

February 15, 1973

Matthews, Susan W., [REDACTED]  
 McConnell, Robert M., [REDACTED]  
 Mc Elmurry, Ralph E., [REDACTED]  
 Miller, Dwayne E., [REDACTED]  
 Miller, William T., [REDACTED]  
 Moleski, Carol M., [REDACTED]  
 Morrill, Kenneth F., [REDACTED]  
 Natho, James E., [REDACTED]  
 Needham, Suzanne L., [REDACTED]  
 Nessle, Keith E., [REDACTED]  
 Nolen, Raymond D., [REDACTED]  
 Olson, Richard L., [REDACTED]  
 O'Neal, Robert B., [REDACTED]  
 Ory, Ronald R., [REDACTED]  
 Peoples, Thomas E., [REDACTED]  
 Peterson, Fleix, [REDACTED]  
 Phillips, Roy S., [REDACTED]  
 Porter, Donald L., [REDACTED]  
 Priddy, William L., [REDACTED]  
 Proctor, Ronald E., [REDACTED]  
 Rees, Marilyn S., [REDACTED]  
 Rice, Mary J., [REDACTED]  
 Rose, Steven A., [REDACTED]  
 Rosnick, Denis, [REDACTED]  
 Ruff, Edwin R., [REDACTED]  
 Sawyer, Leroy, [REDACTED]  
 Scates, Joseph F., [REDACTED]  
 Schock, Thomas W., [REDACTED]  
 Sculinary, James R., [REDACTED]  
 Simms, James H., [REDACTED]  
 Skeldon, Daniel J., [REDACTED]

Smith, James B., [REDACTED]  
 Snell, Allen S., [REDACTED]  
 Steen, Kenneth B., [REDACTED]  
 Stenbakken, Richard O., [REDACTED]  
 Stolarcek, William G., [REDACTED]  
 Sullivan, Michael L., [REDACTED]  
 Sundin, Robert K., [REDACTED]  
 Tansey, Bruce M., [REDACTED]  
 Teepe, Karl W., [REDACTED]  
 Thomas, Patricia P., [REDACTED]  
 Tibbit, William T., [REDACTED]  
 Vik, Donald R., [REDACTED]  
 Wallman, Jeffrey R., [REDACTED]  
 Warren, Pierre S., [REDACTED]  
 Weber, Jack E., [REDACTED]  
 Weeks, Howard R., [REDACTED]  
 Weems, Fred T., [REDACTED]  
 Wheelon, Carroll B., [REDACTED]  
 Wiley, John L., [REDACTED]  
 Worthington, Donna L., [REDACTED]  
 Wright, David V., [REDACTED]  
 Zoller, John G., [REDACTED]  
 Zygan, Robert F., [REDACTED]

To be second lieutenant

Allen, William P., [REDACTED]  
 Baird, Robert A., Jr., [REDACTED]  
 Baker, Donald C., Jr., [REDACTED]  
 Bresnahan, Richard E., [REDACTED]  
 Brown, John M., III, [REDACTED]  
 Calhoun, Charles B., [REDACTED]

Dauster, Charles L., Jr., [REDACTED]  
 Den Beste, Edwin J., [REDACTED]  
 Duke, Ransom B., [REDACTED]  
 Fano, Robert M., [REDACTED]  
 Ferralli, Peter A., Jr., [REDACTED]  
 Gardner, William H., Jr., [REDACTED]  
 Gravish, Joseph M., [REDACTED]  
 Green, Charles J., [REDACTED]  
 Grimes, Walter B., III, [REDACTED]  
 Hochberg, Richard C., [REDACTED]  
 Hughes, George W., [REDACTED]  
 Jacobson, Richard G., [REDACTED]  
 Johnson, Richard G., [REDACTED]  
 Jones, Ronald G., [REDACTED]  
 Lewis, Linda G., [REDACTED]  
 Luckenbill, Richard J., [REDACTED]  
 Malcom, Joseph A., [REDACTED]  
 Marlow, Richard P., [REDACTED]  
 Menser, Michael W., [REDACTED]  
 Miller, Thomas A., [REDACTED]  
 O'Hara, Doris H., [REDACTED]  
 Pein, Heiko W., [REDACTED]  
 Selle, Grace A., [REDACTED]  
 Sheehan, Edward M., [REDACTED]  
 Sunday, John W., [REDACTED]  
 Smith, Marie E., [REDACTED]  
 Stahl, John A., [REDACTED]  
 Stephens, Charles R., [REDACTED]  
 Taylor, Marvin C., [REDACTED]  
 Tilden, Robert J., [REDACTED]  
 Tio, Alberto W., [REDACTED]

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION BY  
SOUTH CAROLINA GENERAL AS-  
SEMBLY REGARDING WORLD  
BANK LOAN TO ZAMBIA

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1973

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) and myself, I bring to the attention of the Senate a concurrent resolution passed by the South Carolina General Assembly on February 1, 1973.

On January 16, 1973, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development approved an \$11.5 million loan to Zambia to aid in the production of tobacco and maize crops. Both Senator HOLLINGS and I protested this course of action.

Mr. President, I am pleased that the United States did not support this loan. Unfortunately, however, other members of the World Bank did not see fit to follow our Nations example.

Senator HOLLINGS and I jointly endorse the concurrent resolution of the South Carolina General Assembly opposing this loan and asking for appropriate action to insure that Zambia's tobacco will not come into direct competition with tobacco produced in the United States.

Mr. President, on behalf of Senator HOLLINGS and myself, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO OPPOSE THE PROPOSED LOAN OF \$11½ MILLION BY THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT TO THE COUNTRY OF ZAMBIA FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO THE FARMERS OF ZAMBIA IN TOBACCO PRODUCTION

Whereas, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has recently announced its intention to loan Zambia eleven and one-half million dollars, the proceeds of which will be used for the most part to provide assistance to Zambian farmers in the growth of tobacco; and

Whereas, even though none of this tobacco is expected to enter the United States market, the Zambian tobacco grown with the help of this loan is expected to be marketed under preferential trading agreements with the European communities which will place tobacco grown in the United States at a competitive disadvantage in this market; and

Whereas, this Zambian tobacco is also expected to be of inferior quality as compared to most American tobacco exports, thereby increasing the possibility of inroads being made into the United States' share of the export market; and

Whereas, it makes little sense to aid foreign countries such as Zambia in the development of tobacco and other agricultural crops where such crops will compete with the crops of our own farmers on the foreign markets.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

That the Congress of the United States be requested to oppose the proposed loan of eleven and one-half million dollars by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to the country of Zambia for the purpose of providing assistance to the farmers in tobacco production.

Be it further resolved that Congress be requested to take any appropriate action necessary to insure that the tobacco production of Zambia and other foreign countries does not come into direct competition

with the tobacco produced in the United States in any domestic or foreign market.

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and to each member of the South Carolina Congressional Delegation.

## THE 108TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOKOL FOUNDING

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1973

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on February 15, 1865, a group of Czech immigrants organized the first American Sokol Unit in St. Louis, Mo. The first Slovak Sokol Society was organized in Chicago, Ill., on October 30, 1892. The American Sokol Organization—Czech—and the Sokol U.S.A.—Slovak—are working closely together to achieve their common goals. Also pursuing similar objectives are Catholic Sokols in the United States.

Last year, to honor all Sokol organizations across the country, the Congress passed my bill designating October 30 as National Sokol Day and authorizing the President to call upon the American people to observe October 30 with appropriate ceremonies.

I felt it was most fitting for the Congress to honor the Sokol organizations because of their dedication to the development of physical, spiritual, moral, and cultural enlightenment among its members.

The Sokol membership varies in age

from the preschooler, the adolescent, the middle-ager, to the senior citizen.

Sokol physical education stresses individual initiative, creativity, and self-discipline, which are basic requirements for personal achievement. Sokol gymnasiums and Sokol activities provide a training ground where each one can develop according to individual strength and skill.

The membership enjoys the facilities of many Sokol summer camps in various parts of the country, which are used for gymnastic schools, clinics, summer youth activities, and other year-round functions. The camps are primarily financed, operated, and maintained through the voluntary services of their dedicated members. The camps are an ideal place where the training and development of young people can be fulfilled to the greatest extent.

In uniting the American heritage and the Sokol ideals in the hearts and minds of their members, the Sokol organizations contribute greatly to the welfare, safety, and freedom of the United States.

I extend my greetings to the Sokol membership in the 11th district of Illinois, which I am privileged to represent, the City of Chicago and all over the Nation. They are to be commended for their enthusiastic dedication and noble example to their fellow citizens.

#### DIARY OF AN UNBORN CHILD

#### HON. STANFORD E. PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1973

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, there has been a growing tide of controversy in this Nation for more than a decade on abortion and whether or not a woman has a right to terminate an unwanted pregnancy. This controversy began to crest last month with the decision by the U.S. Supreme Court to allow abortions prior to the 27th week of pregnancy.

Since that decision much has been said and written. But in my opinion, one of the most thought-provoking comments was written by one of my constituents, Mrs. Gail Miller, of Manassas, Va., in a letter to the editor of the Manassas Journal Messenger. At this time I would like to include the letter, which was published February 9, 1973, in the RECORD:

#### DIARY OF AN UNBORN CHILD

To the Editor:

How thankful I was to read the letter opposing the recent change in the abortion law. I wonder what has happened to our "Nation Under God." Now that we've ended the killing in Vietnam we're going ahead full force in allowing the murder of unborn children. Even though the Commandments tell us "Thou Shalt Not Kill," we continue to be obsessed with taking lives.

If we listen closely we might hear the diary of an unborn child being read.

Conception: Today my life began. No one knows it yet because I'm so tiny. My sex is

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

already determined. I'll be a blond-haired, blue-eyed little girl.

3 Weeks Old: Some say I'm not a real person—but I am. My heart began today to beat all by itself. It will continue beating like this for many many years before retiring.

4 Weeks Old: I'm growing a bit every day. My legs and arms are forming but it will be a while yet before I'll be able to run to Mommy.

6 Weeks Old: Look! Tiny fingers are forming on my hands. They'll help me to squeeze my Daddy's hands as we walk together.

7 Weeks Old: Today Mommy's doctor told her I was here, living under her heart. She must be very happy.

11 Weeks Old: I wonder if Mommy hears my heart whispering. It's a strong heart, beating evenly. I'm glad I'll be healthy for you, Mom. I'll love you very much.

12 Weeks Old: Today my Mother killed me. Are we proud of our "New America"? Are we still a "Nation Under God"?

Isn't it about time we exercised our freedom of speech by letting our government know how we feel?

Mrs. GAIL MILLER.

MANASSAS.

#### THE ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

#### HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in this week which marks the anniversary of the independence of Lithuania on February 16, 1918, the time is at hand to pause and pay homage to the great tradition of Lithuanian nationalism and independence. The tragic story of the short-lived independence of this small nation serves to reinforce our moral responsibility to respond to the hopes of freedom among these courageous people.

The Republic of Lithuania became a reality in the modern world with the conclusion of the First World War. In a treaty signed in conjunction with the Treaty of Versailles, the Lithuanian state was formally separated from czarist Russia. The new state quickly embarked on a positive course to progressive statehood. Tragically, the period of independence was destined to last only a short 21 years. Caught in the power struggle between Hitler's Nazi Germany and Stalin's Soviet Russia, the small state had little chance of survival. In June 1940, Stalin's armies initiated the occupation which has lasted to this day.

This episode in history is not isolated; the roots of Lithuanian nationalism run deep into time. They begin with the initial unification of the Lithuanian nation by Mindaugas the Great in 1251 and stretch to the recent actions of 17,000 Lithuanian Catholics who petitioned the United Nations, charging the Soviets with religious persecution. For 700 years the small nation has been buffeted by the cruel winds of history.

We must not betray the hopes and aspirations of the Lithuanian people. The Freedom of Emigration Act of 1973,

which I introduced with Chairman MILLS earlier this session, is an effort to call attention to the Soviets of their responsibilities to the minorities under their control. Only through positive action by our Government and a continual reaffirmation by our people of the goal of freedom for all men can Lithuania hold the hope of regaining her lost independence. As John F. Kennedy once stated—

The vital spark of freedom has not been extinguished among Lithuanians. Their cause remains our cause and their hopes more than ever remain our responsibility.

#### A RETURN TO FISCAL SANITY

#### HON. L. A. (SKIP) BAFALIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1973

Mr. BAFALIS. Mr. Speaker, the Presidential budget message, as usual, has kicked off a hue and cry from many members of Congress. Some condemn the Chief Executive for the cutbacks proposed for existing programs; some condemn him for not cutting more. And still others commend him for his determination to bring spending more in line with revenues.

But few Members of Congress bother to make mention of the fact the responsibility for balancing the budget, for appropriating moneys and levying the taxes necessary to get those funds, lies not with the President, but with Congress.

In view of the dismal record of fiscal irresponsibility in recent years, however, it appears Congress has not been willing to seriously accept this responsibility. It has been easier to appropriate money on a piecemeal basis, so much for this program, so much for that one, and a tad more for still another—with the final accounting left for someone else after Congress adjourns.

But the duty to balance the budget is still there. It has been there all along, outlined in the Constitution, waiting only for Congress to accept its responsibility.

Today, I have introduced a proposed constitutional amendment to force Congress to accept its responsibility—and amendment stating simply that expenditures cannot exceed revenues in any given year.

This amendment—which I am proud to say has the support of several of my colleagues including Congressmen BAKER, COLLINS, CONLON, CRANE, DERWINSKI, FROELICH, ROUSSELOT, SPENCE, SYMMS, and TREEN—requires Congress to put its house in order.

It would mean establishing priorities, deciding first how much we can afford to spend, then working within those limits.

If we want to approve new programs, then we must also approve higher taxes to finance them. This will make the full impact of our Federal programs available to our constituents—the taxpayers whose hard-earned dollars finance all our spending.

This proposed amendment also con-

tains a provision requiring that one-tenth of the national debt be repaid during each 10-year interval of a 100-year period. This would be a major step forward in providing America with a sound, inflation-free economy.

In addition, there is also a provision which allows the suspension of the anti-deficit spending mandate—but only in time of war or national emergency, and only with the consent of three-fourths of the members of both the House and Senate.

It is a hard step. But it is one we must take.

During my campaign, I found the vast majority of the people of the 10th District of Florida do not want any increase in taxes. And they do not want any more deficit spending.

They—and the people of this Nation—want Congress to do what they do, live within their means.

#### SENATE WAR ON MALNUTRITION

#### HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1973

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, during the last few years, a major legislative interest of mine has been nutrition, and the lack of adequate knowledge and awareness about nutrition on the part of most Americans of all economic levels.

I have been privileged to serve on the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, and have introduced bills for nutritional labeling and for nutritional education in medical and dental schools. In December, I presided at hearings of the Nutrition Committee on the general subject of nutrition education. There is an important education task ahead of us, and all media sources must be utilized to wake more Americans up to the need for better nutritional balance in our daily eating habits.

A Fairchild Publications trade newspaper, *Supermarket News*, for January 22, 1973, published an article on this problem, and some of my work in nutrition. I ask unanimous consent the article, entitled "Senator SCHWEIKER Declares War on Malnutrition, Unwise Eating," be printed in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that my opening remarks at the December 1972, Nutrition Committee hearings be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROMOTION NEWS: SENATOR SCHWEIKER DECLARIES WAR ON MALNUTRITION, UNWISE EATING

(By Penny Girard)

WASHINGTON.—Sen. Richard Schweiker (R., Pa.) is trying to foment a revolution in which key combatants will be housewives and supermarket aisles the battlefields.

He is one of a slow-to-surface but growing number of health professionals, academicians and lawmakers who see malnutrition and poor eating habits taking their toll at all economic levels in the U.S.

Schweiker is appalled at what he sees. "Most Americans take better care of their cars than their bodies," he says in an interview with *Supermarket News*.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A few years ago, mention of nutritional illiteracy brought an automatic association with poverty. But health statistics are proving otherwise. Infant mortality, life expectancy and certain illness rates in the U.S. are higher than in many other countries.

One university nutrition professor put the cost of hunger and personal food mismanagement in the U.S. at \$30 billion annually. This figure includes sickness and treatment, absenteeism from work, loss of life, dental decay, alcoholism and diseases such as diabetes and obesity.

The U.S. has become, in Schweiker's estimation, "A nation of nutritional illiterates." His criticism is aimed at all economic levels, coupled with a warning that an adequate income is not synonymous with an adequate diet.

"Nothing is further from the truth," he tells SN. "In this country, affluence breeds false security about nutritional habits," he said.

Schweiker is presiding over a continuing probe of nutrition education which the Senate's Select Nutrition Committee launched late last year.

While the committee has no legislative powers, Schweiker and others are hopeful that the subcommittee work can trigger favorable reaction to other nutrition oriented legislation, some of which he is sponsoring.

#### INFORMED SOCIETY

The first-term Pennsylvania lawmaker believes the answer is a better education program aimed at the housewife who shops, and the prospective doctor in medical and dental schools. Schweiker has reintroduced a bill from the last Congress, which would provide grants to medical and dental schools.

He believes an atmosphere for good nutrition can and should be set primarily in the supermarket, where basic food purchases are made. He has endorsed giving consumers basic tools to make wise purchases. For the second year, he is sponsoring a bill to require nutrition value of food commodities to be listed on each product label. Where a package denotes the number of servings, the label must provide a breakdown of the nutrition value of each serving.

The last Congress did not make major headway on either of his proposals, but Schweiker said he is encouraged by industry and other support. He said the Grocery Manufacturers Association has been "pretty cooperative."

#### PRODUCT LABELING

Schweiker believes that as consumers see the advantages of labeling, more of them will make use of it and he foresees sales of those products increasing.

"Without nutritional labeling, consumers face a mind-boggling assortment of items—between 15,000 and 18,000—on the supermarket shelves," he said in introducing the bill.

Although he does not relieve the industry of its responsibility for nutritious products, Schweiker is not critical of producers and manufacturers. "You can't blame them any more than you can blame the public at large," he told SN.

But he admits that "in the rush to mass produce and mass market foods, we've overlooked important nutritional matters."

Witnesses at the nutrition committee's hearings in December were critical of the food industry's role. One doctor accused the industry of being more concerned with the profit ledger than the nutrition value of its products. Several witnesses charged that the advertising emphasis of prepackaged, processed foods and sugar-coated cereals was out of proportion to their nutrient contribution.

OPENING STATEMENT BY U.S. SENATOR RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER AT HEARINGS OF SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NUTRITION AND HUMAN NEEDS ON "NUTRITION EDUCATION"

WASHINGTON, D.C.—We take better care of our automobiles than we do our own bodies.

February 15, 1973

Yet, what can be more important to each of us than our personal health and that of our families? The hearings we begin today will focus on one of the underlying problems causing widespread nutritional ignorance—the inadequacy of nutrition education.

Are we a nation of nutritional illiterates?

In the last few years, many experts, including Dr. Jean Mayer, who will appear before us this morning, have answered this question with a definite "yes". These hearings are designed to give us some answers as to why we are a nation of nutritional illiterates. The purpose of these hearings is to explore the status of nutrition education in the United States today.

These hearings will prove, I believe, that the widespread belief that nutritional ignorance is limited to poor people alone is absolutely false. In other hearings before this Committee we have frequently noted that there are tremendous gaps in nutritional knowledge among all income levels in our society. Having the income needed to maintain a nutritionally adequate diet does not guarantee that this will be done.

We will attempt to determine how our people are obtaining nutrition information. There are many sources, including schools, colleges, doctors, advertising, and the mass media. We will see how federal nutrition education programs are working, or not working. We will look at how many people are being reached, who they are, and in general how good a job we are doing.

I am particularly pleased that we will also cover the status of nutrition education in medical schools. Earlier this year, I introduced a bill, the Nutritional Medical Education Act, which is designed to provide grants for medical schools to teach nutrition education to future doctors. I strongly feel we must fill this gap in medical education by providing courses in our medical schools which will teach applied nutrition.

Future doctors are now taking nutrition-related courses, such as pharmacology, biochemistry and physiology.

However, most medical schools do not have courses in applied nutrition which deal in a fundamental way with the relationship between good nutrition and good health. As a result, people are turning to food faddists and other often inadequate sources of information. They do not seek help from doctors, many of whom are not in a position to give it anyway. Since it has been clearly shown that there is a direct relationship between nutrition and health, between the foods we eat and many diseases, it is vitally important that doctors be fully trained to recognize the relationship between diet and health.

We will open our hearings this morning with witnesses from the private sector. Dr. Jean Mayer, President-Elect of the Society for Nutrition Education, Professor of Nutrition, Harvard University, will lead off the witnesses. Dr. Mayer will discuss the meaning of "Nutrition Education", and the respective roles of the federal government and industry.

Mr. Robert Choate will discuss the relationship between nutrition education and advertising.

Dr. George Briggs, Executive Editor of the *Journal of Nutrition Education* and Professor of Nutrition, University of California at Berkeley, will discuss the federal role in nutrition education through both the educational programs and food programs presently in existence.

Our last witness this morning will be Dr. George Christakis, Professor of Community Medicine (Nutrition), Mount Sinai School of Medicine, New York, who will testify on the role of nutrition education in community medicine and the availability of nutrition education in medical schools.

Tomorrow, we will have witnesses from the United States Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to discuss the nutritional activities of these agencies.

I believe these hearings will illustrate that nutrition education is clearly an important part of an overall program of preventive medicine. We will show, too, that there are great gaps in this area nationally which need to be filled. The hearings will point to the urgent need for a coordinated national policy as an integral part of our overall effort to keep our people healthy.

### SURVIVAL OF OEO

#### Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1973

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 8, 1973, I testified before the Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities of the House Committee on Education and Labor concerning the President's cutbacks and reorganization proposals for the Office of Economic Opportunity.

There is more at stake here than just the proposed decrease in Federal funds. Many operational programs of OEO will actually be closed, not transferred to other line agencies, including most probably the outreach activities which community action agencies have started. Further, the use of community participation to influence local policies affecting the disadvantaged will, most likely, disappear entirely, and the innovative "one-door" approach to health care for the poor that has been the hallmark of community health centers may well be lost as the administration shuffles priorities in health care.

I am including at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of my testimony before the Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities for my colleagues' immediate attention:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSWOMAN YVONNE B. BURKE

Mr. Chairman, there is a somber mood which prevades this room today, and it is a mood of sincere and profound concern about the commitment of the present Administration to pursue policies which effectively deal with the problems of the poor, the sick, the homeless, and the jobless.

We have heard the President say in past weeks that "we must reject the mistaken notion . . . that ever-bigger government is the answer to every problem." But, Mr. Chairman, we must ask here today, "What are Mr. Nixon's answers to these problems?"

Mr. Nixon has proposed to abolish the Office of Economic Opportunity and transfer certain of its programs to other federal line agencies and national excellence in place of the combination of good intentions and fuzzy follow-through . . ."

But many operational programs of OEO will actually be closed, not transferred. The out-reach activities which non-profit community action agencies have started and the use of community participation to influence local policies affecting the disadvantaged will, most likely, disappear entirely. And it is less than certain that any of the revenue sharing funds will fill the gap. I would enjoy learning which cities will be receiving more total federal funds under revenue sharing and the proposed 1974 Budget when they are scheduled to receive under this year's budget.

OEO was established to bring about conditions at the local level to help the plaguing problems of poverty and to serve as a coordinated link between human resources of

### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the government and the poor. OEO was established because the line departments—the very agencies to which OEO programs now are being scattered—were both unwilling and unable to deal effectively with low income and minority citizens.

Over the past few weeks, as the Administration's policy regarding OEO and its programs have become increasingly clear, most people have labeled the President's actions as an administrative reorganization. Some have seen it as an end to the federal War on Poverty effort. Yet labeling the Administration's policy as merely reorganization overlooks in what my view is the real nature of the Administration's policy, namely to destroy the unique functions that OEO-sponsored activities have performed.

One example of this attitude is the Administration's decision to eliminate funding for Community Action Agencies and certain other community action operations. This will result in the destruction of most existing Community Action Agencies as they are presently constituted.

If the functions that the OEO-sponsored Community Action programs perform are viewed as being simply another form of government services for the poor and disadvantaged—such as a local welfare department's day-care program or payments made for medical services—then it would probably be proper to see the Administration's policy as one of rational consolidation of federal and local services. But OEO's Community Action Agencies are not simply providing services to ameliorate the conditions of poverty and they were never meant to. They provide much more.

A host of other government programs provide the vast bulk of services and income supplements to the poor. These include Social Services grants under the Federal welfare program, ESEA educational assistance, manpower training programs, Medicaid, and Food Stamps, to name a few. The contribution of OEO's Community Action Agencies is in a very different and much needed and neglected area.

The over 900 Community Action Agencies consolidate and coordinate the various Federal, state, local and community service programs and activities and make them workable, cohesive efforts rather than scattered and fragmented lungen at various problems of the poor. On the average, approximately 50% of the funds that Community Action Agencies administer come from OEO. The bulk of Community Action Agency sponsored programs have sharply defined goals; the Agency provides the overview and direction. The local agency serves as the mechanism to coordinate the attack on problems the poor face in the area of services.

By eliminating OEO's Community Action Agency funding and forcing them to depend on the revenue sharing pot, the Administration is not just shifting administrative responsibility for Community Action Agency functions to local governments. Rather it is, for all practical purposes, eliminating the major sources of program consolidation and mobilization for institutional change at the local level. Services in the limited sense of Head Start projects or Neighborhood Health Centers will probably continue, although probably in an altered form as other agencies impose their own guidelines on the former OEO programs. However, the unique functions that CAAs performed will disappear. Programs that were once part of coordinated efforts and "sparks" for further logically, linked changes will become simply, dead-end service providers, offering little chance of change in the wider complex of problems facing the poor in Los Angeles. Community Action Agencies such as the FYOA and the Compton CAA will lose the "core" funding from OEO that made it possible for them to coordinate existing programs and mobilize the community to launch out in new directions. At this moment, their future is uncer-

tain, and no substitute has been offered to take their place.

Mr. Chairman, I have had an opportunity last night briefly to review an unreleased OEO developed evaluation of the community action agencies. This evaluation applauds the agencies for their efforts in helping the poor become self-sufficient. This evaluation is entitled *Utilization Test Survey Data for 591 Community Action Agencies, January, 1973*. This evaluation states, and I quote,

"There is now emerging for the first time a national picture of community action achievements in terms of the mission emphasized by this Administration.

"Community action is already producing highly constructive results in both urban and rural communities and the trends indicate that continued effort in this direction will produce substantially greater returns on a small investment.

"Perhaps most surprising is the very substantial mobilization of business and industry resources, especially in rural areas. Total business resources amount to about \$75 million. The total emerging picture of Community Action clearly shows that Community Action Agencies are rapidly becoming very positive forces in their communities. They can play significant roles in helping communities rise to the challenges of revenue-sharing and other forms of government decentralization."

This then is a far different analysis of the effectiveness of community action operations than the President presented in his recent Budget message. In the Budget, he claimed that "community action has had an adequate opportunity to demonstrate its value to local communities. Little justification for continuing separate categorical funding can be identified." What I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, is on what information and facts did the President rely in making this statement?

In the last few years, OEO programs have increasingly committed themselves to a new area of activity—"self-help" programs. The newly-established Community Economic Development program, formerly called the "Special Impact" program, is the primary example of this new thrust. The Community Development Corporations supported by OEO's Community Economic Development program have been widely recognized as the most successful effort by any organization—governmental or non-governmental—to promote realistic economic development in low income communities, using both seed money and technical assistance to deal with the multiple problems involved in economic development.

In addition to removing the support Community Action Agencies have given these corporations, the Administration has proposed transferring this economic development effort to the Office of Minority Business Enterprises (OMBE) in the Department of Commerce. The combined budget for fiscal 1974 for OMBE and the OEO economic development program shows, however, a net reduction of some \$28.7 million in programs designed to support minority businesses. The traditional thrust of OMBE has been one of providing educational and technical assistance to individual businessmen in poverty areas. Contrasted with the corporation's approach, it makes little sense to send an individual businessman into a low-income area with little capital, no matter how much technical expertise to which he may have access.

The community development corporation approach of involving the community in a large project with necessary capital where various components will reinforce one another has proved itself more successful. The East Los Angeles Community Union, a community development corporation has joint ventured with a housing planning group for a community-based housing project to demonstrate real "urban renewal" supported by

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the community! It is likely that, placed in OMBE, the community economic development program will become just another half-way and fragmented attempt to aid the poor.

With a transfer to OMBE, what will happen to the needed stress on an approach which uses *all* the resources of the community to create economic development? What will happen to the linkage to the community that the community development corporation supplies?

The next area that I want to talk about is the OEO health programs. The Administration proposes to transfer OEO's health programs, most importantly, Comprehensive Health Services Centers, to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This is, supposedly, to centralize the administration of health programs in one agency. But will the *innovations* of OEO health centers, such as the South Central Multipurpose Health Service Corporation in Los Angeles (which has already seen over a \$1 million drop in its budget) be continued or will they be dropped in favor of some different approach?

We already have one indication in the President's fiscal 1974 budget proposal which calls for a de-emphasis on health services delivery with a possible switch-over to Health Maintenance Organization. A total of \$147 million for OEO health programs is requested in the 1974 Budget for HEW, compared with the 1973 obligation of \$165.2 million, a reduction of \$18.2 million. When this account of \$147 million is transferred to the HEW Health Services Delivery budget of 1974, one discovers a further cut in the overall Health Services Delivery budget of nearly \$47 million. Further, the administration is proposing a reduction in the 1973 appropriation of some \$45 million, bringing the total net loss to some \$110 million.

The innovative "one-door" approach to health care for the poor that has been the hallmark of Community Health Centers may well be lost as the administration shuffles priorities in health care—with the result that the poor, with their very special set of health problems, will suffer. The successful South-Central Community Health Center in Los Angeles services about 500 people per month, and has demonstrated its importance of the community.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, a word about OEO Legal Services. Recent reports and news stories have indicated a definite Administration bias *against* OEO's Legal Services' "back-up" centers. Since this committee will soon be dealing with legal services legislation, I would like to make a few observations concerning the role these centers have played in our community and their critical relationship to the rest of OEO's programs.

Two centers in California—the Los Angeles-based Western Center on Law and Poverty, and the University of California at Berkeley's National Housing and Economic Development Law Project—serve as vivid examples of their fundamental value and importance. The "back-up" functions of the Western Center have included assistance in appellate litigation, training assistance, and clinical education assistance to law schools. The recent California precedent setting decision of *Serrano vs. Priest*, Declaring unconstitutional California's school financing scheme, was a direct result of Western Center's skill and involvement. Also, the Western Center participated in the case of *Blair vs. Pitches*, wherein the California Supreme Court declared unconstitutional the practice of possessing personal property upon the mere filing of an action by a creditor without a prior court hearing to determine the validity of the charge. These cases have profoundly altered the law, affecting significantly the lives of thousands of the poor by a single ruling.

The kinds of assistance and services these centers provide to legal service projects and

to law schools are badly needed by individual projects and by lawyers who don't have the time or expertise to become proficient in every area of poverty law. The centers also play a role with the rest of OEO's programs. The "back-up" functions of the Berkeley project, for example, are directed at assisting lawyers working with Community Development Corporations. One of the recent successful CDC ventures they contributed to was the Salinas Valley "Strawberry Cooperative". It brought a group of migrant families from average incomes of \$3500 per year to nearly \$12,000, and provided the basis for future spin-offs of new cooperatives sponsored by the parent "Strawberry Coop."

"Back-up" centers like these fill a special need for Legal Services projects and for programs like Community Development Corporations attempting to help the poor. Efforts to help the poor always face legal problems. In many cases, developments in one area can be applied to others. In general, legal services lawyers cannot, by themselves, provide a broad range of expertise in every facet of "poverty law". The function of back-up centers is to assist by "filling in the gaps" and searching out new ways to handle legal problems faced by the poor. They help make the Legal Services program and all OEO's programs a unified operating system. When this Committee considers the Legal Services Corporation legislation, I would strongly recommend that specific provisions should be made for preserving and protecting the independence necessary to ensure the continual role of these centers.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out that what I am worried about today is not only the decrease in federal funds. The President's Budget for 1974 represents more than a shift in priorities of spending the federal tax dollar. It demonstrates a radical reorganization of our federal system of government.

This proposed new federalism represents a direct challenge to the institutional changes developed over the last five years in employment practices, education, and in medical and legal professions in improving the access of services to the poor. OEO brought the alienated and disenfranchised into the democratic process, gave them a window to government, provided them with hope at a time when hope was obscure. With the dismantling of OEO, not only the symbol of concern, but the actual involvement and commitment of the government will be suspended.

Who will lobby for the poor in communities where the poor have no effective voice in the decisions of government? I urge this Committee to review carefully the full implications of the President's proposal before it accepts the demise of OEO, and to consider the possibility of enacting categorical funding legislation to preserve these programs which have aided the poor.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, thank you very much for your patience and courtesy in allowing me to present this testimony.

## MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

## HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1973

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, for more than 3 years, I have reminded my colleagues daily of the plight of our prisoners of war. Now, for most of us, the war is over. Yet, despite the cease-fire agreement's provisions for the release of all

February 15, 1973

prisoners, fewer than 600 of the more than 1,900 men who were lost while on active duty in Southeast Asia have been identified by the enemy as alive and captive. The remaining 1,220 men are still missing in action.

A child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife wonders: "Is my husband alive or dead?" How long?

Until those men are accounted for, their families will continue to undergo the special suffering reserved for the relatives of those who simply disappear without a trace, the living lost, the dead with graves unmarked. For their families, peace brings no respite from frustration, anxiety, and uncertainty. Some can look forward to a whole lifetime shadowed by grief.

We must make every effort to alleviate their anguish by redoubling our search for the missing servicemen. Of the incalculable debt owed to them and their families, we can at least pay that minimum. Until I am satisfied, therefore, that we are meeting our obligation, I will continue to ask, "How long?"

## PROBLEMS OF REVENUE SHARING

## HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1973

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, the Staunton, Va., Leader of February 8 contains an excellent editorial analyzing some problems in connection with the revenue-sharing program enacted last year.

The editorial points out that in some cases capital outlays made with revenue-sharing funds by the localities will produce projects which will have continuing operating expenses—and that revenue-sharing funds may not be available to meet these operating expenses.

I opposed the revenue-sharing program last year, despite its great appeal to State and local governments, primarily on the grounds that with the Federal Government running huge deficits in its own budget there was no revenue to share.

But this is not the only questionable aspect of revenue sharing. I stated last year, and I still believe, that many problems are bound to arise with a program which provides for spending by units of government which do not have the responsibility for raising the revenues they are dispensing. I think the problems of revenue sharing will multiply as time goes by.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

## REVENUE-SHARING DISAPPOINTMENTS

One of the possible sources of disappointments over federal sharing is that while it provides funds for capital projects which states and localities could not produce with-

out more taxation, it is unlikely to bear the recurring costs of operation.

Moreover, Congress could quit handing out funds limiting distribution to the one already made, although it committed itself to five years of aid in addition to grants under existing programs.

The National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., which boasts the largest individual membership of any business organization in the United States and has some savvy officers and committees, says that at best, revenue sharing will probably be a mixed blessing. It opposes the whole concept.

So did Virginia's Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr., who declared the obvious fact that the federal government, operating under billion dollar deficits, didn't have any revenue to share.

NFIB quotes the Wall Street Journal to the effect that more than 6,000 governmental units received less than half of the sums they had been led to believe they would get by revenue sharing. This cutting has created a storm of protest by some of the big cities' mayors, who haven't hesitated to say the Administration isn't doing what it should to help them out of their financial difficulties.

This is all due to a "joker" that was put into the legislation and which largely escaped public notice, says NFIB. This is the clause which requires the Treasury Department in splitting up the \$30 billion over the next five years to ascertain if the governmental unit, state, county, city or town is levying sufficiently high local taxes on its citizenry. The organization's statement continues:

In some respects, this puts the federal government in the role of a national board of equalization, with the Washington bureaucrats with little knowledge of any locality's situation, making the determination.

Obviously, when a government unit does not receive its full share of this "free" government money, there is bound to be a certain element in the community severely critical of local government leaders. On the other hand, those who actually pay taxes will be equally as critical if such tactics promote unwarranted tax increases.

It does not look as if in many localities officials will be happy for long with revenue sharing.

#### THE 55TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

#### HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1973

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, during the month of February, Lithuanian-Americans are commemorating two important occasions.

In February 1251, Mindaugas the Great unified all the principalities of Lithuania into one great kingdom.

On February 16, 1918, the Republic of Lithuania was established. It was with great joy that the Lithuanian people welcomed the coming of freedom, and with it, self-determination and the right to maintain their own national life and cultural institutions.

It was during this 22-year period of independence that the nation of Lithuania made great and astounding progress both socially and materially. Land reform was instituted, industry and trade were strengthened, transportation facilities were expanded, social legislation was enacted and educational institutions were enlarged. Lithuanians took pride in

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

their energetic nation and its principles of freedom.

In 1940, however, this amazingly successful experiment in democracy was put to an end. Stalin marched his Red Army in, occupied the country, and incorporated the buoyant Lithuanian nation into the Soviet Union. The Soviet occupation has been marked by extreme brutality, deportations, and suppression of Lithuanian culture. The oppression of this heroic people continues to this day.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has never recognized the seizure and forced "incorporation" of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union. Our Government maintains diplomatic relations with the former free governments of all three Baltic States.

Many citizens of the three Baltic nations, in an effort to rebuild their lives and maintain their ethnic integrity, have applied for permission to emigrate. Soviet authorities have mocked these requests by imposing an "education tax" which can amount to \$18,000 per person depending upon the level of education attained by an intended emigrant.

Consequently, on February 7, I joined over 250 of my colleagues in the House of Representatives in introducing a bill urging suspension of trade with the Soviet Union until such time as that country does away with its arbitrary and discriminatory methods of limiting the right of emigration. The text of my resolution follows:

H.R. 3911

A bill to prohibit most-favored-nation treatment and commercial and guarantee agreements with respect to any nonmarket economy country which denies to its citizens the right to emigrate or which imposes more than nominal fees upon its citizens as a condition to emigration

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Act for Freedom of Emigration in East-West Trade."*

Sec. 2. To assure the continued dedication of the United States to fundamental human rights, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, after October 1, 1972, products from any nonmarket economy country shall not be eligible to receive most-favored-nation treatment, such country shall not participate in any program of the Government of the United States which extends credits or credit guarantees or investment guarantees, directly or indirectly, and the President of the United States shall not conclude any commercial agreement with any such country during the period beginning with the dates on which the President determines that such country—

(1) denies its citizens the right or opportunity to emigrate;

(2) imposes more than a nominal tax on emigration or on the visas or other documents required for emigration, for any purpose or cause whatsoever; or

(3) imposes more than a nominal tax, levy, fine, fee, or other charge on any citizen as a consequence of the desire of such citizen to emigrate to the country of his choice, and ending on the date on which the President determines that such country is no longer in violation of paragraph (1), (2), or (3).

Sec. 3. After October 15, 1972, pursuant to any separate Act of Congress, (A) products of a nonmarket economy country may be eligible to receive most-favored-nation treatment, (B) such country may participate in any program of the Government of the

United States which extends credits or credit guarantees or investment guarantees, or (C) the President may conclude a commercial agreement with such country only after the President has submitted to the Congress a report indicating that such country is not in violation of paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of section 2. Such report with respect to such country, shall include information as to the nature and implementation of emigration laws and policies and restrictions or discrimination applied to or against persons wishing to emigrate. The report required by this subsection shall be submitted initially as provided herein and, with current information, semi-annually thereafter so long as such treatment received, such credits or guarantee extended, or such agreement concluded pursuant to any separate Act of Congress is in effect.

As a representative of a free people in the U.S. Congress, I consider it most important that we take this occasion to encourage the people of Lithuania in their continuing struggle for basic human rights. I extend my greetings and support to Americans of Lithuanian descent in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois, which I am privileged to represent, and in Chicago and our Nation, as they commemorate the independence of a people whose determination has never wavered in the face of enormous intimidation and oppression.

LEE HAMILTON'S FEBRUARY 12, 1973, WASHINGTON REPORT ON THE LESSONS OF THE VIETNAM WAR

#### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1973

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the text of my February 12, 1973, Washington Report on the lessons of the Vietnam war:

WASHINGTON REPORT OF CONGRESSMAN LEE HAMILTON

The Vietnam War has been a searing experience for Americans. It has cost at least 1.3 million lives over the last decade, according to U.S. figures, including more than 56,000 American combat and non-combat deaths.

We dropped over 7 million tons of explosives from aircraft on both North and South Vietnam. That's 3½ times more than the total dropped in World War II, and it adds up to 289 pounds of explosives for every man, woman and child living in the four nations of Indochina.

Some economists estimate the total cost to be \$400 billion, including the costs of benefits to veterans in the decades to come, plus the economic loss of the contributions those who died would have made. If one takes into account inflation, unemployment, the diversion of public resources, the failure to meet our domestic needs, and the social divisions at home, the war may have been the most costly in American history.

The true costs, of course, are incalculable because they include wasted lives and resources, the anguish and heartache of the surviving relatives, the loss of credibility of government leaders, and the erosion of the Constitution itself. Our confidence in our political institutions was strained because of the secrecy and deception of the war; our respect for justice was diminished

because of the way we manned the armed services; and the respect of our allies was weakened by our conduct of the war and our failure to resolve it quickly.

The impact of the war on the American military was another cost of the war. In the words of former Vietnam commander, General William Westmoreland, Vietnam was "a traumatic experience." The U.S. Army was, in a sense, a major casualty, hit with drug problems, disregard for authority and violence. A Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter said that the Army was saved from ruin by the President's decision to pull out of Vietnam.

It should be said that the military fought the war in the most difficult circumstances with no clear military objectives, a failure to declare war and mobilize for it, a lack of moral imperative at home to support the fighting, and the length of the conflict. One lesson of Vietnam is that the U.S. cannot successfully fight a war that way. We need clear objectives, victory or defeat, and in the long run, our military cannot exist without the good will of the people.

Although we have paid heavily for our Vietnam experience, the United States emerges from the war having learned important lessons. We should know now our limitations in shaping the future of areas as remote as Southeast Asia, and we will be much more reluctant, if not unlikely, to intervene with military forces in foreign countries.

Other nations will see us as less sure of our international course, less predictable, and close association with us will be less attractive to them.

Some say the U.S. will swing back to isolationism. I do not expect that to happen, and I hope it does not. If the Vietnam War causes the American people to turn their backs on their genuine national interests in the world, that would be unfortunate, and could be disastrous for world peace.

The Vietnam settlement leaves the balance of power in Asia relatively stable and the prospects of a major clash between the big powers has been reduced. The U.S. role in Asia will be more restrained, with our trade expected to increase sharply, but our strategic presence in Japan, Thailand and Taiwan diminished.

In the post-Vietnam world, economic power may become the most important element of national influence and prestige, and military power will become less important.

The war is behind us now, and I hope we have ended our involvement in Indochina except for limited economic and military assistance.

#### AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL

#### HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, at the time of the first Earth Day, a constituent of mine, Ira A. Stark, wrote a new and sadly appropriate version of "America, the Beautiful."

Thanks to the hard work of people like Mr. Stark, we as a nation have awakened to the dangers of pollution, and I believe that we will succeed in preventing the death of this planet if we all dedicate ourselves to keeping it alive.

Mr. Stark's version of "America, the Beautiful" is included at the conclusion of these remarks with the hope that its warning will be heeded by all:

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Oh shame on us for hazy skies  
For toxic waves of grain  
For ugly mountain majesties  
Above the gutted plain

America, America, we cast our junk on thee,  
And in our haste to create waste  
We killed ecology

We killed the very atmosphere  
That our forefathers breathed  
Our garbage did accumulate  
And on our shores was heaved

America, America, thy substance we did stain  
Thy water all polluted are  
From Florida to Maine  
America, America, God shed His grace on thee  
Save us from dearth of good clean earth  
And from toxicity.

#### ADDRESS BY GOV. JIMMY CARTER OF GEORGIA TO THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

#### HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on February 9, Gov. Jimmy Carter of Georgia made a remarkable speech to the National Press Club.

Governor Carter, who is an exponent of vigorous and compassionate government, spoke about alarming trends in the Federal Government and its relationships with the States. State governments, he said, have "become hamstrung by recent developments in Washington." He described "Federal Government by crisis and surprise" and "the unhealthy shift of power toward the Federal Executive." Governor Carter said that the State governments are receiving "little cooperation" from Washington on a whole range of important programs. He spoke of a "steady deterioration in the effectiveness of government here in Washington, and also in the relationship between the State and Federal Governments."

I especially commend to all members of this body the Governor's remarks on revenue sharing, the impoundment by the executive branch of funds approved by Congress, and secrecy in Government.

Governor Carter's address was particularly poignant when he referred to people who are suffering from cutbacks in programs for social progress. To these victims, the Governor observed:

It's not enough to say: "Ask what you can do for yourself."

Mr. Speaker, the prepared text of this important address by Gov. Jimmy Carter is as follows:

REMARKS OF GOV. JIMMY CARTER, NATIONAL  
PRESS CLUB, FEBRUARY 9, 1973

I will talk to you today strictly from the viewpoint of a governor who has seen State governments become stronger and more effective, but at the same time become hamstrung by recent developments in Washington.

We all serve the same people. In my inaugural address I said that the public can best be served by a strong and independent executive working with a strong and independent legislature.

In Georgia, Minnesota, Oklahoma, Virginia

February 15, 1973

and most other States this is proving to be true. In Washington, this basic premise is being abandoned.

Since 1970 when new governors were elected in Georgia, Florida, South Carolina, Tennessee, Arkansas and Oklahoma, a constant stream of newsmen have been through Atlanta to ask about the new south.

I don't think there is any such thing as a new south, but there is definitely a "new freedom".

Let me tell you what I mean. I ran for governor for four-and-a-half years. I made eighteen hundred speeches which I wrote myself and contacted in person more than six hundred thousand Georgians.

I stood in factory shift lines at five o'clock in the morning and at midnight, and shook hands with customers in shopping centers and country stores.

Just a few years ago this would not have been necessary.

A quiet and satisfactory back room conversation with a judge or sheriff or banker or perhaps an editor could insure the delivery of the county's votes.

Then came the civil rights demonstrators and the students who showed the other citizens that a small voice could be heard and an injustice could be corrected by people who cared enough to express their concern.

The farmer, the filling station owner, and the taxi cab driver may not have agreed with the goals or the tactics of these early movements, but he learned that they could produce results and he began to ask himself, "If they can do it, why can't I?"

Many Americans began to realize that powerful intermediaries between themselves and their public officials were neither necessary nor desirable. They attained an influence and a freedom which they had never had before.

This new freedom to speak out and to participate among average citizens has brought about a realization by elected officials that the primary role of government is not to serve the powerful and influential, but to create a climate in which every citizen can realize his full potential.

We began to see that few of the business or government leaders who make the decisions have ever felt personally the direct impact of government programs involving such things as prisons, welfare lines, employment agencies, manpower training, venereal disease control, school busing, or public housing.

It is well known that during the 1950's many State governments deliberately abrogated their power rather than face up to the difficult decisions involving civil rights and other social problems.

Many governors then were hand-picked and controlled by powerful special interests. Dynamic leadership had to come from Washington.

But I tell you that this is no longer the case. In State after State there has been a demonstrated willingness, even an eagerness, to deal with tough problems.

We realize that to the States are reserved those constitutional powers not expressly granted to the Federal Government, but the courts have often filled a power vacuum by leaning toward Federal authority in interpreting this principle.

However, the principle becomes significant when aggressive State leadership is combined with original development of new problems or issues at the local level of government.

For instance, a question about environment, insurance, education or land use planning first arises within a State and for a time may be of interest only in that particular community.

A dynamic and creative state government will move to solve the problem, will enact laws to deal with it, and then, through its experience, begin to establish a pattern of solution for possible nationwide emulation.

State government, properly used, can be a powerful force for solving problems and for strengthening our system of federalism.

Like many other States, we have taken advantage of these changing attitudes in Georgia.

For instance, more than fifty thousand citizens participated in evolving a definitive set of goals for Georgia which prescribed optimum purposes of our state government during the next few years.

These goals are now being put into effect by me and the general assembly, in an orderly and almost inexorable manner.

Both the State government and the courts have liberalized eligibility for welfare payments, but with a strong emphasis on training and employment opportunity we have leveled-off the number of Georgians on our welfare rolls. Our last month's data show the first actual numerical reduction in many years.

After a full year of study, conferences, debates and public forums, we eliminated three hundred agencies in our government and substituted for them twenty-two well coordinated departments. We were able to overcome inevitable and substantial opposition with massive public involvement.

We have also completely implemented for two years, what I believe to be the best budgeting system in the nation. Known as zero base budgeting, the process divides State government into more than eleven thousand individual functions. Each one is analyzed on a one-sheet form by the person directly responsible for that function. He must analyze his responsibility, list the tangible achievements which measure his effectiveness and then describe how he would perform this job next fiscal year, at several levels of funding, beginning with eighty-five percent of his present budget. Old programs and new proposals are considered on the same basis.

Each department head then arranges these functions in order of priority. I approve the arrangement after consultation with the department head and then budget funds, as available, to each department.

This budget, with associated data is presented to the general assembly for final approval.

It is perhaps the only practical means of controlling a bureaucracy.

Although I am sure all governors are making similar efforts, we are still dependent for successful public service on a viable state-federal relationship.

Programs and responsibilities are interrelated and mutually supportive. We need to understand and seek a common national purpose.

Distrust of any government by our people is contagious; it spreads to other governments.

Our state budgets are dependent on federal appropriations.

Even the balance of trade deficit has a direct adverse effect on the economy of individual states. The average or nationwide effect is bad enough, but the localized impact, when a particular kind of product is involved, can be even more serious. We governors have begun to protect ourselves and our business communities by direct action in the field of foreign trade. This past year I visited five foreign nations and had trade representatives of more than twice that number as my guests in Georgia. In May I shall be in five countries of Europe and the Middle East.

It is imperative that state and federal governments work together on other critical matters such as health care, land use planning, law enforcement and energy supplies. We have little cooperation in these fields now. Our system of federalism was conceived to make such cooperation possible

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

and we have a responsibility to make the system work.

In summary, many state governments are now much more dynamic and competent than before, but our system of federalism is no stronger because there has been a steady deterioration in the effectiveness of Government here in Washington, and also in the relationship between the State and Federal Governments.

When I became governor in 1971, I remembered the recent words of the president, and I quote: "I would disperse power instead of taking all power to myself. I would select cabinet members who could do their jobs and each of them would have the stature and the power to function effectively. Publicity would not center at the White House alone. Your most creative people cannot develop in a monolithic, centralized, power set-up."

Since we are particularly interested in such things as environment and social programs, I began to study the attitudes of those independent and creative officials who had the stature to insure a lasting influence—men like Walter Hicken and Pat Moynihan.

We then established a tracking system for federal legislation and provided a continuing analysis from the state's viewpoint to our senators and congressmen. After the vetoes were over-ridden, we planned our state programs and budgets accordingly. At that time I had not heard of impoundment.

We applauded with anticipation the highly publicized concept of a new federalism—getting the decision-making process closer to the people—and we are now beginning our fifth year of anticipatory applause.

Nowadays we seem to have Federal Government by crisis and surprise. Decisions are made in secrecy and consultations are few.

Our contacts as State officials are mostly with the Congress and sometimes with a Cabinet officer.

Final decisions, however, are made by the Ehrlichman's, the Haldeman's and the Ash's. I don't know them and I have no access to them. Neither, unfortunately, do most of our Congressmen.

In spite of a balanced budget and a dynamic economy, our State funds are limited. Revenue sharing has been a cruel hoax. Our State's thirty-six million dollars in revenue sharing, per year, was off-set by fifty-seven million dollars in lost funds when the title IV-A and title sixteen sections of the Social Security law were first amended (and now they are even further drastically reduced).

The President's proposed new budget will cut Georgia payments on programs at least one hundred seventy-four million dollars more. Impoundment of appropriated funds has already debilitated our efforts to plan and construct interstate highways, to provide compensatory education to the poor, and to finance municipal sewerage systems.

Many of these Government efforts are inherently dependent on Federal funding. You must remember that when the gross national product goes up one hundred percent, local income, which is based primarily on property tax, only rises seventy percent. State revenues increase about ninety-five percent and the progressive Federal taxes go up one hundred thirty percent. Consequently, abrupt changes in national program funding can be devastating to a State.

I consider myself a fiscal conservative. To me the essence of that conservatism is an orderly, logical, and planned approach to problems and to the allocation of public funds. The present Federal system actually encourages a cavalier, unplanned, and wasteful attitude toward Federal dollars.

The responsible, predictable, businesslike approach to Federal legislation, appropriations and budgeting does not exist. This is creating havoc in all States, but particu-

larly in those legislatures which meet briefly or sometimes every other year.

I prepare budget projections five years in the future. Of our two and one-half billion dollar 1974 budget, about three-quarters of a billion dollars are federal funds.

How do you encourage local and state officials as well as private citizens and groups to develop long-range plans and well researched priorities based on federal law when all their work may be shot to pieces by a sudden and apparently capricious decision in Washington?

What encouragement is there to try to make a program run right in Waycross, Georgia, when it may be wiped out because a similar effort was mis-managed somewhere in California?

I represent and speak for almost five million people who are harmed by these developments.

To the dairy farmer, expecting emergency farm loans to replace cows which were ruined by a lack of electricity for milking during a five-day ice storm, it's not enough to say: "Ask what you can do for yourself."

To the mentally afflicted child who had just begun to enjoy his first chance for treatment and training in a community treatment center, which is now closed, it is not enough to say: "Ask what you can do for yourself."

To a mother of dependent children, holding her first job in eight years through the emergency employment program, who will now return to the welfare rolls, it is not enough to say: "Ask what you can do for yourself."

To the home owners, the contractors, the construction workers and the merchants who would have benefited in the next eighteen months from almost three hundred million dollars worth of new housing in Georgia, which now will not be built, it is not enough to say: "As what you can do for yourself."

We in Georgia are willing to do our share but the State-Federal partnerships are being dissolved.

I cannot understand what are our common national goals. They should be defined with maximum input from the Congress, from private citizens and local and State governments.

What will happen now that we have finally accepted the status quo in Vietnam?

I cannot understand how or why the Congress has lost control of the budgetary process and almost legalized it with the debt ceiling bill.

In order to protect our people, impoundment of funds should be stopped, and the Congress should demand the immediate return of its constitutional powers. Post-impoundment notification of Congress will not help.

It seems to me that a zero base budgeting system should be implemented by the executive branch of Government and that a maximum spending limit adopted by both Houses of Congress could provide clear and firm restraints on total congressional appropriations. Such action would insure a continuing and understandable determination of national financing priorities.

Intimidation of the press should cease, and the veil of secrecy should be removed from Government so special interests will not maintain exclusive access behind the closed doors.

We have a sunshine law in Georgia. There is a freedom of information act at the Federal level. There is room for legislative action to improve the impact of both, but there is no legislative remedy for the attitude that the people are too ignorant or too unsophisticated to be told what is really happening. That attitude must be clearly identified where it exists by you the members of the press. I hope that you, who are charged

with letting the people know what is being done to them, will conduct a holy war against the secret maneuvers of all branches and all levels of government.

Budget cuts can be reinstated, vetoes can be overridden, and policies can be changed; but governmental contempt for the people can destroy the very basis of democracy unless it is exposed and ruthlessly eliminated.

The sunshine law is working in Georgia. The deliberations of our legislature and its committees are filmed each day by educational television and broadcast nightly throughout the State.

If other news media and the Public Broadcasting System could record the deliberations of the national Congress and make frequent and comprehensive reports to the Nation, public confidence might be restored and an effective forum would be guaranteed to the legislative branch of government. Last year the House Appropriations Committee, here in Washington, opened to the public only 33 of its 399 meetings. Do you think the lobbyists got a full report? As a Governor, I would like to have the same information.

It would help us if congressional committee staffs could be enlarged and professional staff members could spend more time with appropriate State agencies as major legislation is being considered.

We would be glad to send key people to Washington to help evolve acts of Congress which so critically affect us all.

I have been gratified by the cooperation and communications that has been established between our State government and the members of the Georgia congressional delegation—of both parties.

But if the unhealthy shift of power toward the Federal executive with its attendant problems is to be reversed, all Governors and Members of Congress are going to have to realize that we are in the same leaky boat.

Both Congress and the Governors have been partially responsible for allowing the shift to take place. Only by concerted, common effort can it be reversed.

Well, with all of these concerns, one might ask about election mandates which allegedly gave prior blanket approval to recent administration attitudes.

The mood of the people, in my opinion, is one of basic conservatism. But one has to be careful about the definition of the word.

Conservatism does not mean racism. It does not mean stubborn resistance to change. It does not mean callousness or unconcern about our fellow human beings.

I think it means a higher valuation of the human being, of individuality, self-reliance, dignity, personal freedom; but I also think it means increased personal responsibility through governmental action for alleviating affliction, discrimination and injustice.

Reinhold Neibuhr said that the purpose of politics is to establish justice in a sinful world.

As more of our citizens choose to exercise their exciting new freedom and as the conglomerate and more unselfish will of the people is felt on government, I predict that we shall see an emergence of what might be called benevolent conservatism. There are many conservative people who care.

They want government to play a more dynamic role in insuring that each person can overcome affliction and realize his full potential and achieve maximum personal freedom.

They perhaps agree with the ancient Chinese philosopher Kuan Tzu, who said: "You give a man a fish, he has one meal; if you teach him to fish, he can feed himself for life."

This is a time for benevolent conservatism. I may be wrong, but I hope and believe that this is true.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON: EPITOMIZING THE IDEALS OF A NATION

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1973

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues today in mourning the passing of a good man and a great American, Lyndon Baines Johnson.

As a Congressman and a Senator, and as President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson embodied the ideals of this Nation and the ideals of humanity. There is no need to recount his specific accomplishments here; suffice it to say that in his 30 years in public office, he did more good for more people than any of us have done in a lifetime. I say this because, of all the Presidents in this century, Lyndon Johnson had the singular distinction of being the one who had the keenest grasp of what the goals of our form of government are and how to translate these goals from the sterile words of the Constitution into true meaning for all Americans.

The Founding Fathers used the inclusive phrase "we the people" to define who is protected by constitutional rights. But, for so many years, "we the people" too frequently meant those who were wealthy, those who were enfranchised, those who were white, and those who were in control of the powers of the U.S. Government. For the Lyndon Johnson years, "we the people" referred to each individual in this country, be he rich or poor, black or white, powerful or powerless.

The legacy of Lyndon Johnson has assured us and our posterity that the application of laws under the Constitution will be made fairly and equally. His legacy has assured each American that he or she would have an equal opportunity to seek and achieve the American dream of success and happiness. His legacy has assured each person in this country that he will have the opportunity for an education equal to that of his peers. His legacy has assured those who were powerless that the Government of the United States would extend a helping hand to them so that they could indeed help themselves.

Yet, for all the glory of the Johnson years, the story of his Presidency ended in personal frustration and disappointment. Perhaps this was because Lyndon Johnson believed too strongly in the greatness of America; he believed that there were no bounds to what America could accomplish in the world. It was a contagious belief, one which we in Congress felt ourselves.

Yet, as we worked together to achieve those goals of justice and equality for all Americans, we both failed to recognize that the escalation in the Vietnam war would delineate the boundaries of our Nation's greatness.

For this reason, Lyndon Johnson's detractors are several; yet, history is certain to vindicate his name, for decades

February 15, 1973

from now, when the pain and suffering of the Vietnam war have waned, the groundwork which he laid for freedom in America will live on and continue to be strong.

We mourn the passing of this great man for we knew him in life as a true friend. So, too, we mourn for him as a symbol of the ideals which our country holds so dear. Let us pray to God that our Nation is blessed in the future with leaders who have the ability and foresight of Lyndon Baines Johnson.

## MUST WE BE BORED?

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the young lady with a headache loses her cool. A series of persons are spotted toting giant chewing gum cartons around the town. A waitress shows a preference between customers at a coffee counter. Joe Namath gets "creamed."

And on and on TV goes—providing the "hard sell" by repetitious commercials which could be threatening the well-being of the Nation by deadening the senses of our people.

How many times in one evening must we see the feverish cold sufferer undergo a miraculous capsule cure, or hear the traveler lament the loss of his luggage to a different destination, or watch the car being taken apart by a gang of professional strippers to reveal to us its inner strengths?

The effect of reiterated commercials invites the attention of psychologists. What does the utter boredom of the practice do to us as individuals? Could the mental lapses we are compelled to suffer so often in front of the TV screens change us into less alert, more likely to be turned off people in matters of larger importance?

Currently, the Federal Communications Commission is sorting through complaints filed against its 1970 rule restricting the networks' prime time use of local stations. One such complaint is that the stations are using the rule to increase the number of minutes allotted per hour to commercials beyond that which prevailed when the networks held full sway. In considering this objection, I would suggest that the FCC also give thought to the commercial replays.

Why would not a new rule be in order banning the showing of the same commercial more than 1 hour on any one station? Few advertisers, I am certain, now lack sufficient sales pitches to provide a variety. I realize commercials are expensive to make and that good ideas for them come only periodically to admen. But, still, they could be used less frequently and yet over a greater span of time, thus leveling out their cost per showing while, at the same time, having greater effect on a less-wearied viewing public.

Television has become a matter of extreme significance in our lives. It delights and it educates. It sets popular moods and standards. It also, by our general devotion to it, affects us in very subtle ways which we have yet to clearly understand. Thus the tedium of looking time after time at commercials we have seen time and time before may be taking a toll of the national acumen. It is something which the FCC well could take into account in its continuing efforts to improve both the quality and impact of TV.

THE 500TH ANNIVERSARY OF COPERNICUS

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, this week—February 14 to be precise—marks the 500th anniversary of that scientific giant, Nicolaus Copernicus of Poland, who laid the foundation of modern astronomy by demonstrating with reason, logic, and imagination that the sun, not our earth, was the center of our solar system.

Not only will scientific communities throughout the world be noting this anniversary, but Polish Americans are staging their own Copernicus birthday celebrations in Michigan's 18th District and throughout America. A committee in Philadelphia is raising funds for a statue of the Polish astronomer, I understand, to be erected on that city's Benjamin Franklin Parkway.

When Copernicus finished his extensive schooling in 1503, it is a fair estimate that he possessed virtually all the knowledge of the Western World in mathematics, astronomy, medicine, and theology. He used his education well for the benefit of others. He used his medical skill on behalf of the poor in Frauenburg. He applied his knowledge of economics to formulate the principle that when both good and bad money are in circulation together, the bad drives out the good—a principle incorrectly attributed to Thomas Gresham and known as Gresham's law. And he was a leader in the Catholic church, serving as canon of the duchy-bishopric of Varmia as well as physician and secretary to his uncle, Bishop Lucas.

But first and foremost, Nicolaus Copernicus is recognized for his contributions to astronomy. He replaced Ptolemy's centuries-old theory of a geocentric solar system, in which the earth was the center of the universe, with his own heliocentric system. In the Copernicus theory, the sun was at the center of a universe around which the individual planets and other heavenly bodies orbited.

In the words of Stephen Mizwa of the Kosciuszko Foundation:

Audacious as a thinker and not lacking even in physical courage, Copernicus was timid in pushing his own discoveries. He wanted to work out, check and recheck all details before eventual publication. . . . The

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

testimony of the senses was against him and he was afraid that the Church, of which he was a faithful son, might take exception to his revolutionary theory.

One of his students finally persuaded Copernicus to publish his manuscript, and the first copy of the six-section "De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium"—"Concerning the Revolutions of the Heaven Spheres"—was handed to the aging scientists during his final illness in 1543.

Acceptance of the new theory made steady progress, but it literally took some 200 years. For example, in Colonial America in 1721, Cotton Mather wrote:

The Copernican hypothesis is now generally preferred . . . and there is no objection against the motion of the Earth.

Copernicus lived in a transition period between the Middle Ages and modern times, during which scientists began to turn from meditation to experimentation. His studies and his devotion to scientific truth hastened the modern era on its way.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1973

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleagues and my fellow Americans a deep sadness at the death of Lyndon Baines Johnson, a President who, through his great concern and great courage, initiated and fought for the most far-reaching legislation in the field of civil rights and social opportunity in the past century in America.

I had the privilege of serving in the Congress at the time when Lyndon Johnson was pursuing his distinguished career as a brilliant and forceful leader of the Senate, when he served under John F. Kennedy as Vice President, and when he brought his skills, knowledge, and experience to the White House as President. His love for this land and all its people was limitless; his untimely death is a loss for all Americans.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1973

Mr. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take this opportunity to note that tomorrow, February 16, 1973, Americans of Lithuanian origin and descent will commemorate two anniversaries. These are the 722d anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian State, and the 55th anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania.

I would like to join with them in commemorating this occasion and the cul-

tural contributions which they have made to all mankind.

FRANK ROSENBLUM—LABOR LEADER

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1973

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sad heart that I call to the attention of my colleagues the death last week of Frank Rosenblum, general secretary-treasurer emeritus of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

I knew Frank Rosenblum personally. He was a man totally dedicated and devoted to the cause of the working men and women of America and he always championed the underdog. His entire career was spent trying to uplift the living standards of millions of Americans. Along with the late Sidney Hillman and Philip Murray, he was one of the pioneers in the labor movement.

Frank Rosenblum was among the founders of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America and his career spanned 62 years. Although his union activities centered in Chicago, it was under his dynamic leadership that clothing workers were organized in Cleveland, St. Louis, Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Cincinnati.

The passing of Frank Rosenblum is the passing of an entire era. He will be sorely missed.

Mrs. Annunzio joins me in extending to his widow, daughter Beatrice, two sons, Leigh and Howard, and their grandchildren, our deepest sympathy on their great loss.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS AT CROSS-PURPOSES

HON. PETE V. DOMENICI

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 15, 1973

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have spoken before this body previously on the need for Congress to establish fiscally responsible budgetary procedures before we begin considering individual appropriations bills. I have cosponsored legislation to that effect—S. 40, S. 565, Senate Joint Resolution 27, and Senate Resolution 36.

Therefore, my position in this matter is well established, and I reaffirm it at this time. Another issue on which I have spoken is the critical and pressing need to straighten out Federal programs which at times are at cross purposes with each other. Some of these programs, enacted in good faith to benefit persons in need, have actually been detrimental in some cases by their cumulative effect.

One situation is dramatically illustrated by the following excerpt from a

letter I received from a citizen of New Mexico:

I am a World War I veteran, 75 years old and living on Veterans and social security pensions. On account of the 20 per cent social security raise, my Veterans check was

reduced. My rent has also been raised and the Medicare program went up. I would like to know if some kind of legislation can be passed to protect my pension.

This is a circumstance so obviously unfair and disastrous to this good citi-

zen and others like him that I urge the Senate to enact with all possible speed S. 275, which would restore the pensions of veterans and their survivors to their original level prior to the recent increase in social security payments.

## SENATE—Monday, February 19, 1973

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

### PRAYER

The Reverend William Sydnor, rector, Christ Church, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

O Holy God, Lord of the forces of history and Father of all men, we remember in gratitude the great and the noble who have been the lights of the world in their several generations. Especially this day, we remember Thy servant, George Washington. May the memory of his reliance on Thy heavenly grace, his integrity of character, his devotion to duty, and his courageous concern for the welfare of this people inspire and sustain us that the good work which Thou didst begin in him may be furthered and strengthened by our endeavors so that there may be justice and peace at home and through obedience to Thy law, we, Thy people, may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth. All of which we ask through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

### REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 15, 1973, Mr. DOLE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, reported favorably, with an amendment, on February 16, 1973, the bill (S. 43) to provide for the mandatory inspection of rabbits slaughtered for human food, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 93-22) thereon, which was printed.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 15, 1973, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees

may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### PATRIOTISM AND GEORGE WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, a famous wit, Artemus Ward, once wrote:

A good many politicians stop over. G. Washington never stopped over.

As we meet today to honor the birthday of George Washington, a birthday which keeps us skittering around from date to date as we change it, we should remember another statement that George Washington himself made—and I paraphrase it:

Every citizen may be expected to contribute some part of his property to the support of his Government and may even be expected to contribute some part of his services to the support of his country.

I believe that the principle of service has been well exemplified in the attitude of the returning prisoners of war, who served, and served well—served with a distinction that brings to them great respect and which brings to the United States a great pride.

I am glad that they have set the tone which has brought simple patriotism back into fashion in this country.

It is good that our people have seen how their prisoners of war have reacted. They have given us all a light to guide our footsteps. They have set for us a path and a pattern.

They have confounded the critics and silenced those who would create dissent among our people. They have helped to unite us. They are a reconciling force.

It is, therefore, fitting that on the birthday of our first President we can take pride in the fact that, as a nation, we are stronger today, we are more united today, and we are making progress toward reduction of tensions in the world.

I believe, Mr. President that we are, therefore, truly exemplifying the Biblical direction to "follow after the ways that lead to peace."

### READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, as modified, the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), having been appointed by the Vice President to do so, will now read Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. MATHIAS, at the desk, read the Farewell Address, as follows:

### To the people of the United States.

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should not apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to this country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifica-