Like business, we have begun looking to new products. The success of several new postal products was demonstrated by the growing demand for Express Mail, a premium service for documents with a high time value.

There was also a demand for the Mailgram, a message which combines the speed of electronic communications with the Postal Service's unrivaled delivery network.

Perhaps most importantly, we are now treating mail users as customers and through a series of actions are working to be more responsive to their needs. An intensive effort to improve existing postal facilities so as to better serve customers and provide a modern working environment for postal employees is under way.

This year, the Board of Governors authorized implementation of the National Bulk Mail System, providing 21 major centers and 12 satellite facilities to form a nationwide system for handling packages, magazines, catalogs, books and advertising mail.

When completed, the \$950 million investment in plant and machinery is expected to provide an excellent financial return, with significant improvements in the consistency of service.

Each of these strategically located centers will process bulk mail for post offices and stations within a radius of from 100 to 200 miles. Construction will follow techniques similar to those employed in private industry, using several standard light industrial building designs and commercially available equipment.

Completion of the first bulk mail center—for New York City—is expected in fiscal year 1974. The operation of the Bulk Mail Center processing plant is based on the utilization of new equipment concepts designed to keep the mail continuously on the move from arrival to departure.

Our second goal was cost reduction. Strong measures have been taken to reduce operating costs. On March 29, 1972, restrictions were placed on the hiring of additional employees. The effect of these restrictions was significant, since 85 percent of the Postal Service's costs are for labor.

In a four-month period, the employment level was reduced through attrition by more than 33,000 persons.

The commitment by postal managers, especially in the field, to hold costs in line enabled us to announce in the summer of 1972 that the Postal Service would avoid the previously budgeted \$450 million postage rate increase scheduled for January 1973.

We achieved a significant 2.4 percent productivity gain in the fiscal year ended June 30. This productivity figure contrasts sharply with gains averaging less than one percent annually through most of the 1960s.

In part, this reflected increased mechanization in mail processing. A larger share of the productivity gain, however, must be attributed to our managers in the field. This year, they had the authority to make more effective use of manpower and other resources.

New systems for handling the mail also helped boost the output. The bulk mail centers for processing parcels are an example. Another is Area Mail Processing, perhaps the most important system developed in recent years for increasing productivity.

In the smaller cities and villages, letters with non-local addresses are dispatched, without sorting, directly to a central area mail processing office. These centers have the mail volume and mechanization to distribute the mail efficiently to other offices within the area as well as to more distant destinations.

Typically, a center can serve customers and post offices within a radius of from 60 to 90 miles, depending upon highway conditions and population densities.

During fiscal year 1972, the number of area mail processing programs climbed from 91 to more than 200. Within the coming six months, we expect to nearly complete implementation of this program by adding more than 100 areas.

The "massing" of mail at area centers and larger cities has increased the percentage of mail processed with modern equipment. For example, the percentage of letters handled mechanically by letter sorting machines is estimated to have reached 35 percent of the 55 billion letters delivered annually.

The key to mechanized letter processing is the 12-position letter sorting machine. Its effectiveness was strengthened with the installation of a computerized system for "translating" the ZIP code in the address. This eliminates the need for "scheme" knowledge on the part of the postal clerk and makes it possible for postal managers to quickly change distribution patterns to meet transportation schedules and mail processing needs at the destination cities.

More than ever, the ZIP code is the key to moving the mails promptly.

Despite the productivity gains achieved last year and those projected for fiscal year 1973, postage wage costs are rising significantly. In addition to wage increases amounting to 10 percent for rank and file postal employees in fiscal year 1972, we are committed in fiscal year 1973 to an additional annualized salary increase of 8 percent for these employees. The average postal employee today makes more than \$12,000 annually in salary and benefits.

In the fiscal year ended June 30, 1972, we also embarked on programs that will make the Postal Service more competitive in the decades ahead.

In addition to the bulk mail facilities program, transportation services have been strengthened. The surface transportation network now has express trucks and special mail trains geared specifically to our mail processing requirements.

We are moving time-value publications, perishables and other preferential surface mail between Atlanta and Los Angeles, for example, in 52 hours instead of the 100 hours required for "piggy-back" rail shipments. At the close of the year there were 72 primary truck and rail routes in the national network.

Airmail service was also improved with the expansion of the air taxi network. Private firms contract, typically, to provide air service between the medium-sized cities where the scheduled airlines are not offering service at suitable hours.

Still under development and testing is a preferential mail processing concept which could eliminate much of the manual processing of letter mail.

Inevitably, these changes will bring broader career opportunities and greater self-satisfaction for employees and local managers who are willing to be judged by actual accomplishments.

Our customers—the American people—will receive better, more consistent service at reasonable prices.

The process of turning around an organization as vast and geographically dispersed as the Postal Service will require time. Given the patience and understanding of our customers, our employees, the news media, and the Congress, I am confident that the Postal Service will become a productive and creative force in the coming decade.

#### TRIBUTE TO WITT STEPHENS

### HON. RAY THORNTON

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Speaker, we sometimes fail to note the truly important events in the lives of our neighbors and friends. To capture in a few words the spirit and depth of a great man is never easy. Although we note the events in his life which are best publicized, we sometimes overlook the ones which reflect his real worth—the events and accomplishments which reflect the intangible facets of his character.

It is unimportant that W. R. Stephens did not finish high school. But it has often been noted. My uncle's path from a farmhouse door in Grant County has led to a noteworthy career in business which has brought him great recognition.

We know of the responsibilities he assumed for the benefit of his employees, business associates and consumers. But some may have overlooked the responsibility he assumed for the welfare of a fourth group: the people who "need a boost just to get to a place where they can start making it on their own."

When he announced a program pledging his company's commitment to this fourth responsibility, he voiced his belief that all of us benefit when we help people who start out with less than their fair share.

As president and chairman of the board of the Arkansas-Louisiana Gas Co., he played a pioneering role in the development of the gas industry, for which he earned the American Gas Association's highest honor: the Distinguished Service Award.

But people in Arkansas appreciate the commitment he made—long before the "energy crisis" was recognized and labeled—to acquire and dedicate sufficient gas reserves to fulfill his pledge to the "biscuit cookers" in his five-State area.

Now, we are noting his retirement, in keeping with company policy, at the age of 65. But what lies ahead for him is more important to note. For his will be no ordinary retirement.

Already he has pledged to continue working for the economic development of our region and for a higher quality of life, better jobs, better training and better opportunities for the young, the unemployed and those who need help.

For example, Witt Stephens has announced that he intends to build a college in Grant County, Ark., aimed at providing vocational, technical and business training for young people.

This is something important, Mr.

Speaker, and it is something I want to help accomplish.

#### A UNIQUE ROLE

### HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, in his column which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, Columnist David Broder highlighted the new era into which this Nation is entering after the end of the Vietnam war and the beginning of President Nixon's second term.

In my mind, this is one of the most incisive and perceptive discussions of our situation I have read. I congratulate Mr. Broder of the clarity of his writing and the depth of his insight and I commend it to all my colleagues as a most useful exposition of the new debates and new era which we are facing.

The article follows:

#### A UNIQUE ROLE, A UNIQUE MAN

(By David S. Broder)

An era ended for Washington, for America and, quite possibly, for the world this past week. And Richard Nixon stands unchallenged in his opportunity to shape what comes next.

He is quite literally alone now—without a living predecessor in office, without a peer among those who share power in America's government or who hold power in other nations.

If you stood in the Capitol last Wednesday when Mr. Nixon laid a wreath at the bier of Lyndon B. Johnson, you sensed the solitude of his position even more poignantly than at the inaugural ceremonies five days earlier.

Seeing his head in profile, as he inclined it in prayer, you had to think to yourself—how much now depends on what is going on behind that forehead.

It is an extraordinary coincidence that has brought within the compass of these few days the inauguration of the President, the death of his predecessor, the end of the Vietnam fighting and—with tomorrow's budget message—the start of a radical redesign of the domestic policies of the past four decades.

Both ceremony and substance are telling us: One period has ended and now another begins.

What is ending is an era of international politics shaped by a constant threat of conflict with totalitarian powers. What is ending is an era of domestic politics formed by fierce struggle over the allocation of government benefits to rival claimant groups.

The chief byproduct of that era was the creation in Washington of a huge governmental structure, whose existence and activities were premised on the belief that the American government could decide, in specifics, how the world order and the domestic society should be arranged.

The old order was symbolized by the parade of foreign potentates and domestic leaders through the White House in the first days of Lyndon Johnson's presidency. They had come to pay honor to the slain President, but they also came—the kings and prime ministers, the governors, mayors and party chieftains, the union and business heads—as clients of the government Mr. Johnson had just begun to lead.

The hallmark of the Johnson presidency was the extension of the domestic policies of Franklin Roosevelt and the foreign policies of Harry Truman to their ultimate reach.

By the end of Mr. Johnson's tenure, there was very little—from the quality of a school system in Sonoma to the security of a village in the Mekong Delta—that was not regarded as the responsibility of the Washington government.

The new era, in a curious way, was probably symbolized by the absence of any such parade of personages through the White House either at Mr. Nixon's inaugural last week or at the Johnson services here this week. Mr. Nixon discourages such visits, as he discourages patron-client relationships between the government he heads and people with problems, at home or abroad.

He has not been notably successful in explaining his notion of what the new era is about. In Vietnam, his critics have accused him repeatedly of prolonging the war in order to save a particular government headed by President Thieu.

Many of these same critics have faulted Mr. Nixon for being too eager to sacrifice particular domestic programs—be they farm subsidies, housing subsidies, or aid to the poor.

The President's view is that he is being more consistent than his critics. His goal—the goal of the Nixon Doctrine in foreign policy and of New Federalism at home—is neither to save nor eliminate specific foreign governments or specific domestic programs dependent on Washington, but rather to end the relationship of dependency for both.

What is consistent about the Nixon view of the new era is its belief in the critical importance of the process of local self-determination. That is what Mr. Nixon said he was fighting to preserve in Vietnam and it is what he says he is striving to achieve in his proposals for decentralization of government at home. He deserves to be taken seriously—even by those who disagree.

In this capital, there are many who do disagree. They see both the Nixon Doctrine and the New Federalism as an abdication of responsibility, a retreat from the obligations America undertook for the world and for its own citizens in the past two generations.

That debate is as legitimate as it is important, but as it begins, one must marvel at the fact that fate has put Richard Nixon in a unique position of power at this particular juncture.

He is not the man one would have guessed would win a landslide election victory and he is not the President one would have guessed would shape a transition of historic dimensions. But we have underestimated the role history had in mind for him.

I once wrote that he "got to be President of the United States by being more durable than any of his political rivals—not by being brighter, more attractive, wittier or more eloquent."

As President, it is his doggedness more than anything else that has distinguished him.

But now we have arrived at what, one feels, is surely a genuine turning point in our national history, and the man who can lead us past this juncture is our old friend Richard Nixon. The campaign slogans have turned out to be true. Wonder of wonders, "now more than ever, Nixon's the one."

#### MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

### HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 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?

#### TAX CREDITS FOR NON-PUBLIC-SCHOOL STUDENTS

**HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to provide tax relief for the families of non-public-school students.

This past week in Cincinnati, Ohio, one of the major nonpublic schools, St. Xavier, announced that it was forced into again raising its tuition from \$600 to \$850. This represents a doubling of the school's fees in the past 3 years. In 1970, it stood at \$400.

The school's president, the Reverend Mark Schuler, S.J., cited the same problems that are plaguing all our schools. In a newspaper article he told of the school's enlarged faculty, additional courses, past salary raises and increased maintenance costs.

With these same problems affecting all education, today we find ourselves at a crossroads. Are we going to ignore non-public schools and let them disappear, or are we going to give them the support they need and deserve?

The Supreme Court will soon be considering tax credit proposals that have been approved by State legislatures. Courts in New York and Minnesota have upheld tax credit programs while the Ohio plan has been ruled unconstitutional. The issue will now be resolved by the highest court.

Let me for a moment turn to the legal question that is involved with this issue. There are those who desire an early demise to the non-public-school system and feel that any assistance is a major threat to the public school system and unconstitutional. This view greatly limits the role that nonpublic education should play in our society. As a lawyer, former judge, member of the House Judiciary Committee, but most important a parent, I do not share this opinion.

The court decisions in the field have laid two basic tests for aid to be constitutional: One, that the aid is secular in both purpose and effect; and two, a criteria that was made clear in the decisions of last fall, excessive entanglement.

The tax credit would be secular in that it would go directly to the parent, and be for the education of his child. The fact of the matter is that there is no such thing as Jewish algebra, or Lutheran chemistry, or Catholic economics. The basic skills that our children receive in school have nothing to do with sectarian beliefs.

There are those who would argue that the mere presence of religious objects in the school make the education sectarian. Yet if we were to take this argument to its logical conclusion, no Federal money could be given to the construction of a home or hospital that displays religious objects. The tax credit legislation does not establish a religion, but merely makes it possible for any citizen to freely exercise his free choice of belief.

The other criteria spelled out in the Lemon decision last fall is entanglement. The Pennsylvania statute that the court ruled unconstitutional provided for payment directly to the schools required the schools to maintain detailed accounting procedures that separated the cost of secular and religious expenses. The Rhode Island statute that the court ruled against provided for payments directly to the teachers and directed the State commissioner of education to require eligible schools to submit financial data which shows how much was for religious activity. Rhode Island further forbids teachers being paid under the act to teach religious courses.

The tax credit does not have these entanglements. The credit is given directly to the parent, and the only requirement for the school is that they maintain records as always for taxation purposes and that they meet the antidiscrimination laws of the land.

The President's Commission on School Finance, pointing to the fact that one in 10 school age youngsters attend non-public schools, recommended the enactment of constitutionally allowable aid to nonpublic schools.

If one looks at the policies of the nations in the free world, the overwhelming study of secular subjects in schools where children can also study religion and moral values.

Today in England, a substantial proportion of the schools remain private and are able to continue because of legislation which enables them to receive public financial support. In France under General De Gaulle the General Assembly passed legislation to give financial assistance to private schools. In Germany today, nearly 55 percent of West German students attend denominational schools. These and other countries in the free world permit tax dollars to go to nonpublic schools.

If no action is taken in the United States, there will be a monopoly in the educational field. Whenever there is a monopoly there is usually a lack of creativity, a lack of innovation, and a lack of excellence. We cannot allow this to happen in an area of education that is so important to the future of our Nation.

Tax credit bills that have been introduced in the Congress will not challenge or destroy the significance of public education. The economic benefit will improve both the public and nonpublic sectors. As we search for new methods of school financing, this type of legislation is necessary and appropriate. It is my hope that this committee will make the enactment of this legislation a high priority.

#### BUFFALO EXPERIENCING A RENAISSANCE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT IN MASS TRANSIT, OTHER REVITALIZATION

**HON. JACK F. KEMP**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the president of the Buffalo Area Chamber of Commerce and my good friend, Mr. Richard F. Torrey, pointed out on January 11, this year, in a speech before the 38th annual interclub luncheon in Buffalo that the people in our community are experiencing a renaissance of attitude and accomplishment.

While citing a long list of impressive achievements in the Buffalo area during the past year and plans for the future, Mr. Torrey most kindly referred to "definite strides" which will be made this year in the planning and design of the rapid rail transit system from downtown Buffalo to the new University of Buffalo campus in Amherst.

A part of that planned system, he said, has already been funded by the Federal and State governments.

In response to this recognition, I wish to praise, before my colleagues, the long and patient, bipartisan, cooperative efforts of local, county, State, and Federal officials which produced the first increment of Federal funding for our transit system.

More specifically, I want to thank Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller; Buffalo Mayor Frank Sedita; Erie County, N.Y., County Executive Edward Regan; Niagara Frontier Transportation Authority President William Miller; Lou Harriman, chairman of the Area Transportation Committee; Gordon Thompson, NFTA's urban transportation planner; Buffalo Deputy Mayor Stan Makowski, and Buffalo City Planner Dick Danforth who worked with Congressmen THADDEUS DULSKI and HENRY SMITH, the outgoing Urban Mass Transportation Administrator Carlos Villarreal and me to launch the planned transit link.

Mr. Speaker, it is also appropriate to note that yesterday, January 31, Mr. Frank Herringer was confirmed as the new Administrator of UMTA.

I am confident he will continue to promote the principles of a balanced transportation system as his predecessor, Mr. Villarreal did, and to produce the necessary results in this vital aspect of national growth.

At this point, I include Mr. Torrey's remarks, and the very impressive background of the new UMTA Administrator, Mr. Herringer:

#### MR. TORREY'S REMARKS

Twelve months ago, my predecessor, John Nasca, said to you from this platform . . . "of all our assets, we think the most outstanding one is our people." . . . and with those words he unveiled before you an advertising program with the theme "You are Buffalo."

No more appropriate audience could have been assembled to witness the introduction of that program.

For surely, you are Buffalo. You came here

today from the Boston Hills, from Clarence and Amherst, from the industry of Lackawanna, from West Seneca, Nottingham Road, Central Park, the Fruit Belt, the West Side or Cheektowaga.

Buffalo—as our friends of the *Courier Express* recently noted—is not a city confined to 100-year old boundaries. Buffalo is a way of life—and you are a big part of it.

And that leads me to the message which I hope to leave with you today, and it deals with Buffalo as a way of life.

The message is *Renaissance*—and that fits the Buffalo way of life today. The dictionary describes renaissance as a renewal of life, vigor, interest. It is rebirth, revival.

Buffalo today is caught up in a renaissance of attitude and accomplishment, of activity and ambition.

Buffalo has heeded the words of John Nasca who last year from this vantage point challenged this community to change—and changes have been made.

Startling they are not. Gradual they are—and they—these changes—are transforming Buffalo into a major league metropolis in every way.

Mind you, this Queen City of the Lakes will never be Utopia, or Shangri-La or Camelot. No city ever is. And we recognize that just as our ambitions and our accomplishments are assuming major league proportions, likewise so are the problems that beset us.

But we as Buffalolians will never stop trying to turn our weaknesses into strengths.

In many ways, the past year has tested your determination. It wasn't easy to radiate optimism and good will if you were laid off in the steel industry, or thrown out of work when plants closed such as the G. E. Semiconductor, Continental Can, Wood and Brooks, Sylvania or Curtis Wright. It mattered not that it wasn't Buffalo to blame but an illness in the national economy, changes in federal spending policies, foreign competition, changing technology or changing markets.

It was a combination of conditions such as these which led another Chamber of Commerce president to comment: "Recession? We didn't experience any recession here last year, but I will admit we had the worst boom in many, many years."

We had a bad boom in Buffalo in early '72. The simple and painful fact to the guy with the lunch pail was that we had to live in Buffalo with an average 8 percent unemployment for the year. Of course averages are dangerous as the statistician found out who drowned while fording a stream with an average depth of three feet. Nevertheless we have to deal with averages even though they don't emphasize that the unemployment rate headed downward at the end of the year. More about that later.

But elsewhere in our local picture, we scored glorious failures in a significant portion of our civic decision-making. Witness the months of continuing rancor over a stadium, the delays in the Exhibition Center and regional airport, costly labor-management and jurisdictional work stoppages, a notable standstill on arterial construction, leaving a large swath of fallow land through the heart of our city. With this on our minds, we taxpayers could hardly be buoyed up by learning toward the end of the year that perhaps our neighbor was earning a healthy stipend by not showing up for his municipal work assignment.

But through all this, to your credit, you—the leaders and the dedicated—took heart in the words of a Roman scholar: "Prosperity tries the fortunate, adversity the great."

And that greatness began to emerge again in '72. Already employment had turned the corner in July. With fits and starts it clawed its way up to a yearly high in the fall, gradu-

ally eroding the substantial unemployment rate, with every promise of continuing the climb during 1973. Granted, it would take a miracle to make up ground not gained during the past decade, but the pattern is encouraging.

By the end of this past year, that guy with the lunch pail in the shop, led perhaps by our large auto plants, had pushed his average work week back up to 41.8 hours, slightly less than in 1968, the best in recent years. And it's expected to go higher this year.

And that same guy with the lunch pail helped to propel the United Fund to its best year in history under the leadership of Bill Hassett.

Remember that renewal of life, of vigor and of interest which I noted earlier . . . that rebirth, revival.

Many building blocks began to shape that renaissance, particularly as the year wore on. With Ned Regan and others in local and state government spearheading the effort, tax relief was granted to Bethlehem Steel and promptly resulted in a commitment to a \$50 million bar mill on the shores of not-so-dead Lake Erie.

Financial transfusions through \$9 million in industrial revenue bonds contributed to the continuance or expansion of at least six manufacturing plants.

Our local economists point to the 10 percent increase in plant capacity during the past year, and note such bullish signs as the anticipated \$30 million in bonds which the Erie County Industrial Development Agency is expected to issue by summer for new and expanded industrial facilities.

In another area, the fine health-care facilities in Buffalo are getting better in leaps and bounds. During the past year we undertook to build an amazing \$150 million in new health facilities led by the \$85 million complex on the Meyer Hospital grounds and including Roswell Park and Millard Fillmore in the city and Kenmore Mercy and Millard's Amherst hospital in the suburbs.

Great strides along our potentially-impressive waterfront area were provided by the construction of hundreds of new residential units in the Maryner and Shoreline developments and by Holiday Inn's commitment to build an \$11 million motel complex. The outlines of the marina development began to take shape.

A proverbial shot-in-the-arm was provided just up the street from here when WGR-TV constructed on Delaware Avenue a beautiful new communications facility.

And in the other direction—down Main Street—the first tenants took up residence in the still unfinished magnificence of Marine Midland's 40-story banking house. From there, they could peer out at the attractively refurbished face of Ellicott Square.

Already, native Buffalonians who have been gone from these environs for no more than eight or ten years find it necessary to ask directions around a continuously reshaping downtown business district.

Like manufacturing, like health care, and like communications and banking and housing, there is another industry which is showing a new dynamics and a new vibrancy in our community—another building block in our renaissance—sports, a multimillion dollar industry in Buffalo.

The only city in Upstate New York to sport a major league entry of any kind, Buffalo is one of the handful on the continent to be represented in three major leagues.

The resurging Bills, the eternally hopeful Braves and the incredible Sabres are carrying the name Buffalo throughout the continent showing promise of ever-growing success, success enhanced by the confident determination of Mayor Sedita and the Common Council in expanding Memorial Auditorium, success punctuated by the comforting jingle of the cash register.

It is interesting to note that the conserva-

tive *New York Times* last Sunday recognized the championship caliber of the Sabres and noted they are already the hockey champions of the Empire State, winning the first seven straight of the scheduled 12 games against the Rangers and Islanders. This would seem to indicate the *Times* has an insight far superior to that of the sports director who selected the hockey games for showing on the NBC Television Network. The NHL tells us they've offered a couple of dates to the Sabres for national television exposure. Regrettably, schedule conditions make these dates unfavorable and we would ask NHL and NBC to try harder.

As for our other major league entries, we take heart in the counsel in Matthew 19: "and the last shall be first."

This past year witnessed the final resolution of the horrendous great debate over a football stadium and the beginning of construction in Orchard Park which will be a source of great pride. At the request of the county, your Chamber brought forth prospects to pay for the privilege of affixing their names to the \$20 million project. County officials ultimately determined that Bob Rich and his Rich Products Company could blend good business with good taste in an agreement which benefits everyone involved.

That construction progress on the new stadium was one of the focal points of interest when your Chamber initiated a program of hosting out-of-town sportswriters preceding each Buffalo Bill's home game. This hospitality, we believe, was extremely effective in overcoming some of the misconceptions which have appeared about our community in the out-of-town press.

Still another sports event which drew continental attention to our area was the splendidly executed 1972 Canadian Open at Cherry Hill, the first major golf tournament here in almost a quarter of a century.

This has been but a capsule of 1972's accomplishments which have triggered this renaissance. What, might you ask, is needed to continue this pattern of progress?

Remember—we are not launching a renaissance—we are propelling it onward—and there is a role for each segment of our community.

Many of the key items on our shopping list for 1973 depend on teamwork, close cooperation between government and citizens—governments on every level and citizens from all walks of life.

Let's look down the road into 1973. What do we see? What do we expect? What do we need in this renaissance era?

First, we look across the street into City Hall, soon to be restored to the glistening figure of its old self when workmen finish exterior cleaning next summer.

But to our city leaders we look for early action on the vital Exhibition Center, a project with exciting potential benefiting our entire community. Unquestionably, additional downtown development will follow this construction, encouraging renewal of significant portions of upper Main Street. Council President Chester Gorski could foresee this in his annual message to the Council Tuesday.

By vote of its directors, the Chamber of Commerce has thrown the support of its nearly 6000 members behind this landmark project, and I have today dispatched a call for support by individual letter to each organization represented here at this civic luncheon. I ask each of you to join with the Greater Buffalo Development Foundation, the Downtown Development Corporation, Mayor Sedita and others who have spearheaded this great effort for Buffalo. We have faith that the city comptroller will provide the promised site appraisals as scheduled next week and will aid in expediting the necessary action.

We are not unaware that two additional hotel chains besides the Holiday Inn are standing in the wings. Further, we expect



shortly an announcement on the federal funding of a major Tourism Plan which, together with an Exhibition Center, will draw new income to our community.

To City Hall, we look also for renewed efforts to create a climate of credibility and confidence. We recommend Mayor Sedita for initiating the investigation of the goldbrick-ing problem. We are counting on him in 1973 to keep the pressure on this problem until every conscientious city employee can hold his head high. No taxpayer (which is virtually every one who lives, shops or works in the city) relishes the thought that he is contributing to the support of a goldbricker.

We like the new ideas in county government, such as the central police services and the centralized data center, and we look for continued improvement in the county budget process such as emerged this past year. One of the county's great responsibilities is the successful completion of the 80,000-seat Rich Stadium this summer, and what a triumph that will be.

The state, too, has its major role in our renaissance. We are pushing for an up-tempo construction timetable for the Amherst campus of the State University at Buffalo. A hundred million dollars was spent on UB construction last year, another 100 million is scheduled this year and another 450 million is earmarked. Upon completion, the University will be the second largest employer in Western New York with 15,000 employees and 45,000 students. It will generate economic contributions of at least 200 million annually. Of additional significance is the fact that 60 per cent of UB graduates remain to live in metropolitan Buffalo.

And in Albany, we call on the support of our Western New York Legislators for legislation to encourage expansion of industry by increasing the investment tax credit for new capital investment in plant and equipment from one to five per cent. Likewise important will be support for moves to eliminate employer financed unemployment insurance for strikers, while at the same time granting immediate unemployment relief without present six-week delay to innocent workers laid off as a result of strikes in other locations.

I have by letter to Governor Rockefeller today also called on his good offices to introduce and aggressively support this legislation so important in our effort to retain jobs and create new jobs in New York State.

Transportation is due for ever-increasing emphasis in 1973 . . . the vital rapid transit system, the regional airport and the lagging highway system.

Definite strides will be made this year in the planning and design for the rail system to connect the new UB campus with downtown. A portion, thanks in part to efforts of Congressman Kemp, has already been funded by the federal and state governments. Rapid Transit is another of the keys to downtown's continued revitalization and another project which the Chamber supports.

Extensive refurbishing has increased the lifespan of Greater Buffalo International Airport, but a location must be finalized in 1973 for a new regional airport so that it may be ready a decade hence when the present airport becomes inadequate.

We have been distressed by the halt in the urban arterial construction but we are heartened now by reassurances from the state and city that they will once again press forward together on projects such as the Elm-Oak and the widening of the Kensington Expressway, although construction may be 3-5 years hence.

Now, aesthetically speaking, a year-round Chamber-sponsored program to beautify Buffalo will reach a crescendo this spring. There are many intriguing facets to this program, not the least of which is the replacing of our blighted trees throughout the community, a

program high-lighted by our friends at the News.

And to many of us, downtown will be even more beautiful and vibrant with the completion in 1973 of the great Marine Midland Center, of the modern *Buffalo Evening News* building, of the distinctive City Court Building and of the marina on the waterfront.

With all this activity, perhaps you wonder if anyone is really noticing Buffalo's renaissance. What better manifestation of interest than has been shown by the major banks of the nation. First the Bank of New York, and now First National City, Chase Manhattan and the Chemical, with maybe another one or two on the sidelines. Perhaps these financial giants know something about us that we haven't really recognized.

Within days, additional national attention will focus on Buffalo, on this very room. Sports figures from throughout the nation will gather here before 1100 of you, your friends and neighbors at the first Buffalo Chamber sponsored Dunlop Pro-Am Awards Dinner. Our own Buffalo-based Dunlop Tire and Rubber Company will present a \$10,000 Steuben crystal creation of magnificent beauty to the winner as selected in a national poll of sportswriters and sportscasters now being conducted by Price-Waterhouse. Within 2½ weeks ago to go, almost 800 tickets have been sold and a sellout is virtually assured.

And now my friends, I know and you know that what I have been telling you today is nothing new; it really couldn't be because the year-end editions have covered most of it in detail. I believe it is useful to pause on an occasion such as this to appreciate and understand what is happening to us, to come up with an interpretation—and that interpretation can only be described as a renaissance.

We as Buffalonians have a unique heritage. Because we come from so many varied backgrounds, there is a tendency to think of us as somewhat splintered. Not true. In fact, we benefit from the conglomerate advantage inherent in our colorful ethnic quilt. Our people care about one another and most of us care deeply about our community. We are defensive about it, and perhaps too easily offended by its detractors. We work hard, and we work together without a lot of fanfare, just as you from so many civic and business organizations contribute to the community in projects which often few outside your organization ever hear about.

Whether Polish, Irish, German, Italian or otherwise, black, white or red, our heritages have given us a mixture of toughness, humor and thriftiness which forges a well-rounded community, a community which produced two United States Presidents.

Together we shall strive for an ever greater Buffalo, together we shall propel the renaissance of Buffalo in a new surge to greater heights.

The symbol of the grazing Buffalo in statue-like repose is no longer appropriate; our new Buffalo is charging in the spirit of our Renaissance.

My friend, danke schoen, dzienkuje, grazie, gracias. And to all of you I say "thank you" in the language which is our common bond, just as our faith in the future of Buffalo is also our common bond.

FRANK C. HERRINGER

Mr. Frank C. Herringer was born Nov. 12, 1942, in New York City, attended public schools in Seaford Long Island, N.Y. He received his A.B. degree, magna cum laude in 1964 at Dartmouth College where he majored in mathematics and economics and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa.

In 1965, he received his M.B.A. degree from the Amos Tuck School of Business Administration at Dartmouth, majoring in finance and marketing, graduating with the

highest academic average in his class and with "highest distinction."

Mr. Herringer began his career in 1965 as an associate with Cresap, McCormick and Paget, Inc., the well-known international management consulting firm of New York. Some examples of his work for clients include:

Coordination of an 18 month study of one of the largest urban public utility companies in the world, involving the efforts of a 25 man consulting team that analyzed the organization, management information system, procurement functions, and other aspects of the company.

Direction of a study of all aspects of the management of Dartmouth College.

Management of studies of organization, management controls and strategy for a variety of firms, including: a large industrial corporation in upstate New York; a steel company in Australia; a recreational products company in New York; a New York financial services company; and many others.

From November, 1971, until his new appointment as UMTA administrator, he served on the White House staff as a deputy to Fred Malek, the President's top advisor on personnel matters. He has had the responsibility for assisting in the selection of Presidential appointees and has represented the President's interests in lower level personnel-related decisions in one-half the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, involving over 1,500 full-time, non-career positions. The evaluation and clearance of proposed appointees, training, recognition and patronage, and special, in-depth analysis of particular problem situations have all been part of his responsibilities.

Mr. Herringer is a resident of Fairfax, Va., and married to the former Nancy Lynn Blair.

#### TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

#### HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has lost a great and patriotic citizen, one whose passing has deeply saddened the Nation.

The American people loved, respected, and admired the 36th President of the United States—Lyndon Baines Johnson.

They knew he was their friend, they had confidence in him and they knew he was, without question, a man of the people and for the people.

Lyndon Johnson has returned to the Texas hills, the place where he spent most of his life, and the land he loved the most. However, he will not be forgotten by the Nation and the world, who loved and respected him, not only as a leader, but as a man.

As a Congressman, Senator, Vice President, and President of the United States, Mr. Johnson's accomplishments and achievements are numerous.

He put his principles into action with the greatest amount of energy and enthusiasm. As chairman of the Senate Space Committee, he initiated the great strides made in the national space program.

Lyndon Johnson's accomplishments in the areas of civil rights, medicare, poverty, and housing are unmatched. They

were truly a victory for him and a victory for the Nation as a whole.

I am extremely proud to join my colleagues in paying homage to Lyndon B. Johnson. I feel honored to have known him—a man with the deepest compassion for all mankind and a true American.

He will be remembered in the hearts of all who knew him and of those who had the great privilege of his friendship.

The United States has lost a fine citizen and public servant.

We shall all miss him. Mrs. Anderson joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Johnson and their two daughters, Lynda, and Luci.

#### TRIBUTE TO OLIVER P. BOLTON

#### HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of sorrow that I join in this tribute to a former distinguished Member of the U.S. House of Representatives from Ohio, the late Oliver Payne Bolton. Ollie, a member of one of this Nation's most renowned families, passed away this past December 13.

Oliver Bolton served three terms in the House, representing the 11th District of Ohio.

His interest in politics and public service can be readily traced to his famous parents—Chester C. and Frances P. Bolton. The late Chester Bolton was serving his fifth term in Congress when he died in 1939. It was after he died, that the Honorable Frances Bolton—a granddaughter of former U.S. Senator Harry B. Payne—was elected to complete his term. Frances Bolton represented Ohio's 22d District for 14 consecutive terms until 1968. When Ollie earned his first term in 1952, it marked the first occasion in the history of the Congress that a mother and son served concurrently in the House.

Oliver Bolton, like his parents, took a great deal of pride in working for America. He was an untiring legislator and his service on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and the House Administration Committee was marked by a sense of obligation not only to the people of his district but to all taxpayers who deserve to see their tax dollars spent wisely. In addition, his loyalty to this Nation was displayed by the legislation he sponsored. One such bill, for example, added the words "under God" to our pledge of allegiance.

Before coming to Washington, Ollie served in a number of posts in the Young Republicans, rising from president of his local club to the presidency of the Ohio League of YR's in 1948, and the vice-presidency of the Midwest council and finally as National YR Committeeman from Ohio. Winning the Republican nomination for the newly created 11th District over four candidates in the 1952 primary election, he was elected to the 83d Congress and reelected to the 84th. He did not run for reelection in 1956,

however, he did remain active in Ohio Republican affairs. He was the Director of Commerce of the State of Ohio in 1957, chairman of his county Republican organization and a member of the Ohio Republican State Central and Executive Committee in 1958-61. During this period he resumed his newspaper publishing business, owning two small dailies and a weekly.

In 1962, Ollie, resumed his political career and returned to Capitol Hill as the 11th District representative.

An eloquent and talented legislator. Oliver Bolton will be missed by all who knew him and by all he served. At this time of eulogy for Mr. Bolton, I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

#### WETLANDS CONSERVATION

#### HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government drains wetlands so farmers can grow more crops, while at the same time it pays farmers to let fertile cropland lie idle. Compounding this waste of budget dollars is the destruction of irreplaceable wildlife habitat which accompanies wetlands drainage. The following article by Oliver Austin Houck, which appears in the February-March 1973 issue of National Wildlife magazine, is a particularly well-written description of this problem:

#### UNCLE SAM: SPLIT PERSONALITY

(By Oliver Austin Houck)

When I first heard about the Starkweather project in North Dakota it didn't make sense. Uncle Sam preparing an ambush—for himself? I decided to go out and have a look.

On a windy summer morning I went up in a small plane over the big farms of the Starkweather watershed, large rectangles of golden grain dotted with green bordered prairie ponds—potholes they call them. Flying low I could see clusters of ducks on the water and white egrets in the reeds. We flew north and suddenly the potholes were gone. You could tell where they used to be by the drainage ditches, networks of gray canals running south.

"See down there" yelled my pilot over the roar of the engine. "That used to be a regular lake. A few years ago you couldn't fly very low because of the birds. They'd come up off it by the hundreds."

It was a grain field now with a big ditch straight out of the center. I didn't know how my pilot felt about it so I shouted that it must be easier flying now without all those birds. He gave me a funny look. "I miss those birds," he said.

If someone told you that Uncle Sam was going to spend nearly four million dollars to drain one of the last large waterfowl breeding grounds in the United States, you'd say "Well, it must be for a good reason."

It's called "prairie pothole" country, and it's the last we have. There used to be millions of potholes, little half-acre, one-acre, five-acre freshwater ponds, scattered all over the Dakotas, west to Montana, east to Minnesota and Wisconsin and down into Nebraska and Iowa. Great waterfowl migrations bred and formed there pond by pond. Tens . . . hundreds . . . thousands . . . and then millions of ducks, geese, grebe, and rail.

Every fall they rose from these prairie wetlands, a family here, a flock there, until they covered the sky with a great rush of wings and were gone.

It doesn't happen much in our country anymore, except in North Dakota. We've dried up their breeding grounds, and the remaining birds must fly up to Canada to nest. The Starkweather region of North Dakota, with over 50,000 acres of prairie pothole wetlands, is the best breeding area we have left in the United States. And now we're going to dry it up.

If someone told you that a "good reason" to drain these wetlands was so farmers could produce more crops, you'd say, "Well, I guess we need the crops."

There are just ninety-one farm units to be benefited by the Starkweather project. They all produce surplus grain crops, mainly wheat. The drainage project will help them grow more. In case you had forgotten about surpluses, these are the crops Congress has directed the U.S. Department of Agriculture to buy and store to support farm prices. So you, and your government, own hundreds of millions of bushels of corn and wheat.

But, hold your hat—these are the same crops we also pay farmers not to grow, at a cost of additional millions of dollars. In 1971 we paid farmers more than \$2.75 billion to idle 37 million acres of surplus cropland; in 1972, more than 62 million acres were idled. Despite the number of "set aside" acres, the government still has had to buy hundreds of millions of bushels of surplus grain. (Even though the U.S. is selling large quantities of grain to the U.S.S.R. and China, Federal subsidies will still be needed for surpluses.) Projects like Starkweather aggravate this problem. The government pays people not to grow grain, it buys surpluses from what they do grow, and then turns around and finances projects to grow more. Using your money, of course.

If someone told you that another purpose of the Starkweather project was "flood control," you'd say, "Well, we've certainly got to stop those floods."

When you walk in water you are likely to get your feet wet. And when you plant crops where water gathers every spring, you are just as likely to get your seeds wet. It happens every spring: the snows melt and the April rains collect in the depressions, forming the great prairie wetlands. By fall most of the ponds are dry. But you plant crops in the spring, and you can plant more crops in the spring in Starkweather if you drain all of those potholes and move the water out. It's called "flood control."

What it really does is help make floods. The water used to settle on the land and percolate slowly through the surface. Now it is rushed out in large ditches. Where? Somewhere downstream, and someone at the other end of the ditch gets a lot more water now, every spring. But then that's his problem.

So he is almost compelled to get his own "flood control" project. Bigger ditches, to move the water on down. This leads, of course, to more "flood" water further on down, and naturally more ditches. And, eventually ditches won't do the job. It takes dams . . . more crops and houses in the flood plains . . . more "flood control" projects . . . pork barrel handouts by Congress and make-work for the Corps of Engineers . . . all the way down the muddy Missouri and the mighty Mississippi to New Orleans, now seven feet below river level.

It all starts way up north, with Starkweather and those lovely, rich, doomed prairie potholes waiting to be drained.

"You know," said Bob Scheer, president of the North Dakota Wildlife Federation, our affiliate, "Congress really passed this small watershed law to stop floods where they begin, to hold the water in the land. But instead we seem to be using the law to get the water off faster."



"I have a friend who farms on the edge of Starkweather," he continued. "One day I went over to visit and he'd just put in a new ditch. I said, 'Owen why did you do that?' and he said he had to because everybody else was doing it, and he'd end up with their water. And besides the government was paying for it."

"I said, 'Owen, suppose there was a program to hold the water on the land and nobody built ditches to give it to you, and you didn't build ditches to give it to somebody else?'"

"Owen thought about that for a moment and then he shook his head. 'I never heard of a program like that,' he said."

If someone told you that Congress authorized the Starkweather project after carefully considering its impact, you'd say, "Well, I guess they took all these things into account."

Unfortunately, Congress doesn't review "small watershed" projects. Because they are so "small," Congress has delegated their authorization to a committee. In the case of Starkweather, it was a subcommittee. On July 14, 1970, with just three subcommittee members of one house of Congress present, the Department of Agriculture presented Starkweather along with one North Dakota Congressman and Gordon Berg, the chief local sponsor. No notice of the hearings was given, no opposing testimony was invited. The Congressman said it was a good project and Gordon Berg, who one year later was convicted of draining wetlands illegally and placed on Federal probation, said he thought it was a good project too.

That's the way it went with Starkweather, and that's the way it goes with most "small watershed" projects. Except not all the sponsors are on Federal probation.

The "small watershed" aspect is even more interesting. Congress did not mean to abandon its authority over large water programs. It put a 250,000 acre ceiling on the "small watershed" projects which the Soil Conservation Service could undertake virtually on its own.

The hitch in Starkweather is that the natural Starkweather drainage area is about 518,000 acres. But you can't put an acre limit on ambition. So the solution was to cut up the area into two smaller projects which on paper would slip under the Congressional limit.

So there are now two separate proposals: Starkweather, 246,477 acres, and Edmore, 246,118 acres. They are in the same drainage basin, linked by a single channel and draining into the same big exit ditch.

You may have noted that these two projects add up to 492,595 acres, and there are about 518,000 acres overall. Since the additional acres could not be tacked on to either project without pushing it over the limit, there is a 26,000 acre "dead area" right in the middle, undeclared in either project. Administrative genius!

When someone tells you that Starkweather isn't really that big, and anyway it's the kind of project that's been popular for years in most Congressional districts, you finally rebel and say, "It just doesn't make sense—from any angle."

Starkweather is a natural basin. The water stays where it falls, or collects in natural kettles and ponds, shallow, freshwater wildlife incubators, the stuff of prairie life. Now we plan to pull the plug, rush the water out. And call it flood control.

These wetlands will be dried up, and plowed in the fall to get a jump on spring. The winter winds will whip up the exposed soil and dry snow into brownstorms. And we call this soil conservation.

These lands will grow more surplus for government granaries, and we will pay more money to set aside more acres. And we call it a farm program.

And when you want to see those great

restless movements of waterfowl rising and wheeling in the morning light, you can go to Canada for the few that remain and you can say, "We used to see them in our country too, once upon a time. . . ."

## THE SOCIAL SECURITY LEVY

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, when President Nixon said:

It is time to get big government off your back and out of your pocket.

Was he talking about \$10 billion social security payroll levy that went into effect on January 1?

According to a recent study by John A. Brittain, the Brookings Institution, the social security tax now accounts for 23 percent of all Federal revenue, more than half the amount collected from the individual income tax and far more than is collected from the corporate income tax. This tax burden now falls most heavily on the lower and middle income people who are struggling to make ends meet. A study by Pechman and Okner entitled "Individual Tax Erosion by Income Classes," demonstrates that the poor pay proportionately more in taxes than wealthy people do when all taxes are considered.

Carl T. Rowan's column that appeared in the Sunday Star and Daily News on January 21, 1973, pursues the same theme. I am submitting this column for the RECORD because it states the problem forcefully.

The article follows:

LET'S GIVE TAX CREDIT FOR SOCIAL SECURITY LEVY

(By Carl Rowan)

Rep. Wilbur Mills, D-Ark., the king of the congressional road when it comes to tax laws, has pledged that the 93rd Congress is going to review every single one of those exclusions, exemptions and preferences otherwise known as "tax shelters" and "tax loopholes."

Bravo! But don't expect too much. They'll plug the holes in Swiss cheese with moon dust before they seal off all those legal openings that allow some Americans to escape the grasping fingers of Uncle Sam's revenuers.

First, they'll threaten to deny deductions for the interest on home mortgage payments, and maybe even for real estate taxes. This will create such an uproar from millions of moderate-income home owners that someone will quickly say, "That's one 'loophole' we'll keep."

That will make it seem fair, then, to keep those fast-depreciation regulations that have made real estate one of the juiciest of the get-rich-by-minimizing-income-taxes operations.

The truth is that when Mills and Co. conclude their survey, this Congress will still embrace the notion that \$10,000 made by investing money ought to be taxed at a lower rate than \$10,000 made by the sweat of some man's brow.

This society is steeped in the notion that what makes the economy run is people with money risking it in oil exploration, housing developments, ore extraction, cattle breeding and myriad new business enterprises, and not the brawn or even the brains of laborers.

If economic philosophy were not enough to prevent this, accept the reality that most of the powerful men in both houses of Congress have vested financial interests in a lot of those tax shelters.

What chance is there, then, for something closer to justice for the average working Joe in this country? Not much, because our tax laws have long been proof that the smart operators can fool enough of the people enough of the time to have things go their way indefinitely.

If Working Joe had enough savvy and enough zip, he'd be raising hell right now about the fact that his Social Security deductions are 35 percent higher than last year. But he's so enthralled with President Nixon's pledge of "no tax increase" that he can't feel that long arm from Washington reaching deeper into his hip pocket.

They taxed only the first \$9,000 of Working Joe's pay, at a rate of 5.2 percent, last year. This year they'll tax \$10,800 at 5.8 percent—and next year the tax will apply to the first \$12,000 of Joe's earnings.

I have written before that this is a regressive tax where the guy earning 120,000 bucks a year will pay the same \$632 this year that the struggling earner of \$12,000 will pay.

What is worse—and little realized by the average American—is that in millions of poor and moderate income families the wife works; both pay the full Social Security tax, but the ultimate benefits on retirement will be the same as if only one spouse had worked.

Let me put it another way. Joe Smith earns \$15,000 a year. Nice, but not enough with two kids in college. So his wife works, earning \$11,000 per year. They will pay a whopping \$1,264 in Social Security taxes this year.

Sam Fullbull earns \$100,000 a year (plus \$30,000 worth of nontaxable fringe benefits) and wouldn't think of allowing his wife to work. His family pays \$632 in Social Security taxes.

On retirement, the Fullbulls will get the same Social Security benefits as the Smiths.

Now, since I know the Congress is not going to wipe out all of the loopholes that are as beneficial to the Fullbulls, but are mostly out of reach of the Smiths, I propose this simple change in the law to provide at least a pretense at justice.

Where husband and wife both work, as in the case of the Smiths, with a combined income of less than \$42,500 a year (that's a congressman's salary) let's allow a full income tax credit for the Social Security payment of the second spouse.

It wouldn't hurt the Social Security program where the reserve already is \$50 billion and moving toward \$74 billion by 1977. The shameful truth is that this regressive tax is now being used to finance non-Social Security programs that ought to be financed through the fairer income tax.

## PENNSYLVANIA RADIO STATIONS EMERGENCY PUBLIC SERVICE

### HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, a number of Pennsylvania radio stations provided valuable public services during and after the tragic flooding caused by Hurricane Agnes last June. One of the stations to keep its listeners posted on a 24-hour basis was WHEX in Columbia.

WHEX, under the direction of General Manager Edwin Moshier, kept its listeners up to date with flood bulletins, information from State and local rescue officials, and personal messages from friends and family by the disaster.

It is impossible to say how many lives, and how much personal property were saved by community-minded radio stations in flood areas, but I do know that the dedicated efforts of the personnel of these stations will not soon be forgotten by the communities they serve. WHEX and its fellow stations distinguished themselves in Pennsylvania's hour of need, and I, for one, congratulate them.

### INSPECTION OF OVERSEAS NATIONAL CEMETERIES

#### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for several years the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs has been considering legislation relating to our Nation's national cemetery system. Many recommendations have been received to incorporate the functions of the American Battle Monuments Commission into one central cemetery system under the Veterans' Administration. As chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee in the 92d Congress, I visited a number of our overseas cemeteries and I also urged other members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee to make similar inspections.

Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) was able to visit many of our overseas cemeteries maintained by the American Battle Monuments Commission, as well as numerous private monuments which have been erected in honor of countless Americans who fought to preserve freedom throughout the world. I understand that Congress will shortly be considering legislation relating to the national cemetery program, and I am pleased to share with my colleagues the following outstanding report which Congressman SAYLOR made to me when he returned from his trip.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,  
Washington, D.C., January 15, 1973.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,

Chairman, Veterans' Affairs Committee, U.S.  
House of Representatives, Washington,  
D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The following is a brief summary of my trip to Europe for an inspection of the American Battle Monuments Commission installations in England, Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg, France and Italy. My wife accompanied me at my personal expense, and visited with me all of the cemeteries and monuments hereafter mentioned. We were inspecting cemeteries in which American men are buried and memorials dedicated to the American fighting man. Mrs. Saylor's presence gave me the advantage of viewing them not only as an interested Member of Congress but through the perceptive eyes of a woman who frequently pointed out to me many significant matters

of importance in the maintenance of our cemeteries.

We flew to London on the 19th of November and were met by Major George H. McManus, Director of Maintenance, Operations and Management, American Battle Monuments Commission. We visited the cemetery at Cambridge, and even though it was a cold, damp, dreary day as only England can be, the bright spot in the trip from London to Cambridge was a visit to the cemetery. We found it to be in excellent condition except for a few minor problems that appeared to be under control. The superintendent did not hesitate to call them to our attention and to tell us what changes were being suggested so that the minor problems could be corrected.

We then flew to Brussels. From there we visited probably the most famous of all our cemeteries; namely, Flanders Field. Very frankly, it was the most disappointing of all the cemeteries. It is not only the smallest, but I can assure you it has the poorest facilities of all the cemeteries. Unfortunately, it appears to have been ignored for some time so that it was absolutely necessary for the present superintendent to have major surgery done on many of the trees planted in the cemetery. I would suggest that the American Battle Monuments Commission consider replacing many of the trees that had to undergo such surgery since they contribute materially to the poor appearance. While I do not propose to tell the American Battle Monuments Commission how to operate their cemeteries, I can assure you that a replanting of the major trees in this area would be a distinct improvement to the cemetery.

We then visited one of the World War I monuments at Audenarde. This monument is a private monument not maintained by the American Battle Monuments Commission and is one that should be maintained by that group. We left Brussels and went to visit the Netherlands and the Henri-Chapelle Cemetery. These are both a tremendous credit to the American Battle Monuments Commission. Words are impossible to describe these cemeteries because of their size. The Netherlands Cemetery covers 65½ acres while Henri-Chapelle covers 57 acres. More than 16,000 of our honored war dead are buried in the two cemeteries.

After visiting the Netherlands and the private monuments at Henri-Chapelle, we then went to Luxembourg and there visited the Cemetery at Ardennes and Luxembourg as well as the private monument at Bastogne. This latter monument was erected by the people of Bastogne in grateful appreciation of their liberation by the American Forces and in memory of the almost 77,000 officers and GI's killed, wounded or missing in the Battle of the Bulge.

It is rather interesting that on the site where the Bastogne Memorial is built, the French Dragoons first came to blows with the Uhlans in World War I. And again on that same spot the first shots were fired in 1940 during World War II. As we all know, in the winter of 1944 it was a town where the American Army played such a valiant part in the liberation of Europe. While the thought behind the Bastogne Memorial is marvelous, its condition is deplorable. If it is to be the responsibility of the American Battle Monuments Commission, I would urge that a substantial sum of money be appropriated for the proper job of revitalizing this monument. If a timely, first-class renovation is accomplished, it will eliminate the need for even greater sums of money earmarked for repairs in the future.

From Luxembourg we visited the Lorraine Cemetery containing the largest number of graves of our World War II dead, St. Mihiel Cemetery, and the Montsec Monument as well. Enroute from Verdun to Paris, we visited several of the other private monuments;

namely, the Pennsylvania Monuments and the Missouri Monuments. From Paris we visited the Suresnes Cemetery, five miles west of the city, where both World War I and World War II servicemen are interred. We also inspected the Lafayette Escadrille Monument and visited for a short time the European Office of the American Battle Monuments Commission at Garches.

From Paris we went to Caen and visited the Brittany Cemetery. From there we also visited the Normandy Cemetery and the Normandy Beachhead as well as the private monuments along the Beach road. It was our good fortune to be there on a day when the Museum at Normandy was open and we were privileged to review the entire panoramic view of the Normandy Beachhead operation.

We returned to Paris and flew to Rome where we were met by Col. Brown and with him visited the Sicily-Rome Cemetery on the Anzio Beachhead. Col. Brown was instrumental in arranging for us to visit both a German Cemetery and an English Cemetery located near the Sicily-Rome Cemetery. This gave us an opportunity to compare the burial grounds for our honored Dead with those of other countries. We returned to Rome, and embarked for the United States.

As you know, from time to time in our discussions, I have been critical of the independence of the American Battle Monuments Commission and I still do not believe any harm would be done by having it report to the President through the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. However, I cannot praise too highly the operation of the American Battle Monuments Commission in its maintenance of the cemeteries under their jurisdiction which it was my privilege to visit. I found the personnel in the Headquarters offices in Paris and Rome well informed with the ability to communicate bilingually and trilingually. The superintendents have a good rapport with their employees, but even more important, they appear to have an excellent rapport with the local officials in their respective areas.

I have visited Forest Lawn Cemetery in Burbank, California. According to many persons this is the most beautiful cemetery as far as maintenance is concerned to be found anywhere in the world. My only response today to anyone who would make that claim is that the poorest of the cemeteries under the American Battle Monuments Commission far exceeds any other cemetery it has been my privilege to visit.

In closing this brief report, I want to pay a special tribute to Major George H. McManus, Major McManus, a West Point graduate who comes from a military background, is not only a credit to the American Battle Monuments Commission and the military staff under whom he serves, but he is a tremendous credit to the United States of America and its people. I am proud to have an American soldier of this calibre serving abroad in a position of responsibility. I felt for some several days after meeting Major McManus that my views on his ability might be distorted, since his roommate during four years at West Point was a candidate that I was privileged to nominate. However, the longer I saw Major McManus both professionally and socially, and visited him in his home, the more impressed I was with his capabilities. It is men with such motivation and dedication to the ideals of our Nation who enable the Army of the United States to maintain its proficiency for excellence. His integrity, his friendliness, his sincerity, his ability, and his obvious potential, I hope, will not be overlooked as the promotions are made for those dedicated men who want to make the military a career.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN P. SAYLOR,  
Member of Congress.



# A TRIBUTE TO FARMINGDALE HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL TEAM

## HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, tonight, February 1, 1973, close to 1,000 people will assemble at the Huntington Town House to pay tribute to a nationally rated and No. 1 high school football team in New York State. I speak, sir, of the Farmingdale High School football team and its members who have brought glory not only to themselves but to their coaches, Don Snyder, Bob Mulligan, and Irv Apgar, their faculty, student body and yes, their entire community. They epitomize that which is good with America today, they reflect the achievements not of the unusual, but rather those of the greater number of their contemporaries. They give witness to Theodore Roosevelt's statement:

A sound body is good; a sound mind is better, but a strong and clean character is better than either.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to a group of outstanding young men, the Farmingdale High School football team.

# OUR DEBT TO RURAL AMERICA

## HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I am dismayed by the Department of Agriculture's recent actions, terminating or cutting back programs which are vital to the well-being of our farm and rural communities. I am fully cognizant of the administration's reasons for these actions. I would be the first to admit the Congress needs to thoroughly reevaluate and reform its system of appropriations if our Government is to ever realize a balanced budget. It is for this reason that, within the next few days, I will introduce legislation which would insure fiscal responsibility by the House of Representatives. However, the administration seems to be challenging the authority of the Congress by curtailing valuable agriculture programs the Congress had already funded.

The district I am proud to represent is largely farm/rural-oriented. Each time I return to Illinois, I can see the good that farm and rural development programs are doing for my constituents. I also can see how much still needs to be done. Over the Christmas holidays I met with members of several Illinois County Soil and Water Conservation Districts. They showed me impressive outlines of what they were planning to do with 1973 REAP funds and what they had done in the past. Their proposals included long-range environmental improvements, such as permanent vegetative covers, water im-

poundment reservoirs, the planting of new trees and shrubs, and improving stands of forest areas.

The people with whom I spoke were designing important conservation plans. They were getting ready to move ahead on projects which would improve soil and water; which would build up forested areas; which would prevent wind and water erosion; which would help to slow the agriculture-related pollution; and which would serve not only farm people—but all people in Illinois—for generations to come.

They felt confident these improvements would be made. But in late December, the announcement that cost-sharing activities for REAP were being terminated put an abrupt and sad end to most of these plans. Since that time, I have had numerous letters pouring into my office and nearly as many visitors stopping by, asking me: "What happened?" "Why?" "Will the Congress do anything?" This week I welcomed the opportunity to submit these individuals' and my concern to the House Agriculture Committee which has just begun hearings on reinstatement of funds for the REAP program.

I have always been an enthusiastic supporter of the Department of Agriculture. I have considered Mr. Butz a good friend of the small farmer and the rural resident. Now I find it difficult to explain how this administration, which has in the past done so much for the farmer, could be responsible for such unexpected and sudden decisions. The blow was especially hard since it came at a time when many farmers had already completed their plans for 1973.

Similarly, I have talked to and corresponded with many persons who are upset by the administration's action on REA loans. Rural electric and telephone loans actually helped bring the 20th century to millions of America's farmsteads. Before REA, rural families had no radio, no incandescent lights, no modern cooking appliances, no indoor running water, no refrigeration, no modern farming equipment. In fact, in 1935, only about one farm in 10 was electrified. By 1971, rural utilities were serving 6.4 million meters and reaching nearly 20 million farm and rural people in 2,700 counties in 46 States. Since I am also concerned about the continuation of REA loans, I have asked that I be notified when hearings are held on them.

Mr. Speaker, the administration's cutbacks on various agriculture programs are particularly distressing since statistics would indicate that we have been witnessing the demise of farming in this country. The farm industry, which was at one time the mainstay of rural economies, has dwindled to the point where only 800,000 farms produce 90 percent of all our food and fiber.

Although net farm income for 1972 will reach nearly \$19 billion, production costs continue to rise at a faster rate than most farm incomes—thus forcing many of the smaller farmers to abandon their farms, their way of life, their heritage. In short, technological progress has backfired on many of our family farms. In

1920, our farm population was nearly 32 million. It represented 30 percent of our total population. By 1970, less than 10 million people remained on farms; less than 5 percent of the total U.S. population. In my own congressional district, 800 farms folded between 1964 and 1969.

In a nation where every man's birthright is the chance to make a good living for himself and his family, many farmers are not breaking even. The men and women who have worked our land to give us an abundance of agricultural products are now being repaid with unemployment and a bleak future. The promise of a good life has eluded them in spite of laudable industriousness and sobriety.

Many of us here worked hard to see the Rural Development Act of 1972 become law. We saw in it viable programs to help fulfill the American promise to millions of rural residents. But we did not see in it programs to substitute for those we had already funded.

Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged by the widespread concern in Congress over the termination of various agriculture programs, and am hopeful farmers will soon have back the programs which never should have been taken from them in the first place.

In conclusion, there is a very real question as to whether the President can deny funds appropriated by the Congress. We owe good, sound programs to rural America; and we owe to ourselves "the power of the purse."

# ELLIOT LEE RICHARDSON—SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

## HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, historically, the Military Establishment of our country has been kept under civilian control.

However, the appointment of Elliot Lee Richardson, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and former Under Secretary of State, appears to be a radical departure from the acceptable practice of placing an impartial civilian in control of the military as Secretary of Defense. The Richardson appointment will be another historic first. For the first time the State Department will be in control of both our diplomatic and military departments.

The Richardson appointment should remind Americans of President Nixon's earlier promise to clean out the mess at the State Department. Appointing an individual who has been involved in the mess to the top civilian post over the military, hardly seems a reasonable way to clean out the State Department.

While Mr. Richardson's service as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will not be remembered as one of holding the tide on inflation and on unnecessary spending, I daresay he will become an administration leader in financial cut-

backs and program dismantling as Secretary of Defense.

I ask that an interesting report on the new Secretary of Defense from the February 2, 1973 issue of *The Herald of Freedom*, Box 3, Zarephath, N.J., follow my remarks.

The report follows:

[From the *Herald of Freedom*, Feb. 2, 1973]

ELLIOT LEE RICHARDSON

President Richard M. Nixon's selection of Elliot Richardson as his new Secretary of Defense has sent shock waves through military leaders in the Pentagon. After the appointment was announced, the board of directors of the American Conservative Union voted unanimously to oppose his nomination.

Human events pointed out that the Defense community already believes our country's defenses are in a state of rapid decline and that with Richardson as chief of the Defense Department the U.S. military position will deteriorate even more drastically. A Washington official who worked in close contact with Richardson stated that when Richardson chaired the Under Secretaries Committee of the National Security Council for two years, his opinions invariably were geared against the Defense Department's point of view.

Richardson's view toward the threat of the International Communist Conspiracy was made clear in a speech on June 9, 1969 before the Advertising Council in Washington, D.C. when he stated: "The unity of Communist discipline or dogma is increasingly a phenomenon of the past. In fact, the term 'Communist' now covers such a multiplicity of states, parties and tendencies as to have little usefulness." The fact that one billion people are kept under tyrannical police state control and the fact that the Soviet Union is building up its military and technical strength while the U.S. has been disarming do not seem to be of any concern to Mr. Richardson. He was the featured speaker at a luncheon meeting of the Fund for Peace (made up of leftist, pacifist and world government organizations) held April 29, 1970, at which time he extolled the virtues of co-operating with the Soviets.

Elliot Lee Richardson was born in Boston, Mass. on July 20, 1920, the son of Dr. Edward P. Richardson and the former Clara Shattuck. He graduated from Harvard with an A.B. degree in 1941 and obtained his LL.B. from Harvard Law School in 1947, after having served in the U.S. Army from 1942 to 1945. At Harvard he was editor of *The Law Review*. He married Miss Anne Frances Hazard, a Radcliffe graduate, August 2, 1952; they have three children, Henry, Anne Hazard, and Michael.

Richardson's first position (1947-48) was law clerk to the famous judge, Learned Hand, who was at that time superior judge of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Judicial Circuit. As of 1949 Judge Learned Hand had completed forty years on the Federal bench, having first been appointed by President Taft in 1901. His thousands of decisions were described by Felix Frankfurter as "an enduring source of truth-seeking and illumination."

Richardson then became a law clerk to the great Frankfurter himself from 1948 to 1949. Frankfurter by then had progressed from being a Harvard law professor, who had been supplying law clerks to Supreme Court and Federal judges for many years, to being a Supreme Court Justice (appointed by Franklin D. Roosevelt January 5, 1939). Frankfurter's pro-Bolshevik-Communist bias is well known and was stated in a letter written to him by Theodore Roosevelt on December 19, 1917, in which he stated: "... you have taken, and are taking on behalf of the

Administration an attitude which seems to me to be fundamentally that of Trotsky and the other Bolshevik leaders in Russia; an attitude which may be fraught with mischief to this country..."

Among Frankfurter's proteges at Harvard were such subversives as J. Robert Oppenheimer, Lawrence Duggan, Harry Dexter White, Alger Hiss (for whom Frankfurter was a character witness), Lee Pressman, Harold Glasser and Owen Lattimore. Frankfurter was on the National Committee of the American Civil Liberties Union with such (subsequently identified) Communists as William Z. Foster, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Louis Budenz and Scott Nearing. He was an intimate of Harold Laski, who taught with him at Harvard and then went to the London School of Economics and established what became known in academic circles as the "Frankfurter-Laski Axis." Laski eventually secured a teaching post in Moscow.

From 1949 to 1953 Richardson was with the Boston law firm of Ropes, Gray, Best, Coolidge and Rugg. In 1952 he was also a lecturer on law at Harvard and in 1953 he was proposed by Felix Frankfurter to be president of Harvard, a fact which indicates Frankfurter's high regard for, and faith in, him. From 1953 to 1954 he was a staff assistant to U.S. Senator Leverett Saltonstall, after which he went back to his law firm from 1954 to 1956. Saltonstall was a former governor of Massachusetts who was elected to fill the unexpired term of Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr. who resigned from the U.S. Senate February 1944. Saltonstall was known as a "liberal Republican" because of his stand on civil liberties and international cooperation. He was a sponsor of U.S.-Soviet "Friendship Rallies" and of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship of which Corliss Lamont (identified Communist) was chairman.

In January of 1957 Richardson was appointed by President Eisenhower to be Assistant Secretary for Legislation in the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. His long time friend, William Rogers, was then Attorney General of the United States and in 1959 Richardson was appointed U.S. Attorney in Massachusetts under Rogers. The *N.Y. Times* tells us that "During those years Mr. Richardson was widely regarded as one of the brighter and more creative spirits in an Administration that was not noted for them. He became identified with the moderate, even liberal, wing of Republican thought." One of the "several notable convictions" won by U.S. Attorney Richardson was that of Bernard Goldfine for tax evasion. Bernard Goldfine was the wealthy textile manufacturer whose gifts to one of Eisenhower's top aides created a scandal. Among the goodies given to Sherman Adams was a fabulously expensive vicuna coat and Sherman came to rue the day he ever laid eyes on it, for it became a symbol of influence peddling. The Goldfine involvement cost Adams his White House job and greatly embarrassed the Eisenhower Administration which had been so sanctimonious about the scandals of the Truman Administration which preceded it.

When the Eisenhower Administration was succeeded by the Kennedy Kingdom, Richardson was selected to be a special assistant to Attorney General Bobby Kennedy. He tried in 1962 for the Republican nomination for Massachusetts Attorney General but lost in the primary to Edward W. Brooke, now the U.S. Senator from Massachusetts. He was a partner in the firm of Ropes and Gray from 1961 to 1964 at which time he was elected Lt. Governor of Massachusetts. In 1966 Richardson ran for Attorney General of Mass. and allowed his second cousin, Francis W. Sargent, to run for the position he then held as Lt. Governor. This was a maneuver

which supposedly was to make the ticket stronger. It resulted in Sargent taking over as governor when President Nixon appointed Governor Volpe to the position of Secretary of Transportation, thus dashing Richardson's hopes of trying for the governorship himself.

In his 1966 campaign for Attorney General, Richardson was assailed for making charges against his opponent that he could not substantiate (*N.Y. Times* 1/5/69). A more interesting item, however, was the long list of Democrats who supported Republican Richardson. In the *Record American* (Boston) of November 4, 1966 a full page advertisement stated: "The office of Attorney General is too important... that is why we and thousands of other Massachusetts Democrats support Elliot Richardson for Attorney General." Among the signers were Henry Commager and Adam Yarmolinsky. The ad also carried a quote from John F. Kennedy, Washington, 1956: "I want to show the very high regard in which Mr. Richardson is held by all who know him, including myself. I have worked with him on many occasions in the past and always found him to be extremely able, dependable and fair-minded." Richardson was also supported by the Americans for Democratic Action (A.D.A.).

Adam Yarmolinsky's endorsement should be enough to warn anyone against endorsing Richardson. Yarmolinsky attended Harvard at the same time as Richardson, graduating two years later. During his sojourn at Harvard, Yarmolinsky was head of the Marxist Club, a founding member and editor of the Marxist magazine, *Yardling*, which presented the views of the Young Communist League. He admitted attending meetings of the Communist Youth League and an investigation by the Army into his left-wing background quoted him as stating, "They (the Young Communist League) believed and I was inclined to believe that a so-called Communist government was a desirable end." As a free-wheeling commissar in the Defense Department during the Kennedy Kingdom, Yarmolinsky was instrumental in trying to destroy the morale of the armed forces of the United States. High-ranking military personnel had their every word and action carefully scrutinized by Adams and his "Whizz-Kids." He became so powerful under McNamara that reportedly no one could be hired, assigned or discharged at the Pentagon without his O.K. Exposure forced Yarmolinsky out of public life but he continued and continues to be active "behind the scenes."

Endorsement by Yarmolinsky did not militate against Richardson and he was elected Attorney General of Massachusetts. One of his more regrettable acts in this capacity was granting permission for a "documentary" film to be made of the inmates at the Bridgewater State Hospital for the criminally insane. These unfortunates were photographed in their degenerate and private activities and the film, entitled "Titticut Follies," was shown commercially. It was from this post that Mr. Richardson moved into his position of Number Two man in American diplomacy as Under Secretary of State on the recommendation of Secretary of State William Rogers.

Richardson is a long-time close personal friend of Rogers who explained his choice as "springing mainly from a desire to have as his deputy someone with whom he is personally close and compatible, a man who would serve as his 'alter ego'."

Richardson was quite acceptable to the "Liberal Establishment" in spite of his "limited experience in foreign affairs." The *N.Y. Times* of January 1, 1969 in announcing the selection of Richardson for the State Department post stated:

"Although Mr. Richardson has no official



experience for the Under Secretaryship, he has traveled widely. In 1961, as president of the World Affairs Council in Boston, he visited Africa for a first-hand look at emerging nations. He has also attended a policy seminar at Salzburg, Austria."

With the Institute of Pacific Relations thoroughly discredited and exposed as subversive by extensive hearings and investigations, its work did not cease but was continued by other groups. The internationalists have never ceased to propagandize, and among the "educational" organizations through which they work are the various regional World Affairs Councils. In the House of Representatives report of hearings on Tax-Exempt Foundations appears a document called Recommendations of the President to the Trustees (Carnegie Endowment for International Peace) signed by Alger Hiss and published in the 1947 yearbook of that organization. It states in part:

"The United States was the chief architect of the United Nations and is its chief support. The opportunity for an endowed American institution having the objectives, traditions, and prestige of the endowment, to support and serve the United Nations is very great. No other agency appears to be so favorably situated as is the endowment for the undertaking of such a program . . . I recommend most earnestly that the endowment construct its program for the period that lies ahead primarily for the support and the assistance of the United Nations . . . the endowment should utilize its existing resources, such as the international relations clubs in the colleges and . . . should strengthen its relationship with existing agencies interested in the field of foreign affairs . . . the Council on Foreign Relations, the Foreign Policy Association, and local community groups interested in foreign affairs, of which the Cleveland Council on World Affairs and the projected World Affairs Council in San Francisco are examples . . . These organizations . . . are not equipped to set up foreign policy research staffs on their own. The endowment should supply these organizations with basic information about the United Nations, and should assist them both in selecting topics of interest to their members and in presenting those topics so as to be most readily understood by their members . . ."

What Hiss was describing and recommending was a huge brainwashing operation to be performed on the American public. Such organizations as the Foreign Policy Association and World Affairs Councils, fronting for the Council on Foreign Relations, pretend to be "non-partisan" and educational but are strictly World Government propagandists. Richardson has been closely associated with this as a member of the board of directors and president of the World Affairs Council of Boston. He is also a member of the Council on Foreign Relations itself.

Mr. Richardson was described by the N.Y. Times as having all the attributes of the proper Bostonian, family background, and "the distinctive New England upper-class way of talking." We are told, however, that his intimates know him "as a great party man with a robust sense of humor, a good dancer and avid skier, even an adventurer." The late Drew Pearson was not quite so kind in his comments, recollecting that Richardson had a good record in government and was "a far-sighted HEW executive" but he had a problem—alcoholism. It sounds strange, coming from Pearson, but he stated:

"It is a firm rule of the State Department that an alcoholic is a security risk. The theory is that he's subject to blackmail, or can be indiscreet under the influence of liquor and leak security information . . ."

Citing a record of fifteen automobile arrests for Richardson, Pearson stated that his first

brush with the law was at the age of nineteen when he was arrested on May 6, 1939, at 8:30 P.M. for operating under the influence of liquor on Beacon Street in Boston. Pearson quoted the arresting officer as stating: "Richardson was very abusive at the time of his arrest and threatened to have me fired." After pleading guilty to the offense, Richardson was fined \$75 and his license suspended. For an offense in April 1951, Richardson pleaded guilty and was fined \$200 and his license suspended. This was for striking a stop sign and going through a hedge at 2:00 A.M. in Brookline, Mass. Of his numerous arrests, three involved driving under the influence of alcohol and most of the others involved speeding.

Richardson was on the other side of the problem when he later headed the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (after his Number 2 job in the State Department) and joined the Secretary of Transportation (John A. Volpe) in announcing the signing of an agreement coordinating alcoholism programs of the National Institute of Mental Health with those of the Highway Traffic Safety Administration. A huge education program was planned to demonstrate that "responsible" drinking is not incompatible with modern living. It was pointed out that the program would have to be carefully handled so that the Federal Government would not be accused of "teaching people how to drink."

In all his various capacities, Richardson has been described as "vocal and active" and he carried these characteristics into his State Department position; "observers" acknowledged him to be the State Department's most influential voice at the White House with an "especially close working relationship" with Henry Kissinger. He also developed a good relationship with the State Department dissidents ("Young Turks") by his initiation of "reforms."

Richardson was sworn in as head of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare on June 24, 1970, replacing Robert H. Finch, Nixon's California crony who could not cut it with the Eastern Establishment. Since Richardson served in H.E.W. during the Eisenhower Administration it had doubled its size and now had a budget of 81 billion dollars, employed over 100,000 persons and financed 40,000 institutions and agencies. One of Richardson's first acts after taking office was to discontinue the policy of cutting off federal funds to school districts that refused to desegregate. He simply turned the cases over to the Justice Department for prosecution, a process he felt to be more "effective." Desegregation, medicare, mental health, welfare were now in the hands of a man who does not play games, at least not while on the job.

Fresh from the State Department where security regulations were seemingly nonexistent, Richardson instituted the same policy in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare where some did exist when he came upon the scene. Secretary Richardson signed new regulations on September 20, 1970 formally relaxing security and suitability regulations for scientists who serve it as part-time consultants. There were 6,000 of these, most of them acting as advisers to the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Maryland. Hundreds of scientists had previously been barred from becoming advisers because of their political beliefs and affiliations, which, of course, would be Communist and subversive. All that was changed under Richardson, with no investigations of consultants before they were appointed; under the new rules the suitability and loyalty of the scientists was to be "vouched for" by a senior H.E.W. official. The fact that

a few conservative congressmen and Department of Justice employees objected to the elimination of security checks was overcome by pointing out that the old rules were instituted during the "security risk scares" of the early 1950's, now considered to be outdated. A senior H.E.W. official gave an indication of the type of consultant who would be helping H.E.W. to formulate its socialistic programs when he said he believed in the future prospective consultants would be rejected for personal behavior (possibly homosexuality or drug abuse) whereas in the past most rejections had been due to questionable loyalty. Like a true Frankfurter protege, Richardson was now making it possible for Communists and subversives to penetrate an area of government from which they had previously been barred, a very sensitive and important area where plans for the future are made.

Although he came from a family of doctors—his father, both grandfathers and several uncles as well as his two brothers—Richardson decided upon a career in politics. Operating within the framework of the Republican Party, he is of the strange new breed of the Republicans known as the "progressives" who number among them such as Mayor John Lindsay, and former Senator Charles Goodell. His left-wing credentials seem to be impeccable, and his connections with the Establishment and World Government advocates are of long standing. He is truly an international man in an international-minded administration, and now as the number one man in the Defense Department is in a position to play the part for which he was trained in the Felix Frankfurter school of social revolution. If President Nixon's purpose in appointing Richardson as Secretary of Defense is to liquidate it in favor of U.N. peacekeeping forces, then he has picked the right man for the job.

THE LATE OLIVER P. BOLTON

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the sad news about the passing of our former colleague, Oliver P. Bolton was a shock to all of us. He was universally respected and admired by all who served with him. In the Congress he always operated on a high level of statesmanship and decorum. He made an excellent record while serving here.

We all recall Oliver's distinguished mother, Mrs. Frances P. Bolton, one of the most able and respected Members who has served in this body for many years. I understand she is presently in Florida taking advantage of the winter climate there, and that she is enjoying very good health.

That mother-son relationship, both serving at the same time in the Congress, provided something of a footnote to history. Both of them were the kind of people America desperately needs in positions of responsibility.

To Mrs. Bolton, the mother, and to other members of that family, I extend my profound sympathy in their bereavement.

MOVE OVER J. L. SEAGULL, HERE IS JONATHAN LIVINGSTON CHRISTIAN

## HON. WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, one of the great surprises in the publishing business has been the success of a book containing only 40 pages of text and some pictures of seagulls in flight. This book, called "Jonathan Livingston Seagull," appeared on the top 10 best seller list during most of 1972. It is rather remarkable that such a book proved to be so popular with all segments of our population from the very young to older persons.

This story was written by an aircraft pilot named Richard Bach. The Reverend Kenneth S. Jones, pastor of Faith United Methodist Church in Rockville, Md., is a pilot also and, after reading "Jonathan Livingston Seagull," Reverend Jones was so inspired that he based one of his sermons on the story and entitled it "Jonathan Livingston Christian." Reverend Jones, in discussing why Jonathan is so popular, says:

People admire the idea that you can be better than you are. If you give it all you've got, success is unlimited.

This is certainly a wonderful goal for our young people as well as all others to follow.

Reverend Jones' sermon, "Jonathan Livingston Christian," has been published in the current issue of the Washingtonian magazine, and after reading it, I was so impressed, that I wanted to share it with my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD:

[From Washingtonian magazine]

MOVE OVER, J. L. SEAGULL, HERE IS JONATHAN LIVINGSTON CHRISTIAN

(The publishing phenomenon of the 1970s has been a slender book called Jonathan Livingston Seagull. Written by a pilot named Richard Bach and rejected by most major book publishers, Jonathan was quietly launched into print two years ago by Macmillan. Sales started slowly but grew and grew, and Jonathan perched atop the best-seller list most of 1972. Hardback sales are nearing two million, with a paperback printing out this month. The movie, with only seagulls as characters, will be out later this year.)

(What kind of seagull inspires that sort of interest? Jonathan yearns to fly better and faster than any other gull. At first he has trouble with his high-speed dives because of his long wings. He gives up. "If I were meant to fly at speed," he says, "I'd have a falcon's short wings." But he tries again and again, and finally achieves perfection.)

(Being inspirational and about flying was enough to catch the interests of Kenneth S. Jones, pastor of the Faith United Methodist Church in Rockville. Jones is a pilot—he learned while a missionary in the Congo—and he likes to bring new ideas into his young, growing church. So a sermon titled "Jonathan Livingston Christian" was a natural.)

("I got an extraordinary reaction," Jones says. "People hugged me, women kissed me. They told me it was the best sermon I ever preached." Jones' son Jeffrey, a student at Western Maryland College in Westminster, heard about it and invited his father to talk about Jonathan Livingston Christian at Sunday chapel services. The students gave the

sermon a rousing ovation—"a first for me in twenty years of preaching," Jones says.)

(Why is Jonathan so popular? "People admire the idea that you can be better than you are," Jones says, "that if you give it all you've got, success is unlimited.")

(Some think the book is not all that Christian. A bishop has denounced it for the sin of pride, for its emphasis on the self over others. But Jones points out that after Jonathan learned to fly, he wanted to teach others. Jones emphasizes "this Christian interpretation of Jonathan's willingness to share what he knew with others.")

(So move over Jonathan Livingston Seagull and make room for Jonathan Livingston Christian.)

How could a book with only 40 pages of text and some pictures of seagulls in flight become a national best seller? There is no sex, not even a single human being mentioned in the story.

Jonathan Livingston Seagull discovered the joy of flying. He found it was more challenging than following fishing boats for castaway fish and spending his life as a beachcomber. By holding his wings close to his body he was able to dive at more than 200 miles an hour. One day he climbed to 5,000 feet and dove right through the midst of his home flock a hundred feet above the water. He thought they'd be proud of his accomplishment, but instead they expelled him from the flock, banished him to a lonely life on the Far Cliffs.

The head gull, called the Elder, pronounced his banishment and gave this philosophy: "Life is the unknown and unknowable, except that we are put into this world to eat and to stay alive as long as we possibly can." In disregard for tradition, Jonathan Seagull talked back to the Elder: "For a thousand years we have scrambled after fishheads, but now we have a reason to live—to learn, to discover, to be free." "The Brotherhood is broken" the adult gulls intoned together and that meant that Jonathan was no longer part of them.

Jonathan suffered not so much by his loneliness as by the fact that the other gulls could not believe the glory that would be theirs if they would open their eyes and see. Jonathan discovered that boredom and fear and anger are the reasons that a gull's life is so short, and with these gone from his thought he lived a long fine life indeed.

Then one evening two shining gulls, who actually flew with more grace and skill than Jonathan, appeared at his wingtips. He added full power and zoomed away from them, but they dove and rolled and banked with perfect precision. "We are from your flock, Jonathan. We have come to take you higher, to take you home." With the promise of flying higher and with greater skill, he gladly flew with them to heaven.

He asked a nobler Elder Gull: "Is this heaven?" "No, Jonathan, there is no such place. Heaven is not a place or a time. Heaven is being perfect."

One day, standing on the shore, Jonathan understood what the Elder Gull had told him. "It's true! I am a perfect, unlimited gull!"

Jonathan learned so much he longed to return to the flock that had made him an outcast. At the Far Cliffs he found first one new outcast, then another, until he had seven students who learned to fly as well Jonathan.

Then one day the eight of them flew right through the old home flock in a double-diamond formation at 135 miles per hour wingtip-to-wingtip. The elders of the flock cried "Outcasts. They're Outcasts." "Sure they're outcasts," cried the young gulls, but where did they learn to fly like that?"

Jonathan and his students relaxed on the beach at night, and gradually the young gulls gathered in the dark around them, listening to Jonathan's wisdom. Oh, they wanted to

fly. But they said, "How do you ever expect us to fly as you fly? You are special and gifted and divine, above other birds." "None is more special or divine than any other" Jonathan said. "The only difference, the very only one, is that they have begun to understand what they really are and have begun to practice it."

Fletcher Lynd Seagull was the name of that first outcast gull that Jonathan had met in the Far Cliffs. Fletcher became an instructor for the young gulls who believed. Then one day Jonathan said to Fletcher: "You don't need me any longer. All you need is to keep faith in your unlimited self. He'll be your instructor. I have other flocks, other Fletchers that need an instructor more than you." And with that Jonathan's body wavered in the air, shimmering, and then went utterly transparent.

Now what is this all about? Why have I left some parts of the story still untold? Why should I call a sermon by the name Jonathan Livingston Christian?

Well, first it's important to know that author Richard Bach is a pilot. There is so much to learn in life that simply is not comprehended if you are earthbound. This is what Jonathan's rebellion was all about. Down at the beach or a few yards above the water all there is to life is the struggle for survival. Jonathan's father said to him one day: "If you must study, then study food and how to get it. Don't forget that the reason you fly is to eat." Isn't that terrible that a father should say to his son, in effect, the purpose of life is to earn a living? There is one main purpose to life, and all the rest is incidental. The purpose of life is to discover and fulfill what God had in mind when he made us.

Down on the surface of the earth the hills seem so steep and hard to climb, but from a thousand feet up the 30- and 50-foot elevations are practically flat. And it's that way with life. Obstacles rise up in our paths—sorrows, burdens, setbacks—and they seem insurmountable, but viewed from the vantage point of a thousand feet closer to God, they all flatten to ripples. Compared to the mountains and chasms others confront, we live on a smooth plain. With God's help we are able to rise above the apparent limitations that frustrate a person who is weak in faith.

Now, with a view to helping you learn to fly, I am renaming each of you Jonathan Livingston Christian. Oh, you're still free, I haven't taken anything away from you. You can still choose to live like a two-legged creature, distinguishable from other mammals only by the power of speech and the wit to make tools. You can continue with first-things-first, continue until your deaths in the struggle for survival and shelter and the lordship of real estate. Or you can heed the promises of God. Jesus said: "The person who wants to save his own life will lose it; but the one who loses his life for my sake will save it. Put God's kingdom first in your life, and he will provide whatever it is you will need." You can do anything, but only by prayer and believing.

If you are going to be thought of as a Jonathan Livingston sort of Christian, you'll have to imitate his determination to succeed, Jonathan tried to develop a slow-flying technique and he stalled and fell into the sea like a rock. Still he tried again and again. He tried high-speed dives, so fast that when he stuck out a few feathers to end his dive his wings were nearly torn from his body. But he kept on until he perfected it. His single-mindedness, his devotion to perfecting his skill, made him an outcast and it just might make an outcast of you. But never mind. In your striving for perfection, you are not seeking cheers from the stands, but a "well done" from your Creator.

Jonathan Livingston Christian is also training himself for a future life. Jonathan Seagull's attitude of preparation stood him in good stead. How do your attitudes support



you? If you are striving today to be better than yesterday—more faithful, more loving, more useful, more grateful—you'll not have any anxieties about a life hereafter. It can only be an enlargement, an amplification, a great expansion of the joys we've known right here. Jonathan Seagull didn't miss one beat of his wings. He was in mid-flight when two shining gulls escorted him to Elysian Field.

Now if it's true that heaven is merely an intensification of the perfection we have achieved in the present, then our present duties will be similar to the duties of angels. Jonathan Livingston Christian, that's you, will want to share your knowledge of perfection, spread the joy, tell the world, get someone else ready for the great journey. Jonathan Seagull was a compulsive flight instructor. He knew there would be others somewhere who wanted to know how to fly. You know how to fly, Jonathan Christian, and out there on the lonely Far Cliffs of this world there are lonely people who need to know what you know. Have you ever heard evangelism described that way? That's what it is. You may not claim a comfortable pew for your perpetual and private use and enjoyment. Unless you share it, it will lose its power to hold and lift you up in spirit.

I left out an incident in the other Jonathan's story. On the beach, his native beach, one Kirk Maynard Gull came to Jonathan, dragging his left wing. "I want to fly more than anything else in the world," he said.

"Come along then," said Jonathan. "Climb with me away from the ground and we'll begin."

"You don't understand. My wing, I can't move my wing."

"Maynard Gull, you have the freedom to be yourself, your true self, here and now, and nothing can stand in your way. It is the Law of the Great Gull, the Law that is."

"Are you saying I can fly?"

"I say you are free."

As simply and as quickly as that, Kirk Maynard Gull spread his wings, effortlessly, and lifted into the dark night air. The whole flock was awakened by his loud scream from five hundred feet up. "I can fly! Listen! I can fly!"

By sunrise nearly a thousand gulls gathered around Maynard. And Jonathan was there to explain: "You must understand that a seagull is an unlimited idea of freedom, an image of the Great Gull, and your whole body, from wingtip to wingtip, is nothing more than your thought itself."

You, Jonathan Livingston Christian, are made in the image of God, made for perfection, made to find your life in giving it. You can fly. By faith you can fly and you'll know the destination of your final flight.

#### PROTECTING OUR PROTECTORS

#### HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I am joining my able colleague from our neighbor State of Missouri, the Honorable RICHARD ICHORD, in introducing H.R. 2693, a bill to make it a Federal crime to kill or assault a fireman or law enforcement officer engaged in the performance of his duties.

In my opinion, it is a shame that legislation such as this is necessary in this Nation of justice and order. The overwhelming majority of our citizens abhor the senseless violent acts we have recently witnessed against our police and firemen.

But a tiny minority of madmen has

declared war on these brave public servants. We have seen the tragic slaughter in a New Orleans hotel and the increasing number of ambushes against policemen in New York City. Hardly a day passes that similar reports do not appear in the press.

The time has come for us to protect those who spend their lives protecting us.

With this purpose in mind, I have cosponsored this legislation. The bill is similar to the Federal kidnaping statute—the "Lindberg Law." Just as this Nation was shocked into action following the tragic Lindberg kidnaping, we must now act to control atrocities which are growing in number and viciousness against our society based on order.

It is not the intent of this legislation to replace State criminal statutes against this sort of crime. Instead, our bill is designed to augment State efforts in this area. In many cases, the assailants have been able to escape across State lines. Prompt initiation of Federal anticrime machinery, which this bill would provide for, will hopefully cut off these escape routes.

I feel certain that legislation such as this would receive wide support from our constituents. I have received a considerable amount of mail on this issue, and the news media in my district has been unanimous in condemning these outrages.

In conclusion, I include a recent editorial which appeared in the McPherson, Kansas Sentinel in which editor Ken Krehbiel expresses well the prevailing sentiment.

The editorial follows:

#### POLICE AND FIREMEN MUST HAVE BETTER PROTECTION

The New Orleans slaughter of police and firemen on top of many nationwide killings of policemen should convince us they need better protection. The killings, senseless and unexplained, often seem part of a conspiracy to kill every policeman they can.

Many are demanding a return to the death penalty for those convicted of killing a policeman. That may be necessary, but penalties we have now do not seem to be used to their full effect.

To begin with, some lawyer takes the defense of the murderer for publicity reasons. He drags the case on and on until most people forget about it. Sometimes he even slips in a confession which gets the murderer off with a few years.

A police or fireman killer should know beforehand that he will be tried with the highest speed with few delays and once convicted he will always get at least the maximum sentence with no parole for anything.

If that doesn't stop the present murders, then go to the death penalty if we must.

Whatever the means, the murders must stop if we are to have effective police protection of our cities and homes.

#### NEED FOR FURTHER REDUCTIONS IN SUPPORTING ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATIONS

#### HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I call to your attention a matter

that should be of grave concern to this Congress. On January 24, President Nixon declared a cease fire for Vietnam effective January 27, 1973. It is difficult to understand why it was necessary for our fighting forces to finish out the week—during which four more American fighting men were killed—but it would seem that the fighting in Vietnam is finally nearing an end. Sadly, the same does not appear to be true for Laos and Cambodia.

A contributing factor to the continuation of the fighting in Laos and Cambodia is undoubtedly the amount of American dollars supplied to feed the existing corruption. As long as powerful groups of individuals in Laos and Cambodia can make a dollar on the war, they will attempt to continue the fighting.

During the last Congress, the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, which I chair, prepared reports showing the gross lack of control over the expenditure of millions of dollars under U.S. grant programs to both Laos and Cambodia which are administered by the U.S. Agency for International Development—Need a copy? Phone 225-3741. In replying to our reports, Agency officials have advised me that they have carefully reviewed the reports but that nothing will be done to establish proper U.S. controls over these programs.

Over the past 20 years, one scandal after another has surfaced in our foreign assistance operations. Past programs in both Laos and Cambodia have been especially troublesome. To cover up the continued corruption in these countries, AID officials have devised schemes whereby the United States contributes millions of dollars purportedly to pay the foreign exchange costs of imports needed by the Lao and Cambodian people. However, our officials have been especially careful not to create any real control over this expenditure of the taxpayers' money. In fact, the AID mission director in Laos reported that over \$50 million of the \$95 million made available to Laos for imports over a recent 4-year period could not be accounted for by commodity imports into Laos. Our officials in both Laos and Washington readily confessed that they do not know what the Lao did with the \$50 million.

During our hearings on the economy and efficiency of U.S. economic assistance programs in Cambodia, AID officials clearly explained their reasoning for establishing a special exchange fund to finance imports for Cambodia when they testified that the fund would finance "those kinds of things that we either did not wish to, or legally could not finance out of a commodity import program."

Our officials rationalize that concealed corruption cannot hurt the U.S. foreign assistance program. Are we as responsible representatives of the American people going to permit this uncontrolled expenditure of millions of U.S. tax dollars to continue?

Mr. Speaker, during the closing days of the 92d Congress, we passed a continuing resolution for the funding of our foreign assistance programs. In doing so, Congress indicated that final funding for the administration's \$894 million sup-

porting assistance appropriation request would not exceed \$600 million. Every Member of the 93d Congress should be carefully considering the authorization and appropriation of funding for AID's supporting assistance programs which will be up for a vote before the Congress very shortly. With proper U.S. control over the expenditure of these funds, it would be necessary for the Congress to appropriate less than half the amounts it has been providing for supporting assistance purposes. Clearly, we must speak to our AID officials in the only language they understand—the language of the appropriated dollar.

OLIVER BOLTON

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in eulogizing the passing away on December 13 of a distinguished member of a distinguished family, Ollie Bolton.

I had the privilege and pleasure of getting to know Ollie when we were both members of the House Banking and Currency Committee. He was always ready with a helping hand and friendly word of advice.

The story of the Bolton family is truly a remarkable one. Ollie was raised in an atmosphere of public service to his Nation, and it was only natural that he would want to do the same. Certainly no man was better prepared by background to serve in Congress.

As my colleagues know, both Ollie's father and mother were Members of Congress, his mother, the distinguished Frances Bolton, having served in Congress until 1969. Also, he was the great grandson of another Representative from Ohio, Henry B. Payne.

Ollie's record shows that he lived up to this great legacy. He was a compassionate and dedicated man, and he left his mark on history as did his forebearers.

Ollie Bolton was a great friend of mine and I have a deep sense of personal loss. To his wife, Adelaide, his two sons and daughter, and to his mother, the Honorable Frances Bolton, Mrs. Harvey and I extend our deepest sympathies.

#### EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Bob Yeargin, staff writer for the Las Vegas Sun, has written a detailed series of articles on the equal rights amendment, which is now before the Nevada Legisla-

ture for ratification. At this time, I would like to insert in the Record the beginning two articles of this six-part series. The study appeared in the Las Vegas Sun in December 1972. The articles follow:

#### DISCRIMINATION: SEXUAL AS WELL AS RACIAL (By Bob Yeargin)

(EDITOR'S NOTE: The equal rights amendment, also known as the ERA, has the distinction of being one measure which evokes all manner of response, from the politely stifled yawn to an almost shrill reaction, depending on who discusses it. With this article the SUN embarks on a six-part study of the amendment, its background, its effect, and its chances for ratification by Nevada's legislature next year. Today's installment treats the sexual discrimination in American society which has led to the ERA.)

Women's Lib, credited by many with splitting American females into opposing camps, has accomplished something else, too.

The controversial movement, bursting into the national consciousness in recent years, has made America aware that discrimination is sexual as well as racial, and even women who vehemently deny being "Women's Libbers" can recount personal experiences of sexual discrimination.

The disputes surrounding Women's Lib, have predictably spilled over into other discussions on women's rights, most notably those dealing with the women's equal rights amendment (ERA).

Lost in the shuffle, though, is the fact that the ERA was created to deal with the discrimination women have faced in various segments of society.

"I have been far oftener discriminated against because I am a woman than because I am black," Rep. Shirley Chisholm D-N.Y., told the House Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments in May, 1970.

Portions of the testimony leading to the equal rights amendment and later reprinted in the Congressional Record detail amply the extent of this discrimination.

For example, until 1966 three states excluded women from jury duty altogether and even today women wishing to serve on Florida juries must register for the responsibility.

"Equal justice under the law" rings rather hollow, when in one state a woman may be jailed for three years for habitual drunkenness, although the maximum sentence for the same offense for a man is only 30 days.

Comparable injustices exist in those two states where a deceived husband may use a defense of "passion killing," while a wife in the same situation may not.

Women also face substantial discrimination in educational circles, so much so that an independent agency told the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare this year, "Discrimination against women, in contrast to that against minorities, is still overt and socially acceptable within the academic community."

The percentage of college-age females actually enrolled in college underlines the situation. Twenty-nine per cent of the women between the ages of 18 and 21 and nine per cent of those between 23 and 24 were college students in 1970, compared to more than 40 per cent and 20 per cent of the males in those respective age groups.

The reasons for this discrepancy are more easily traceable when one runs across admissions brochures such as the one published by a state university in 1969 which stated that "admission of women on the freshman level will be restricted to those who are especially well qualified."

In the 1968-69 school year, more than 50 per cent of the bachelor's degrees awarded in the United States went to women, but

just 37 per cent of the master's degrees, 13 per cent of the doctorates and 4 per cent of the professional degrees.

To proceed with the disadvantages facing women in business and labor may appear to belabor the point, but their existence cannot be denied.

For example, Nevada is among those states which restrict married women—but not married men—in establishing businesses.

And the 1970 hearings of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments revealed that 26 states then had laws excluding adult women from certain occupations. Among them was Ohio, which does not permit women to work as crossing watchmen, section hands, bellhops, gas or electric meter readers, pin-setters or drivers of delivery vehicles of more than one ton, to name just a few.

What was formerly protective labor legislation has to a great degree become restrictive, as in the case of those laws limiting the hours women may work. Such statutes have often made it impossible for qualified women to advance, since supervisors must put in overtime.

Common knowledge through it may be that most women will learn less than men doing the same job, it nevertheless comes as a shock to learn that the female median income is just 59.5 per cent of the male or that four years of college gives a woman just a slight advantage over a man with an eight-grade education.

While women make up 40 per cent of the white collar work force, they can be found in just one of 10 managerial positions and just one of seven professional positions. The pattern is identical among female federal civil service employees.

The courts have afforded women little solace in their struggle for equal rights, upholding discriminatory statutes in most cases. The Supreme Court took the lead, upholding in 1872 an Illinois Supreme Court decision forbidding women to practice law and maintaining in 1874 that the Fourteenth Amendment did not extend to women citizens the right to vote.

More recent decisions have seen the nation's highest court affirm in 1948 a Michigan law prohibiting females—apart from wives and daughters of male licensees—from obtaining licenses as bartenders and upheld in 1967 a Florida statute relieving women of jury duty unless they registered to be placed on the list, the reasoning behind these decisions being that the laws were "reasonable."

The court decided in 1971 in "Reed vs. Reed" that a state law favoring men over women as administrators of estates was unconstitutional, but it neglected to overrule its previous decisions, leaving the burden on women to establish the unreasonable nature of discriminatory laws.

In the wake of this decision, The Association of the Bar of the City of New York commented, "The 1971 Reed case indicated no change in judicial attitude."

Under these circumstances, with the Supreme Court refusing to consider sex discrimination "suspect" of itself, as it does racial discrimination, there is little hope the court will overrule all discriminatory statutes on its own.

#### ERA'S EFFECT . . . REALLY A NAGGING QUESTION (By Bob Yeargin)

(EDITOR'S NOTE: The drafting of women and the abolition of separate restrooms for men and women have been raised as possible results of the equal rights amendment (ERA). Congressional testimony behind the amendment concedes one possibility and rejects the other, the second article in the SUN's series on the ERA reveals today.)

Behind the debate over the Women's equal rights amendment (ERA) lingers the nagging question of the amendment's effect.



Among the more extreme fears voiced in this regard is that families will be torn apart as the mothers are drafted.

Yet the amendment reads simply, "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex."

Not a word about abolishing separate restrooms for men and women.

Advocates of the ERA point out that the amendment merely requires federal, state and local governments to deal with male and female citizens as individuals.

The amendment, far from setting quotas or establishing priorities, simply forbids discrimination because of a person's sex in governmental matters. Private or social relationships do not fall within the amendment's jurisdiction.

"Equality" does not mean "sameness," observes the House of Representatives' report on the ERA. "As a result, the original resolution would not prohibit reasonable classification based on characteristics that are unique to one sex."

So while laws concerned with payment of hospital expenses of child bearing could concern only women, statutes dealing with traits common to both sexes would apply to all individuals.

The constitutional right to privacy, affirmed by the Supreme Court in 1965, permits separation of the sexes in areas such as toilets and sleeping quarters in public institutions, adds the House report.

Unnoticed in the uproar over drafting women is the fact that the amendment will allow women volunteering for the armed forces to meet the same qualifications as men rather than the more stringent requirements presently in force for them.

Servicewomen will also be able to avail themselves fully of the benefits military service has offered to men for years, including the educational benefits of the G.I. Bill and medical treatment both in the service and afterward through veterans hospitals.

Much opposition to the amendment is rooted in a fear of the draft, which, ERA supporters concede, would apply equally to men and women with the amendment's ratification.

They point out, though, that the draft is being phased out and that a draft would not be any more all inclusive for women than it presently is for men.

Consequently, physically or mentally unqualified women would not be drafted, nor would conscientious objectors. In addition, women with dependents or certain public duties would be exempt.

Beyond these obvious examples, notes the Congressional Record, Congress would be able to provide "legitimate sex-neutral exemptions from compulsory service."

Since women already serve in the armed forces, though, there is little question of whether men and women can work together in the various branches of service.

Also instructive in this regard is the experience of Israel, where women are required to serve but do not fill combat posts, working instead in communications, nursing, electronics and clerical positions.

Ratification of the equal rights amendment will confirm the benefits women have gained from protective labor legislation while removing these laws' restrictive aspects, Congressional testimony reveals.

In this respect, America's females have nothing to lose, since, as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has noted, many of the labor laws "do not take into account the capabilities, preferences and abilities of individual females and tend to discriminate rather than protect."

Those laws containing real benefits will be extended to apply to men as well, the amendment's sponsors expect, while more restrictive statutes will be taken off the books.

Included in the first category would be those laws concerning rest periods, minimum wages, or health and safety safeguards.

The principle of expanding or nullifying statutes affected by the equal rights amendment will be exercised with regard to laws in other fields as well.

Offending statutes have been extended in many other situations, among them the Supreme Court's action in expanding state laws which restricted admission to institutions of higher education because of race to include black students.

Laws prescribing different penalties for men and women committing the same crime would be struck down, but statutes "designed to protect women in a way that they are uniformly distinct from men," such as those punishing rape, would be unaffected by the amendment.

The ERA would affect state laws on domestic relations in that it would prohibit states from placing greater demands on one spouse because of sex.

"The support obligation of each spouse would be defined in functional terms based, for example, on each spouse's earning power, current resources and nonmonetary contributions to the family welfare," explains a report of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

The report goes on to indicate that while the courts would be hesitant to step into an ongoing marriage, both sexes would receive more equitable treatment when a marriage is dissolved.

OLIVER PAYNE BOLTON

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to Oliver Bolton.

Oliver Bolton came from an Ohio family where public service was a tradition. Both his mother and father served in the House and he served simultaneously with his mother the Honorable Frances Bolton. They were the only mother-son Representatives to ever serve in the House at the same time.

He served in the 83d and 84th Congress and then served as director of commerce for the State of Ohio in 1957. Representative Bolton was then again elected to serve in the 88th Congress.

As a young man he served with distinction in the armed forces including service in the Pacific theater during World War II on the staff of C-2 section of 5th Amphibious Corps. After the war he was active in Young Republican activities and was a reporter for the Daily Reporter, in Dover, Ohio.

Oliver Bolton was the great grandson of Representative Henry B. Payne from Ohio and the son of Chester and Frances Bolton.

This record of public service to the Nation he loved is one that can serve as a model to all Americans. His family's tradition of public service gave the House of Representatives four outstanding leaders. The State of Ohio and indeed all America mourns the passing of Oliver Payne Bolton.

## AN APPEAL TO THE CONSCIENCE OF THE WEST

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, today the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, chaired by Senator EDWARD GURNEY, of Florida, made public, via an open hearing, valuable, current information on the existence of concentration camps in the Soviet Union. Equipped with pictures, documents, and maps, Avraham Shifrin, a Russian Jew now residing in Israel, recounted his experiences during 10 years—1953 to 1963—as an inmate of various camps throughout the Soviet Union. Contrary to the belief of some, such camps are very much in existence today, according to Mr. Shifrin's testimony, housing millions of political prisoners. The number of camps run into the thousands and the conditions are just as bestial as they were in the days of Stalin.

Speaking on behalf of all the prisoners, regardless of their nationality or religion, Mr. Shifrin, in addition to his own experiences before his departure from the U.S.S.R. in 1970, provided information from many different sources inside the Soviet Union—and even from inside the camps—concerning conditions in the Soviet concentration camps today.

In his appeal to the conscience of the free world, Mr. Shifrin stated, in the accurate summary of his testimony distributed by the subcommittee:

But the people of the Soviet Union resist, they struggle, they are not broken. They refuse to permit the communists to destroy God's image in their souls, to corrupt them and turn them into beasts, or into robots. . . .

That is the reason why I am here today. I want to remind you of our responsibility to those who are oppressed. They need our help. How can we help them? We can help them in two ways: first, by exposing the facts; and second, by voicing our indignation.

In helping them we shall also be helping ourselves.

The summary of the extemporaneous testimony of Avraham Shifrin before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security today follows:

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY BY AVRAHAM SHIFRIN BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY, FEBRUARY 1, 1973

(The following statement will not be given by Mr. Shifrin, who will testify extemporaneously. However, it does represent an accurate summary of his testimony, with a few of the highlights spelled out in detail.)

Permit me to begin my testimony by saying how honored I am to be given the privilege of speaking here about my experiences during the 10 years of my imprisonment in Soviet concentration camps and prisons, and about the information I have received from many different sources inside the Soviet Union—and even from inside the camps—concerning conditions in the Soviet concentration camp empire today.

I am a proud Zionist, and, of course, I am very deeply concerned with the plight of the Jews in the Soviet Union, but as a human being I feel it my duty to speak here on behalf of all the prisoners, regard-

less of their nationality or religion. All nationalities are represented in the Soviet concentration camps. In fact, the camps are the only place in the USSR where there is no discrimination.

I also want to ask my friends in Soviet captivity to forgive me for not mentioning them all by name here in the Senate of the United States. Hundreds of prisoners whom I know personally are today on the other side of the barbed wire fence. They occupy the same concrete bunks on which I used to spend sleepless nights in the camp barracks. They eat rotten cabbage, and with bare hands they build industrial plants, electric power station dams and fell timber in the wild forests and in the Arctic.

I was amazed to discover when I left the Soviet Union in 1970 that most people in the free world—even well-informed people—appear to believe that the massive concentration camp system which existed in Stalin's day has for all practical purposes been abolished in the U.S.S.R. At the height of the Stalin terror, according to Khrushchev's statement of 1956, there were 15 million prisoners in the camps of the U.S.S.R. It is true that after Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin in 1956 he did order the release of many millions of political prisoners—and this unquestionably does have a good deal to do with the confusion that exists in the free world. I myself saw how the camps over a period of a few years were emptied of almost half of their population. But I also saw in the period immediately following the suppression of the Hungarian revolution how the camps rapidly filled up again to capacity with soldiers, officers, workers, intellectuals, but mostly with professors, students, and young people.

Today the concentration camps house far fewer people than they did during the peak years of Stalin's terror. But the sad fact is—and I shall document this in the course of my testimony—that there are millions of political prisoners in the concentration camps and prisons of the Soviet Union today; that the camps, far from having disappeared, number into the thousands; and that the conditions are just as bestial as they were in the days of Stalin.

I want to make it clear that I am not speaking about 1963, when I was released. I am speaking about today.

That conditions in Soviet concentration camps have changed little since the times of Stalin is evidenced by numerous letters received by Alexander Solzhenitsyn after the publication of his novel *One Day In The Life Of Ivan Denisovich*. Excerpts from these letters were released by Solzhenitsyn and published in the collection of his works (v. 5, *Possev*, West Germany, 1969). In general, these letters said that conditions were very much the same, or that they were even worse than those described by Solzhenitsyn.

A group of prisoners of the *Ust-Nera* camp, for example, wrote: "Our conditions now are much worse (worse than those described in your novel). We are not being beaten, but soldiers say that we should all be done away with. Where does such hatred come from in boys 18-20 years old? They are obviously being incited. . . . In December 1962 [when the novel was published] out of a total of 300 prisoners in our zone, 190 of us were suffering from scurvy."

Here you see a map of the USSR. The red flags stand for concentration camps. The blue flags indicate entire complexes of camps. There may be a hundred camps or more in a single complex, each camp housing 2,000 to 5,000 prisoners. There are millions of prisoners in Soviet punitive institutions today. In Moscow alone, tourists, could find 27 huge prisons, had they made an effort to see them instead of the "Swan Lake" in the Bolshoi Theater Ballet.

I am unable to show you all the camps on

this map. There simply is no room to stick in the flags. Around each big Soviet city you will find three to five concentration camps. In Odessa, a city which the tourists love so much, there is a huge concentration camp with towers and barbed-wire fencing, right in the center of the town, on Chernomorskaya Doroga.

Here, for example, is Orsha, a minor provincial city, not even marked on the map. Yet, it is surrounded by six concentration camps. Here are their addresses:

P.O. Box UZh 15/6—"B".

P.O. Box UZh 15/2—"V".

P.O. Box UZh 15/12.

P.O. Box UZh 15/12-1.

P.O. Box UZh 15/12—"E".

P.O. Box UZh 15/12—"Zh".

This is a situation that should be of profound concern to the entire free world. It should be of concern, first, on moral and humanitarian grounds. But beyond this, the existence of this massive concentration system poses a serious danger to the security of the Free World. To the extent that the men in the Kremlin are able to repress all dissident opinion and all restraining voices, they are freer to engage in subversion and blackmail and expansion abroad.

I feel it to be my moral duty to tell you about the new wave of arrests in the Soviet Union, about starvation in concentration camps and prisons, about the mortal danger to which sick prisoners—like Silva Zalmanson, Eduard Kuznetsov, and Anatoli Altman—are exposed there. Remember the conditions under which Yuri Galanskov died only a few weeks ago. His friends had appealed to the free world time and again. They warned how gravely ill Galanskov was, but nobody seemed to have listened to them.

My memories of the camps consist of a succession of nightmares.

Today in Soviet concentration camps you can see hundreds of thousands of women, including mothers with babies. They are being held in special subdivisions. Once in Potma in 1961, I saw some 200 or 250 women with babies in their hands, children screaming, women crying, guards cursing, dogs barking. Revolted and outraged we began to shout at the guards: "Fascists!" "Murderers!" There were about three thousands of us. The guards panicked and began to shoot in the air. And suddenly in the midst of this pandemonium we heard the metallic voice of the radio announcer, amplified by the loudspeakers: "Citizens, rejoice, the Soviet Union has scored another great victory: a rocket with Cosmonaut Yuri Gagarin on board has been launched into space!"

Thousands and thousands of men and women languish in concentration camps because of their faith in God. The Communists want to destroy all confessional groups, all religions. I wish to remind you of such martyrs as Boris Talantov, Anatoly Krasnov-Levitin, Schelkov, and thousands of other nameless victims—Christians, Jews and Moslems. The believers cannot pray, they are denied the opportunity to observe religious holidays. The guards deride them, molest them, and throw them into punitive cells whenever they catch them praying. In the Tayshet Camp No. 10 in Siberia, I have witnessed the following scene. One Sunday the guards decided to break up a prayer meeting of Russian Orthodox nuns, so they ordered them to go to the shower-room to wash. The nuns asked that they be permitted to take their baths on Monday, because they did not wish to violate their Sabbath, but the guards refused. They tore the clothes off the women, and dragged them, naked, by their legs through the snow to the shower.

In the concentration camp of Kenigirin/Kazakhstan about 500 women were run over by tanks, when they formed a line in order to protect the male prisoners whom the guards were trying to punish for staging a

riot. This incident took place after the prisoners had stopped their work in the mines and gone on a hunger strike to protest against the unbearable conditions in the camp. And the conditions were such that some prisoners in desperation opened their veins, inflicted wounds on themselves, swallowed spoons and nails, drank their own blood and ate their own flesh. Yes, understand me correctly, their own flesh, driven to a state of delirium by hunger.

In the Potma Camp No. 10 I saw a prisoner, Nikolai Shcherbakov, cut off his own ears and throw them into the face of the camp officer. When I asked him later why he did it, he answered: "When I am free some day, I'll tell them of the horrors of our life here, and they may not believe me. So I'll show them my earless head and the inscription tattooed on my forehead: 'Slave of Communism.' That should convince them!"

The brutality and Sadism of the concentration camp guards—to which I will refer later in my testimony—partly results from the KGB instructions. But in part it is due to the initiative of officers and soldiers who have been completely dehumanized by their work. When you see a guard crushing the skull of a dead prisoner or plunging a red-hot iron into a corpse to ascertain that the man is really dead, then he is following instructions. But when—as I have seen in the wild forest near Lake Baykal—the KGB soldiers tie a naked prisoner to a tree and leave him there to be devoured by swarms of poisonous gnats, they act on their own initiative, because the government encourages them to be brutal and their occupation has dehumanized them.

When the prisoners are made to eat rotten cabbage, and sleep on concrete bunks in cells covered by a thick layer of frost—these are Moscow instructions. But when the guards throw the corpses of dead prisoners out on the snow to be devoured by wild beasts in the forest then it is the guards' initiative.

All these awful things you can see now, today, in the thousands of concentration camps and prisons of the Soviet Union. But the people in the Soviet Union resist, they struggle, they are not broken. They refuse to permit the communists to destroy God's image in their souls, to corrupt them and turn them into beasts, or into robots.

Numerous underground groups and movements are springing up all over the Soviet Union. Many hundreds of freedom fighters have been arrested, and sent to jails and concentration camps for up to 15 years. We must remember the names of these heroes:

The civil rights movement in the Soviet Union goes back to before the Hungarian revolution of 1956. Among the early heroes of this resistance, I note particularly the names of Eduard Kuznetsov, Illya Bokshstein, Igor Avdeev, Viktor Khaustov, and Yuri Osipov. They began their resistance with the public readings of poetry in Mayakowsky Square. First they read the poems of Mayakowsky. Then they began to read some of their own poetry that contained criticisms of the Soviet regime. Then Bokshstein one day climbed up on the statue of Mayakowsky and delivered a passionate oration against Soviet tyranny. A battle ensued with the secret police, and scores of those who took part in the demonstration were arrested and imprisoned.

Since that time there have been many similar public protests in the Soviet Union—some of them inspired by the suppression of the Hungarian Revolution, some of them inspired by the desire for more freedom and hatred of the regime of oppression, some of them inspired at least in part by the recurring food shortages. In every case the answer of the regime has been more arrests and more repression. Over the past 16 or 17 years in the Soviet Union there have



been riots and even major clashes in a whole series of Soviet cities, including Ryazan, Timyr Tau, Krasnodar, Vladivostok and Novocherkassk. Only half a year ago there was a major riot in which many people were killed in the city of Dnepropetrovsk, on the river Dnieper.

Intellectuals like Galanskov and Ginzburg tried during this period to publish an underground magazine. The *Samizdat* movement became nationwide—thousands of people participating in the laborious copying of documents of opposition. The *Chronicle of Current Events*, chief of the *Samizdat* publications, began to come out on a regular basis—and despite frantic efforts on the part of the regime it continues to come out until this day. A Jewish underground chronicle, *Exodus*, also began to appear on a regular basis. Entire books, like Marchenko's "My Testimony," were circulated in *Samizdat* form.

There were many casualties in this unrelenting battle for freedom—men and women whose names are justly honored throughout the world. Among the best known of these martyrs for freedom were Sinyavsky and Daniel, Pavi Litvinov, General Grigorenko, Anatoli Marchenko, Victor Krasnov and Victor Feinberg. All of these men are still in prison.

I would like to pay special tribute here to two young men who have paid an incredibly high price for their defiance of the Soviet regime—Pyotr Yakir, the son of a Jewish General who was executed by Stalin, and Yuri Shoukhevich, the son of a Ukrainian insurgent General who was also executed by Stalin. Both of these, remarkably enough, were first sent to the concentration camps at the age of 14 as sons of the "enemies of the people;" both were released after serving 20 years; both resumed the battle for freedom immediately on their release. And both are now back in prison.

I must also say a few words about Vladimir Bukovsky. He was one of the initiators of the Russian democratic opposition. Out of 30 years of his life, 9 were spent in psychiatric prisons and concentration camps. In January 1972 he was sentenced to a total of 12 years for having sent to the West a collection of documents concerning the confinement of healthy dissenters to special psychiatric institutions. These documents together with other materials were released by this Subcommittee on December 4, 1972.

Igor Ogurtsov, Mikhail Sado, Yevgeni Vagin, and Boris Averochkin, leaders of the *All-Russian Social-Christian Union for the Liberation of the People*, and some sixty of their followers were arrested in Leningrad, Tomsk, Irkutsk, Petrozavodsk, and other cities, because their patriotic appeal for the revival of Russia's spiritual and religious values did not fit into the pattern of the Communist-sponsored in the Red Army because in his heart he felt himself a citizen of Israel. He got a three year sentence. A three year sentence was also imposed on Vladimir MARKMAN just for a few telephone conversations with friends in Israel. But all this does not intimidate the Soviet Jews. I wish to mention here the names of such heroes as Eduard Kuznetsov, Silva Zalmanson, Anatoli Altman, and their friends who tried to fly secretly to Israel because the government of tyrants stubbornly refused to permit them to emigrate legally. Today they languish in the Potma concentration camp No. 10—the most horrible of all in the Soviet Union—locked up for 15 years.

And now let me voice a note of warning. The cancer of Communism has now spread over half of Europe, China, Cuba and parts of Africa. The Communists try to destroy your society with the help of all those radical groups. They deceive your youth with propaganda, they try to demoralize you so that

they can seize power in your country. And don't think that I am spreading panic. Remember that there was a time when there was no Communism in Eastern Europe or in Cuba, and the red flags were not exposed so boldly in France and Italy. In the Soviet Union Communists try to eradicate all dissidents, all democratic elements. They lock people up only because they dare to think. All this spells danger to you: The more they consolidate their power internally, the greater is the threat to the free countries.

That is the reason why I am here today. I want to remind you of our responsibility to those who are oppressed. They need our help. How can we help them? We can help them in two ways: first, by exposing the facts; and second, by voicing our indignation.

In helping them we shall also be helping ourselves.

#### POOR QUALITY OF POSTAL SERVICE

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 24, 1973

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I have recently requested that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and the General Accounting Office conduct an in-depth investigation of the U.S. Postal Service. Correspondence reaching my office has indicated that not only is the American public losing confidence in the mails, but, in fact, the deteriorating service is already having damaging effects on business. I have received letters from all over the country describing overdrawn and canceled accounts due to the delay of payments in the mails. The point has already been reached when anyone doing business with a deadline is hesitant to use the mails, and with good reason.

A recent article in the *Boca Raton News* spoke of this problem, and I insert it in the *RECORD* at this point:

#### ROGERS PUTS ON GLOVES

Eleventh District Congressman Paul Rogers has done what thousands of U.S. citizens wish they could do . . . he has "put on the gloves" and invited the U.S. Postal Service to join him in the ring.

Rogers, this week, has requested an investigation of the U.S. Postal Service, claiming the deteriorating condition of service is adversely affecting business and commerce.

He is asking the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and the General Accounting Office to ramrod the investigation.

Rogers' local constituents, who are disturbed by the poor service offered by their Post Offices should not now stand idly by. They should take the time to write Rogers at his Washington, D.C., office (Congressman Paul Rogers, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515) and provide him with documented examples of poor service they have encountered in recent months.

Such material should be beneficial in substantiating Rogers' claim that an investigation is needed and it also should be solid evidence once the investigation is approved and started.

Rogers, in demanding the investigation, mentioned several examples of poor service, including one constituent's letter which took nearly three months to travel less than a half mile.

"A constituent wrote to me at my West Palm Beach office. The letter was written and

postmarked on Sept. 18," Rogers said. "It was mailed from Palm Beach. These two cities are separated by a lake which is at most a half mile wide."

"Yet this man's letter was not received until Dec. 15 . . . three days short of three months. This may be an extreme case, but there are many cases which run into weeks."

Rogers said he has heard from many postal employees who all are disenchanted by the new postal service setup. "They claim the cutbacks have increased the problems," he said.

A thorough investigation will help determine if the cutbacks should be blamed or if it's simply poor management.

Rogers, in calling for the probe, hit on one key item. "There is one thing which seems to have been forgotten by the new postal officials and that's service. We had hoped that the new postal service could pay its own way if it were operated as a corporation. But first and foremost, the postal system should and must be a service to the American people."

HON. OLIVER P. BOLTON

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable sadness that I rise to make a few comments on the passing of my longtime friend, Oliver Bolton. Those of us who knew him during his years of service here in this body can attest to his value, both to his district and our country, as a legislator. He was intelligent, conscientious, and quick witted. He was keenly interested in his job and also in the world around him. By fully using his many talents, he ably and vigorously carried on the enviable tradition of service exemplified by both his father and mother. His retirement from the Washington scene left us the poorer.

It is not only, however, of Ol's legislative accomplishments that I wish to speak, Mr. Speaker, though these were substantial. I should like to comment on the manifold contributions which he made here on Capitol Hill, and also in his private life, because of the rare nature of his personality. Among Democrats and Republicans alike, he was an admired and popular individual. His was a happy, zestful nature. It was impossible not to be affected by his enthusiasm and love of life. He was interested in people as well as problems. During his years of public service he was unquestionably a lively source for good.

Ol's passing, we recognize, should not have come as a complete surprise because he was not in robust health. Nonetheless, his passing comes as a real shock. Because of his unceasing vitality and his positive attitude toward his personal problems, he created in us all the feeling that he would prevail over any weakness. Now that he has gone, and gone so suddenly, we realize even more vividly how indomitable was his spirit.

To his mother, whom many of us also know and love, to his beloved wife, and to his children, we extend our condolences.

# JOHN A. VOLPE—AN OUTSTANDING SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

## HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to pay tribute to a standout figure of this administration—the Honorable John A. Volpe, our outgoing Secretary of Transportation.

As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I had the pleasure of working closely with Secretary Volpe on a number of projects. I have come to respect him both for his ability to get things done and for his vision of a genuinely balanced transportation system to help bind and unite our Nation and all its disparate parts.

In an administration regarded by some of its sterner critics as gray and faceless, Secretary Volpe has been conspicuously his own man—sure of his convictions and with the strength and determination to act on them. On occasion, as at last spring's opening against heavy odds of the Transpo exposition, he has even given vent to a public display of emotion. The usual prim bureaucrat would keep his feelings to himself, of course, but for Mr. Volpe, such openness contributes to the empathy he has enjoined in his relationships with most Members of Congress, and official Washington generally.

Always a doer, he has compiled an impressive line of credits for his 4 years in Washington. Amtrak, the effort to revive passenger train service in the United States, owes its inspiration to Mr. Volpe. It was he who first proposed Amtrak, and then waited for the rest of the administration—in a few notable cases a bit reluctantly—to fall into line behind the plan.

Last fall, as most of us will recall, Mr. Volpe labored valiantly for an amendment to permit some diversion of highway trust funds for transit if that were desired by the local governments immediately concerned.

That effort failed, but through no fault of Secretary Volpe, who personally mustered dozens of votes for his fine cause. A high and mighty type of Cabinet official might have been content to languish in his office, leaving the hard work of rounding up support to his subordinates. But Secretary Volpe was too close to the action himself, too personally involved, to delegate that sort of responsibility.

Even the lowly bicycle has benefited from Secretary Volpe. He has taken the national lead in promoting the pollution-free bike as an alternative to the automobile, setting an example by pedaling himself and encouraging his top executives to do the same.

We frankly could use a good number of officials at all levels and in all branches of government who are as dedicated as Secretary Volpe to getting on with the job, no matter how challenging or forbidding.

John Volpe's life has been a continuous success story, of which his Washington service is but the latest chapter.

By way of further tribute to this outstanding public servant and fine man, as he embarks on his latest assignment as our Ambassador to Italy, I include at this point his official biography:

THE HONORABLE JOHN ANTHONY VOLPE, SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

John Anthony Volpe was appointed the Nation's second Secretary of Transportation by President Richard Nixon and was sworn in on January 20, 1969. He was serving his third term as Governor of Massachusetts when the President asked him to be a member of his Cabinet.

He was the Massachusetts Commissioner of Public Works for almost four years, just prior to his appointment by President Eisenhower as the Nation's first Federal Highway Administrator to launch the interstate highway system.

The Secretary brought to the Department his ability as an organizer and his reputation for getting things done, which have resulted in a more unified and coordinated Department of Transportation. Since Secretary Volpe took office, new channels of communication and cooperation between the operating administrations have been created in response to his call for an overall balanced transportation system, which is essential to the basic fabric of the American economy.

Aware of his responsibility to the citizens he serves, Secretary Volpe has guided the Department toward a new emphasis on environment. One of his first actions was to create the post of Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems to coordinate transportation progress with its environmental effects. Among the significant decisions made by the Secretary to prevent urban and environmental damage include those to cease construction of the Miami-Dade Jetport in Florida to protect the Everglades National Park and to route an interstate highway around New Orleans' famed French Quarter and around the scenic Franconia Notch in New Hampshire's White Mountains.

Secretary Volpe is an outspoken advocate of highway safety and won Congressional approval to establish the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration as an operating agency to replace the National Highway Safety Bureau. He is also instituting a new alcohol counter-measures program; establishing new standards for motor vehicles to prevent accidents; and initiating the development of an experimental safety vehicle. In all areas, the Secretary has emphasized safety as one of the Department's primary concerns.

The Secretary also has many legislative victories to his credit: the Airport and Airways Development/Revenue Act of 1970; the Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act of 1970; the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970; the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970; the Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970; and the St. Lawrence Seaway Legislation.

Born on December 8, 1908 in Wakefield, Massachusetts, as one of six children of Italian immigrant parents, John Volpe's personal history reflects the Horatio Alger success story of the self-made man.

At the age of 12, Volpe went to work for his father as a hod carrier and then as a plasterer's apprentice. After graduating from high school, he worked for his father full-time and attended Boston's Wentworth Institute evenings. Two years later, he gave up his work as a plasterer, returned to the Wentworth Institute full-time, and graduated in 1930. He majored in architectural construction. In 1933, he cashed a \$300 insurance policy, borrowed an additional \$200, and started his own construction business in Massachusetts.

During World War II, Volpe closed his construction firm and volunteered for duty

with the Navy's Civil Engineer Corps (Seabees). He left the Navy with the rank of Lieutenant Commander and returned to building schools, hospitals and office buildings. The Volpe firm soon established a national reputation for construction excellence.

Volpe first entered politics as Deputy Chairman of the Massachusetts Republican State Committee in 1950. In 1953, he received his first major public appointment: Massachusetts Commissioner of Public Works. From there he served in 1956-57 as the first Federal Highway Administrator, and was elected Governor of Massachusetts in 1960 for a two-year term. Losing by a narrow margin in 1962, Volpe came back and was returned to office in 1964. In 1966, he was re-elected Governor for the first four-year term in the State's history by the largest margin ever accorded a Massachusetts gubernatorial candidate—over a half million votes.

Throughout his career, Secretary Volpe has been the recipient of many honors. He has received 21 honorary degrees from colleges and universities across the nation. He is a past chairman of the National Governors' Conference and past president of the Council of State Governments. Volpe is a past president of the Associated General Contractors of America and the Society of American Military Engineers and the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce.

The Secretary is the recipient of the highest honor of the Order of Merit of the Italian Republic—the Knight of the Great Cross. He has been Knighted by the Vatican both as a Knight of Malta and as a Knight Commander in the Order of the Holy Sepulcher.

Secretary Volpe is married to the former Jennie Benedetto. They have a son, a daughter, and four grandchildren.

# THE HARTFORD FLORIDIAN SOCIETY—50 YEARS OF SERVICE

## HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago, a group of 60 people of Italian descent formed an organization. This organization, which was the first of its kind in Hartford County, was designed to aid Italian immigrants in establishing a life in America by assisting them in times of financial need.

This organization assists members of the Floridian Society who become widowers and orphans. The Society also helps other citizens who are unable to cope with medical expenses, and also aids other philanthropic and charitable activities.

The Floridian Society is not restricted to the Hartford area, but has a membership which stretches nationwide. Recent figures show that the original membership has been augmented by over 500 new members.

On February 10, 1973, this organization, which has begun under the auspices of Angelo Alasso, will celebrate its 50th anniversary. Other distinguished founders are: Salvatore Bassano, the late Eniaco Gallo, Sarino Metera, and Mr. Paul Giann, who is still an active member of the Floridian Society.

The anniversary will be marked by a dinner at Valle's Steak House in Hartford. Mr. Paul Privatera and Mr. Arthur



Spada will be the cotoastmasters of this affair.

I know that my colleagues will join with me in recognizing this worthwhile organization.

# LAUNCHING OF S.S. "DELTA MAR," LARGEST LASH SHIP EVER BUILT

**HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 29, 1973

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege and pleasure on Saturday, January 27, to be present at Avondale Shipyard in New Orleans for the launching of the largest lighter-  
aboard-ship—LASH—vessel constructed anywhere in the world, and to christen this remarkable ship the S.S. *Delta Mar*.

The first ship to be contracted for under the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, the *Delta Mar* is 893 feet 4 inches long, the equivalent of three football fields, and will hold 74 fully loaded 61 by 31-foot lighters, or barges, of 300 tons capacity each, along with 288 standard containers. Without the barges on board, it can carry 1,740 containers. It is one of three sister ships under construction at Avondale for the Delta Steamship Lines for use on South American trade routes.

As chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am deeply gratified by the confidence these ships reflect in the future of the American-flag merchant marine, now struggling to recover some of the vast ground lost by American ships over the years since World War II to foreign-flag competition.

The *Delta Mar* and other LASH vessels can contribute greatly to this objective by lowering operating costs, reducing the time for loading and unloading to hours instead of days, providing more versatility in cargo mix, and affording more protection against damage and loss.

## NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE NEW SHIPS

The significance to our merchant marine of the launching of the *Delta Mar* was underscored by Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Maritime Affairs Robert J. Blackwell's insistence upon going to New Orleans to make the principal address in person, rather than have his prepared remarks read for him by a surrogate speaker, despite a broken foot requiring the use of crutches. I include the text of the Assistant Secretary's address at the conclusion of my remarks. While he and I might disagree over some of the political implications of his talk, there is no disagreement between us on the importance of the *Delta Mar* and its sister innovative ships.

## INDUSTRIAL STATESMANSHIP IN DEVELOPING LASH SHIPS

I congratulate Capt. J. W. Clark, president of Delta Steamship Lines, Inc., and Mr. F. Evans Farwell, chairman of the board, and their associates for Delta's industrial statesmanship in developing this huge class of LASH ships; and also Mr. H. Zac Carter, board chairman of

Avondale, and Mr. Edwin Hartzman, president, and the thousands of employees of the shipyard for their work in constructing the impressive *Delta Mar*. The sidewise launching of the vast ship into the Mississippi River provided one of the most thrilling spectacles of American industry.

A modest gentleman present at the launching, Mr. Jerome L. Goldman, president of Friede & Goldman, Inc., New Orleans naval architectural firm, was identified as the designer of the *Delta Mar* as the largest LASH vessel ever built. According to the New Orleans Times-Picayune of January 28, however, the whole idea for LASH ships, equipped to lift and stow fully loaded river and harbor barges aboard ocean vessels was the brainchild of Mr. Goldman "who spent 17 years developing the system from drawing board to maiden voyage of the first LASH vessel."

## REMARKS IN CHRISTENING THE "DELTA MAR"

Following a blessing of the ship and a prayer for those who will man the *Delta Mar* by the Reverend Joseph Thomas Donnelly, S.J., chaplain of the Port of New Orleans Catholic Maritime Club, and remarks by Mr. Hartzman, Captain Clark, Assistant Secretary Blackwell, and Mr. Carter, and a greeting from Mrs. Hale Boggs whom all of us in Congress hold dear, it was my privilege to make a few remarks before christening the *Delta Mar*, as follows:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, DEMOCRAT, ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI, AT LAUNCHING OF "DELTA MAR," AVONDALE, LA., SATURDAY, JANUARY 27, 1973

Although my role here today is largely a ceremonial one—a privileged role accorded only to women at one of the most thrilling events which can occur in American industry, the launching of a ship—it is impossible for me as a Member of Congress deeply involved in maritime legislative issues to separate the ceremonial from the national implications of this event.

When the magic moment arrives for me to christen the S.S. *Delta Mar* and transform a hull into a ship with the crash of a champagne bottle, my thoughts will be those of any woman sponsoring a ship—I will be thinking of, and praying for, the officers and crew who will operate the *Delta Mar* in the years ahead, whose lives will be entrusted to the workmanship of the shipyard workers here at Avondale and to their own skill in seamanship; I will be thinking of the stormy days ahead in turbulent seas and the beautiful tranquility of a sea voyage under fair skies and bright sun; I will be thinking of the solitude of long ocean voyages and the excitement of entering bustling ports.

But in these moments before the signal is given to launch, let me mention some of the less romantic but profoundly important aspects of this launching which occur to me on this occasion. Speaking as the Chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, where the legislation originated which made possible the construction and operation of this unusual and versatile new instrument of American commerce, I am deeply impressed by the industrial imagination and statesmanship which are bringing the *Delta Mar* and its two sister ships into the important South American trade routes, and by what they mean for the future of the American Flag Merchant Marine.

These huge lighter-aboard-ship vessels mean that American shipping will be able to compete more effectively for cargoes in the bitterly competitive world of maritime

commerce. They open up new vistas of coordinated transportation on both land and sea, offering inland shippers quicker access to world markets, lower costs in loading and unloading, safer carriage, and greater versatility. I am sure I speak for all of the Members of the Committee—and, in fact, for all Members of Congress—when I say that this great ship, the *Delta Mar*, largest LASH ship ever built anywhere, gives us great pride and renewed faith in the future of American Flag shipping.

And if we can revive and strengthen our Merchant Marine, we know it will mean a strengthening of the entire economy of the United States—more jobs at good American wage rates, more profits for American industry to provide the solid base on which our entire economy can expand and prosper, a better balance-of-payments situation and a new sense of confidence in the reliability of American Flag ships in meeting schedules on time and thus winning back some of the business we have lost to foreign flag ships manned by citizens of other countries for the benefit of the economies of other countries. As a St. Louisan, I see great potential for my own city's commerce in this event.

It is a special thrill for me to have the great privilege of sponsoring the *Delta Mar*. I congratulate Captain Clark and the Delta Steamship Company for their vision in making this launching possible, and I thank them deeply for affording me this opportunity to speak the words which will soon start the *Delta Mar* down the ways and toward her promising destiny.

Following my remarks, and accompanied by the Honorable Edna F. Kelly, former Member of Congress who served as the sponsor's matron of honor, I then had the pleasure of naming the ship and sending it rushing into the water with the splash of champagne on its prow. A ship launching is always a thrilling event. This one had particular significance to me.

## ADDRESS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY BLACKWELL

Mr. Speaker, I now include the remarks of Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Maritime Affairs Robert J. Blackwell at the launching of the *Delta Mar*, as follows:

REMARKS BY ROBERT J. BLACKWELL, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR MARITIME AFFAIRS, AT THE LAUNCHING OF DELTA STEAMSHIP LINE'S S.S. "DELTA MAR," NEW ORLEANS, LA., JANUARY 27, 1973

It is a great privilege to be with you today to witness the launching of this splendid ship poised on the launching ways before us.

At the very outset of my remarks, I would like to commend Captain Clark on his selection of Congresswoman Leonor K. Sullivan as the sponsor of the S.S. *Delta Mar*, the first of three LASH vessels being built here at Avondale for the Delta Steamship Line. Mrs. Sullivan, who represents the Third District of Missouri centered in St. Louis, has been a prominent member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee since her election to the Congress 20 years ago. Earlier this week she was appointed Chairman of this important committee and, in this role, will greatly influence the future course and destiny of the American Merchant Marine.

Having given so much of her time and energy over the years in grappling with the problems of our maritime industry and dealing with the multitude of legislative proposals to foster the industry's growth, I know of no one more qualified or deserving to christen the newest addition to the American Merchant Marine.

While the participation of Mrs. Sullivan in this christening ceremony makes the launching particularly noteworthy, there are a

number of other factors that add to the significance of this occasion.

The SS *Delta Mar* the first ship contracted for under President Nixon's maritime program which is embodied in the Merchant Marine Act of 1970. As such, it is the forerunner of a large number of merchant ships of highly advanced and productive designs that will be built under this program.

For its proud owner, Delta Steamship Line, the *Delta Mar* and her two sister ships under construction nearby, attest to the confidence that Delta has in its maritime future and add continuity to its tradition of consistently upgrading its fleet with new and more efficient ships to improve services to shippers.

To the management and workers of Avondale Shipyards, this occasion marks an important juncture in the outstanding series construction program the yard initiated back in 1969 when it laid the keel for the first of 11 LASH vessels ordered by Prudential Grace and Pacific Far East Line. The *Delta Mar* is the lead ship of a second flight of nine LASH ships contracted by Delta, Central Gulf Lines and Waterman Steamship Corporation. The 20 LASH ships ordered to date from Avondale represent the largest series production run of standardized merchant ships awarded to an American yard since World War II. This is an outstanding accomplishment, one in which the Avondale team can be justifiably proud.

The LASH program is monumental. More than half a billion dollars have been invested in LASH ships and barges, of which 235 million dollars were funded by the U.S. Government.

Thus, our government has a vital interest in working with all principals involved, with, or who could affect the success of, LASH operations—shippers, longshore labor, both here and abroad, and the governments of our trading partners. It is our objective to ensure that these ships are not encumbered by any discriminatory restraints that could jeopardize the success of their operations. For these vessels represent a technological breakthrough which will bring increased trade and economic benefits to the nations they serve.

Mrs. Sullivan, our sponsor today, in a speech made in Washington, D.C. to a maritime audience earlier this week, stressed that the industry must show that the federal support it receives is justified in terms of the benefits that accrue to the nation. In her words, the industry must demonstrate that what is good for the American merchant is good for the country . . . and ensure that the American taxpayer, the largest single investor in our merchant marine, gets a fair return from his investment.

I fully agree with her view. That is a fair test for any federal assistance program. In fact, President Nixon, back in 1969 when he restructured and renovated this nation's federal maritime policies to revitalize the American merchant marine, incorporated this same philosophy in his maritime program. His program contains a number of provisions to ensure that the shipyards and ship operators, who are the beneficiaries of federal assistance, return far greater dividends to the taxpayers than they did under previous maritime policies.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1970 was enacted into law less than 27 months ago. I think that the accomplishments and progress to date in implementing the President's program demonstrate that American shipbuilders and ship operators have responded affirmatively and effectively to the challenges and opportunities of the President's maritime program.

Let me cite a few indicators of the progress made to date in fulfilling the program's objectives:

More than \$1.7 billion in federally assisted shipbuilding contracts have been awarded to domestic shipyards since enactment of the

1970 Act. These contracts comprise the construction of 37 new ships and the conversion of 16 existing conventional freighters into highly efficient container ships. This surge of orders has provided the American shipbuilding industry with its largest peacetime backlog of commercial orders in history.

Another objective of the Nixon maritime program was to encourage the American shipyards to upgrade their facilities with technologically advanced equipment to improve their productivity and thereby reduce their need for federal assistance. During the past years domestic shipyards have been expending about \$100 million per year for plant modernization and capital improvements.

These efforts have helped the yards to increase their efficiency and meet the reduced subsidy guidelines prescribed by the 1970 Act. Prior to the Act the government was empowered to subsidize up to 55 percent of the cost of building a merchant ship. However, this subsidy ceiling was reduced to 45 percent when the new law was enacted in the fall of 1970. In each successive fiscal year the subsidy guidelines were reduced an additional 2 percentage points, and currently stand at 41 percent. Further reductions are called for until a 35 percent subsidy level is reached in fiscal year 1976.

All of the contracts covering the 37 new ships and 16 conversions awarded under the 1970 Act to date have met the reduced subsidy guidelines. And, I would emphasize that the taxpayer, not the shipowners, has been the beneficiary of the attendant cost savings.

Concurrent with the productivity gains that are being achieved by the shipyards, efforts have been made to improve the productivity of our fleet and reduce the level of ship operating subsidies. In this connection, the 1970 Act instituted a wage-index system whereby the escalation of the wages of seafarers to be subsidizable must not exceed an average of the wage gains of a broad cross-section of workers in American industries.

Additionally, all of the new ships being built under the maritime program will have greatly reduced crew sizes, which will further reduce the level of ship operating subsidies. Thus, for example, while the older conventional ships carry crews of 40 to 50 men, the ships ordered under the 1970 Act will have crews of only 26 to 32 men. The *Delta Mar* will have a 32-man crew as compared to 38-men crews aboard the earlier LASH ships delivered by Avondale.

Another important development that bodes well for the maritime industry is the entry of American shipbuilders and ship operators into the liquefied natural gas (LNG) market. Last year two domestic shipyards each received construction contracts for three of these specialized ships which carry their cargoes at a temperature of minus 260 degrees Fahrenheit. Because our yards have considerable experience in building complex ships, and their access to the unmatched expertise of American cryogenic systems manufacturers, the subsidy rates required for these six ships are less than 25 percent—as contrasted to the 41 percent subsidy that currently prevails for other types of vessels.

We believe that with sufficient contracts U.S. yards will be able to go into series production of LNG vessels and substantially reduce their unit costs to the point that no construction subsidies would be required. Such a development would put American yards in a position to build ships for export.

Even though the new ships generated by the 1970 Act, such as the *Delta Mar*, are only starting to come off the ways, the retirement of obsolete and inefficient ships from our fleet during the past few years is having a profound effect on the composition of our fleet and on our operating subsidy program. Three years ago 37.5 percent of the ships in our subsidized fleet were over 20 years of age. Today only 21 percent exceed the 20

year mark. During those same three years the subsidy cost per ton of liner cargo carried dropped by 19 percent.

It also should be noted that the LNG ships and very large crude carriers being built under the program, because of their efficiency and high productivity, will be operated without subsidies.

The *Delta Mar* and the other vessels being built under the program will greatly enhance the competitive position of the American flag fleet on the world's trade routes.

Delta's new LASH vessels are particularly well-suited for the company's trade routes serving the East Coast of South America and the Caribbean. Each of these 893-foot ships—the largest LASH ships ever built—will carry 74 barges measuring 61 feet long by 31 feet wide and 13 feet deep. In addition they will accommodate 288 containers of the standard 20-foot size.

In operation, the LASH ship serves as a mother ship quickly discharging and loading her barges without need of shoreside cargo-handling facilities. This self-sufficiency and the ability to discharge and load away from congested terminals is particularly advantageous, since many South American terminals lack the cargo handling equipment and the channel depths to permit efficient transfer of cargoes.

In summary we have made good progress in the little more than two years that the 1970 Act has been on the books. But we still have a long way to go before the success of the program is assured.

We will continue to work toward rebuilding our merchant marine in a manner that is beneficial to the nation and compatible with the taxpayer's interests.

The launching of this ship today measurably advances us towards that objective.

I believe that the time has now come to permit our sponsor, Mrs. Sullivan, to proceed with her important task.

#### THREAT TO FREEDOM

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, an ominous event took place yesterday in the Nation's Capital. A news reporter, while in the course of covering a story, was arrested by the FBI and hauled off in handcuffs to the lockup at the U.S. courthouse for 5 hours. I cannot at the moment think of anything more chilling on freedom of the press in this country. When is this harassment of the press going to stop?

These and other actions of the Federal Government—such as the attempt at prior restraint aimed at several newspapers a year or so ago and which was struck down by the Supreme Court—seem to be more at home in a totalitarian country rather than the United States of America.

This constant chipping away at the first amendment has got to halt. What reporter is going to look at any Government document which might embarrass the Government if he faces the threat of arrest, fines, and possible imprisonment?

I, for one Member of Congress, intend to speak out on this muzzling of the press at every opportunity. Indeed, Congress itself should act now in every way pos-



sible to strengthen the constitutional guarantee which distinguishes a free country from a dictatorship.

# COTTER ON CONSUMER LEGISLATION

## HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, perhaps caveat emptor—"let the buyer beware"—had relevance in the economy of feudal times or, perhaps, in a barter economy where the participant knew each product and how to evaluate it. In the current U.S. economy, it is literally impossible to understand the maze of claims and counterclaims made by various manufacturers and salespersons.

In an economy where the consumer is virtually pitted against million dollar corporations, it is not unreasonable to expect that Federal, State, and local governments would become involved to assist the consumer. Government intervention does not mean that the Government will tell manufacturers what to produce, but it should require the manufacturer to fairly and truthfully present his product.

I am guided by this principle in dealing with the consumer affairs and in my proposals for legislation.

For those who would prefer the caveat emptor position, I ask how they would be able to judge the nutritional content of "Crunchy Munchies" the biological and psychological effect of untested drugs, or the safety of automobile components.

The plight of the consumer is understandable when we realize that businesses spend over \$20 billion a year in advertisements to get their message across. Many of these advertisements contain more than a modicum of deceit and very few give adequate information.

The results of some Federal and State efforts to substantiate advertising claims brought red faces to some producers. For example, one "lead-free" gasoline was found to contain lead, the magic "active" ingredients in a complex remedy turned out to be aspirin and, perhaps, the most publicized were the conclusions made by a 1971 University of Georgia study which stated that—

The cereal boxes, if taken with milk and raisins, are as nutritious as all but the most sophisticated cereals.

It is for this reason that the FDA, the FTC, and other Federal agencies were established. The need for new and stricter laws and the push to create a Federal, separate consumer agency indicates the widespread conviction of many knowledgeable observers that so-called consumer agencies have been co-opted or captured by groups that were designed to control or regulate.

Again, it is not my desire to tell the manufacturer or seller what they must produce or sell, but I do believe that they have the obligation to tell the consumer what he is getting. The burden of weigh-

ing this honest information lies with the consumer.

If accurate information appears to be a thin reed when ranged against the combined forces of incomprehensible technology, Madison Avenue salesmanship, and incomprehensible and self-serving statements, it is a necessary step forward.

Therefore, I am introducing a series of 12 bills, with a number of my colleagues, that are specifically designed to provide such information to the shopper, to hopefully drive down food prices, to provide the consumer with accurate information on durable goods, and create effective warranty regulations and, finally, to strengthen State and local consumer protection agencies:

### A SERIES OF 12 BILLS

#### A. FOOD LABELING AND INFORMATION

1. Truth in Food Labeling—This bill requires food makers to indicate, on their labels, all ingredients by percentage, including all additives and preservatives, and by their common or usual names. At the present time, it is virtually impossible to detect from a label what is in a food product. This would be required of all food makers.

2. Nutritional Labeling Act—This bill would make it mandatory that any packaged consumer food product be labeled by the producer with the following information: a) nutritional statements including fat content, vitamin and protein value, fats and fatty acids, calories and other nutritional data; b) the net weight and drained weight of canned or frozen products packed in a liquid medium; c) the major ingredients by percentage weight of any combination food item.

Food labels presently contain little information on the nutritional value of a product even though this is important to the consumer's health. Furthermore, food labels presently fail to show the exact proportion of one ingredient to another, and some brands of combination food items contain more of the major ingredients than others. This bill is much stricter than the voluntary labeling program recently announced by FDA.

3. Open Dating Perishable Food Act—This bill requires that all packaged perishable and semi-perishable foods be prominently labeled to clearly show the date beyond which it should not be sold and the optimum storage conditions at home. It also provides that overage products can be sold but only if they are safe, separated from other items and clearly identified as being beyond the expiration date.

There is growing evidence that a sizable number of perishable food items on the market are overage and may be unhealthy. Open dating information would give the consumer an advantage of information in purchasing products, and later in storing these products at his home.

4. Consumer Food Grading Act—This bill provides for a uniform system of retail quality grade designations for consumer food products based upon quality, condition and nutritional value.

There is presently no uniform system for determining and labeling the grades of food products. For instance, one product may be graded A.B.C. and D., while another AAAA, AA and A: therefore, the two "A" grades are opposites, not equals, thus leaving the consumer with inadequate information.

5. Honest Label Act—This bill requires labels on foods, drugs and cosmetics to show the place of business and name of the manufacturer, packager and distributor.

Its value is two-fold: Most importantly, it would aid government, industry and consumers in event of a recall by permitting quick

and easy identification. This is now difficult because hundreds of private labels and private brand products on the market do not bear this information. (Bon Vivant Vichyssoise was packed under more than 30 different private labels without Bon Vivant's name ever appearing on one of them—a fact which hindered that extensive recall.) Secondly, it would aid consumers in selecting products because they would know who really made the product under the private label. Private label products often tend to be priced lower than their nationally advertised counterparts, although there is frequently no difference between them.

6. Unit Pricing Act—This bill requires disclosure by retailers of the unit price of packaged consumer commodities. Individual retail businesses with sales below \$250,000 a year are exempted.

The myriad of package size makes it extremely difficult for consumers to compare the prices of two or more package sizes of the identical product to determine the real cost and the best buy. Recent studies indicate that unit pricing provides valuable, objective price data which can save consumers around 8% on their food bills. Some stores now have unit price information but uniformity and comprehensiveness are lacking.

#### BILLS DESIGNED TO LOWER MEAT PRICES

1. Meat Price Freeze—This bill requires the stabilization of retail prices of meat for 45 days at November, 1972 levels and requires the President to submit to Congress a plan for insuring an adequate meat supply for U.S. consumers, reasonable meat prices and a fair return on invested capital to farmers, food producers and food retailers.

The lack of price controls on meat at a time when other products are controlled has sent costs soaring and there is no letup in sight. Inflation cannot be controlled so long as the prices on such a major item in the American budget, food, and especially meat, are permitted to go unchecked.

2. Meat Quota Repeal—Repeals the Meat Import Quota Act of 1964 to increase the supply of lower cost meats.

Repeal of quotas is an essential first step toward lowering the high price of meat products such as hamburgers, hot dogs and cold cuts. President Nixon suspended quotas last summer for the balance of 1972, but a permanent repeal would help foreign suppliers plan better to meet American market needs.

#### C. APPLIANCE DISCLOSURE

1. This bill requires manufacturers of durable consumer products, including appliances and electronic items, to disclose on a label or tag affixed to each item sold at retail to consumers, the performance life, under normal operating conditions, of each manufactured durable product or its major components. It also requires such products as film and batteries be labeled as to the date beyond which they should not be sold because they begin to lose performance life.

Knowing the performance life expectancy of a product, consumers will be better equipped to decide on the best buy for their money. It will also help them avoid buying durable products that are perishable.

2. Appliance Dating Act—This bill requires that any appliance, TV or other durable product whose design is changed or performance capabilities altered, on a periodic basis shall have its date of manufacture permanently affixed to the product.

Dating will prevent the sale of older models as "new", something now done with relative ease because the consumer does not have an effective method of checking the model data for himself prior to purchase.

3. Consumer Warranty Protection Bill—This bill requires minimum disclosure standards for written consumer protection warranties against defect or malfunction. It would also define minimum Federal content standards for such warranties, and amend

the Federal Trade Commission Act to improve its consumer protection activities.

#### D. STATE AND LOCAL CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

This bill provides federal grants and technical assistance in the establishment and strengthening of state and local consumer protection offices.

Consumer protection must be a joint effort at all levels of government. Some excellent work is being done by state and local consumer offices, but funds and technical assistance are desperately needed.

Each of the foregoing bills is designed to give the consumer new information or roll back food prices. There is still the distinct need for an ongoing and effective consumer voice in the Federal Government. In the 92d Congress, I introduced a comprehensive consumer protection bill that included establishing a Consumer Protection Agency. When a weaker version of this bill came before the House of Representatives last year, I fought to strengthen it.

I am now joining with other Members to introduce a new bill to establish an Independent Consumer Protection Agency that is specifically designed to represent the consumer before other Federal agencies.

The crucial difference between this legislation and weaker versions is that under this bill, the Consumer Protection Agency has different obligations and a right to appear before Federal agencies to assure that the consumer voice will be heard. This is the same right that business groups now have before Federal agencies.

This bill is long and complex, but it is estimated that it is designed to place the consumer voice in crucial agency decisions. Under the current procedure, consumers, in effect, have no voice in Federal agency decisions. At this point, I am enclosing a brief description of this bill:

#### SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE CONSUMER PROTECTION AGENCY ACT OF 1973

SEC. 2. Statement of Findings. The Congress finds that the interests of the American consumer are inadequately represented and protected within the federal government; and that vigorous representation and protection of consumer interests are essential to the fair and efficient functioning of a free market economy.

##### TITLE I—OFFICE OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

SEC. 101. Office Established: to be headed by a Director and Deputy Director appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

SEC. 102. Powers and Duties of Director of Office spelled out.

SEC. 103. Functions of the Office:

To coordinate the consumer programs of federal agencies;

To assure the effectiveness of federal consumer programs;

To submit recommendations to the Congress and the President on improving federal consumer programs;

To initiate and coordinate consumer education programs;

To cooperate with and assist state and local governments and private enterprise in fostering consumer programs;

To publish and distribute a Consumer Register listing federal actions of interest to consumers.

SEC. 104. Transfer of Functions.

##### TITLE II—CONSUMER PROTECTION AGENCY

SEC. 201. Establishes Independent Consumer Protection Agency, to be headed by an

Administrator and Deputy Administrator, appointed by the President for a term of four years coterminous with that of the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. (The four-year term is a new provision designed to increase the independence of the Administrator from the White House).

SEC. 202. Powers and Duties of the Administrator:

(b) Employ experts and consultants.

Appoint advisory committees.

Promulgate rules.

Enter into and perform contracts and leases.

(c) Upon written request by the Administrator, each federal agency is authorized and directed—

To make its facilities and personnel available to the greatest practicable extent;

To furnish to the CPA information and data and to allow access to all documents, papers, and records in its possession which the Administrator deems necessary for the performance of his functions. Except that, a federal agency may deny the Administrator access to and copies of—

(1) Information classified in the interest of national defense and national security and data controlled by the Atomic Energy Act;

(2) Policy recommendations by agency personnel intended for internal use only;

(3) Information concerning routine executive and administrative functions not otherwise a matter of public record;

(4) Personnel and medical files;

(5) Information which such agency is expressly prohibited by law from disclosing to another federal agency.

(d) Trade secrets and commercial or financial information are available to the Administrator only upon a written statement by him when he has determined that immediate access to such information is necessary in order to protect public health or safety or to protect against imminent substantial economic injury due to fraud or unconscionable conduct; and only after notice that the request for access has been immediately communicated to the person who provided such information to the Agency. However, any such information described above cannot be disclosed to the public by the Administrator if it was received by a federal agency as confidential.

(The specific mention of types of information not available to the Administrator from other federal agencies has been added in the new CPA bill. Also added is a provision that information involving trade secrets and commercial or financial information from industry shall be available to the Administrator of the CPA only upon a written statement when he has determined that immediate access to such information is likely to be necessary in order to protect public health or safety or to protect against imminent substantial economic injury due to fraud or unconscionable conduct, after notice has been communicated to the person who provided such information. Also, such information even if available to the Administrator cannot be disclosed to the public if the agency originally receiving the material agreed to treat it as confidential.)

(e) The Administrator shall report once each year to the Congress and the President on the effectiveness of federal consumer programs and the adequacy of enforcement of consumer laws.

SEC. 203. Functions of the Agency:

To represent the interests of consumers before federal agencies and courts.

To support research, studies and testing leading to a better understanding of and improved consumer products and services.

To submit recommendations to the Congress and the President.

To publish and distribute consumer information.

To conduct surveys and investigations con-

cerning the needs, interests and problems of consumers.

To keep the Congress fully informed of all its activities.

SEC. 204. Representation of consumer interests before Federal agencies:

(a) Whenever the Administrator determines that the result of any federal agency proceeding which is subject to the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act or which is conducted on the record after opportunity for an agency hearing, may substantially affect the interests of consumers, he may as of right intervene as a party by entering his appearance or otherwise participate for the purpose of representing the interests of consumers in such proceeding. The Administrator shall comply with agency statutes and rules of procedure governing the timing of intervention or participation and, upon intervening or participating, shall comply with agency statutes and rules of procedure concerning the conduct thereof.

(b) Whenever the Administrator determines that the result of any federal agency activity to which subsection (a) does not apply may substantially affect the interests of consumers, he may as of right participate. In exercising such right, he may in an orderly manner and without causing undue delay

(1) present orally or in writing to responsible agency officials relevant information, briefs, and arguments; and (2) have an opportunity equal to that of any person outside the agency to participate in such activity. Such participation need not be simultaneous but should occur within a reasonable time.

(d) The Administrator may request or petition a federal agency to initiate a proceeding or activity or to take such other action as may be within the authority of such agency if a substantial consumer interest is involved.

(e) In any federal agency proceeding or activity in which he is intervening or participating, the Administrator is authorized to request the host federal agency to issue and the federal agency shall issue such orders for the summoning of witnesses, copying of documents, papers, and records, and submission of information in writing, unless the agency determines that the request is not relevant to the matter at issue, is unnecessarily burdensome, or would unduly interfere with the conduct of the agency proceeding or activity.

(g) The Administrator is authorized to intervene or participate in any state or local agency or court proceeding, except a criminal proceeding, where the Administrator determines that a substantial consumer interest is affected and a request for intervention or participation has been received in writing by the Governor, a state Consumer Protection Agency, or a state or local court conducting the proceeding.

SEC. 205. Judicial Review:

(a) The Administrator shall have standing to obtain judicial review of any federal agency action reviewable under law in any civil proceeding in a court of the United States involving review or enforcement of a federal agency action substantially affecting the interests of consumers, if the Administrator intervened or participated in the federal agency proceeding or activity out of which such action arose; or, where he did not so intervene or participate, unless the court determines that such intervention in the judicial proceeding would be detrimental to the interests of justice.

(b) Before instituting judicial review of any federal action where he did not intervene or participate in the agency proceeding or activity out of which such action arose, the Administrator shall file a timely petition before such agency for a rehearing or reconsideration.

SEC. 206. Notice: each federal agency considering any action which may substantially



affect the interests of consumers shall, upon request by the Administrator, notify him of any proceeding or activity and furnish a brief status report. Every federal agency in taking any action of the nature which can reasonably be construed as substantially affecting the interests of consumers shall take such action in a manner calculated to give due consideration to the valid interests of consumers. In taking any such action, the agency concerned shall indicate concisely in a public announcement of such action the effect that its action or decision is likely to have on the consumer interest.

SEC. 207. Consumer Complaints. The Agency and the Office shall receive, evaluate, develop, act on and transmit complaints to the appropriate federal agencies or non-federal sources concerning actions or practices which may be detrimental to the consumer interest, including information disclosing a probable violation of any law, rule or order of any U.S. agency, and commercial or trade practice affecting the consumer interest. The Agency and Office shall ascertain the nature and extent of action taken with regard to the complaints and shall promptly notify persons complained against. The Agency shall maintain in a public document room for public inspection and copying an up-to-date listing of consumer complaints arranged in meaningful and useful categories, together with annotations of actions taken on those complaints. Provided, that a complaint may be made available for public inspection only with the permission of the complainant and only after the party complained against or agency to which such complaint has been referred has had a reasonable time, but not more than 60 days, to comment on such complaint.

SEC. 208. Consumer Information and Services. The Agency is authorized to conduct and support studies and investigations concerning the interests of consumers and shall develop on its own initiative, gather from other federal agencies and non-federal sources, and disseminate to the public information, statistics and other data concerning (1) the functions and duties of the Agency; (2) consumer products and services after such have been determined to be accurate and provided such are not within the trade secret and financial limitations of Section 552 of Title 5 of the United States Code; and (3) problems encountered by consumers generally including commercial and trade practices and practices of federal, state and local governments which adversely affect consumers.

(b) In exercising the authority under subsection (a) of this section, the Administrator is authorized to the extent required by health or safety of consumers or to discover consumer frauds, to obtain information from industry, by requiring such person engaged in a trade, business, or industry which substantially affects interstate commerce, by general or specific order setting forth with particularity the consumer interest involved and the purposes for which the information is sought, to file with him a report or answers in writing to specific questions. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the inspection or copying of documents, papers, books or records, or to compel the attendance of any person. Nor shall anything in this subsection require the disclosure of information which would violate any relationship privileged according to law. Any district court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such person is found or has his principal place of business, shall issue an order requiring compliance with the valid order of the Administrator so long as the request for information is not unnecessarily or excessively burdensome and is relevant to the purposes for which the information is sought. The Administrator shall not exercise the authority of this subsection if the information sought is for use in con-

nection with his intervention in any pending agency proceeding, is available as a matter of public record, or can be obtained from another federal agency.

(c) In the dissemination of any test results which disclose product names, it shall be made clear, if such is the case, that not all products of a competitive nature have been tested and that there is no intent or purpose to rate products tested over those not tested or to imply that those tested are superior or preferable.

SEC. 209. (a) The Agency shall, in the exercise of its functions (1) encourage and support testing of consumer products and research for improving consumer services in the exercise of its functions under sections 204 and 208 of this Title; (2) make recommendations to other federal agencies with respect to research and studies which would be useful to consumers; and (3) report to Congress on establishing a national consumer information foundation.

(b) All federal agencies which possess testing facilities relating to the performance of consumer products are authorized and directed to perform promptly such tests as the Administrator may request, in the exercise of his functions under Section 204 of this Title.

(c) Neither a federal agency nor the Administrator shall declare one product to be better, or a better buy, than any other product. The Administrator shall periodically review products which have been tested to assure that such products and information disseminated about them conform to the test results.

SEC. 210. So as to assure fairness to all affected parties regarding the release of product test data containing product names, prior to such release, the agency shall act pursuant to regulations after notice and opportunity for comment by interested persons.

SEC. 211. Information disclosure. The Administrator shall not disclose any information which it has obtained from a federal agency through its records which such agency has specified is exempted from disclosure under Section 552 of Title 5, United States Code or by any other provision of law and which such agency has specified should not be disclosed.

(c) The Administrator shall not disclose any trade secret or other confidential business information described by Section 1905 of Title 18, United States Code (concerning trade secrets and financial information), except that such information may be disclosed (1) to the public only if necessary to protect health or safety and (2) in a manner designed to preserve confidentiality to duly authorized committees of the Congress, to courts and federal agencies in representing the interests of consumers.

#### TITLE III—CONSUMER ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 301. Establishes a 15 member Consumer Advisory Council appointed by the President. Members of the Council shall be paid only while on the business of the Council. The Council shall (1) advise the Agency and Office on matters relating to the consumer interests (2) review and evaluate the effectiveness of federal consumer programs.

#### CONCERN ABOUT OUR MARITIME INDUSTRY

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, all of us who are concerned about our mari-

time industry have had an opportunity to study many position papers and speeches on this subject. Yesterday I came across a speech delivered by Rear Adm. George H. Miller, retired, before the Unified Sea Power Seminar of the National Maritime Council. Because of its importance I thought many of my colleagues would also be interested in reading through this message:

REMARKS BY REAR ADM. GEORGE H. MILLER, U.S. NAVY, RETIRED

(Before the unified sea power seminar, National Maritime Council, San Diego, Calif., January 18, 1973)

It is a pleasure to participate in this Seminar on Unified Sea Power sponsored by the National Maritime Council. It is particularly gratifying and significant that this seminar should be held in San Diego, the focal point of West Coast naval activities.

Formation of the National Maritime Council is in my view one of the most important developments in our country in many years. It represents a significant step toward restoring a sense of cooperation and unity of purpose in the maritime industries. We must face the fact that the present disarray of our maritime resources constitutes an Achilles heel in our national security structure. Unfortunately, this great Nation of ours, which owes so much to use of the seas, seems to have forgotten its importance to our economic health and our very survival.

Two and one-half years ago, shortly before the National Maritime Council was formed, the then Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Maritime Affairs, Andrew Gibson, and the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Zumwalt, began a series of meetings designed to strengthen Navy-Merchant Marine cooperation as envisaged in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. These meetings are being continued with the enthusiastic participation of Secretary Robert Blackwell, Mr. Gibson's successor.

Admiral Zumwalt said that because of growing obsolescence in the Fleet and inadequate shipbuilding budgets, the Navy is compelled to concentrate on building combat ships. He asked that the U.S. Merchant Marine provide more of the Navy's logistic support. Both Secretary Gibson and Secretary Blackwell have responded with enthusiastic support.

Present Navy-Merchant Marine recognition of the need for closer cooperation is a key to restoring the maritime effectiveness we must have if our country is to survive. But agreeing to cooperate and making cooperation a reality are two different things. This is a difficult goal we set for ourselves in today's environment—difficult, but not impossible.

Our Constitution states that the Congress shall provide and maintain a Navy. At the time our Constitution was written we were a sea-oriented, trading nation. Our great naval captains of the 18th Century—John Paul Jones, Hull, Biddle and others—were not only merchant shipmasters but capable naval tacticians, traders, and diplomats as well. In those days the Navy, Merchant Marine and foreign commerce were virtually a single entity. Thus the term Navy as used in the Constitution meant maintaining an integrated capability to conduct sea commerce, sea protection, and foreign affairs on a continuing basis in furtherance of foreign policy.

The U.S. Constitution uses more restrictive language with respect to land forces. It empowers the Congress to raise and support armies, with no appropriation for this purpose to be for longer than two years.

The Constitutional approach to national security was inherited from our English ancestors. Their bitter experience at the hands

of Cromwell's army dictatorship in the 17th Century led them to fear the enormous tax burden and internal political threat associated with large cadres of disciplined manpower stationed in the Homeland. They therefore chose to maintain navies for national defense. They reasoned that as long as the admirals ruled the waves, they could not rule Britannia.

It was this lower-profile concept of national security which helped the British Empire outlast the landpowers of Europe and become the most successful and durable political entity of modern times. Decline came rather quickly after Britain sent the best of her own manpower into the ground fighting of World Wars I and II.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is the basic legislation covering the U.S. Merchant Marine and Shipbuilding industry. The Act provides for a U.S.-Flag Merchant Marine capable of carrying all our domestic waterborne commerce and a substantial portion of our foreign commerce. It provides that the U.S. Merchant Marine be capable of serving as the country's naval and military auxiliary force and assumes that sufficient numbers of Naval Reserve Officers will be on board to do the job. It provides for efficient facilities for shipbuilding and repair. To carry out its provisions, the Act also created a Maritime Commission responsible directly to the President.

Of great significance at the time the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was passed, is the fact that the Secretary of the Navy was a member of the Cabinet. He was responsible directly to the President. The Secretary of the Navy thus was the Cabinet-level focal point for coordinating the Navy, Merchant Marine, Coast Guard, fishing and shipbuilding industries in support of national interests. The Secretary of the Navy also worked directly with the Secretaries of State and Commerce, and the U.S. Maritime Commissioner in low-profile support of foreign policy and trade.

In the Congress, both the House and the Senate had Naval Affairs Committees to carry out Congressional responsibility for providing and maintaining a Navy.

Thus, until 1947, the national security organization was structured to provide and maintain a Navy in the broad sense envisaged by the framers of the Constitution. It provided for integrated maritime planning based on the continuing, open-ended nature of world political, maritime and trade competition, in which land wars were limited-duration episodes.

The National Security Act of 1947 and subsequent legislation removed the Navy Department from the Cabinet and placed it in the new Defense Department, whose Secretary has direction, authority and control of the "combat forces." Under the present national security legislation, the United States now provides and maintains an Army and Air Force, as well as a Navy. With the Navy now assigned as part of the Department of Defense, its role is confined to that of a combat force.

Rising Defense costs associated with maintaining land-based as well as naval forces has dictated that Defense Budget planning be based on limited-duration scenarios in which all combat forces participate. When land forces participate, land warfare becomes the primary area of emphasis.

Based on experience since 1947, it may be appropriate to question whether current combat force planning can adequately provide and maintain a Navy in the broader Constitutional sense.

The facts are that the United States Navy and Merchant Marine were supreme on the seas following World War II. Since that time the Navy, Merchant Marine, and shipbuilding industry have continued to diminish in size and modernity.

In 1950, three years after enactment of the National Security Act, Government Reorganization Plan No. 21 abolished the U.S. Maritime Commission created in 1936 and divided its functions between the Federal Maritime Board—later made a Commission—and the Department of Commerce. What was formerly the U.S. Maritime Commission is now the Maritime Administration in the Department of Commerce.

Many of the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 have fallen into disuse. With the maritime services distributed among subordinate echelons of government, the capability of providing and maintaining a Navy in the broad sense of the Constitution no longer exists.

Meanwhile, times have changed. There are no longer allies capable of controlling the seas and absorbing the shock of aggression while we prepare. We are now importers of raw materials and exporters of manufactured products. We depend on foreign sources for all or part of 69 vital raw materials of the 72 needed to sustain our level of civilization. Over 99 percent of these vital raw materials must travel by ship over the world's oceans, in sufficient quantities to keep our industries alive and our country secure.

Our nation is therefore compelled as never before in our history to turn again to the seas to cope with current economic as well as national security needs.

However, today only six percent of our foreign trade is carried in American ships. Over 75 percent of our oil imports, for example, is carried in foreign-flag tankers. The largest segment of the U.S.-owned bulk carrier fleet is under foreign registry. Many of these ships are beyond our control in an emergency.

American maritime technology and innovations are exploited abroad, but neglected here at home. The container ship concept, LASH and SEA-BARGE ships, the world's best gas turbines, steam turbines and boilers, automation, modular construction, merchant ship nuclear propulsion—all these American innovations are being put to good use by our competitors.

As the United States has dismantled its maritime coordination structure since World War II, the Soviets upgraded their's. With their tremendous manpower losses of World Wars I and II fresh in their minds, Soviet leadership made a reappraisal of basic national security policy in an effort to find a better way. As a result of their reappraisal the Soviet Union turned to the sea. A massive build-up of their commercial and naval fleets has been underway since the mid-1950's.

Today the Soviet Ministers of Merchant Marine, Shipbuilding, Foreign Trade, and Fishing Industry have direct access to the Council of Ministers. The Chief of the Soviet Navy, Admiral of the Fleet, S. G. Gorshkov, is also Deputy Minister of Defense and has been in office 17 years.

Today in the United States there is no maritime arm with direct access to the President or the Congress. Prior to 1947, both the Navy and Merchant Marine had direct access.

In the Soviet Union the Soviet maritime arms are being coordinated at the Kremlin level in one of the most successful low-profile conquests of all time. Meanwhile, Soviet land forces remain close to home.

Soviet ship construction—military and commercial—is directed by a single Ministry of Ship Production that obtains the maximum possible efforts from shipyards, supporting industries, and marine-oriented laboratories.

The Soviet deep-sea fishing fleet is the world's largest and most modern.

The Soviet ocean research and intelligence fleets are the world's largest and most modern.

The Soviet merchant marine is one of the world's largest, most modern, and fastest growing.

It is the Soviet Merchant Fleet which is in the vanguard of their drive for world influence. It is the Soviet Merchant Fleet which provides the initial penetrations, builds up trade and carries the weapons to arm and sustain the wars of liberation in distant lands. Every indication suggests that Soviet maritime arms are being coordinated by a single authority at the Kremlin level and that the emphasis is on the long-term political-maritime-trade competition rather than limited-duration, formal land wars.

With the fragmentation of U.S. maritime arms among a number of Departments, no U.S. government agency has responsibility for the continuous, told maritime coordination and planning which appears to be the key to Soviet success. A way must be found to remedy this deficiency, if we are to regain leadership in overall maritime power. How and by what means do we accomplish this?

Fortunately, there is some movement in the Department of Defense, led by Secretary Laird, that relates directly to what I am talking about. I am referring to his Total Force Concept, which is much more than just better use of our nation's combat forces in a military strategy. Total Force means use of all resources, military and nonmilitary, in pursuit of not just military, but national security objectives.

In his final report to Congress on January 8, 1973, Secretary Laird emphasized two aspects. First is the role of trade as an integral part of national security planning. Second is the fact that the United States no longer enjoys a dominant position in the world. He goes on to say we must make better use of our resources, that doing so will undoubtedly lead to controversy, and that this controversy must be faced.

We have a President who is well aware of the need to upgrade our low-profile capabilities. In 1968, for example, Mr. Nixon called for a U.S. merchant fleet carrying at least 30 percent of our foreign commerce. This is generally consistent with the experience of the more successful powers of today, which seem to be carrying between 40 and 50 percent of their own trade. Building the ships to carry a substantial portion of our own cargo would create the modern maritime industrial base needed to help sustain and finance a low-profile international effort.

The Nixon Low-Profile Doctrine phases down emphasis on U.S.-controlled land contingents in foreign territory. It upgrades emphasis on trade, maritime, political, and other forms of peaceful competition. It charts a course which historical experience shows to be most successful. To implement this concept requires re-establishment of government machinery to coordinate low-profile assets in furtherance of U.S. foreign policy.

One way this might be done—and it is merely one possibility—is for the Department of Commerce to assume responsibility for total low-profile planning and coordination of the type at which the Soviet Union has become so successful. The Department of Commerce already administers most of the maritime assets essential to such an effort—foreign trade, merchant marine, fishing fleet, scientific fleet, and shipbuilding. The Department of Commerce was assigned cognizance of Maritime Affairs by the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, which created the post of Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Maritime Affairs. The Secretary of Commerce could therefore appropriately be designated Secretary of Commerce and Maritime Affairs.

Other administrative arrangements—relatively minor—could also be made to assure appropriate participation of the other maritime services. The Coast Guard, now located in the Department of Transportation, could have a contributing role. The planning and cooperative arrangement between the U.S. Merchant Marine and Navy, envisaged by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, should be placed on a more formal basis.



The Secretary of Commerce and Maritime Affairs would have overall responsibility for that portion of maritime planning and coordination not within the purview of combat forces. The Secretary of Commerce and Maritime Affairs would also provide the essential maritime input to the National Security Council's deliberations.

Finally, to give appropriate emphasis to the Constitutional responsibility to "Provide and Maintain a Navy" in the broad sense intended, a Congressional Committee in both the House and the Senate could be designated Maritime Affairs Committees.

Bringing maritime and foreign trade coordination together under one roof would enable low-profile budget and strategy options to carry comparable weight in national security matters with those of the combat forces. In this way it would provide a balancing influence, in the traditional Constitutional sense, to the military-industrial complex.

Our Chief Executive has a grasp of the total maritime concept which ranks with the understanding of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. We have officials in the Department of Commerce who are moving vigorously to carry out the President's Merchant Marine modernization program. We have a Chief of Naval Operations whose leadership in Navy-Merchant Marine cooperation has been an inspiration to all of us concerned with maritime matters.

With world events pressing in upon us—the energy shortage, balance of payment problems, Soviet and Japan maritime expansion, our own growing maritime obsolescence, and our overseas commitments to allies—there is no time to lose in marshalling our low-profile resources and putting them to better use in the national interest. The Nixon low-profile doctrine should have the whole-hearted, nonpartisan support of all the people and the entire government of the United States.

Our problems are clear and of considerable magnitude. You of the National Maritime Council are showing the way in the important task of revitalizing our maritime resources. It is your example we must follow in bringing about low-profile coordination in the Government.

#### SOVIET GRAIN SALES TO RESULT IN HIGHER FOOD PRICES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, this week the Soviet cargo vessel *Ussurijsk* was loaded with almost 12,000 tons of Louisiana soybeans to deliver to its home port of Vladivostok.

The skipper and his crew were enthusiastically received as a part of the new Nixon trade policy with the Soviet Union.

Many Americans have not yet noticed the increase in food prices as a result of the shortages caused by the Russian sales and the pressures which can only result in further food price hikes.

Feed grains, including soybeans, are necessary feed for dairy cattle, beef, hogs, and chicken. As supply and demand increase the farmer's feed prices, he must have higher market prices for his products. A farm is not a nonprofit operation. He must realize some return on his investment.

An indication of what the American

consumer can expect can be best seen in the soaring prices of soybean meal—which 18 months ago sold for \$65 to \$85 a ton was quoted in the Wall Street Journal on January 31, 1973, at \$205 a ton. Soybean meal is a vital part of the diet of dairy cattle.

Everyone is happy to see the farmer get more for his product, but when the dairyman pays two to three times as much for his feed as previously, he is bound to expect a sizable increase in his milk prices. The American people are going to have to decide which of the necessary evils they prefer—much higher milk prices or no milk at all.

I would suggest that the American consumer, before becoming irate at higher food prices, should remember the role played by the Russian grain sales—which were heralded not too long ago as an historic breakthrough in foreign export sales.

The reports do not indicate the price paid by the Russians for the soybeans, but it can be safely assumed that their American agent made the purchase at a lower price than is presently available to the American farmers.

I insert a related newsclipping:

[From the State-Times (La), Jan. 27, 1973]

SECOND STOP IN UNITED STATES—BR REPORTER TOURS SOVIET SHIP

(By Bob Dardenne)

It was an impressive sight—an unloaded cargo ship, sitting high on the Mississippi. We approached in a small launch, pulling up next to a long, wobbly ladder down the ship's port side. The vessel towered up above us.

In a few days, its belly loaded with almost 12,000 tons of soybeans, the huge ship will sit a little lower in the river. But yesterday, it sat high, two flags whipping about in the brisk winds.

Flying forward was a familiar sight—the red, white and blue of the American flag. And aft, well, that was something else. With the Louisiana State Capitol in the background, a red flag with hammer, sickle and star waved in the breeze.

The nation, of course, is the Soviet Union. The ship is the *Ussurijsk*.

Standing at the head of the ladder, a Russian seaman waited to receive his American visitors. For him, the captain and most of the crew, it is the first visit to the United States. The general cargo ship itself docked at Portland, Ore., in 1970 for its only other trip to America. Only two members of that crew remain aboard today.

The trip to Baton Rouge is the first for Captain Gennady Kuzmenko since he took command of the *Ussurijsk*.

"To our friendship."

VODKA TOAST

It was the captain. We toasted, and he lifted the glass of Russian vodka to his lips. "To our friendship." We drank.

We had carefully hopped from the launch in the choppy Mississippi River waters to the ladder. It swayed as we walked up. At the top, the bearded crewman met us, and led the way through the ship's interior to the captain's quarters.

SPOTLESS CONDITION

Inside and out, the *Ussurijsk* is spotless. Its walls gleam, its chrome shines and its wood is polished. Up one deck and then another. For a minute, we waited in a comfortable room, carpeted, with chairs, a couch and a television set. In one corner, laid out in a three-fourth completed game, was a chess set—one of many on board.

The room, we found out later, is the officer's lounge area and adjoins the officers

dining room. The lounge is where the officers, as the captain said, go to "rest."

But it was up one more small stairway before we got to the captain's cabin.

COMFORTABLE LOUNGE

It, like the officer's lounge, was extremely comfortable. There is a wide couch, a table, several chairs and a desk, stacked with papers and books. Captain Kuzmenko is tall, balding, lean and looks as though he belongs here.

Quiet, reserved, he rarely talked at first except to answer questions. He spoke good English, having learned it in Vladivostok, the ship's homeport, and his hometown.

We sat around the table, and we talked. Not about anything specific, just talked.

His ship has been away from Vladivostok about 65 days, he said and expects to arrive back, with its cargo of soybeans from Louisiana in early March.

Three months is a long time at sea. And it looks as though the crew will have been aboard ship the whole time. So far, the captain said, only two men, he and his ship's officer, are allowed off here.

CAPTAIN DISAPPOINTED

And the captain, plainly, is disappointed. "It's no good for us. Usually a ship that goes to a U.S. port the first time, they have permission. Now we have none."

He could get off, but prefers not to, knowing his crew cannot. "It's no good for us."

It is possible, before the vessel leaves early next week, the crew will be allowed off the ship in Baton Rouge. The ship's agent here is applying through U.S. Immigration for permission for the men to come into the city.

Meanwhile, the only sight of aBton Rouge, besides the various cars and trucks along the levee, is about a mile off the ship's starboard, where the top portion of the Louisiana State Capitol building protrudes from behind the levee.

On board ship, crew and officers entertain themselves like most other seamen. By this time, the captain was showing us about. Chess games peered out from around corners in some of the quarters; reading material, including newspapers, was abundant, and on the aft deck, a curious little square table stood out.

FAMILIAR GAME

It looked familiar. The captain smiled at my puzzlement. It was a seagoing billiards game. The familiar numbered balls, however, weren't there. Instead there were round, flat pieces of wood. A larger piece of wood, smooth and slippery, serves as the cue and it is used to knock smaller pieces into four holes—one in each corner of the table.

"Like this?" I asked, using the cue stick to attempt to chip one of the smaller pieces in a hole.

"Of course," the captain said. He smiled.

"Would you like to see the quarters?" We did. So, back into the interior of the vessel we went, through the passenger section, the officers quarters, a section for the stewardesses and to an interesting little reading room, filled with books, newspapers and magazines.

The quarters, predictably, were immaculate, spotless. There is room, Kuzmenko said, for 12 passengers, but the *Ussurijsk* carries none this trip.

On board the Russian vessel are six women, who work along with the regular crew. Their quarters, near the passenger section, were the same—neat, clean, orderly.

In the reading room, three newspapers, Russian naturally, were on the table. The walls were covered with posters and maps and the shelves had magazines and books. On one was a sign, in English, referring to the *Ussurijsk's* Australian voyages—"Ussurijsk ships crew is a collective member of the USSR-Australia society."

Kuzmenko said the same was true with

the Japanese. "And now, after this, with the Americans."

#### TOUR ENDS

Our little walk around the ship, after again passing through the officers' lounge where three young men watched a Baton Rouge television station, ended back in the captain's office.

He passed out glasses, then poured a portion of a dark, brownish-black liquid in the the glasses with Russian vodka. "Bvoka."

Only the brown stuff was not vodka. It said what it was: "Melnals Balzams." He filled the glasses with Russian vodka, "Bvoka."

The glasses sat there. The captain sat back and smiled. I asked if the ship's crew drinks much vodka on a voyage. "No, only the captain drinks vodka." And that, he said, only when guests are present.

Some ships apparently have alcohol. But, and although the translation slipped a little here, I got the impression the Ussurijsk crew is not allowed to keep it.

#### FRIENDSHIP TOAST

Kuzmenko leaned forward, picked up his glass. I did the same. We waited. He smiled, held out his glass.

"To our friendship."

We drank. Like him, one gulp, and it was gone. It was interesting, and very good.

Curious, I asked about the brown liquid. He did not know the translation, but looked it up in two books on his desk. He found it. One look and I was sorry I asked. The word translated to "embalm."

By the time I turned around, the captain filled the glasses again.

"To our friendship."

#### LACKAWANNA, N.Y., YOUTH, 12, WINS NATIONAL TITLE

#### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a 12-year-old Lackawanna, N.Y., boy, Peter Jancevski, has won a "Punt, Pass, and Kick" contest in national competition involving a million youngsters.

Last year, Peter was runnerup in finals for 11-year-olds and this year he showed

his ability by winning the national championship in his class.

The contest starts at the local level and progresses up the line to the national final held in connection with the "Pro Bowl" matching the American Football League All-Stars and the National Football League All-Stars.

Peter went to Dallas, Tex., last month as the representative of the American Football Conference and competed against the representative of the National Football Conference.

Peter wore the uniform of the Buffalo Bills and, incidentally, it was a Buffalo Bills' running back, O. J. Simpson, who led the AFL All-Stars to a stunning 33-28 victory.

The son of Mr. and Mrs. Kiri Jancevski, of Lackawanna, Peter was born in Yugoslavia and came to the United States 9 years ago.

All of Lackawanna and Buffalo are indeed proud of Peter's victory. He showed last year that he is championship caliber and this year he proved it by winning the national title.

### SENATE—Friday, February 2, 1973

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, whose grace is sufficient for all our needs, as we turn from the busy pace of life about us and quiet our hearts in Thy presence, we beseech Thee to guide us through the labor of this day by the light of Thy spirit. May we fear only to be disloyal to the highest and best we know, or to ignore the truth Thou hast made known, or to betray those who love and trust us.

Help us this day to meet its joys with gratitude, its difficulties with fortitude, its duties with fidelity. Bring us to the evening unashamed and with a peaceful heart.

We pray in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

#### STATE OF THE UNION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (S. DOC. NO. 93-3)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*  
The traditional form of the President's annual report giving "to the Congress information of the State of the Union" is a single message or address. As the affairs and concerns of our Union

have multiplied over the years, however, so too have the subjects that require discussion in State of the Union messages.

This year in particular, with so many changes in Government programs under consideration—and with our very philosophy about the relationship between the individual and the State at an historic crossroads—a single, all-embracing State of the Union Message would not appear to be adequate.

I have therefore decided to present my 1973 State of the Union report in the form of a series of messages during these early weeks of the 93rd Congress. The purpose of this first message in the series is to give a concise overview of where we stand as a people today, and to outline some of the general goals that I believe we should pursue over the next year and beyond. In coming weeks, I will send to the Congress further State of the Union reports on specific areas of policy including economic affairs, natural resources, human resources, community development, and foreign and defense policy.

The new course these messages will outline represents a fresh approach to Government: an approach that addresses the realities of the 1970's, not those of the 1930's or of the 1960's. The role of the Federal Government as we approach our third century of independence should not be to dominate any facet of American life, but rather to aid and encourage people, communities, and institutions to deal with as many of the difficulties and challenges facing them as possible, and to help see to it that every American has a full and equal opportunity to realize his or her potential.

If we were to continue to expand the Federal Government at the rate of the past several decades, it soon would consume us entirely. The time has come when we must make clear choices—choices between old programs that set worthy goals but failed to reach them

and new programs that provide a better way to realize those goals; and choices, too, between competing programs—all of which may be desirable in themselves but only some of which we can afford with the finite resources at our command.

Because our resources are not infinite, we also face a critical choice in 1973 between holding the line in Government spending and adopting expensive programs which will surely force up taxes and refuel inflation.

Finally, it is vital at this time that we restore a greater sense of responsibility at the State and local level, and among individual Americans.

#### WHERE WE STAND

The basic state of our Union today is sound, and full of promise.

We enter 1973 economically strong, militarily secure and, most important of all, at peace after a long and trying war.

America continues to provide a better and more abundant life for more of its people than any other nation in the world.

We have passed through one of the most difficult periods in our history without surrendering to despair and without dishonoring our ideals as a people.

Looking back, there is a lesson in all this for all of us. The lesson is one that we sometimes had to learn the hard way over the past few years. But we did learn it. That lesson is that even potentially destructive forces can be converted into positive forces when we know how to channel them, and when we use common sense and common decency to create a climate of mutual respect and goodwill.

By working together and harnessing the forces of nature, Americans have unlocked some of the great mysteries of the universe.

Men have walked the surface of the moon and soared to new heights of discovery.