

unfinished business, S. 518, with a time limitation thereon of not to exceed 1 hour.

The bill, having reached third reading, no amendments will be in order. A yeas-and-nays vote will occur on that bill at no later than 2 o'clock p.m.

Upon disposition of S. 518, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 38, a bill

to amend the Airport and Airways Development Act of 1970, as amended. There is no time agreement thereon. Yeas-and-nays votes can be expected.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, if there be no further business to come

before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock meridian on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and at 3:01 p.m., the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 5, 1973, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BEGINNING A NEW CONGRESSIONAL YEAR

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 2, 1973

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. President, in order to maintain close contact with the people of Virginia to keep them apprised of current issues before the Congress, it was my practice in the House to send out regular newsletters.

This week, the first of our Senate newsletters is in the process of being sent to constituents throughout the State. It contains a commentary on the issue of Government spending and on other subjects of mutual concern, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

BEGINNING A NEW CONGRESSIONAL YEAR

My Senatorial service commenced on January 3 upon taking the oath of office in the Senate chambers. This was repeated as shown above in the Vice President's office with my wife, Inez, holding the Bible.

Following the swearing in ceremonies, several hundred constituents and friends attended an informal reception and buffet in the Senate Caucus Room. They came from all parts of Virginia and it was very pleasant to share this day with them.

Much of the time after being sworn in was spent in getting settled in the Senate Office Building, supplementing the staff that worked with me in the House of Representatives, obtaining committee assignments and general orientation.

Committee assignments are Armed Services, Public Works and Small Business which seem very good for one ranked 91st in seniority among a Senate membership of 100. Of course, the past six years of Congressional service puts me ahead of nine of the new Senators and gives me a base on which to build.

There were very few committee meetings during the month of January and very little legislation considered in the Senate. The President has been inaugurated, the Vietnam War ended and we have received the annual budget. All of these will affect Congressional activities.

PEACE

The length of the Vietnam war according to official statistics, was eleven years and twenty-six days, although for POWs or MIAs and their loved ones, such statistics do not tell the complete story. There were 359,859 American casualties including 306,622 wounded in combat, 45,937 killed in combat, and 10,300 dead (not as a result of hostile action). The cost has been estimated at between \$130 to \$140 billion with an anticipated increase to around \$400 billion as a result of Veterans benefits, interest payment

on war loans etc. It has been a terrible and terrifying experience for Americans many of whom were in such strong disagreement with the government's policies in Vietnam under Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon as to threaten their allegiance to the United States, its leaders and its commitments at home or abroad. I certainly hope that our generation will now enjoy peace throughout the world. Following the signing of the cease-fire agreement, the President was kind enough to send me the following letter:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., January 24, 1973.

HON. WILLIAM L. SCOTT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: Now that we have finally achieved peace with honor in Vietnam, I particularly want you to know how much I have appreciated the support you have given during these difficult years to the policies that made that achievement possible. Without those in the Congress who stood steadfastly as you did, we could not have won the settlement that I announced last night.

I know how great the pressures have been. I know the sort of attacks to which you have been subjected, as a result of following your conscience. But I also am confident that history will prove you to have been right, and that in the years to come you can look back with pride on a stern test nobly met.

With best personal regards,

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

You have no doubt heard that the President is impounding Government funds, which is to say, that the Congress has appropriated money for a number of purposes and the President has refused to spend all of the money. He has expressed a determination to hold Government spending for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973 to \$250 billion. Now the President has submitted a budget to the Congress for the 1974 fiscal year. This new budget contemplates expenditures by the Government of \$268.7 billion and receipts of \$256 billion, which leaves a deficit of \$12.7 billion.

In his budget message the President indicates that this 1974 budget fulfills his promise to hold down Federal spending so there will be no need for a tax increase. He rationalizes that based on a concept of full employment, the 1974 budget is balanced. I say "rationalizes" because the concept of a full employment budget in my opinion is another name for deficit financing which we have had practically every year since the depression of the thirties. No businessman would operate his establishment on the basis of full production, in fact, his plant was not operating at full capacity and I do not believe it is fiscally sound to operate the Government on the basis of full employment when we have roughly 5% unemployment in the labor market.

Let us think about it in another way. The Government's total expenditures for 1974 includes an item of \$26.1 billion as interest on the national debt. This is the money we must pay because of deficit financing in the past. This fixed interest charge will continue to

increase each year that the Government operates on an unbalanced budget. If we had not had deficit spending in the past, we could still spend everything in the President's budget and have a surplus of \$13 billion. It just seems reasonable to me that we return to the concept of a balanced budget.

The Federal budget, as you know, is vast and complicated. It is difficult for even the fiscal experts to understand. The President is apparently making a sincere effort to restrain Government spending. It is heartening to note that we are able to reduce the percentage spent on defense but I have reservations about the tremendous increase in recent years on the amount of Government funds spent for human resources. There seems to be a conflict between the pronouncement of a shifting of responsibility to the individual to look after his own needs and a shifting from the Federal government to state and local levels with the funds for human resources provided in this budget.

Perhaps we can reduce the budget to a more understandable basis when we mention that average taxes for the Federal government alone will be more than \$1,000 per year for each man, woman and child in the country. If your income is above average, of course, you will pay more than this amount for each member of your family.

While a number of charts have appeared in the newspaper, the one printed below may be useful in seeing a broad picture of where the money comes from and where it goes.

During a private meeting a few days ago, one of our Senators said that we would never again have a balanced budget. While I have no way of knowing whether the budget will be balanced in the future, I intend to be as selective as possible in supporting spending projects so that the Government can once again operate in the black. This may mean that some good programs will have to be deferred or eliminated but I believe the strong desire of the taxpayer to reduce the cost of Government compels us to take a second look at all spending programs.

THE BUDGET DOLLAR—FISCAL YEAR 1974 ESTIMATE

	Billions	Percent of total
Where it comes from:		
Individual income taxes.....	\$111.6	42
Corporation income taxes.....	37.0	14
Social insurance taxes and contributions.....	78.2	29
Excise taxes.....	16.8	6
Other receipts.....	12.4	4
Borrowing and other means of financing.....	12.7	5
Total.....	268.7	100
Where it goes:		
National defense.....	81.1	30
Human resources.....	125.5	47
Physical resources.....	25.7	10
Net interest.....	18.7	7
Other.....	17.6	6
Total.....	268.7	100

STATE OFFICE

In order to serve you better, we have opened a state office in room 8000 of the Federal Building, 400 North Eighth Street, Rich-

mond, Virginia. Our office secretary is Mrs. Dorothy Robinson and the telephone number is 649-0049. The office will be kept open during the usual business hours, five days a week. I will be there all day on Friday, February 9 and should you desire to talk with me about any matter, please call Mrs. Robinson for an appointment. If this is not convenient, we will, of course, attempt to fit you into the schedule if you drop by the office anytime during the day.

LEGISLATION

During the six years in the House of Representatives, I attempted to be as helpful to constituents as possible in their contacts with the Federal government. We want to continue to give the maximum assistance in individual cases but in order to properly attend to legislative duties, I will have to rely more heavily on the staff. My principal assistant is Donald J. Musch, a former lawyer and FBI agent who lives in the Middleburg area. He is assisted in casework by three ladies who have been with me most of the time I have been in Congress. They are Mrs. Flo Hart, Mrs. Dorothy Hope and Mrs. Grace Scott. They are available to assist you anytime you visit the office. It is preferable, however, to write us regarding a specific problem, give as much information as is necessary to understand the matter and we will see that your correspondence gets prompt attention.

Our Legislative staff consists of Jack Davis, a lawyer and former Naval Captain; Stan Cook, formerly an assistant College Professor and Don Senese who was an Associate Professor at Radford College. These men have helped me prepare for introduction a variety of measures most of which were previously introduced in the House of Representatives but not enacted into law. Among these are measures to:

Prohibit mailing of obscene matter to minors;

Transfer jurisdiction of Lorton Penal Institutions from the District of Columbia government to the U.S. Bureau of Prisons;

Establish a veterans cemetery on or adjacent to the Manassas National Battlefield Park;

Establish a Bureau of Mines Research Center at V.P.I.;

Prohibit issuance of food stamps to strikers;

Return Memorial Day and Veterans Day to May 30 and November 11;

Have children attend neighborhood schools;

Establish a national right-to-work law;

Provide a Constitutional Amendment prohibiting assignment of children to public schools on the basis of race, creed, or color;

Exclude from gross income first \$250 of interest from deposits in thrift institutions;

Transfer jurisdiction over issues and controversies involving the public schools from federal to state courts;

Reduce the size of juries in federal courts from 12 to 6 persons;

Provide certain veterans up to 9 months educational assistance for retraining or refresher courses;

Permit optional retirement of federal civilian employees after 30 years of service;

Preserve Ferry Farm, boyhood home of George Washington near Fredericksburg;

Amend Constitution to permit non-denominational prayers in public buildings;

Provide 10-year terms for federal judges.

We now want to encourage the various committees to hold hearings on as many of these bills as possible and to determine what other supplementary legislative proposals should be considered.

Perhaps in your own field of work you have knowledge of a particular problem which should receive the attention of the Federal government and would like to give me a factual statement of the proposal, and the reason for Federal action. We would, of

course, give consideration to any suggestion. Let me quickly add, however, that only 5% to 6% of the bills introduced are enacted into law so that there will be no misunderstanding if a given proposal is not accepted.

Newsletter lists: This is the first of our Senate newsletters although periodically reports were sent to Eighth District constituents during the six years I served in the House of Representatives. In the event your address needs to be corrected or should you give this newsletter to a friend who would like to be added to our regular mailing list, the following form may be helpful. We, of course, want to send the newsletter to any Virginian who would like to receive it.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REORGANIZING THE AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT

HON. DICK CLARK

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 2, 1973

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as you know the reorganization of the Agriculture Department has been discussed with great frequency. I would like to insert the following article on the recommendation of Mr. Lauren Soth, editor of the editorial pages of the Des Moines Register and Tribune. Mr. Soth brought this article to my attention and I believe its suggestions deserve wider consideration. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

REORGANIZING THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE: A PROPOSAL FOR CHANGE

(A Statement by the National Planning Association Agriculture Committee)

The American people have been voicing deep concern about the institutions of their government at all levels. Cynicism has grown about the capacity of government agencies to act in the interests of the people. Studies have revealed corruption, favoritism and incompetence in carrying out regulatory and administrative functions.

Not least among the institutions which have been the subject of public doubt and suspicion is the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Sharp criticism of the department has come from numerous quarters with regard to regulatory activities concerning the public forests, agricultural chemicals and meat processing, the handling of grain sales to the Soviet Union, etc. In fact, the very need for a Department of Agriculture to serve farmers has been questioned. On January 22, 1971, President Nixon, in his State of the Union message, presented a broad plan for reorganizing the Federal bureaucracy which would have abolished the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Agricultural economists and other observers of the rural scene have argued for at least two decades that the U.S. Department of Agriculture has done a poor job of administering to the needs of small, low-production farmers. Spokesmen for the black community and other minority groups have long claimed that the interests and needs of these groups have been neglected by the USDA. And spokesmen for consumer-oriented groups have frequently argued that the USDA has failed to adequately represent and protect the interests of consumers in the food field. Thus, there is widespread dissatisfaction with the U.S. Department of Agriculture as it is presently structured and operated.

On the other hand, it should be recognized that the USDA has been highly successful in conducting and supporting agricultural production research, in developing new production technologies, in extending those technologies to commercial farmers, and in providing services required by modern farm units, but external to individual units (e.g., market news and plant and animal disease control). As a result, the commercial sector of agriculture is highly productive, dramatically dynamic, and of a tremendous benefit to consumers. Further, the USDA has been effective in stabilizing prices and incomes for the commercial sector, and in representing the interests of commercial farmers in many and varied problem areas. Thus, the USDA has a highly successful record working with and for commercial agriculture.

But, the question is being raised more and more frequently concerning what should we do about the U.S. Department of Agriculture. In 1971, the Nixon Administration was prepared to reorganize it out of existence. Now the Nixon Administration seems to favor maintaining the USDA with the specific and narrow mission to work with commercial farmers, and to transfer all functions concerned with rural development, rural welfare and consumers to other, essentially urban-oriented, agencies. This approach has considerable appeal for many. But it has two major weaknesses. First, rural development and welfare activities tend to be ignored and overlooked in urban-oriented agencies; the larger, but not necessarily more acute, urban problems simply dwarf the rural problems, resulting in the neglect of the latter. Second, a Federal department concerned with the interests and problems of a small sector of the economy—commercial agriculture—and the relatively few individuals involved would soon become a second-rate, neglected agency in the huge Federal administrative structure.

It is occasionally suggested that a new Department of Rural Affairs be established, leaving the USDA with the role of administering to the needs of commercial farmers. But, such a proposal simply leaves us with two weak, and probably ineffective, departments.

The Agriculture Committee of the National Planning Association thus recommends that an essentially new department, replacing the USDA, be created to deal with the issues and problems of rural welfare, rural development and commercial agriculture. While it is true that most of the staff for this new department would come from the old USDA, the missions of the new department would differ radically from those of the old USDA, as would its structure.

The new department would have three primary missions:

1. the improvement of social conditions and services in rural areas (e.g., housing, education, health);

2. the development of nonfarm economic and social activities in rural areas (our concept of development here is broad and inclusive, ranging from the establishment of a factory in a market town to new rural-urban, living-working communities, to the establishment of recreation and wildlife facilities); and

3. the continued support and development of commercial farming.

Each mission noted above is important in its own right, and is proposed to deal with a recognized and well documented need. Further, and as will be argued later in this article, these missions complement one another to an important degree. Thus, it is recommended that they be combined into a single department to be named the U.S. Department of Agriculture and Rural Affairs.

To stress the fact that each of the three goals is to receive a high priority in the USDARA, each would be headed by an Under Secretary. The work of the USDARA would thus fall into three principal groupings, but would be tied together and integrated

through the administrative device of all three Under Secretaries reporting to the same Secretary.

The operating structure of the USDARA would necessarily vary considerably among the three missions. Since the principal educational and health programs of the Federal government fall under the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, transportation activities under the Department of Transportation, and housing programs under the Department of Housing and Urban Development, it would be unnecessarily costly and administratively unwise to duplicate these programs in the USDARA.

This being the case, the Under Secretary, and his staff, responsible for improving social conditions and services in rural areas would perform a staff coordinating function. This Under Secretary and his staff would have the responsibility for working with the Congress, the appropriate administrative agencies of Federal, state and local governments, and rural interest groups to make certain that national and local programs in this area included rural components which adequately meet the needs of rural people.

Without a high-level administrative official, in this case an Under Secretary to "watch-dog" national programs of health, education, transport and housing, as well as other services, it seems likely that these national programs would increasingly ignore—hence neglect—the smaller rural sector in favor of the now overwhelming urban sector. Thus, we recommend the establishment of the Office of Rural Welfare in the USDARA to be headed by an Under Secretary, and staffed by an appropriate number of Deputy Under Secretaries, to watch over, strengthen and improve national welfare programs as they relate to rural America.

The structure of the USDARA with respect to missions 2 and 3 would be more conventional. As we envision the USDARA, all old agencies, and any new agencies concerned with rural development, would report to the Under Secretary for Rural Development. In a paper such as this, we will not attempt to draw an organizational chart indicating the agency and staff structure of the rural development mission. But, we would expect that such established agencies as the Soil Conservation Service and the Forest Service would report to the Under Secretary for Rural Development, and the current catch-all agency, the Farmers Home Administration, might well be reorganized and renamed. And we would anticipate that certain new agencies would be required to achieve a satisfactory development of rural areas: possibly a new agency to administer certain aspects of the Rural Development Act of 1972, and a new agency or two to deal with missing pieces of the development picture.

In this latter connection, it should be recognized that the Rural Development Act of 1972 assumes that we know how to achieve a satisfactory state of development in rural areas and therefore all that is required is additional financing. But this is not the case. We really don't know how to achieve satisfactory rates of economic development in rural areas. In the past, rural economic development has primarily involved agriculture, forestry or mining. When those industries did not provide the desired rate of economic development, where and to what did they turn? In every little town, there are monuments in the form of empty buildings to manufacturing and distribution enterprises that have failed. Economic development in rural America that does not involve agriculture, forestry and mining is a poorly understood phenomenon.

Local rural areas desperately need technical assistance to guide and direct their non-farm development efforts. But the technical assistance base required to support development in rural areas is still to be created from research still to be done, a technical exten-

sion service still to be established, and local planning organizations still to be made productive. The rural development mission of the USDARA must fill this void through new activities and new agencies.

Mission number 3 should be realized at the outset with existing activities and agencies. We envision the following agencies reporting to the Under Secretary for Commercial Agriculture: the Agricultural Research Service, the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, the Foreign Agricultural Service, the Agricultural Marketing Service (except for food programs), and several smaller agencies.

But it seems likely that price and income stabilization programs will change over time—will be forced to change—as the number of commercial farmers continues to decline, as payments per farm continue to increase, and as foreign trade in agricultural products becomes relatively more important. Thus, we do not foresee the mission of commercial agriculture continuing unchanged decade after decade; on the contrary, we foresee some important changes in the form and substance of stabilization programs occurring as the structure of commercial agriculture changes and the markets for farm products change.

In this conception of a Department of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, we reject certain propositions.

First, we reject the proposition that a viable department representing commercial agriculture alone can be maintained.

The constituency of commercial farmers is already small in size and is becoming smaller each year. When half the families of the nation were engaged in farming, it was easy to visualize and establish a department to look after their interests alone. But, with the present distribution of the working force, there is no more justification for a Department of Commercial Agriculture than there is for a Department of Pharmacy or a Department of Plumbing. In due time, this would be recognized, and a Department of Commercial Agriculture would be folded into some other department, probably the proposed Department of Economic Affairs.

Second, we reject the proposition that viable units concerned with (a) social services for rural areas and (b) nonfarm economic development for rural areas can only occur in some agency divorced from commercial agriculture.

We have learned from experience that programs designed to improve social services in rural areas and increase nonfarm employment in rural areas get short shrift in new urban-based agencies. The agencies established to combat poverty were "captured" in large measure by urban interests; as a result, the poverty programs have focused on urban problems and neglected rural problems. Further, we know that weak and non-existent programming in nonfarm rural communities results from weak and non-existent representation of these communities in the Congress; missions 1 and 2 described above for dealing with problems in rural areas outside the commercial farm sector will become strong and vigorous only as the representation from those areas becomes stronger and more vigorous. Placing the agencies concerned with improving social services and nonfarm economic development for rural areas in urban-based agencies will not in itself strengthen their work and effectiveness.

The complementary nature of the three missions should contribute to their respective effectiveness when all three are placed in the same department. (Throughout this discussion, we recognize that national programs concerned with such areas as health and education will not be torn asunder and placed in part in the new USDARA; but, the coordinating responsibility for health and

education in rural areas will be placed in the USDARA.)

Increased prosperity of the commercial farm sector, for example, in no way conflicts with the goals of improved social services in rural areas and increased economic activity in the nonfarm rural sector. On the contrary, increased prosperity of the commercial farm sector should contribute (1) to new agribusiness enterprises and increased employment in those enterprises, and (2) to the increased financial support of social services for all rural residents.

Similarly, increased economic activity in the nonfarm rural sector should lead (1) to increased employment opportunities for surplus farm workers and (2) to a further easing of the financial burden of providing a desired level of social services. Finally, improved social services in rural areas will benefit farmer and townsman alike.

It is true that the kinds of program activities provided rural areas will differ markedly by mission. Hence, there is need for separate and differently structured missions, with the work of each reporting to its own Under Secretary. The commercial farm sector needs production and marketing research and price and income protection; the small towns need technical assistance and credit; the rural community as a whole needs improved educational and health services and environmental protection. But, although the activities undertaken and the services provided by the separate missions vary to an important degree, they reach the same people in many cases, people with similar backgrounds and interests in many more cases, and they interact at many, many levels. Thus, we argue that these missions should be placed side by side in one Federal department.

We have not mentioned food programs to this point, but we will now. We recognize that food products are produced, in most cases, from farm products, hence there is continuity in the product stream. Nonetheless, consumer interests conflict in most instances with producer interests. Consumers are interested in low food prices, an abundant food supply, and pure, healthful products. Producers seek high prices, are best served by a short supply, and are largely indifferent to health aspects of food. Because of this basic conflict of interest, we recommend that all food programs—inspection, regulation and distribution—now in the USDA be transferred to a consumer-oriented department. In a consumer-oriented department, food programs will be supported more vigorously and administered more effectively than in a producer-oriented department.

The question now arises as to where the Forest Service should be located—whether in the proposed USDARA or some other department. If a strong Department of Natural Resources is established in the Federal administrative structure, logic would argue for a transfer of the Forest Service to such a department. Such a department would have the responsibility for managing the use of all natural resources. But, if a strong Department of Natural Resources fails to emerge, a reasonable argument can be made for locating the Forest Service in the proposed USDARA. The forest sector is an important provider of nonfarm employment in rural areas. Thus, timber production and wood working industries might well become an important part of programs and activities designed to increase the development of the nonfarm rural sector. In this organizational conception, the Forest Service would become a part of the mission for developing nonfarm economic activities in the proposed USDARA.

The work of statistical reporting and economic analysis which presently comes under the purview of the Director of Agricultural Economics should remain unchanged as regards organizational structure, with the Di-

rector of Agricultural Economics, like the General Counsel and Administrative Assistant Secretary, reporting to the Secretary. But, the substantive work of the Statistical Reporting Service and the Economic Research Service should be broadened to adequately service the three primary missions of the USDARA. The Director of Agricultural Economics and his staff should expect to service the statistical and economic research needs of each of the three missions.

Finally, a word needs to be said regarding the Congressional committees to which the proposed department would (1) interact regarding legislation and (2) seek appropriations. Assuming that there is reasonable consensus favoring the departmental organization proposed above, and the President recommends its establishment, the Congress, in a rational world, would reorganize its Authorizing and Appropriation Committees along those lines. But this is not a rational world, and asking the Congress to reorganize its committee structure is like asking the elements to modify Minnesota winters—neither is what you would call responsive. Thus, we suggest that Congressional committees will come into being which recognize the three principal missions proposed above for the new Department of Agricultural and Rural Affairs, and which are organized into the appropriate subcommittees to deal with those missions, only as:

(1) the blacks and other minority groups in rural areas overcome the obstacles to their voting and are able to make their votes count;

(2) state and local politicians in states with large rural populations make the needs of rural people felt in Washington, as well as at the local levels;

(3) farm groups place as high a priority on the quality of life and social services as they do on goods, prices and incomes.

In other words, in making the recommendations that we have in this paper, we recognize full well that the Congressional committees are not going to change in organization and composition until the message comes through to them that the power structure in rural areas wants a change. But, they will begin to change when that message begins to come through.

NEW DIRECTIONS—THE 1974 FEDERAL BUDGET

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith, as a part of my remarks in the Record, the text of my current newsletter in which I make a number of observations about the fiscal 1974 Federal budget:

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON NEW DIRECTIONS

They were hauled from office to office on long, low flatbed trucks, five volumes to each Congressman ranging in size from a 71-page summary to a 1,120-page book the size of the New York City telephone directory, bound in dark blue and lettered, appropriately, in gold—"The Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 1974."

It is, beyond a shadow of a doubt, the most important single publication that will enter Room 1513, Longworth, or any other congressional office, this year.

CXIX—203—Part 3

By this time, you're no doubt familiar with the broad outlines of the President's budget: spending up from an estimated \$250 billion this year to \$268 billion for the year beginning July 1; dozens of substantial reductions in specific programs; virtually no new programs proposed; an increase of more than \$4 billion in military spending; but, overall, a hold-the-line, noninflationary, no-new-taxes budget.

The Federal budget, however, is much more than a dollars-and-cents accounting of past, present and future government revenues and expenditures.

PLAN FOR THE FUTURE

It's nothing less than the Government's (the Executive Branch, at this early stage) plan for the future.

Both in its direct effects and in its underlying assumptions, the Budget represents the Administration's judgment of the direction which social and economic policy should follow. It allocates human and material resources. It defines, in effect, what the public sector will be and what the private sector will be. And it influences all kinds of ostensibly private decisions: business investment, hospital location, the availability of housing, education, medical care, and jobs, as well as the prices we pay for most products and services.

It is a very significant document.

And this year, especially, the Federal Budget is also a very controversial document. Time magazine terms it the President's "Call to Counter-Revolution." The President, also using military terminology, announces the beginning of "the battle of the budget." And eager recruits hasten to assemble on each side of the battle, some hailing the President's mastery of Federal spending, others condemning his insensitivity to human needs.

At this point, either judgment would seem to be premature. The Budget is so vast and the issues it raises are so complex that the job of deciding what is acceptable or unacceptable in the Budget will tax to the utmost the capabilities of every Congressman.

FEW DULL MOMENTS

There won't be many dull moments in this first session of the 93rd Congress, nor much time on our hands. Among other things, the President proposes to: abolish the billion-dollar Emergency Employment program of public service jobs for hardcore unemployed; dismantle and scale down the anti-poverty program; transfer and downgrade the White House Office of Consumer Affairs; close down the Office of Science and Technology and the National Aeronautics and Space Council; terminate Federal aid for hospital construction; stop new commitments for housing subsidies for low- and middle-income families; abolish the farm conservation program; and sharply reduce funds for such programs as the special milk program for school children. Model Cities, community development, education, manpower training, farm price supports and veterans' benefits.

All told, the Budget schedules major spending cuts for 113 individual programs, principally of the social services variety. While it proposes to consolidate about 70 of these programs in four broad-purpose, few-strings-attached special revenue sharing programs—in the areas of education, urban community development, manpower training, and law enforcement—available funds, in most cases, will be substantially reduced and critics fear the time lag in establishing special revenue sharing (assuming Congress agrees) will seriously disrupt the continuity of important programs at the local level.

NOTABLE OMISSIONS

Moreover, the Budget is almost as notable for what it omits. Absent from its thousands

of pages, for instance, is any mention of welfare reform, which I strongly advocated during my campaign for Congressman and which was once one of the President's most heralded objectives. Similarly, no funds are budgeted for tax relief for homeowners burdened with high property taxes, nor for a national health insurance program, though the President indicates he's still in favor of it.

Obviously, there is much to argue about in the Administration Budget. Many special interests are threatened. Some real needs are down-graded. Conversely, such Presidential objectives as restraining inflation, keeping the lid on taxes, eliminating bureaucratic red tape, and bringing governmental decisions closer to home will be—and should be—widely welcomed.

All this presents Congress with some tough questions and even tougher decisions. I, for one, will want some answers to these:

How much fat can be squeezed from the defense budget without endangering national security? (A question which new Defense Secretary Richardson has just agreed, happily, to explore beginning right now.)

ANSWERS NEEDED

How can we differentiate more effectively between programs and functions which are primarily local in character and those designed to meet truly national needs which require Federal funds, standards and administration?

To what extent are State and local governments as a result of Federal revenue sharing equipped to accept responsibility—and higher costs in some cases—for programs previously administered by the Federal Government?

Since programs are seldom either 100% effective or totally ineffective, can't we find a way to assure that communities having real needs, a genuine commitment to service, and skilled administrators doing a superior job will be adequately funded? In other words, can't we avoid penalizing good projects along with the bad?

In the emerging confrontation between a powerful and determined Executive and a Legislative fearful of losing its authority, between a Republican President and a Democratic Congress, the final question may be the most critical: can we reach agreement on these momentous issues calmly, rationally, intelligently, willing to compromise where necessary, and recognizing that most of us—however much we may disagree—truly wish to serve the public interest?

These are your decisions, too! Whether you are rich or poor, worker or businessman, Democrat or Republican, it's your future at stake.

I shall welcome your views.

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?

**MR. NORMAN A. CARLSON SPEAKS
ON REHABILITATION OF NON-
VIOLENT CRIMINALS**

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, the entire population of our Nation is concerned about crime in general and correctional alternatives in particular. Many people feel that to place an offender in prison for a nonviolent crime only tends to make a criminal out of him. This is particularly true of white collar offenses. Others feel that stiffer penalties should be handed down by the court as a deterrent to crime. I personally feel that nonviolent offenders should be handled in community centers or halfway houses.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to your attention and that of our colleagues to an outstanding speech made on this subject. On Tuesday, January 16, 1973, we, in southern Illinois, were honored to have the outstanding and able Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, Norman A. Carlson, address the annual chamber of commerce banquet at Marion, Ill. Mr. Carlson and Warden George Pickett of the Marion Institution were recipients of the Industry of the Year Award presented by the Marion, Ill., chamber.

I had the great honor of making the presentation. We are all proud of the manner in which the Bureau of Prisons is operating the Marion Institution. It is the most modern prison in the world with much emphasis being placed on rehabilitation of the inmate. The Marion community, Southern Illinois University, John A. Logan Junior College, and the entire area are cooperating with prison officials in an effort to bring in a feeling of community pride. This helps the administration and the inmate feel that he is wanted as a valued citizen when he is released.

Mr. Speaker, under previous order granted me, I herewith commend Director Carlson's remarks for printing in the RECORD and hope that every colleague and reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will take time to go over the remarks of the brilliant Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, Mr. Norm Carlson.

First, let me say what a pleasure it has been to be on hand for the recognition which you have bestowed on the men and women who work at the U.S. penitentiary here in Marion.

Flying out here today gave me a good chance to sit back and think about just how significant this honor is to the Department of Justice.

For years, many staff members of the Federal prison system have made a continuing effort to bring together our institutions and the communities that surround them.

Our reason for doing so has been the firm belief that community involvement in the correctional process is critically important. The philosophy which prevailed in the past—that of isolating and trying to forget about offenders—has been one of the major causes of previous correctional failures. We do not accept the notion that an offender can be cut off from society—as you might cut off a diseased limb—and be expected to make

a successful readjustment some years later when it suddenly becomes time to recognize him as a citizen again.

I might add that this philosophy of cutting people off has also been directed to some extent at many of our line correctional staff—the men charged with round-the-clock responsibility for supervising offenders. Over the years, the reward they have received for their thankless, often dangerous work, has usually been second-class citizen status in their communities. Obviously, the situation here in Marion is different. The recognition which you conferred tonight is a tribute to every employee at the institution, and I know that you are as proud to call them neighbors as we are to have them in the Department of Justice.

I wish that we had the same situation everywhere. I wish I could tell you that all the barriers to community involvement had fallen. But that is not the case. Unfortunately, there are not enough communities like Marion and in far too many instances, correctional institutions are politely tolerated instead of being welcomed.

I think the slow progress to date can be attributed to two main factors. One of these is the unfortunate reluctance of many people to make a place in their community for the offender after he is released. It goes back to the diseased-limb philosophy and the attitude that those in corrections have the sole responsibility for changing men and women in our prisons. It results from the unwillingness of many to admit that offenders represent the failure of all the institutions in our society—the home, the church, the school, the community.

The other reason for slow progress may be that all of us in corrections have to work harder on community relations—letting our fellow citizens know what's going on in our institutions, why it's happening, and what they can do to help.

In any case, it won't ever work unless it's a two-way street as it has been in Marion. Our efforts will be in vain unless people like yourselves, throughout this country, make a similar commitment to full involvement in the process of criminal justice. If interest in the crime problem stops at prison gates, then we're only paying lip service to finding a solution to that problem.

The role corrections plays in seeking a solution to the crime problem is implicit in the title. The goal is to correct the offender so that he will be a productive member of society after release.

I can't fully describe the challenge which confronts us. But I can tell you, at the risk of disappointing some of our more impatient critics, there are no panaceas to get the job done.

The magnitude of the challenge and the failures of the past, however, are no justification for throwing up our hands.

It means that we must increase our efforts to offer educational, training, counseling, and other opportunities which can prepare the offender to play a productive role in the society of which he is a part.

We are not so unrealistic as to believe that all offenders will take advantage of these opportunities. What makes it worthwhile, though, is that even at an institution like Marion—which houses our most difficult offenders—we frequently have success.

I can't tell you how pleased I was in October about the front page New York Times story on a Marion inmate who earned his undergraduate degree magna cum laude from Southern Illinois University. Not only did he graduate with honors, but through sheer determination he completed four years' work in 21 months, setting a record unequalled by SIU studies who have a lot more opportunities.

His accomplishment was, most of all, a credit to his motivation. But it also says something about community involvement in that such a program could even be made available. It throws at us the hard challenge of finding and reaching other such men.

Taking a moment to look into the future, I don't know of any substantial change in the vital role now played by the institution here.

Marion is one of our newer institutions and, as such, has benefited by having industrial programs that are relevant to needs of the job market outside. We employ inmates in a sheet metal factory and a printing shop within the institution and wish that we had similar industries in some of our older facilities.

Marion has a modern vocational training program and the education department has a wide offering that ranges from literacy training to college studies. We are extremely pleased by all the assistance we have had from both SIU and from John A. Logan College.

Looking ahead for the entire Federal prison system, a number of new institutions are either under construction or on the drawing boards.

These new institutions will help to alleviate some of the pressures we have been feeling as a result of getting increasing numbers of offenders.

They will be small and modern and we have deliberately attempted to eliminate the oppressive atmosphere that is prevalent in so many of the Nation's aging, outmoded prisons.

In the past, and today especially, there has been a great deal of criticism about the correctional system in general. Much of this criticism, of course, has been justified so the question becomes whether or not we are making positive steps forward.

The answer to the question is that we are making such steps. The Bureau of Prisons recognizes that 98% of the offenders we get will some day be back on the streets again. We recognize that our role in the protection of society is to hold these offenders safely and to do whatever we can to keep them from returning to a life of crime.

Citizens across the country have begun to take note of the deplorable conditions in many of our institutions and are now beginning to understand the problem. Part of the credit for this understanding must go to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce which has published a pamphlet called, "Marshaling Citizens' Power to Modernize Corrections." The pamphlet (and a slide presentation is also available) gives insight into correctional issues and tells how to mobilize citizen and legislative support for correctional programs. Approximately one million copies already have been distributed.

The most encouraging progress in corrections has been the recognition and support we have received from the Congress. In fiscal year 1969, for example, the budget for the Federal prison system was only \$69 million. Last fiscal year, it was \$175 million. As businessmen, I think you can appreciate that all the good intentions in the world are of no use unless you have the financial backing to put them into action.

Because of the new awareness and support for corrections, however, there has also been a disturbing attempt in some quarters to find a panacea that will cure all of our correctional ills. In recent months, there has been quite a clamor that we should give up all correctional institutions in favor of treating offenders within the community.

The Bureau of Prisons supports community treatment and pioneered in the use of halfway houses. We operate 15 of our own and have contracts with more than 70 others. But we realize that many offenders still need

institutions and that the institutions we put them in are going to have to offer a lot more than some of the steel and concrete fortresses that have been in vogue for the past century.

Community treatment has a lot to commend it. It has a degree of humaneness which institutions can never achieve and it is cheap by comparison. But it is not a panacea.

The rational approach is to develop each method of treatment so we can offer correctional alternatives that will meet both the needs of our offenders and the requirements of our society.

Whether corrections can realize the full potential of either method will depend on men and women like yourselves throughout this country. Unless there is a national commitment, community treatment will never get off the ground and institutions will continue to be places where isolation and dehumanization prevail.

Should that occur, we can forget about diminishing the problem of crime!

CONGRESSIONAL LEADERSHIP AND THE FEDERAL BUDGET

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, if there is any total agreement in this body, it may well be that our branch of Government has lost power to the executive.

We have chosen to react rather than act ourselves in the first place as a co-equal branch of Government—one which is responsible for making the laws and overseeing the manner in which they are executed and administered.

While we may be able to ameliorate our immediate problems, there is no realistic probability of escape from them until we face up to the responsibilities of the Constitution.

The biggest arena of this debate is, no doubt, the handling of the Federal budget by the Congress. We must and should initiate strong programs to reduce waste of tax dollars throughout our entire government. There are many areas in which we can save Federal dollars without impairing economic or social growth.

The Christian Science Monitor discussed this in a recent editorial which I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point, and I am hopeful that my colleagues can find time to read it.

The last paragraph of the article succinctly sums up our responsibilities, saying:

Congress can either contribute greatly toward a constructive and fiscally sane budget, or it can muffle the job. Before it can make a positive contribution, however, it must straighten out its own absurd and self-defeating budgetary and revenue procedures. The present non-system parcels out the budget in so many directions that the overall budget picture is lost sight of and, with it, any real control. If Congress wishes to regain its constitutional powers, it would do well to make a start at precisely this point.

The editorial follows:

THE BUDGET: MR. NIXON'S BID

The first thing to be noted about President Nixon's proposed budget for fiscal year 1974 is just that: It is a proposed budget. It is in essence Mr. Nixon's opening bid in the next round of the political-economic-fiscal-social-defense game at which politicians in both the executive and legislative arms of government, at all levels, endlessly play.

In fact, his latest bid comes even before the last round is played out. And it is instructive, in examining the trend of this bid, to review what happened in the last round. In brief, a year ago Mr. Nixon proposed to spend \$246.3 billion in fiscal 1973, which ends this coming June 30. Congress meanwhile voted to spend \$261 billion, and the President in turn countered with a request to cut that back to a ceiling of \$250 billion, with him making the itemized cuts. Congress said no. The President then dug in his heels and refused to spend more than \$250 billion of the money which Congress had appropriated.

Viewed from this background, President Nixon's new proposed budget of \$268.7 billion for fiscal 1974, while presented as a conservative and noninflationary federal spending program, is actually 7 or 8 percent higher than last year's proposal. That is pretty much in line with the way the federal budget has been increasing in recent years. And it is considerably higher than the minus-3 or -4 percent annual increment in the gross national product—hardly regressive from a conservative economic standpoint.

Mr. Nixon characterizes his budget in terms of an effort "to chart a new course for America." In his Sunday night address to the American people, he referred to the budget as a major campaign effort against a spendthrift Congress in "the battle of the budget." As a scene-setting effort this is all within the ordinary context of American political theater. But it has to be recognized as such.

In our view, the new Nixon budget is more nearly an effort to strike a middle path between the extremes of spending too much too fast in social betterment on the one hand, and pulling in the economic reins too hard on the other. From a purely fiscal standpoint, the new budget recognizes that the economy is still not fully recovered from recession, but is growing healthily. It provides for a \$19 billion increase in federal spending, which the continuing economic growth should allow, without stoking the inflationary fires, which remain a serious threat. And so it sets a realistic overall budgetary limit. Past experience, however, teaches that Congress will regard that figure as a floor rather than a ceiling. And here is where Congress should discipline itself.

Within that context, however, there is surely plenty of room for debate and maneuver. If the Democratic leadership of Congress decides that more spending is needed on social programs than Mr. Nixon recommends, there is one way of achieving that end without inflationary danger: raise taxes. This, of course, is precisely what Mr. Nixon has vowed not to do, and he has gone so far as to say that he will veto any spending Congress calls for beyond his \$269 billion ceiling. In any case, this is not a road the Congress is likely to go down without the President's prodding. Taxes are no more popular with congressmen than with presidents.

The more likely arena for the "battle of the budget" is in the area of priorities. Mr. Nixon has called for scrapping of 70 federal aid programs, including some in aid to education, law enforcement, job training, and urban development. While he has allocated \$6.9 billion yearly to four special

revenue-sharing programs with cities and states, which would allow them to carry on some of the federal programs being eliminated, that proposal is a sharp reverse-march from Mr. Nixon's proposals of a year ago. Then he called for six plans totaling \$12.3 billion.

In many ways the particulars of Mr. Nixon's budget appear to be an attack on what remains of former President Lyndon Johnson's Great Society programs: gone are Model Cities slum restoration; local-action antipoverty programs; local mental-health programs, among others. At the same time, however, gone also are some of Mr. Nixon's own former pet ideas: no mention of welfare reform; no provision for his touted family assistance program; no real commitment to national health insurance. Congress will surely, and rightly, subject these and other decisions to a vigorous debate over priorities.

We ourselves would seriously question the \$1 billion cutback on manpower training programs, the slashes in subsidies for Amtrak passenger rail service, the slashes in research on high-speed rail travel, and dilution of water pollution control. And, as discussed below, there is the whole question of how much of the federal budget should go to defense spending.

In this debate, Congress can either contribute greatly toward a constructive and fiscally sane budget, or it can muffle the job. Before it can make a positive contribution, however, it must straighten out its own absurd and self-defeating budgetary and revenue procedures. The present nonsystem parcels out the budget in so many directions that the overall budget picture is lost sight of and, with it, any real control. If Congress wishes to regain its constitutional powers, it would do well to make a start at precisely this point.

DOMESTIC DOG AND CAT PROTECTION ACT

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 1, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, according to the Department of Agriculture, a group of businessmen in Venezuela is planning to commercially raise cats, slaughter them, and then export the skins and other products to the United States for sale.

In addition to the skins, which reportedly will bring 50 cents each in the United States, these people plan to sell the gut for sutures and strings for musical instruments, and to market the feet for good-luck charms.

The cats' carcasses will then be fed to mice, which, in turn will be fed to the cats.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an isolated case. A South African businessman announced a plan to raise dogs for importation of dog skins into the United States. However, the public outcry led the South African Government to amend its Animal Protection Act to specifically prohibit the slaughtering of domestic dogs for financial gain.

However, existing U.S. laws and regulations would not stop this operation. This utter disregard for domestic cats

and dogs must be challenged by the Congress, and the factory-farming of cats and dogs for pelts—merely to satisfy human vanity—must be halted.

By timely action, Congress could prevent the burgeoning of inhumane foreign industries built around the raising of domestic dogs and cats for slaughter.

For this reason, I introduced H.R. 3347, the Domestic Dog and Cat Protection Act, which would prohibit the importation of domestic dog and cat products into the United States. In addition, this proposal would prevent the interstate shipment of factory-produced domestic cat and dog skins, pelts, and other products for which the animals were slaughtered.

My bill would levy a \$10,000 fine for the first violation, and \$20,000 for the conviction of a second offense.

Mr. Speaker, I personally, believe that those who would slaughter cats and dogs for profit have grossly misjudged the American people, if they expect us to buy cat and dog skin products. However, I also believe that such an act, as I have proposed, would discourage the beginning of such a business before it has had an opportunity to slaughter any dogs and cats. Such an act would lay to rest any visions of marketing dog and cat products in the United States.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD a communication from the Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, and a newspaper clipping from Coro, Venezuela on this topic:

CAT SLAUGHTERHOUSE PLANNED BY CITY OF CORO BUSINESSMEN

(By Michael Salazar Leidenz)

CORO.—This city, lying in the sandy iridescence that surrounds it and her colonial past—much of whose architecture remains intact—will be the center of a new, unusual industry.

A group of concerned citizens, confronting the scarce industrial possibilities that have existed in the region for the past four centuries, decided to found an enterprise that would exploit on a large scale the breeding of cats.

This idea is expected to change drastically the economic situation of the inhabitants who up until now have been receiving income off the money that trickles down from the National Budget and from the tourist industry that has only recently begun.

The company formed by Drs. Mario Jacobo Penso, Raul Lopez Lilo, Ruben Henriquez Garcia, Arnaldo Curiel and Jose Angel Jimenez, and banker Yamil Rujana Eblen, plans to start the industry with 10 thousand cats. The skins of these animals will be sold in the United States and Europe for \$50 after having been processed.

DERIVATIVES

On the other hand, in this line of business there will also be a demand for derivatives that come from the breeding of cats. The insides of the cats, commonly known as "cat gut," are used in the fabrication of surgical thread and for guitar strings. The entrepreneurs also feel that the paws of the cats can be used to make "good luck" key rings and that certain bones may be used for amulets.

It is also believed that the hair from some of these animals will serve in the making of fine artists' brushes.

Banker Yamil Rujana Eblen is the vice-President of the Regional Development Bank and is also a well-known businessman.

He explained that the cat breeding project has received offers of economic backing from various sectors, including businessman Jose Henriquez Morales, who has already offered \$125 thousand for the cat business.

NOVEL IDEA

In reality, he explained, the creation of a novel industry is being tried because the cats will be fed mice and the mice will be fed with the meat of the same cats.

He went on to explain that once the cats' parts which are to be fabricated have been processed, the carcasses that remain will be used to feed a breed of 20 thousand sand mice whose raising will be begun at the same time. With these rodents the problem of feeding the cats will be resolved. The importation of 20 to 30 thousand sand mice, which have been brought in by the biological departments of the national universities and the Venezuelan Institute of Scientific Investigations in the past will be avoided, he added.

REPRODUCTION CYCLES

Drs. Mario Jacobo Penso, Ruben Henriquez Garcia, Arnaldo Curiel and Raul Lopez Lilo explained that the native cats reproduce every 90 days and have a litter ranging in size from 3 to 9 kittens.

At the same time the mice reproduce every 21 days a litter of from 6 to 9 offspring.

"As the growth of both present certain special geometric characteristics, if we initiate the breeding of 10 thousand cats, the 20 thousand mice will allow us to feed all of the animals and we would guarantee in this manner, at a minimum cost, the operation of the industry," they explained.

CANNING PLANNED

"On the other hand," they explained "if we are left with an excess of mice, we could in the immediate future install a canning plant for mouse meat, which will be used as food for house cats in the whole country."

They added that the left-overs of the cats and the mice will be made into fertilizer of prime quality to supply, in immediate condition, the onion, tomato and pepper plantations that are found on the perimeters of the city.

Also, they explained, the heads of mice, dissected, will serve to make tie clips.

Dr. Felix Vargas Graterol, ex-General Secretary of Government, and a person linked with the political and economic sectors of the country, was named the legal counsel of the company which will breed the cats. Referring to the possibilities of this industry, he noted that he will give employment to at least 100 people and to many veterinary and para-veterinary personnel.

The same characteristics of the company, he said, that in beginning were taken with less seriousness than they should have been, will foster other industries, among them tourism, because there will be many tourists who come to observe our original industrial process."

LOW COSTS

Dr. Jose Angel Jimenez, one of the businessmen, explained that the costs of production of this industry will be minimal. Equally the costs of marketing will be reduced. He indicated that a skilled worker makes Bs 15 a day or \$3 more or less. The climate is ideal in allowing production all year long and the city of Coro has temperature averages of 28 centigrades.

The industries that are located in Coro," he said, "will be capable of producing 12 months a year because of the climate, the abundance of water, and the transport roads which connect Coro with the rest of the country."

Dr. Ramon Antonio Medina, the governor of Falcon State, referring to the cat industry, said that his government is ready to give moral and economic support to all of those industries that show the feasibility.

"We believe," he said, "that since we are giving a great push to tourism, constructing projects and bettering the general condition of the state, we also have the obligation to support all of the industries that may operate in Falcon."

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE,
December 29, 1971.

From: Caracas
To: Department of Agriculture, Washington
Ref: Code 13 V Voluntary
Subject: Venezuela: Commercial Cat Production in Venezuela

In a move that may leave some cat lovers with a queasy feeling, a group in the northwestern state of Falcon has announced to begin commercial production of cats. Such production is being spurred by reports that prepared cat skins bring about 50 cents each in the U.S. There are also plans to sell the gut for sutures and strings for musical instruments, and the feet for good-luck charms (rabbits' feet have no special properties in Venezuela—here the good luck comes from a cat's paw).

As an extra twist to this already unusual venture, the group plans to raise mice as feed for the cats. And, because only the skins, paws, and guts of the cats have commercial value here, the meat will be fed to the mice.

Since the plans are to start with only ten thousand cats as compared to twenty thousand mice, and because mice multiply much more rapidly than cats, the enterprise is looking for markets for its mice in research facilities. Waste from this operation will be used as fertilizer in fruit orchards in nearby areas.

Initial investment in this enterprise will probably be about \$200,000 (\$44,000), and since the animals are feeding on each other, upkeep should be minimal. Eventually the operation should provide employment to about one hundred people in the Coro area.

Comment Because this whole proposal has an air of unreality about it we checked its authenticity with the Ministry of Agriculture (MAC). There we were told that not only was this a legitimate enterprise, but that the Director of Livestock Programs in MAC was starting an operation to raise burros for their skins.

DONALD M. NELSON, JR.,
Assistant Agricultural Attaché.

**TRIBUTE TO THE LATE
OLIVER P. BOLTON**

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 1973

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to come to Congress in the 83d Congress as a freshman with Oliver P. Bolton. I enjoyed his friendship and admired the manner in which he worked.

Oliver always had a smile for everyone and I shall never forget the boundless energy and enthusiasm with which he approached every task.

I deeply regret the passing of a good friend and extend my complete sympathy to his family.