

so-called aerial hijacking bill debate on any amendment, shall be limited to 30 minutes and debate on any debatable motion, or appeal, shall be limited to 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Nevada (Mr. Cannon) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Cotton): *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

RESTORATION OF RURAL ELECTRIC AND TELEPHONE DIRECT LOAN PROGRAMS

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (S. 394) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to reaffirm that such funds made available for each fiscal year to carry out the programs provided for in such act be fully obligated in said year, and for other purposes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I yield such time as he desires to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska for yielding time to me.

I take this time to give notice that I will call up my amendment tomorrow at an appropriate time.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, is the amendment at the desk?

Mr. McCLURE. The amendment is at the desk.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, has the Senator from Idaho asked that his amendment be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. McCLURE. No, I had not.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 17

On Page 2, line 20—after "3", insert "(a)".

On Page 3, between lines 3 and 4—insert "(b)", as follows:

(b) Section 4 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 904) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, all loans made under this section shall be made as follows:

(1) A qualified borrower shall be entitled to a direct loan on the total amount of the approved loan at a rate of 2 per centum per annum if, on the basis of the Time Interest Earned Ratio and the Debt Service Coverage prescribed in REA Bulletin 20-14 (as in effect in July 1972), the Time Interest Earned Ratio of such borrower is less than 1.5 or the Debt Service Coverage of such borrower is less than 1.25.

(2) A qualified borrower, if the Time Interest Earned Ratio of such borrower is 1.5 and above and the Debt Service Coverage is 1.25 and above, shall be entitled to loans in the following amounts, based on the Plant Revenue Ratio as defined in REA bulletin 20-14 (as in effect in July 1972):

(i) A direct loan at a rate of 2 per centum per annum for one-half of the amount of the approved loan and an insured loan at a rate of 5 per centum per annum for one-half of the amount of the approved loan, when the Plant Revenue Ratio is 9.01 and above;

(ii) A direct loan at a rate of 2 per centum per annum for one-fourth of the amount of the approved loan and an insured loan at a rate of 5 per centum per annum for three-fourths of the amount of the approved loan, when the Plant Revenue Ratio is 8.01 to 9;

(b) (2) (iii) An insured loan at a rate of 5 per centum per annum for the total amount of the approved loan, when the Plant Revenue Ratio is 8 and below."

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, there will be no further debate on the pending bill today. And in accordance with the previous understanding, the time on the amendment by the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON) will begin running tomorrow upon the resumption of the consideration of the unfinished business. I understand that a yea-and-nay vote will then occur on the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is to be asked for tomorrow.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. The Senator is correct.

The Senator from Idaho (Mr. McCLURE) has an amendment which I presume he will call up immediately upon the disposition of the amendment by the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON).

So, we will have at least two rollcall votes on tomorrow and possibly three before this matter is disposed of, after which the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the aerial hijacking bill on which there is a time limitation, with votes expected thereon.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, for the

RECORD, how much time remains to each side on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has 51 minutes remaining. The Senator from Minnesota has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I have already stated for the record sufficiently, I think, the program. I will restate it briefly.

The Senate will convene at 12 o'clock meridian on tomorrow. After the two leaders have been recognized under the standing order, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes. He will be followed by the junior Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD) for not to exceed 15 minutes, after which there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 30 minutes with statements therein limited to 3 minutes, at the conclusion of which the Senate will resume its consideration of the REA bill.

There will be yea-and-nay votes expected on that bill and amendments thereto on tomorrow, after which the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the aerial hijacking bill. A time limitation agreement has been entered thereon, and votes are expected.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move in accordance with the previous order that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 5:50 p.m., the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 21, 1973, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 20, 1973:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Robert W. Long, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, vice Thomas K. Cowden, resigned.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 20, 1973:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

John Henry Kyl, of Iowa, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

(The above nomination was approved subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OWEN L. HEGGS, JR.

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great feeling of pride that I recently

learned the identity of the new president of the Cleveland Urban League. The man elected to that important post was none other than my former administrative assistant, Mr. Owen L. Heggs, Jr. I know that Owen's many friends on Capitol Hill will want to join me in congratulating him upon his great achievement.

Owen Heggs is a young man who is destined to become a leader in the city of Cleveland. I can think of no man more deserving of this position of leadership and I wish him and his lovely wife both great success and happiness.

The following is a description of some of Mr. Heggs' important accomplishments:

OWEN L. HEGGS, PRESIDENT-ELECT, URBAN LEAGUE OF CLEVELAND

The President-Elect of the Urban League of Cleveland for 1973 is Owen L. Heggs, Attorney-at-Law.

Heggs, Chairman of the Legal Committee of the Urban League, is a native Clevelander and attended high school in Cleveland.

Graduating from Howard University, Washington, D.C., in the Honors Program with a Bachelor of Arts degree in 1964, he continued graduate studies at Western Reserve University Law School, receiving a Juris Doctor in 1967.

Heggs was a Ranney Scholar; Associate Editor, Law Review and the Moot Court Board.

He is a member of the Ohio State Bar Association, the Cleveland Bar Association and the John Harlan Law Club.

A member of the Board of Trustees of Case Western Reserve University, Heggs serves on the visiting Committee, Case Western Reserve University School of Law; Board of Trustees, Ohio State Legal Services Association; the Board of Trustees, Community Action Against Addiction; the Board of Trustees, Citizens for Open Housing and as a Member Selective Service System, Cleveland Board No. 23.

Heggs enlisted in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Naval Reserve in 1968, serving as trial and defense counsel at Twelfth Naval District, Treasure Island, California, and volunteered for tour at Naval Support Activity, Danang, Republic of Viet Nam. He has also served as counsel for the government, U.S. Naval Appellate Review Activity, Washington, D.C.

Honorably discharged in July, 1970 with the rank of Lieutenant, Heggs was awarded the National Defense Service Medal, Republic of Viet Nam Campaign Medal, Viet Nam Service Medal, Presidential Unit Citation and the Navy Commendation Medal.

Serving as a Clerk, Squire, Sanders and Dempsey in 1966, he became an Associate with the firm in 1968.

From 1970 to 1971, Heggs was Administrative Assistant to the Honorable Louis Stokes, Congressman. He is a partner with James, Hill, Heggs, Derrick, Douglas and Company, L.P.A.

Heggs is married to the former Brenda K. Huggins.

LYNDON JOHNSON

HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1973

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, reflecting on the death of Lyndon Johnson, it would be useless and disingenuous for me to praise him as someone I followed and supported in the majority of his programs or presidential endeavors. I did not. We disagreed, and—as opponents are wont to do—we often disagreed vehemently.

And, yet, I feel that I must acknowledge that his death leaves me sorrowful. He was a worthy and energetic opponent—a man who stood up to you when he thought you were in the way of something he thought was right. I still do not think that many of the things President Johnson proposed were right as solutions to the country's ills, but I have never doubted that he was sincere in proposing them—nor do I doubt that he thought they would be best for the

Nation. One must admire the tireless way in which he worked to see them become reality.

He was a leader—a dynamic, vigorous, forthright leader of men. I did not follow his lead most of the time in his legislative programs, but I am proud to have followed him in seeking the best for our Nation. In his love of America, in his desire to do what was best for her, Lyndon Baines Johnson was unsurpassed.

I mourn his loss to us—and to the Republic.

MAN OF THE SOUTH AWARD TO DR. JAMES P. WESBERRY

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, a close friend for many years and a great Georgian has been awarded a singular honor. I wish to call the Senate's attention to his achievement. He has led us in prayer a number of times, and many of us have had the privilege of knowing him personally.

Dr. James P. Wesberry, of Atlanta's Morningside Baptist Church, has been named by Dixie Business magazine as 1972 Man of the South. As such, he has been voted by that magazine into the South's Hall of Fame for the Living, an effort in the words of publisher Hubert Lee—

To honor men who have contributed conspicuously to the South during their lifetime, so they personally may derive some satisfaction in knowing their work has been appreciated.

I ask unanimous consent that the announcement of the Man of the South Award to Doctor Wesberry be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

DR. JAMES P. WESBERRY HONORED

Dr. James P. Wesberry, who begins his thirtieth year as Pastor of Morningside Baptist Church, Atlanta, well-known nationally prominent Southern Baptist minister, is the 1972 Man of the South and elected to the "South's Hall of Fame for the Living" by Dixie Business Magazine, as announced by Hubert F. Lee, the founder and editor of Dixie Business since 1929.

Dixie Business, according to Editor Lee, "seeks to honor men who have contributed conspicuously to the South during their lifetime, so they personally may derive some satisfaction in knowing their work has been appreciated by their contemporaries."

A special citation and award will be presented to Dr. Wesberry at the Eleven O'Clock Worship Service of the Morningside Baptist Church Sunday, March 4, which marks the 29th anniversary of Dr. Wesberry's pastorate and the beginning of his thirtieth year. While many ministers have held long pastorates in Atlanta, Dr. Wesberry holds the honor of serving longer currently than any other known minister.

In announcing this Award Lee pointed out that Dr. Wesberry holds many honors. He said that as a college student at Mercer University Dr. Wesberry received the highest honor given at the hands of the Student Body and Faculty, that of Master Mercerian; that Dr. Wesberry holds four honorary doc-

tor's degrees; that he has served for twenty years as Chairman of the State Literature Commission; was Vice Chairman and Chairman of the Editorial Committee of the Governor's Citizens Penal Reform Commission in 1968; served for six years as a member of the Executive Committee of the Southern Baptist Convention; was President of the Georgia Baptist Convention and the Southern Baptist Pastor's Conference; and served as President of the Atlanta Christian Council and Moderator of the Atlanta Baptist Association.

Lee said Dr. Wesberry is now serving for the third time as a Trustee of Mercer University and had served on the Board of Trustees and Administration Committee of the Atlanta Baptist College since its creation. He also pointed out that Dr. Wesberry is a member of the Executive Committee of the Georgia Baptist Convention and was Chairman of its Administration Committee for four years.

Dr. Wesberry's life and influence has extended, said Lee, to the far corners of our nation and world. Dr. Wesberry was Acting Chaplain of the United States House of Representatives during the summer of 1949 during the 81st Congress while his son, Jim, Jr., who later served for five years in the Georgia State Senate, was a Page. Lee said he believes that Dr. Wesberry knows intimately more Governors, Congressmen, Senators, and has known more Presidents of our nation than any preacher in the South. Dr. Wesberry's Prayers were published by the Congress and Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House, said: "His daily ministrations were helpful and inspiring, lifting all who heard him to a deeper realization of their need for divine guidance."

Dr. Wesberry is also one of the Scottish Rite lecturers and holds many Masonic honors. He served as Grand Chaplain of the Grand Lodge of Georgia during the administration of Grand Master George P. Whitman. On January 17, 1973 he received the Merit Award from Yaarab Temple, Tom Slate, Past Potentate, in presenting the Award, said that Dr. Wesberry "is the first to be appointed to that position (Chaplain of Yaarab Temple) by five consecutive Potentates and that he has served for seven of the past ten years and has been recently reappointed for 1973. Dr. Wesberry is the first Christian minister to ever receive the Merit Award from Yaarab Temple since it was instituted in 1923.

Dr. Wesberry is the author of a number of books. His newest book, "Meditations for Happy Christians," has just recently been released by Broadman Press. In writing about Dr. Wesberry Broadman Press says: "Few men become living institutions, but James P. Wesberry is one of these few. In 1964 he began a pastorate at a congregation of slightly over 500 members in Atlanta, meeting in a small wooden building. That congregation today is the Morningside Baptist Church, one of the great churches of America." "His extensive writings," Broadman Press says, "includes several books and frequent contributions to secular and religious periodicals. Truly, he is an amazing man, an embodiment of the faith proclaimed in this book."

In making this award, "The Man of the South," Hubert Lee said, we also took into consideration that Dr. Wesberry is a true and patriotic citizen of the old South. Dr. Wesberry's grandfather for whom he is named "Pickett" fought in the Confederate Army. Dr. Wesberry was born in Bishopville, South Carolina, in the beautiful cotton and Bible belt section of his beloved Southland and was reared and received his early schooling in Columbia, a city which, like Atlanta, was destroyed by Sherman. From there he has gone to the far corners of the earth.

Dr. Wesberry has been on many preaching missions for the Chief of Chaplains of the United States Air Force and also traveled extensively in other lands.

Dr. Wesberry also moderated for many years the popular "This Is Your Town" interview television program and has appeared often on many other television and radio programs.

While the pulpit is his throne and he takes great pride in being a pastor who really loves people, his number one joy and honor is that of being Pastor of Morningside Baptist Church. In 1943 he was called to one of the largest and most influential city churches in America which had more members than there were people in the town where he was pastor, but Dr. Wesberry says, "The Lord called me to Morningside and to Atlanta, and if there has ever been a man who was of God to preach, I am that man; and if there has ever been a happy pastor, I am that pastor because I know I am where the Lord called and wants me. Dr. Wesberry has, across the years, led his people from a small frame building on Highland Avenue to what he refers to as his dream church, one of the most beautiful in the nation, an architectural gem located on a fourteen and a half acre wooded, hillside site overlooking Atlanta's skyline, estimated in value today at over two million dollars, one of the most influential among Southern Baptists.

Dr. Wesberry has seen the skyline of Atlanta change during the almost three decades that he has lived in Atlanta, and he and Mrs. Wesberry love Atlanta, think it is the most wonderful place on earth in which to live, love, and serve, and every day he gives thanks to God for the great and glorious privilege of seeking to magnify Jesus Christ and of serving the people.

This is the man *Dixie Business* is proud to present as "The Man of the South for 1972" and to its "Hall of Fame for the Living."

Some of the others to have received this outstanding Man of the South Award are: Bobby Jones, noted golfer; Dr. Arthur Moore, Bishop of the Methodist Church; Dr. McDowell Richards, former President of Columbia Theological Seminary; Bernard Baruch, Advisor to Presidents of the United States; James C. Self, owner of the Greenwood Mills, Greenwood, South Carolina; Robert Jemison, Jr., Real Estate, Birmingham, Alabama; J. Craig Smith, of Sylacauga, Alabama; and Luther Hodges, former Governor of North Carolina and Secretary of Commerce.

WHAT THE CONSUMER CAN EXPECT FROM DOLLAR DEVALUATION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration is again attempting to strengthen its position in the international monetary circles at the expense of the American taxpayer and consumer.

The direct effect of the announced 10-percent devaluation of the dollar on the average citizen is to make his dollar now worth 10 cents less in buying power. Imported goods would cost more and our exports will be priced lower. The Japanese camera, German car, or other foreign made article will go up in price. Foreign oil imports will also cost more. But even if a consumer does not plan to buy imported products, it will still cost us all.

After the dollar devaluation last year, Congress was forced to appropriate \$1.6 billion of taxpayer's money to maintain our obligations to international banking institutions. Now the financial experts in Washington tell us that the present 10-percent devaluation may cost as much as

\$2 to \$2.5 billion to keep faith with our international commitments. This so-called obligatory expense benefits no American. And since we do not have the money we will have to borrow the money to pay the devaluation fee.

These same experts point to foreign trade agreements with Red China and Russia as contributory causes to the dollar drain. The only profit to be made will go into the pockets of the Russian wheat dealers, the Chinese cotton buyers, and the international money manipulators.

While Americans export our goods for less, we must pay higher prices for the foreign raw materials that go into virtually all "Made in America" consumer products. What the administration advocates is giving foreign buyers a 10-percent discount on American-made products and, at the same time, slapping the taxpayer with a \$2 billion plus bill for the privilege of international trading.

If a 10-percent devaluation is good for our economy, jobs and the consumer, a 50-percent devaluation should be five times more effective. Or better yet, a 90-percent devaluation nine times more beneficial. This is reverse logic.

Last year's devaluation accomplished nothing but to worsen the dollar situation. Our balance of trade deficit went from approximately \$2 billion in 1971 to approximately \$6 billion in 1972. Share-the-wealth programs like foreign aid, U.N. projects, and underwriting international financial institutions are the reasons why foreigners have so many of our unredeemed dollars. Devaluation is addressed to an effect, not a cause. The dollar will never again regain its strength and prestige as long as we continue these irrational programs designed to "support" the world.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1973

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the death of former President Lyndon B. Johnson brings shock to all America. Somehow it seems inconceivable that this stalwart and tall son of Texas could be taken from us so early in life.

History will be the final judge of President Johnson. He came to the Presidency under conditions he did not want, struggled through more than 5 years of the most trying times in American history, and left the White House under conditions other than those of his own choosing.

It has often been said that Lyndon Johnson was a big man—big in all that he undertook and all that he did. He was large in physical stature, immense in his compassion for the least of us, and he stood second to none in his love of country.

I believe it is safe to say that President Johnson's dream for America was one of justice for all people. Yet, he launched his quest for the Great Society at a time in history when its goals were not to be allowed. Instead of harmony at home

and peace abroad, the President found division at home and war in Asia. He exerted every ounce of his being to ending both division and war, but as the war continued, division grew at home. Some of those for whom he did the most and risked the most were the most critical of his efforts.

Finally, in what must go down as one of the highly patriotic acts in our proud history, Lyndon Johnson stepped down from the presidency in a final effort to bring our Nation together. He was not to live to see his hopes fulfilled. At the time of his death, our Nation still is divided, although not as sharply as before, but peace at long last is at hand. It is a great pity that he was not to hear and to enjoy the official ending of the war which brought him so much personal grief.

No President in modern times has assumed office under more trying conditions, nor has a President used his own personal strength so vigorously to bind up the Nation's wounds. There were those who took advantage of his dreams and who abused his trust, and sometimes the results compounded the Nation's problems.

Now he has been taken from us, almost 4 years to the day from the time he departed this city for his beloved Texas. For only the third time in our Nation's history, we find ourselves without a living former President. President Nixon and many others have relied on the counsel and the wide experience of the former President, and I am certain that his help was gladly given to all of them for the sake of our country.

All of us who knew Lyndon Johnson grieve with his family for their loss and we grieve that our Nation must go forward without the towering patriotism and abiding love the gentleman from Texas had for America.

WEATHERMAN HARRY GEISE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, for many years, California residents have been enthralled by the uncanny ability of Harry Geise to make long-range weather forecasts.

Seen over KCRA-TV in Sacramento, and heard throughout California over eight radio stations, Mr. Geise has attracted a tremendous personal following, mostly by virtue of his record of correctly predicting weather patterns months in advance. Indeed, his accuracy is such that his services have been solicited not only by commercial companies, but also by various State agencies.

Despite his success—or perhaps because of it—Mr. Geise has on occasion been refused information from the National Weather Service. Evidently there is some dispute over Mr. Geise's methods, or at least his unorthodox theories—but his results speak for themselves.

Now comes word that Harry Geise is under attack by local members of the

American Meteorological Society. He is charged with violating five sections of the society's code of ethics. What they are really saying, in my view, is "Mr. Geise: We don't like or agree with your theories, so you should either conform, or stop making weather forecasts." Unfortunately, his detractors have insisted upon remaining anonymous, a decision which the Meteorological Society has defended.

Such nameless attacks are personally repugnant to me. Certainly Mr. Geise deserves better. What is even more disturbing, however, is that actions such as these—actions to make everyone "conform or else"—are increasing at a rapid rate throughout American society. Almost every day, a Federal employee complains to my office that he has been summarily dealt with for "stepping out of line." This ever-growing premium on "team play," which allows little room for dissent of any form or nature, surely strikes at the heart of a democratic society.

I, for one, think it is very important that Mr. Geise be allowed to continue his present practice unimpeded by outside pressures.

Similar "star chamber" proceedings, for similar reasons, were used against the former head of the California Institute of Technology's Department of Meteorology, and he was forced out of the Meteorological Society in 1958.

What we have here, then, appears to be a continuation of a long-standing attempt to discredit long range forecasting by those who think it is impossible.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, it is expected that in the next few years, Congress will be asked to appropriate perhaps billions of dollars for a global atmospheric research program which would be used by the Weather Service to extend forecasts up to 14 days.

Meanwhile, we have Mr. Geise, sitting in Sacramento, apparently able to do a number of things set as goals by the global atmospheric research program, by himself. In my view, Mr. Geise deserves great credit, not only for the substantive work that he does, but also for the symbol of experimentation and courage of conviction that he represents.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I insert a recent article from the Sacramento Union in the RECORD:

WEATHERMAN HARRY GEISE: CAUGHT IN A STORM OF CONTROVERSY

(By David Hatfield)

All involved in radio-television weatherman Harry Geise's dispute with the American Meteorological Society (AMS) agree that Geise does the impossible.

The controversy has arisen over Geise's ability to make long-range weather forecasts, sometimes two or three years in advance.

A local group of colleagues is challenging that ability in a complaint filed with the AMS saying that his prognostications are a "possible violation of the society's code of ethics."

Geise was notified of the complaint Nov. 13 but was not told the identity of his accusers. He has denied the charges.

"I'll show you what I do that is impossible and you can decide for yourself," Geise said.

He produced forecasts he sent to some of his clients last year that had predicted the weather that would occur this week.

One forecast, dated Sept. 24, 1971 and sent to a Sacramento natural gas company, said

the weather for this past Tuesday, for example, would be foggy with temperatures in the mid 40s to low 50s.

The National Weather Service (NWS) in its final forecast Monday night said Tuesday's weather would be clear with the high temperature near 60 degrees.

As it turned out, it was foggy in Sacramento and the high temperature for the day was 46 degrees.

Jim Miller, head of the Sacramento NWS office, said the government does not make long-range forecasts, other than general outlooks for about a month in advance.

"The entire profession has found no way to make long-range forecasts reliably," Miller said.

One of Geise's clients, located along California's north coast, estimated that Geise's long-range forecasts had been about 83 per cent accurate.

In addition to his business clients, Geise makes daily weather forecasts over KCRA radio and television and seven other radio stations.

Irving Krick, former head of the meteorology department at California Institute of Technology, developed many of the theories from which Geise makes his forecasts.

Krick, who operates a private meteorology service in Palm Springs, had similar charges lodged against him in 1958 and was forced to resign from the AMS.

Kinsel Coulson, a meteorology professor at the University of California at Davis, agrees that there is a certain amount of validity to Krick's theory that weather follows synoptic cycles formed by weather systems.

However, Coulson strongly disagrees with Geise's belief that weather runs in six-day cycles.

"People have tried to find the statistical relationship in past weather records and can't find any proof of the theory," Coulson said.

Geise's problems have apparently come to a head since he came to Sacramento four years ago.

"I've been doing weather shows in San Francisco and Fresno for 10 years and never had any problem with the Weather Service in either city," he said.

Tom DuHain, who does weather programs on channel 3, one time was denied information from the Sacramento NWS office and had to call San Francisco for the information.

Geise said the head of the office later apologized.

Among Geise's clients are construction firms, logging companies, farmers, and a Lake Tahoe casino which gears its advertising to days when the roads will be open over the Sierra.

Ironically, the NWS is experimenting with "extended" forecasts which they hope to make up to 14 days in advance.

The experiments, called GARP (Global Atmospheric Research Program), would involve improvement of weather tracking stations in the oceans and on continents which only have limited facilities.

The NWS currently makes only specific day-by-day forecasts up to five days in advance.

"I know what their problem is," Geise said. "Can you imagine what's going to happen when Congress is asked to approve the billions of dollars this GARP will take, and I can already do more than what they hope to do?"

FREEDOM OF EMIGRATION ACT

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I was proud to join in sponsoring the

Freedom of Emigration Act, banning most-favored-nation status to Iron Curtain countries which arbitrarily restrict or heavily tax emigration of Jewish and other citizens.

A majority of both Houses of Congress now support this measure, clearly telling the Soviet Union and its satellites that although freer trade and improved relations may be desirable, we will not purchase them at the cost of denial of basic human rights.

In addition to supporting the Freedom of Emigration Act, I have introduced a concurrent resolution specifically condemning the Soviet Union for its treatment of citizens who wish to emigrate. This resolution and the Freedom of Emigration Act reaffirm a fundamental truth—no one owns a human being except himself. The so-called education tax being levied against individuals in the U.S.S.R. is selective and capricious. Its specific application to Soviet Jewish citizens wishing to move to Israel is obvious. Its repressiveness is beyond question. This practice deserves our direct condemnation. Restriction of emigration by any of the Soviet bloc nations deserves reciprocal restriction of trade by the United States.

We in America pride ourselves on our freedom. We are called upon in these two legislative measures to condemn a terrifying repression of human rights.

By profession, I am an economist. I recognize that free trade can and does offer numerous benefits to participating nations. But I also recognize, Mr. Speaker, that we must sometimes use trade rights as a tool, especially where injustice is blatant. Soviet citizens who want to leave their country have repaid the state for their education by long hours, hard work, low wages, and low living standards. This is a high enough price for the right to leave, especially when the desire to leave emanates from another burden—repression of religious freedom. I call upon Congress to pass the Freedom of Emigration Act and the condemnatory concurrent resolution to insure that the price of leaving is no higher.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—
HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 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 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?"

ADMITTING WRONG IS FIRST STEP TO PEACE, WRITES WAR WIDOW

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article that appeared recently in my hometown newspaper. The article, which deeply moved me, was written by one of my constituents—Gail James Yoakum, a young Tucson war widow who holds a degree in journalism from the University of Arizona. In the article she sets down her thoughts and opinions on the war that took her husband's life.

[From the Tucson Arizona Daily Star, Jan. 28, 1973]

ADMITTING WRONG IS FIRST STEP TO PEACE, WRITES WAR WIDOW (By Gail James Yoakum)

Some believe that, because my husband was killed in Vietnam, I have been bequeathed a unique perspective on war, death and sorrow. David L. Yoakum was Tucson's last Vietnam fatality.

On occasions such as this cease-fire, and probably at similar times in the future, some with maudlin curiosity will ask for my opinion.

Although my husband felt the futility and the anguish of war, I cannot speak for him. The world has lost what he had to give.

As his widow, I have been asked several times to express my thoughts. I sense it may be of value to say what I feel at this time.

Many people have experienced grief and sorrow. They are universal responses to untimely death. David was 28 years old when he died June 25, 1972. These feelings are private and to intrude serves no useful purpose.

But there are other things which need to be said. I care that the healing be over a clean wound. If we do not recognize the disease, the sore will fester. And the next generation will again go to war, and again not find freedom or peace.

I am not bitter or angry. David volunteered. It was through choice that he participated in war and our extreme misfortune that he was killed.

The hurt was deeper because it was unnecessary and we all knew it was a war of politics—a waiting game.

But there were others who did not volunteer. I can imagine the intense anger felt by the families of the men who were called by the draft, shipped to war and returned home in flag-draped boxes.

I would like to think that we learned something from the deaths of David and 45,932

other Americans. We have learned nothing unless we can face the truth.

The families of the POWs and the MIAs have been used as symbols of righteous commitment and as objects of curiosity by the media. It is a most generous proposal of the Arizona Legislature to want to provide a free college education to the children of the POWs and MIAs. But shouldn't gratitude be extended to the children whose fathers will never return?

I am dismayed by the rhetoric that we have created a just and honorable peace. I am distressed to hear that honor is the ability to finish a fight, and justice is that we have not been defeated. Our past day-by-day behavior betrays our sincerity. The words have lost their meaning.

I had hoped that peace would come with a humbleness and not with arrogant pride. The words "building a lasting peace" must sound tinny reverberating off the desolate hamlet ruins, the rubble of Quang Tri, the orphanages, the hospitals. How can we be proud when we must stand in these shadows?

We are being asked to believe that the instruments of war, the pain and the destruction brought about the peace. Were the results and the sacrifices worth the waiting? No, they were not.

I cannot accept war as the road to peace.

The legacy of this war is shame and disillusionment. It was contrived and manufactured. We have saved nothing; we have created nothing. And we have destroyed a great deal. I share the guilt with every American.

I do not think we can purge our conscience of this guilt and responsibility by saying that our honor as a people has been preserved because we have endured.

That the war is ending does not mean we have begun a new era. The real end of the age of wars might begin by our admitting our wrong and changing our fundamental attitudes—but it appears we have not done so.

We need to ask: "Is this really peace, or is this merely a reshuffling of the cards? Our commitments in Thailand, Cambodia and Laos are still shrouded in secrecy. Will we ever extricate ourselves from this arena?"

I am tired and I am sad. But I am also hopeful we will admit that we have accomplished nothing and that we have lost much and destroyed much. Honest recognition of this truth is necessary for us to begin to live in peace.

IN COMMEMORATION OF THE LITHUANIAN DAY OF INDEPENDENCE

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Lithuanian origin and descent, on Friday, February 16, proudly commemorated two important anniversaries. The first and older of the two involves the 722d anniversary of the original Lithuanian State. The second, the 55th anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918. But these are barren memories. The world knows that Lithuania's true independence, which was established by the two acts noted above, was ruthlessly destroyed in 1940. Then the Russians forcibly invaded, occupied, and annexed Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union. The United States has never recognized this illegal act.

Today, I again stand with my Lithuanian friends in hoping that these unresolved legacies of the Second World War will be directly confronted. Once and for all, the status of these Baltic Nations should be equitably resolved. This question should be addressed in the United Nations and other international forums, as the Congress has urged the President in the past, so that on some future anniversary, Lithuanians may again enjoy the freedom and solidarity that February 16 symbolizes.

LITHUANIA STRUGGLES TO REGAIN FREEDOM

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, we Americans sometimes take our freedoms so much for granted than it is difficult for us to really comprehend the struggle of those who do not enjoy these freedoms, and who are fighting every day to obtain them.

Thus it is particularly appropriate that we take a few minutes to consider the plight of the Lithuanian people who, on the 16th of February celebrated, insofar as they were able, the 55th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania. I am sure we are all painfully aware of the brevity of the independence of Lithuania. But we must be encouraged by the brightness of that period of their history, and by the fact that they continue their struggle to regain their freedom, and to reestablish their independence.

Over the years, this nation has steadfastly refused to recognize the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet empire. It is my view that a continuance of this policy is very important, especially to those who look to the freedoms enjoyed by our citizens as a goal to be reached at all costs. These people are risking their lives daily to obtain religious and political freedom for their country.

On the celebration of the 722d anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian State, and the 55th anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania in 1918, our hearts and our prayers go out to these brave people in support of their continuing struggle.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the Record, the resolution which was passed by the Lithuanians of New Jersey concerning this observance:

UNITED COMMITTEE OF LITHUANIAN- AMERICANS RESOLUTION

We, Lithuanian-Americans of New Jersey, gathered in Newark on February 11, 1973, to commemorate the 55th anniversary since the restoration of Lithuania's independence.

Recall: That the sovereignty and independence of the Lithuanian State, which was restored by the act of the Lithuanian Council on February 16, 1918 and protected by the bloody sacrifice of the Lithuanian people, was recognized by the international community;

That in 1940 the Soviet Union occupied

and incorporated Lithuania into the USSR in violation of international law;

That this occupation resulted in acts of genocide, deportation to Siberia, and extermination of about one million Lithuanians;

That these illegal acts still continue to this present day as witnessed by the following acts which received worldwide attention:

The defiant courtroom speech of the sailor Simas Kudirka, following his unsuccessful attempt to escape to the free world on November 23, 1970, and his condemnation in May, 1971 to ten years in forced labor prison;

The self-immolation of Romas Kalanta, a young student and worker, in May 1972, which symbolized the Lithuanian people's protest against the occupying power and their demand for freedom;

The petition of 17,000 Lithuanian religious believers in 1971-1972 to Leonid Brezhnev and Kurt Waldheim, protesting the denial of religious freedom in Soviet occupied Lithuania, under the risk of their personal freedom.

We resolve: To request the President of the United States of America to instruct his delegates at the Conference on European Security and Cooperation in Helsinki to demand the withdrawal of the Soviet Union from the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and permit these people to exercise their sovereign rights in their own lands; To ask the Congress of the United States for their support of this request.

V. MELINIS,

President, Lithuanian Council of New Jersey.

K. JANKUNAS,

President, Lithuanian-American Community of New Jersey.

UNITING YOUTH WITH OPPORTUNITIES

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, it is once again my privilege to pay tribute to the Future Farmers of America who began their national week of celebration on February 17 commemorating the 45th anniversary of this outstanding agricultural youth organization. It is no accident that the anniversary of the birth of the Father of our Country falls within FFA's national week because FFA designates their national week in honor of George Washington who, as many of us may not realize, by his own admission, stated that his first love and interest was farming and who contributed many significant and worthwhile advancements to agriculture.

The theme for FFA's national week this year is "FFA Unites Youth With Opportunities." Today, this is a topic which is very fitting and appropriate when, for America's youth, choosing a career is an extremely difficult decision. However, for FFA members this decision is made easier. During 1973, over 110,000 members will graduate from agribusiness education courses and qualify for job placement relating to the broad field of agriculture. As we all know, farming is now and always has been our Nation's largest industry and in order to cope with the ever-increasing problems of feeding an over-populated world, it is more im-

portant than ever that agriculture in America remain strong.

Nationally, the FFA is composed of 432,000 boys and girls between the ages of 14 and 21 who reside in the United States, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and study vocational agriculture in 8,000 public schools with the primary aim being the development of agricultural leadership, through a spirit of co-operation and good citizenship. By encouraging its members to assume responsibility, take the lead, speak out in public, work with others and make decisions, FFA provides an opportunity for these young people to develop personal as well as career potentials. Indeed, the Future Farmers of America unites youth with their opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, on the basis of what I have observed in my experience and association with the FFA chapters in the Second Congressional District, I feel sure that this program has been and will continue to be a success. In my opinion, FFA provides its members excellent opportunities to grow and become outstanding leaders and citizens, and through its membership, represents a dynamic youth with a purpose. As an illustration of this dynamic youth with a purpose, the Future Farmers of America established the building our American communities program which was initiated 4 years ago to involve members in activities to improve job opportunities and living conditions in rural communities. A new community park, ecological center, outdoor recreational facility, employment service for youth people—these are but a few of the activities carried out last year by members who participated in this program which was designed to improve communities across the Nation, and I am confident that the continuation of this rewarding program will prove to be even more successful during 1973.

National FFA Week affords us all an opportunity to better witness the fine work of these young men and women and to salute this splendid organization on the unlimited agricultural contributions that have been made by its membership. To all of my young friends in the Future Farmers of America, I offer them my congratulations, best wishes and continued support.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF UNITED STATES LINES

HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress whose district is closely tied to the merchant marine, shipbuilding, and seafood industries, I am pleased to note the 100th anniversary of United States Lines, one of the world's foremost ship lines. I make particular note of this anniversary at a time when United States Lines stand in the vanguard of our Nation's efforts to maintain a competitive position in international ocean commerce.

United States Lines has done more

than keep the pace with the rest of the shipping world. Today, a full century after its birth, United States Lines is still forging new channels in ocean commerce with its vigorous promotion and improvement of services. And its fleet of 16 high-speed, high-capacity containerliners provides shippers with service to more than 50 gateways to the world's major marketplaces.

Computers, streamlined containerization techniques, high-speed transfers, and a host of other inventions are trademarks of United States Lines. This world of competition breeds new ideas each day, but this particular shipping company has its own ideas. The future with United States Lines is today—not tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I represent the coastal area of Mississippi, where one of the world's most streamlined, efficient, and productive shipyards is located. I grew up with ships. My father built ships. My neighbors worked in the shipyard. Ships have been a major source of income to my district for as long as I can remember. We understand ships. And we understand the importance of establishing and maintaining a competitive position in international ocean commerce.

United States Lines has firmly established itself in international competition for commerce. Because of that, and because we owe this shipping giant a debt of thanks for helping maintain our position in international competition, I salute United States Lines on its 100th anniversary.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we hear a great deal of discussion about "detente" and an easing of tensions between East and West, the unfortunate fact is that millions of men and women continue to live under Communist tyranny and continue to see their own national life destroyed by those who have, since 1917, been practicing a brutal and ruthless form of colonialism.

On February 16, Americans of Lithuanian descent together with Lithuanians through the world commemorate the 55th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania, whose history dates back to the 12th century. It is an irony indeed that the only country in which Lithuanians will be unable to observe this event will be in Lithuania itself.

It was in 1251 that Mindaugas the Great unified the Lithuanian principalities into one Kingdom. For the better part of their history, the Lithuanians have been subjected to brutal attacks, from the Teutonic knights in the West and from the Russians in the East. It has taken remarkable spiritual and ethnic strength to survive these pressures.

Many Americans have forgotten the history even of our own era. After the

Nazis and Soviets destroyed Poland in September 1939, the Kremlin moved troops into the Baltic Republics and annexed them in June 1940. Thus, the independence of Lithuania was terminated on June 15, 1940, when the Soviet Union sent an army of occupation of 140,000 men into that country. With the support of the occupying force, the Soviets staged mock elections, in which only one slate of Moscow-sponsored candidates was allowed, and through this subversion of the will of the people, formally annexed Lithuania.

The Lithuanian people have shown their hostility to Soviet rule, and have paid a heavy price for such opposition. On June 22, 1941, the Lithuanian people revolted against the Soviet occupation and control and proclaimed the reestablishment of an independent state. This effort cost the Lithuanians almost 12,000 casualties. The Provisional Government, proclaimed by the leaders of the revolt, was disbanded as Lithuania was occupied by the German armies on the march into the Soviet Union.

From 1945, when the Soviet Union reimposed its rule, until approximately 1953 an armed patriotic resistance movement waged a war against the Communists with approximately 50,000 Lithuanian patriots losing their lives. The Soviet leaders, in an effort to eliminate the national resistance, deported about every sixth Lithuanian to the distant parts of the Soviet Union or to concentration camps, where a large number of them died as a result of the harsh conditions, starvation, and executions. Trials of partisans were held as late as 1955.

Lithuania, together with the other Baltic Republics, Latvia and Estonia, represent a special example of Soviet colonialism. They have been physically annexed by the Soviet Union and forcibly incorporated into its group of "socialist republics." As far as the Communists are concerned, these three countries have ceased to exist as separate entities entitled to their own national identity and independence.

During his trial Simas Kudirka, the Lithuanian seaman turned back to the Russians by the U.S. Coast Guard in a shocking reversal of America's humane treatment to all those seeking freedom, declared that:

I have nothing to add to what I have already said, only one wish, more specifically a request to the supreme court and the government of the Soviet Union: I ask that you grant my homeland, Lithuania, independence.

The Soviet Union has been unable to suppress the aspirations of the Lithuanian people for freedom and the exercise of their human rights. This was recently demonstrated by a petition to the United Nations, signed by 17,000 Lithuanian Catholics, charging the Soviets with religious persecution and by riots in Kaunas on May 18, 1972, following the funeral of a Lithuanian youth, Romas Kalanta, who had self-immolated in a public square in Kaunas in a dramatic protest against the Soviet occupation of his country.

As we commemorate this important

anniversary today, our request should be the same as that of these Lithuanian patriots: that Lithuania be granted independence. It is a request which all Americans should share, particularly those who are most vehement in their denunciations of colonialism and imperialism when they think that those committing such acts are on the political right.

All those who deny man's freedom and dignity, and the right of peoples to self-determination should be equally condemned. We must not forget that it is the Soviet Union which has perpetrated this new colonialism across the face of Eastern Europe.

Lithuanian independence and freedom, as well as the independence and freedom of other subjugated nations and peoples, must remain an important goal for all of those in our own country who seek a world at peace. The only peace which will advance mankind is a peace based upon the respect for each man and nation to have an identity and a life of its own. The kind of peace based upon subjugation and surrender to tyranny is one which honorable men can endorse only at the price of their own integrity.

THE 55TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, February 16, was the 722d anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian State and the 55th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania. Americans of Lithuanian descent can indeed be proud of their illustrious heritage which dates back over seven centuries. This small country by the Baltic Sea has endured a great deal during those 700 years, and the courage exhibited by the Lithuanian people can only be equalled by a few.

Lithuania's independence only lasted 22 years, for in 1940 the Soviet Union forcibly occupied the country. The people of Lithuania have remained under Soviet rule since that time, but they have never lost their faith that someday they will be free to choose their own government.

It is truly tragic that the powerful countries of the world have not yet learned that their will should not be forced upon other nations whether it be their neighbors or nations on the other side of the globe.

The people of Lithuania have displayed a remarkable courage over the years that has served as a source of inspiration for all of the world's people. With the passing of this 55th anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania, all Americans should pray that sometime in the near future the Republic of Lithuania will once again be a reality.

MEATCUTTERS ANSWER READER'S DIGEST

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the January 1973, issue of Reader's Digest carried an article written by James E. Roper which attempted to lay the blame for high food prices solely at the door of organized labor.

As is the case in many articles written by "instant experts" these days, the Reader's Digest article failed to tell both sides of the story. The Western Federation of Butchers of California has answered Mr. Roper in an editorial published in its January 1973, newsletter, "Between Us." I wish to insert the editorial in the RECORD at this time and recommend it for reading.

READER'S DIGEST PUBLISHES ATTACK ON MEAT CUTTERS

The scouts in war, and the scouts in the world of fun and games, help form the strategy or tactics of their generals and coaches by the information they bring them after their observations in the field. This information the leaders will use in the ensuing conflict. Often the scout reports signs that put the home forces on the alert.

When the scout reports that the opposition camp is restless and he hears the sounds of marching tunes then it behooves the leadership and the tacticians to post their sentries and to see that their flanks are covered.

1973 will be a year during which we can expect the employer's strategy to come crashing down upon over 4 million workers in America with all the might and power that management can muster. The attack will come on the 4 million-plus workers who are protected under bargaining agreements which are due to expire during the next twelve months.

If we had a scout "out" at this moment he would surely observe that there is plenty of activity in the camp of our friendly adversaries in the board-rooms and directorships of many major corporations. This scout would undoubtedly see the highly visible sign posted in the January issue of Reader's Digest. He would then certainly report, with all haste, that this vicious and vitriolic anti-labor attack was published under the guise of informing the public, "Why Food Prices Keep Rising" and engineered by James E. Roper to begin to "heat-up the kitchen."

Roper irresponsibly lashes out at the Clerks, the Teamsters and the Meat Cutters on behalf of food employers, using the subterfuge that management is forced to raise prices because of the "featherbedding, make-work and greed" of the labor unions involved in food distribution. He challenges that housewives are forced to pay "hidden costs at the checkout counter" by the workers who belong to labor unions who are not providing "a day's work for a day's pay."

Nowhere in the article does the author allow that the massive profits retail chains are enjoying is a benefit derived from wages which have been frozen since August 1971 while no controls were placed on raw farm materials. No mention is included of the fact that processed foods and other supermarket commodities have been held to price "ceilings" equal to the average profit or mark-up enjoyed by the chains in the best two fiscal periods during the prior three (now extended to 2 of 4) periods before the "freeze."

Investment counselors from Wall Street to Pacific coast financial consultants now advise investment and stock purchases in retail food chain corporations with the same confidence they suggest "blue-chip" holdings, but Reader's Digest validates Roper's claim the supermarket profit structure is down. He even makes the unlikely statement, "most supermarkets today lose money on their beef sales—and compensate by raising prices on other items." Yet, the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Department of Agriculture have published testimony showing a 33.3% gap existing between wholesale and retail food prices.

Roper's story is a fantasy wrought with fiction and conceived with the publisher's full approbation despite the obvious omission of most of the reasons which are the chief causes of increased price rises. Primary among the "obvious" is the tremendous demand being made upon our relatively short supply of red meat, not alone in the United States but all over the World during these most affluent times. But, the age-old concept of price being established by supply and demand apparently has escaped the reasoning of this profit-oriented penman.

The meat operations in supermarket chains is, universally pretty well agreed upon as averaging, 6% of the gross for labor costs—and in many, many places it is even less. This establishes that in the retail price paid by the housewife at the checkout counter there are only six pennies in every dollar she spends for meat items chargeable to labor. Roper representing the will of the corporate overlords of the food industry would like to have the public believe that ALL price increases are a direct reflection of higher wages and fringe benefits accruing to the employee. This just is not so!

Under the existing collective bargaining agreement now in force in Southern California, for example Meat Cutters covered by the Retail Market contract received a \$10 per week—or 25 cents per hour—raise in November of last year. The regularly scheduled increase was due under the terms of the agreement which was initiated in 1969 and amounted to less than the allowable guidelines of 5.5% established by the Cost of Living Council.

Approximately 13,000 men and women are protected by the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL-CIO bargaining representation in this area and their November 1972 increase was something close to 4.4%.

Final Department of Agriculture figures for 1972 are still not available but every housewife in America knows without Reader's Digest's help that beef is costing her more and more. It also costs the butcher's wife more and more, it should be observed, unless the lords of industry have suddenly had a change of heart and are granting reduced prices to their supermarket employees.

In the absence of year-end statistics we recently surveyed the prices of one of the country's largest supermarket chains which possibly has the greatest number of store outlets in Southern California and is therefore a highly competitive and price-wise merchandiser.

During the last week of 1972 this chain carried 60 beef items in its meat-cases for retail sale. The varying cuts ranged from filet steaks at a high of \$3.09 per pound to (they used to be "free") clean-bone at a low of 11 cents per pound. The average per pound price of beef in this chain, during that week, for all cuts was \$1.38.

Multiply that average by the estimated 118 pounds of beef consumed by the average American in 1972 and then multiply again by the 10 million Southern Californians (a minimal population estimate according to 1970 Census standards) facing the dilemma

of high beef prices. Our multiplied answer would have a dollar total in the billions.

For some reason none of that type of information got into Roper's article. Neither did the fact that the Department of Agriculture published statistics were available to confirm that during the 15 years from 1956 to 1971 the average Butcher and Meat cutter doubled his wages, but despite fewer workers in the industry, these skilled artisans increased the production of meat so tremendously that they were able to hold down the cost of one pound of meat per manhour of work to less than one-third of one cent (.031¢) per hour. (See, "Productivity Report" prepared by the Research Department of the International and the Western Federation of Butchers, 1972.)

The employer's line-of-reasoning follows through all of the Digest report and the author chooses to ignore the many U.S. agency reports available. Roper maligns working people and disregards the good citizens who personally must meet the spiraling costs of the economy without the due process of free and open collective bargaining procedures. Food workers pay is "frozen" . . . It has been throughout Phase I and Phase II—and now it is again in Phase III.

Yet food workers pay higher prices, taxes, interest and all the other "indulgences" that plague the middle income earner.

How, with any common sense can the worker then be guilty of price-gouging, as this article so unjustly colors him?

Perhaps the publishing of this slanted and unfair article was devoid of common sense?

Perhaps the scouts will be heard reporting to their strategists that the "rustling of sabres" observed in the Reader's Digest camp is merely the beginning . . . the beginning of a 1973 campaign? A campaign to place the blame for high food prices other than where it truly belongs—and that is with those food employers who are not combating the increases passed on by their suppliers, but who in turn pass it along to the consumer, while the corporations enjoy the profits of the harvest they reap from the toil of union men and women.

WITH DEVALUATION, THE DOLLAR CONTINUES TO DIMINISH

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we have all viewed with concern the most recent devaluation of the American dollar.

Recalling when the Smithsonian devaluation was announced in December 1971, then Secretary of the Treasury John Connally hailed that agreement as one of the most significant monetary agreements in the history of the world.

As the Evening Star pointed out editorially recently, we are still awaiting the beneficial effects we were promised from the Smithsonian devaluation—and a little more than a year later, we see a second devaluation.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter, I place in the RECORD an editorial from the Evening Star and an article by James Reston of the New York Times:

THE DIMINISHED DOLLAR

Devaluation of the dollar in some form was inevitable, given the recent facts of international economics. The flight from our currency in the world's money markets, discounting speculative shenanigans, reflected firm evidence that the dollar was overvalued with respect to some other strong currencies, notably the Japanese yen (which may now float even higher with respect to the dollar) and the West German mark. The evidence included the worsening deficits in our trade and balance of payments.

In declaring a 10 percent direct devaluation of the dollar, for international purposes, President Nixon seems to have done what was necessary to restore temporary order on the world monetary scene, in the process sparing some of our trading partners the politically complicated job of revaluing their currencies upward. The United States hopes to benefit from the change by selling more goods abroad at cheaper, more competitive prices, while holding down domestic purchases of more expensive imports. That should help our trade balance and protect American business and jobs, although the similar effect from the Smithsonian devaluation of December 1971 is still awaited.

There are unpleasant effects as well. Travel by Americans in various parts of the world will be more expensive. And while American consumers may be deterred by the higher price tags on some foreign-made goods, the rising cost of imports will push up our cost of living.

Other dangers flow from the latest currency crisis and its aftermath. The threat of more self-defeating protectionism in our trade policy may have been heightened—a problem that was not helped by the terms in which the President asked Congress for new authority in trade negotiations. He stressed the power to raise, as well as lower, tariffs in order to gain concessions for our exports, a tough line that could encourage a protectionist-minded Congress to legislate less discretionary trade barriers than Mr. Nixon wants.

One of the clearest lessons of the dollar crisis, and the stopgap devaluation measure, is that basic reform of the international monetary system is urgent. The old Bretton Woods machinery, which served the postwar world so well, has lain dismantled for a year and a half. A replacement, based on modern realities, is badly needed, and the lagging negotiations should be speeded.

MANY DEVALUATIONS IN AMERICA

(By James Reston)

Almost everybody is being very cool in Washington about the devaluation of the dollar. Secretary of the Treasury Shultz, slipping out of Alice Longworth's 89th birthday party to spring the news, suggested that we must look on the dollar crisis as an "opportunity," and since then it has been discussed almost as a blessing.

This is the new thing in Washington: No-fault government. Noble principles of balanced budgets are proclaimed and then repudiated. Disastrous policies are introduced and then reversed, but nobody's to blame. It is called the "New Pragmatism" or "facing up to realities," and in the present monetary crisis, as in the withdrawal from Vietnam there is much to be said for it.

But at best, the New Pragmatism is a recovered fumble, with a lot of lost yardage, and maybe we have to face up to the larger reality: That a lot of other things were devalued in America before the dollar, and contributed to the present monetary crisis.

In relation to Japan and Germany, the U.S. lead in science, mass production, distribution, and services was devalued in the export markets of the world long before the

devaluation of the dollar. Let's face it: Over the last two decades, U.S. management-labor relations, and U.S. competitive relations with the rising industries of Japan and Western Europe have declined.

The result is that in 1971, the United States had a trade deficit of more than \$2 billion for the first time in this century, and last year, the U.S. deficit was almost \$7 billion. No doubt this deficit will be helped by devaluing the dollar by 10 percent, which will make the things we sell abroad cheaper and the things we buy from abroad dearer, but the chances are that it won't really deal with the devaluation of American work, or the devaluation of American products, which are often built to wear out for the affluent American market, but not to endure for the less-affluent markets abroad.

All kinds of things are being devalued in America today, beginning with the English language. Only a few months ago, President Nixon proclaimed the Smithsonian agreement on the devaluation of the dollar and the revaluation of the world's currencies as "the most significant monetary agreement in the history of the world," but now the dollar is devalued again, with official promises that maybe this time all will be well.

More important, the Democratic process in Washington is now being seriously devalued. The President and the Congress are not really talking to one another about their common problems of keeping the federal budget within noninflationary limits. They are fussing with one another about the Constitution, and who is in charge of expenditures and priorities, and playing politics with what both agree is one of the most serious questions of international economic policy since the end of the last world war.

Meanwhile, the larger questions of politics and philosophy and national purpose are being lost in this squabble over the budget, the price of gold, and the relative value of the American dollar, the Japanese yen, and the German mark.

These are obviously important questions, but they are not the main or the ultimate questions. Walter Lippmann has been in Washington this week, full of years and wisdom, and he stated the central problem many years ago.

"We are not used to a complicated civilization," he said. "We don't know how to behave when personal contact and eternal authority have disappeared. There are no precedents to guide us, no wisdom that wasn't made for a simpler age. We have changed our environment more quickly than we know how to change ourselves."

"And so we are literally an eccentric people, our emotional life is disorganized, our passions are out of kilter. Those who call themselves radical float helplessly upon a stream amidst the wreckage of old creeds and abortive new ones . . . those who make no pretensions to much theory are twisted about by fashions, crazes, at the mercy of milliners, and dressmakers, theatrical producers, advertising campaigns, and the premeditated gossip of the newspapers."

What he was saying then—and he was saying it again in private this week—was that we could not solve our problems by techniques, by monkeying with monetary rates, or arguing about the right of the President to "impound" money voted by the Congress, or by reorganizations of the White House or the Congress.

He was saying, in effect, what John Maynard Keynes said just before he died: That economic and financial questions were important but secondary to philosophic questions about the purpose of life, and that we had to get our purposes and objectives straight first. This is still the problem in Washington and the other major capitals of the non-Communist world.

COMMUNITY SUPPORTS EDUCATION PROGRAM

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, today, in a time when more and more Americans are asking the Government to solve problems for them, a farsighted community in my district is doing its share to help provide financial assistance to its students.

The Willingboro, N.J., PTA scholarship foundation, chartered by the State of New Jersey, is working to build an education fund so that scholarship assistance can be provided to Willingboro students seeking post-high school education.

The ultimate goal of the foundation, now about 3 years old, is to provide financial aid to enable every township high school graduate who wants to continue his education to do so.

The foundation has won the support from a number of other civic organizations, including the local Rotary, Clergy Association and the Jaycees.

The idea behind the foundation is simple—amass a quantity of funds, invest it in very risk-free areas, and use the interest to send kids to college, technical, or vocational schools.

The foundation is seeking financial support from individuals, business firms, and other philanthropic entities. It is not asking for tax dollars.

The foundation is operated by a five-member board of trustees, which includes individuals of varied backgrounds—all of whom are interested in helping to promote higher education opportunities for students from their community.

Almost a year ago, the Burlington County Times, the daily newspaper which serves Willingboro, commented:

It could take a decade or longer for the Foundation to reach its ultimate goal. Indeed, it will require a healthy sum, diligently invested, to produce enough income to aid every graduate who needs assistance.

But if "a journey of a thousand miles begins with but a single step," a goal of community-wide scholarships must begin with those first dollars.

The concept answers a pressing need. College costs are soaring beyond the means of many middle and low income families; taxes to support state educational institutions are also on the increase, and private colleges are in trouble due to rising costs and students discouraged by high tuitions. The idea that a community can help provide for its young people is an encouraging one, and its success could set a pattern for other towns.

Continued support by Willingboro residents, organizations and industries will be necessary if the project is to achieve its goal.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we in the Congress should take a lesson from those dedicated civic leaders in Willingboro, N.J., who conceived and have initiated the Willingboro PTA scholarship foundation.

Perhaps, if it proves successful, it might serve as a model to help other communities provide similar financial assistance to their own students.

I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to offer my sincere appreciation to Mr. John W. Kolb, Robert P. Goldy, Harry D. Ambrose, Jr., Elfriede Reiting and Carl P. Schulze, for their untiring work in promoting this worthwhile goal.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked the 55th anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania and the 722d anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian State. I should like to take this opportunity to salute the courageous people of that nation.

It is once again my pleasure to join in the recognition of these events. Rather than joyous celebration, however, this is a time for us to reflect upon the freedoms we enjoy in the United States that the people of Lithuania so desperately desire.

By accident of geography, Lithuania has been forced to suffer from its position on the Baltic, incurring frequent threats from the Teutonic peoples on the west and Russia on the east. It took remarkable ethnic cohesiveness and determination to survive the pressures from both sides. Unfortunately, as the Members of this body know, the Baltic States have been deprived of their independence since 1940.

At this precarious time in history, when global peace finally appears attainable, it saddens me that the only country in which Lithuanians will not be able to observe these historical anniversaries is in Lithuania itself.

The forthcoming European Security Conference should shine new light upon the question of the territory of the Baltic countries. The policy of the United States and other nations of maintaining non-recognition of the incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Empire must continue if any of these nations are to achieve genuine independence.

Americans of Lithuanian descent, including many of my constituents, have continued the customs of their culture to the benefit and enrichment of this Nation. The cherished tradition of liberty and the historical and familial ties that exist between the Baltic and American peoples encourages the type of congressional attention that we are able to focus on the plight of Lithuania. I join all Americans in hoping that the fundamental right of self-determination will be returned to our Baltic brethren.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
LOBERO THEATER

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, the city of Santa Barbara, one of California's early mission towns and a cultural center of southern California, will be celebrating on February 22 the 100th anniversary of the Lobero Theater. I commend the many dedicated citizens who have made this centennial possible, and I am proud to insert in the RECORD a proclamation by the mayor of the city of Santa Barbara commemorating this historic event:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the Lobero Theatre, one of the oldest and most important continuing theatre operations in the western United States, is celebrating its 100th anniversary season in the beautiful Spanish colonial edifice which is located on the site of the original adobe at Canon Perdido and Anacapa Streets. This event is an important milestone in the cultural history of Santa Barbara; and

Whereas, for generations a symbol of the ever-expanding artistic climate of our City, the Lobero Theatre has served its community in many ways: on its stage have appeared the great performing artists of the world in concert, the great actors and actresses of their day in plays representative of every era and style, and countless amateur and semiprofessional groups from within the community itself. While attracting world-famous performers to Santa Barbara through the years, the Lobero Theatre has at the same time encouraged the development of drama, music and dance among the citizens of the community at large by offering its facilities for widespread local use, and by generously making its Rehearsal Hall and first-class Ballet Studio available to those who would teach the lively arts, and those who would learn. The income derived from its modest charges being far less than what is required to maintain the facility and keep it in first-class condition, the difference is made up annually by a very large and generous number of local citizens, the Lobero Theatre Foundation, led by a group of some two dozen Directors, who serve entirely voluntarily and without remuneration because they are deeply interested in the Lobero Theatre and the role it continues to play in the City which has grown up around it; and

Whereas, during this Lobero Centennial Year beginning on February 22, 1973, the Lobero Theatre Foundation and Executive Director Roger A. Clarke will, as guardians of a unique theatre tradition and overseers of a wide-ranging variety of quality entertainment and instruction, continue to bring great credit and national recognition to Santa Barbara as a center of cultural distinction.

Now, therefore, I, Gerald S. Firestone, by virtue of the authority vested in me as Mayor of the City of Santa Barbara, California, do hereby proclaim the year beginning February 22, 1973, as Lobero Centennial Year in the City of Santa Barbara, and urge all Santa Barbarans and our neighbors in the south-coast communities to support and participate in the many rewarding events in connection therewith.

A MATTER OF FISCAL DISCIPLINE

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, on January 19, the Washington Post printed two articles on the so-called budget debate.

One was a presentation by Senator ERVIN which contained statements being heard frequently in the Congress about "Executive usurpation of legislative power."

The second article, by Mr. Charles E. Walker, former Assistant Secretary of Treasury, took another point of view, one that we do not hear enough of in these Halls. His point was that the question is not whether the President or the Congress is king-on-the-hill, but whether this country is to spend or not to spend. I deplore the "erosion of legislative powers," which I believe is largely self-inflicted, but I believe that ex-Secretary Walker is correct in that the real question is, or should be, one of fiscal discipline.

I commend the Walker article, which follows, to my colleagues:

A MATTER OF FISCAL DISCIPLINE

(By Charles E. Walker)

To spend or not to spend . . . that is the question. Or, at least, it should be the question, but many people insist on talking about who's in charge, Congress or the President.

When it comes to control of federal purse-strings, don't get me wrong. Who's in charge is important. The respective constitutional powers of the Congress and the President over spending have to be sorted out, and the sooner the better. But the "Battle of the Budget 1972" is really about something else: Can Congress put its house in order, promptly and efficiently, so that the President is not in effect forced to man the fiscal barricades alone? With budget control central in the administration's game plan to prevent a recurrence of demand inflation, the problem is urgent. The President could use some help.

The problem results from the inherent—and understandable—tendency of any Congress to overspend. Constituents like federal spending in their communities. But—also quite understandably—they do not like to pay for that spending through higher taxes.

As a non-lawyer, the constitutional issues in the spending-impoundment hassle are too deep for me. As Attorney General, Ramsey Clark said President Johnson could impound, but Bill Rehnquist, as an Assistant Attorney General, said Mr. Nixon could not. Now the new Deputy Attorney General says Mr. Nixon can impound if he wants to. Common sense tells me that the President surely cannot spend that which Congress has not appropriated. Common sense also tells that only the strictest of purists would insist that the President spend funds for purposes that are clearly dumb and unsupportable. But that's what some of the rhetoric from Capitol Hill might suggest.

The President's critics argue that the impoundments represent a sudden grab for power. There might be some weight to this argument if Congress had been taken by surprise, but it was not. Mr. Nixon fired sev-

eral warning shots across Congress' bow, going back to July 1970, when he first endorsed the concept of the full employment budget and urged Congress itself to enact a tough, ironclad ceiling on federal spending—one that, in contrast to earlier efforts, would permit no exceptions.

Generally, Congress ignored these warnings. And it ignored a similar warning by President Nixon in January 1972. Many in Congress and the press seemed to believe that the President didn't mean it, and they greeted his strong reiteration of the request for a budget ceiling last July as simply an effort to create a political issue for the campaign.

The administration and its supporters had a winning issue, and knew it, for the typical voter believes strongly that he's not getting anything like his money's worth for the hard-earned tax dollars he sends to Washington. He believes that, one way or another, Uncle Sam ought to be able to struggle along on a quarter of a trillion dollars a year (the level of the proposed ceiling for this fiscal year). He also thinks Uncle Sam has probably grown too big for his britches.

But the President was serious in seeking that \$250 billion ceiling. So were Wilbur Mills and other Congressional leaders who agreed with the administration, and they almost won—at least both Houses agreed that \$250 billion was enough. But the administration really had something much more important than a campaign issue in mind—it wanted to force Congress, first, to discipline itself with the ceiling, and second, to reform itself by putting its shambles of a fiscal house in order.

Just a word on that shambles. At no time in any session does Congress sit down and say: Okay, we need a budget surplus because the economy is tight and overheating." Or, "A deficit because the economy is slack." Or, "A balance because the economy is in balance." Nor does Congress have any practical system for setting priorities. Bill after bill for a "good thing" comes to the floor, each very difficult for the typical congressman to oppose. When the question should be "which," our Congress (for understandable political reasons) most often says "both."

None of this is to say that pinning down constitutional responsibilities for the federal purse-string is unimportant. It is. And there are also matters of great significance relating to the specific areas where the President has impounded funds.

But Congress was warned. The presidential budget submitted in January 1972 was a blueprint for spending (with later adjustments) within the \$250 billion limit. At that time, Congress could have said that the limit was too low or, accepting the ceiling, rearranged the President's, priorities according to its own image.

Congress did neither. Now the ball is in its court, Congress can trumpet about constitutional prerogatives or it can get down to the hard work of setting its own fiscal house in order so as to regain the power that it has abdicated to the President. The work of the blue-ribbon Joint Committee on the Budget—established as a direct result of last year's fight on the spending ceiling—appears to be off to a promising start.

Admittedly, the President is trying to do something more in his impounding than restrain federal spending. He is also continuing the shift toward a New Federalism which started with general revenue sharing. But that's another issue. In this context, the issue of "To spend or not to spend" drives right to each American's pocketbook—the prices that he pays and the taxes that he bears.

Economically, the issue is clear-cut. Polit-

ically, I think Richard Nixon won the "Battle of the Budget 1973" almost before it began. The people are with him and have been for a long time.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON

HON. JOSEPH P. VIGORITO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1973

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, it was an honor and a great privilege to have served as a Congressman for 4 years under such a great President as Lyndon Johnson.

He was a man and President for all the people and he exhibited this throughout his life, especially in fighting for strong civil rights and social legislation.

The 89th and 90th Congresses, of which I was a part, will long be remembered by Americans for the many landmark measures that were passed at the prodding of President Johnson.

Many Congressmen, including myself, supported Johnson during his administration when he sent measure after measure to Capitol Hill because the time was right for legislation to improve our social and economic life.

President Johnson can best be remembered for his strong stand during the 1964 election campaign for aid to senior citizens in the form of Medicare.

At last, a segment of America which had contributed so much, were being compensated for their work in building the country. Lyndon Johnson saw the inequities in the form of poor health care for the elderly and was able to get the innovative legislation passed in the 89th Congress, of which I was a Member.

Lyndon Johnson was a great leader both in the Senate during his days as majority leader and during his 5 years as President. While in the Senate, Johnson came to know the intricacies and skills of the legislative process which made him one of the greatest legislators of our time.

This special skill became more apparent during the 4 years I was in Congress while he was President. It was one of the most productive years in terms of legislation signed into law.

Johnson will be especially remembered when he became President during a time of national tragedy and grief. He took over the reins of power of this country and brought the Nation back to normalcy after a trying period in American history. I can think of no one more qualified to take the leadership of this great country at such a critical moment.

Lyndon Johnson chose to carry on the hard work of John Kennedy and the ideas of such great men as Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman as he molded his administration programs for the period of the 1960's.

Many great things were accomplished during the Johnson years. Americans from every background will recall Lyndon Johnson as a man of courage and determination. He will have a place in history among our greatest leaders.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY WINNER

HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that Miss Valorie Ann Wade of West Fargo, N. Dak., has won the Voice of Democracy essay contest in North Dakota.

Valorie is a student at West Fargo High School and plans to enter the University of North Dakota this fall where she plans to study law.

She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Wyman Wade. To maintain freedom, Miss Wade says in her essay, young Americans must educate themselves, must become involved, and must feel a sense of loyalty.

Her essay deserves public attention, and I am proud to insert it in the RECORD, as follows:

ESSAY

I am a young American. Born in a country of hope, of prosperity, of justice and of freedom. I have a very big and a very important, yet not burdensome, responsibility to maintain my freedom. Not burdensome because I have a choice. A choice to uphold my freedom or take it for granted and pass the responsibility on to someone else. Somehow the latter is a cop out to me, and the former a hard obligation to define, for the answer is not found in words but in actions.

Now and in the future, I feel there are three things that I, as a young American, must do to become a responsible citizen to maintain my freedom. First, I must educate myself. To know and understand how the law and government system works. To realize the importance of bills before Congress and what they will mean once they are put into effect. To know who is the best man for the presidency and not be swayed by public opinion. As a young American it is vital that I use my knowledge in maintaining my freedom and exercising my right to vote in the upcoming years.

Secondly, I must become involved. This does not mean that I have to travel to a large city to demonstrate, cause riots, throw rocks and shout obscenities. There are many things I can do in my own community to become involved, such as helping clean up litter in the ever constant drive against pollution. People needing people, that's what this country is all about! The government is not a machine in which buttons are pushed and decisions made by a computer. It's people, men and women, young and old, black and white, involved in their fight for freedom, working together for the good of the nation.

And thirdly, I must feel a sense of loyalty. This is my country, for better or for worse, still my country. It is up to me, as an educated, involved, loyal person, to try to make the worse, whatever it may be, better. America is a country run by the people, a democratic nation. Responsibility to freedom does not come in one big package with instructions on how to be a good neighbor. It is something that is achieved bit by bit, and piece by piece which, when accumulated, equals a large, driving force of loyal, educated involved people that cannot be put down by such things as communism, a threat of nuclear warfare or pollution.

Freedom is a struggle, a fight for something sacred and precious. It is not always an easy struggle, but as long as there is man and a planet on which for them to live, there will be a fight for freedom. And, as a young

February 20, 1973

American, I will arm myself with knowledge, be involved with my country and my countrymen and I will loyally defend and uphold my freedom.

OFFENSIVE AND DEGRADING ADVERTISING

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, recently the Oldsmobile Division of the General Motors Corp. has come out with an "Il Signore" model automobile. In promoting this automobile, General Motors has employed the worst kind of racial stereotypes. This may be humorous to some but it is downright offensive to persons of Italian descent and to all Americans who find this kind of thing to be totally out of bounds.

Recently, *Il Progresso*, a very fine newspaper published by my good friend Fortune Pope, took issue with GM's selling campaign. I include this editorial—which expresses most effectively the view of more than 23 million persons of Italian descent, following my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to think that America has come beyond the point where lampooning a person because of his national heritage was considered good clean fun. However, when America's largest corporation stoops to this kind of thing one wonders just how far have we come.

The editorial follows:

OFFENSIVE AND DEGRADING ADVERTISING

Recently some local and out-of-town radio and television stations have been transmitting a commercial advertising an Oldsmobile, an "Il Signore" model.

The commercial is abusive and constitutes an insult to the intelligence of listeners and viewers of Italian origin. This commercial sets an unmistakable underworld theme. It uses words and expressions usually associated with the underworld, with phrases creating the impression that for anyone to buy this car it must have the characteristics of the "Signore", an expression which within the context of the commercial assumes the meaning of Underworld Boss or Godfather.

In the radio version the actor uses a strong southern Italian accent, the type usually associated with a gangster film character actor, who invites the people to a family feast, while the background is filled with music similar to the wedding party scene in the film "The Godfather".

The "Il Signore", the car with which one goes to the feast is also referred to as the Big Man (underworld term for the leader of a gang, with a "hood" as strong as steel and "bumpers" for "protection"). The commercial ends with the words "you are either with us or we kiss you good-bye" a term used, according to testimony given by underworld figure Joe Valachi, by gangsters to indicate a killing or murder.

The television version of the commercial has slight changes in its text but maintains the same theme. Here the announcer, who no longer has the southern Italian accent, indicates that with a car such as "Il Signore" one can acquire many friends and conquer much territory. To sum up, the commercial clearly implies again that Italian is synonymous to underworld and it creates the

image that an Italian-American is ready to pay \$5000.00 to gain from Il Signore, the same power to make friends and conquer territory as if he had the protection of a Don Corleone (the principal in the film "The Godfather") or any other "Godfather".

The creator of this advertising gimmick probably felt that he was providing the viewers and listeners with an amusing commercial. Assuming that this is so and that he was not motivated by sinister motives, he then must be an illiterate who is afflicted by a most dangerous form of illiteracy, a type lacking in good taste and intelligence, a much more pernicious disease when it is carried by a person responsible for preparing radio and television commercials.

Is it possible that he believes he can persuade people to buy cars by insulting and humiliating them? While one is amazed that the radio and TV stations, notwithstanding their own Code of Ethics, accepted these commercials, one is much more surprised by the fact that the Oldsmobile Company allows such offensive language to be aired in its name or in fact that it resorts to utilizing the talents of such a dullminded person, insensitive to slurs which humiliate and degrade not only the sponsors but the same mass media.

Rarely have commercials utilized so low a theme as the one being used for "Il Signore", and the 23 million Americans of Italian origin should feel dutybound to make their feelings known and protest vehemently by means of telephone calls, letters and telegrams, to the Oldsmobile Division of the General Motors Corporation.

Their protest will be much more meaningful if they refrain from buying the car advertised in these commercials until the Oldsmobile Company has eliminated this shameful advertising monstrosity from the airwaves and apologizes to the Italian-American community.

This is the only persuasive recourse and it must be used to prevent other idiots from writing trash so offensive and humiliating to Americans of Italian origin.

FOUR YEARS TO WHERE?

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, this Nation has heard so much about President Nixon's November mandate that the phrase has become hollow. It takes a man like W. O. Walker to come along and give the phrase new life and new meaning—through careful dissection.

In the January 27, 1973 edition of the Call and Post, Mr. Walker, the newspaper's editor and publisher, did precisely that. His probing examination of the President's mandate deserves the undivided attention of my colleagues.

Particularly significant in Mr. Walker's editorial, "Four Years to Where?" was his discussion of black Americans in relation to this mandate. It is W. O. Walker's central contention that, although Mr. Nixon received a very small percentage of the black vote, his large majority should make him a bigger man—it should make him truly a President of all of the people. Mr. Walker believes that one way in which this can be accomplished is by the President calling

a group of black leaders into his office and committing himself to correcting the serious denials of rights and justice to all of America's minorities.

I hereby present Mr. Walker's incisive editorial to this House:

DOWN THE BIG ROAD—FOUR YEARS TO WHERE?

(By William O. Walker)

With the inauguration last Saturday of Richard Milhouse Nixon as President of the United States of America, another four years of his administration of this nation's affairs was ushered in.

At the point of oath taking, Mr. Nixon again becomes the President of all the people, Republicans, Democrats, Independents, voters, non-voters, and any and all other segments of this nation's polyglot population.

In his second administration, Mr. Nixon carries into office one of the largest mandates of any man to hold this high office. While this mandate may be subjected to many and varied interpretations, there is no gainsaying the fact that a whole lot of people gave him a big vote of confidence.

Lopsided elections, especially in second terms, have to be interpreted by the victor as to just what it means. Unfortunately, people are not always clear as to the intent of their voting. It is the wise victor who can read between the lines, the fine and sometimes obscure intentions of the voters.

A big vote also frees the victor from being obligated to any specific group or class. For the mandate is so broad that it encompasses many desires and wishes.

Because of these facts, President Nixon is now free to pursue a course of his own choosing; to do the things he wants to do; to reward and punish as he sees fit.

This kind of a challenge and opportunity is awesome to any man. It is a temptation hard to resist. It is an opportunity few men have.

No President, whether he serves a long time or short time in office, can solve all the problems of this nation with its world-wide commitments. Therefore, he has to be selective as to the areas he wants to be active in; the things he wants to accomplish; the unfinished business he wants to complete; the new beginnings he wants to start.

Negroes did not support President Nixon last November. Yes, there were some percentage points improvement, but these do not alter the fact that Mr. Nixon enters his second term with no valid support obligations to Negroes.

This, however does not change the fact that the problems of the Negro cry out to the high heavens for redress. Righting the injustices our people have so long suffered is the greatest piece of unfinished business this and every other administration in the White House has had to face. It is a problem that cannot be shooed away, swept under the rug, ignored or forgotten. Every President since Washington has had to deal with this problem in one way or another.

Abraham Lincoln took the biggest and boldest step in abolishing slavery. This opened up new approaches to solutions. Some progress has been made since Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, but the goal of freedom is still elusive and the need for justice is still a challenge!

No longer is racial freedom, justice and rights, parochial to America. The narrowing of space and distance has made every nation, every race, our next-door neighbors. The staccato chant of "freedom now" is heard all over the world. The White House is concerned with racial strife not only in the United States, but in Israel, Africa, India and Ireland.

The American Indians have been the most exploited of our minorities, but, the Negro

has been the most used. Our muscle and our talents have been used to build the wealth of this nation; the benefits of which we have been denied. Our cries for freedom and justice are muted by the nation's mad rush for world power.

Because our cause is just and our motives pure, we seek only that to which we are entitled. No more, no less.

Negroes did not give Abraham Lincoln much support, but President Lincoln was big enough to embrace their cause.

So it is with President Richard M. Nixon. He now has the opportunity to be big enough to embrace our cause. The cause of justice is never a liability to those who have the courage to espouse it.

The Negro is too close to his long denied freedom to continue to be stymied. The gap has narrowed since Lincoln's move. President Nixon, if he wills, can close the remaining distance.

With peace returning to the world, President Nixon can now allocate some of his busy schedule time to this too long ignored problem. The factors of solution are not so complicated that any honest intentioned, fair-minded executive can't, within a reasonable time, make appreciable progress.

It would be a sensible and practical approach to reality if, in his wisdom, President Nixon assembled a small but reputable group to his office and requested their full and continuing cooperation in a sincere effort to once and for all, correct the serious denials of rights and justice to all of America's minorities.

The most any man can aspire for, is freedom and justice. And, this is the least any government should guarantee to any of its citizens. Surely before the next four years of President's administration ends, this is a laudable goal he should seek to attain.

From the ballot box, the Negro speaks in a small voice, but, in the halls of justice, the Negro's cause lies heavy on the conscience of this great nation.

A SALUTE TO THE FFA

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the week of Washington's birthday is set aside each year to observe another anniversary, that of the Future Farmers of America, and I want to join in congratulating and showing my support for our Nation's finest and most constructive youth organization.

The program of the FFA combines the development of our youth resources with total community development, and is effectively symbolized by the theme of their national week, "FFA Unites Youth With Opportunities."

In Minnesota we have 14,000 active current members and some 70,000 alumni in 268 high school chapters. Nationally, there are over 440,000 members in 8,276 chapters.

Mr. Speaker, being a farmer myself, and representing a very farm oriented congressional district, I have had a first hand acquaintance with the Future Farmers of America and the great work they have been doing since their founding days.

I am proud to see their accomplishments. I am proud of the dedicated, un-

selfish, clean-cut youth who are its members.

These young people are the agricultural and environmental leaders of tomorrow. As the need for food to feed a hungry world increases, our FFA members of today will play an ever more important role in maintaining the quality of life not only in Minnesota and America, but throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I want to personally commend our FFA leaders and members for their tremendous accomplishments in the agricultural and environmental fields.

MIKOLAJ KOPERNIK COMMEMORATED IN POEM AND PROCLAMATION

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, throughout 1973 Polish-Americans in my own 11th District in Illinois and all over the Nation are celebrating the 500th anniversary of the birth of Mikolaj Kopernik—Nicolaus Copernicus—the world-famous Polish scientist and astronomer.

It is important for all Americans to be aware of the social and cultural pluralism which has made America great, and it is in this spirit that I include the quinquennial proclamation by the distinguished Governor of Illinois, Hon. Dan Walker, and a commemorative poem by Marek Gordon. The proclamation and poem follow:

STATE OF ILLINOIS, PROCLAMATION

Because a lonely man five hundred years ago gazed at the stars through a rusted tube and thought and calculated, astronomers all over the earth will this year cooperate in commemorating the quinquennial of his birth.

Because of his studies and perceptions and courage Americans have explored the moon and our National Aeronautics and Space Agency will launch a new orbiting astronomical observatory named "Copernicus" in his honor.

The Gregorian calendar by which we regulate our lives today utilized the astronomical tables founded on his heliocentric concept that the sun is the center of the universe about which the planets revolve.

Nicolaus Copernicus, or Mikolaj Kopernik, who was probably best known and loved as a canon and physician during his lifetime, was also an economist, artist, lecturer, advocate, pharmacist and surveyor.

His heliocentric theory and his conception of the universe liberated men's thoughts from centuries of bondage and fertilized the minds not only of astronomers and physicists, but also of philosophers and humanists, marking the birth of modern science.

Therefore I, Dan Walker, Governor of the State of Illinois, proclaim the anniversary of his birth, February 19, 1973, Nicolaus Copernicus Day in Illinois and urge all citizens to appropriately observe the quinquennial.

PRIEST FROM THE BORDER

(By Marek Gordon)

they are counting
from ten to zero—
closing in the

computers old time
they also open
with counting a new era
Mikolaj Kopernik
was sleeping in his grave

we are rotating, people,
around orange,
which gives us
light, love, heat ...
that's it, that is it!

everything started
from small thinking,
in spare time ...
but if you put
your modern dime
into the time
machine

(that will happen
in the twenty-first
century, of course),
you will listen to
the lecture, that:

"Mikolaj Kopernik
was born on the
fighting border
between Poland and
Germany ...

(we are rotating,
don't you feel
that the globe
is going faster
than you?)

He asked for help
of Polish King
against
the Black Cross
Knights!

II

the Bishop and the Doctor
of the last resort—
proud of His knowledge,
not begging to any court.

(but, He was rotating
already in His
dreams out
of this world)

If you open the encyclopedia
(except a German one)
you will see the average priest
next to nothing in wealth
but He was counting alright
in the darkest ages
of suspicion
burning piles—
His mother tongue
was the stars,
His Country was the moon.
and soon the ruler
of the souls
and soon the father
of believing
sent Him the message
to come over
to Rome ... to Rome ...
but He was clever,
He stayed at home!

III

old fashioned rider
of the sky ...
people said: "he is wrong"
but HE WAS RIGHT
and He reached heaven
before death
through
the frustrations,
through regret—

He stopped the Sun
and moved The Earth
maybe not knowing
He converted
the whole concept
of life.

HE took the stars
to his cold bed

because his wife
was The Universe!

IV

maybe the children
will be asking us
(because the Children
want to know)—
had this really
happened?
o, yes—o, yes
this happened really
FIVE HUNDRED YEARS AGO!

V

this poem breaks
the sounding bracket ...
that the Kopernik
moves in the rockets
burning the gas or alcohol—
priest from the border
forever Pole.

SAVE MIGRANT WORKER HEALTH PROGRAM

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the passage of the Migrant Health Act in 1962, was one of the rare expressions of concern by the U.S. Congress for farmworkers and their families. Over the past decade, funds appropriated to migrant health have provided much needed, and otherwise unavailable health services to perhaps the single most cruelly exploited group of people in America.

Now we are told that the administration's proposed 1974 budget recommends the termination of the migrant health program. If this program dies, then it will just serve to confirm the already justifiable belief of most farmworkers that the Government just does not care what happens to them.

Congress should not allow this to happen. The need for a separate and distinct health program for migrants is manifestly obvious, and has been clearly demonstrated.

The health needs of farmworkers is a terrible indictment of our society's unwillingness to provide farmworkers with basic necessities which are taken for granted by most other American workers. The litany is overwhelming: Farmworkers are victimized by an incidence of disease, infant mortality, malnutrition, and other health deficiencies unsurpassed by any other sector of the population. Tuberculosis is 17 times more frequent, and infestation with worms 35 times more frequent among migrants than with the usual patient. Infant mortality and death from infectious diseases is 2½ times the national average. Epidemics of polio have recently occurred in areas highly concentrated by migrants; nutritional diseases remain common. The average life expectancy for a migrant is more than 10 years less than the average American's; the average American, compared to the migrant worker, has seven times the number of medical visits per year—4.3 as opposed to 0.61 visits—even though the farmworker is obviously more in need of care. Incredibly, in afflu-

ent America, 59 percent of migrant children under age 3 have had no immunization shots whatsoever. Quite simply, health statistics for today's migrants are comparable to national averages for the year 1930—it is a national disgrace.

Because farmworkers constitute a unique segment of our society, they, therefore, require programs specifically designed to meet their unique problems. As they move around the country, picking the food for our tables, farmworkers constantly encounter language barriers, cultural differences, and, as a consequence of their mobility, are unable to meet residence requirements which then denies them medical services. Studies clearly show that only a very few farmworkers ever become eligible for medicare or Medicaid.

Migrant health programs have been designed to meet the particular need of the people they serve. One hundred and seventeen single and multicounty health projects now assist farmworkers in 317 counties in 36 States. In my State of California, consumer-oriented health programs that should become prototypes for the rest of the Nation have been eminently successful. It has been exciting and gratifying to see programs developed to meet migrant workers' particular needs—it would be cruelly disheartening to see these programs lost because of a bureaucratic shuffle.

Farmworkers know from bitter experience what will happen to their health services if they become just one of many groups competing for scarce funds—farmworker programs will evaporate.

Four decades ago, John Steinbeck aroused the Nation with his accounts of the plight of farmworkers. But nothing was done. In 1960, the powerful television documentary, "A Harvest of Shame," rediscovered the problem. Still, little has been done. Now, in 1973, it appears that one of the few programs that Congress has enacted to specifically aid farmworkers is in jeopardy.

In response to the obvious needs of farmworkers, and in recognition of the lack of effectiveness of migrant health programs—despite the lack of adequate funding in the past—I am introducing a bill to extend the Migrant Health Act, and to significantly increase our financial commitment to the program. This bill would provide authorizations of \$60 million for fiscal year 1974, \$105 million for 1975, \$120 million for 1976, and \$135 million for 1977. In view of the fact that HEW officials have stated that to provide minimum standards of health care for the entire farmworker population eligible under the act would cost \$600 million, it is clear that my dollar figures are a bare minimum.

Meanwhile, unless action is taken immediately, there is every chance that come this summer, health clinics will be closing in the fields of America. Gone with these centers will be whatever small commitment we have made to the betterment of health conditions for farmworkers, as well as the commitment that the community that receives the services makes when participating in the development of these services.

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

A BILL TO EXTEND MIGRANT HEALTH ACT AND INCREASE APPROPRIATION

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Section 310 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting after "June 30, 1973," the following: "not to exceed \$60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, \$105,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, \$120,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and \$135,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977."

Sec. 2. Section 310 of the Public Health Service Act is further amended by striking "and" immediately before the clause designation "(ii)" in paragraph (1) and inserting at the end of such clause the following: "and (iii) premiums for a prepaid health care plan eligible for Federal assistance where such clinics or special projects so request. All such clinics, special projects, and prepaid health care plans shall provide outreach and follow-up services."

Sec. 3. Section 310 of the Public Health Service Act is further amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after the section designation and by adding at the end of such subsection the following new subsection: "(b)" There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, \$35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, \$40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and \$45,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977, to enable the Secretary to assist in the provision of necessary hospital care to domestic agricultural migratory workers and their families."

Sec. 4. Section 310 of the Public Health Service Act is further amended by adding at the end of new subsection (b) the following new subsection: "(c)" In making grants under this section the Secretary shall give priority to those applicants whose policy-making body is composed of a majority of persons who are consumers of its services, where competing applicants appear to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to be equally qualified."

LYNDON B. JOHNSON

HON. JAMES A. HALEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1973

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of humility I add my own remarks to the growing tribute to our late President, Lyndon Baines Johnson. Once again our country finds herself without the wisdom and advice of a living former President. Yet we can still look to the life of President Johnson for guidance in meeting the needs of this country today.

His assumption of the Presidency on one of the United States darkest days made him the first southern President in over 100 years, yet he transcended the politics of regionalism and sought first what was best for the Nation. He used his great leadership in conjunction with the Congress to lead the Nation, reaffirming the strength and vitality of our great people and the stability of our political system.

President Johnson was probably one of the most easily accessible Presidents for Members of Congress to see. He was a man of strong convictions, but he was also a man who listened to many voices. While many of his programs were controversial, he at least had the courage to present and support them.

It will take time for people to fully recognize and analyze his many good qualities, but I think history will judge him kindly.

IS PUBLIC TV UNDER THE HAMMER?

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, controversy is swirling about public noncommercial television these days and a former colleague of ours seems to be in the center of it. I refer to Thomas B. Curtis, former Congressman from Missouri and presently Chairman of the Board of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

Tom Curtis served in this chamber for 18 years and was known here as a man of great principle, fairness and independence. Now vice president and general counsel for Encyclopedia Britannica and the Encyclopedia Britannica Educational Corp., he serves without remuneration on the Board for Public Broadcasting in the interest of improving and strengthening national noncommercial radio and television. It is clear that charges which have greeted his appointment as chairman of the corporation were not made by persons with any knowledge of the character of the man involved.

One of the Nation's eminent columnists recently discussed the public broadcasting controversy and the role of Tom Curtis in it. Roscoe Drummond, an informed commentator on national events for many years, pointed out that criticism and controversy are not likely to dissuade Mr. Curtis from trying to carry out what he believes to be responsible, equitable and beneficial for public broadcasting. I believe many of my colleagues would be interested to read Mr. Drummond's enlightened commentary and I insert in the RECORD his column, "Is Public TV Under the Hammer?" of February 9, 1973.

IS PUBLIC TV UNDER THE HAMMER?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Now is the time for somebody to come to the defense of Thomas B. Curtis, the new and badgered Chairman of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

Or at least to set the record straight. Nothing more would be needed.

Here is a widely esteemed 18-year Congressman from Missouri, who is now Vice President and General Counsel of the Encyclopedia Britannica. The moment he was elected to head the instrument Congress created to develop educational radio and television—even before he had said anything, proposed anything, done anything—he was clobbered.

He was clobbered instantly, totally and

inaccurately, mostly by critics of the Nixon Administration, by many in the media who assume that nearly everything is a censorship plot and by those in television who assume that nothing could be better than the status quo.

The principal accusations aimed at Curtis before he could catch his breath—together with the facts which call them into question—are these:

Accusation—Nixon made Curtis Chairman of the CPB to enable the White House to "take over" public broadcasting.

Fact—The President couldn't make anybody Chairman of the CPB and didn't make Curtis Chairman. Curtis was unanimously elected by the fifteen members of the Board of the Corporation eight of whom were appointed by Lyndon Johnson.

Accusation—The White House wants to turn publicly financed, noncommercial TV into a propaganda arm of the Administration and expects to use Curtis to that end.

Fact—Unproved, I believe untrue and certainly unattainable. Tom Curtis can't be "used" by anybody. He is in nobody's pocket and never has been, as his colleagues in Congress know. One of his central objectives today is to make sure that public radio and television shall not be allowed to become a propaganda tool of this Administration or any future Administration. You can count on him for that.

Accusation—The White House is out to "destroy" public television and hopes the new Chairman will help.

Fact—Apparently the critics disdain logical reasoning. The Administration could hardly set out to destroy public television and at the same time expect to make it into a partisan propaganda arm. It wants to do neither—and isn't. During the first Nixon term Federal appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting rose from \$5 million in 1969 to \$35 million in 1972. The White House is asking Congress to increase this to \$45 million for the new fiscal year and to \$60 million for the next.

Accusation—The critics assume and assert that Chairman Curtis aims to wipe out public affairs programming, opposes controversial programs and wants only bland stuff.

Fact—They don't know this man Curtis. He has been a center of controversy throughout his whole political career, in Congress and out. He likes controversy; he believes in it; he sees it as a vital part of non-commercial television, a needed impetus to public awareness. He is an economic conservative and a civil libertarian and if his critics would take time to get acquainted with him, they would find him a valuable ally of public broadcasting.

During this early period of attack-first-and-get-the-facts-afterward, the aim seemed to be to immobilize the new Chairman before he could do anything. But Curtis doesn't immobilize easily and it is my conviction that in due time public television viewers will find him a boon and the public TV station directors and most producers will find him an asset.

Naturally he wants fairness and balance in controversial programs and in news commentary. He'll get it. The status quo isn't to be sacred. He would like to see more nationally produced programs, not less. He would like to see the local board members of the 223 public TV stations more active in shaping programs for local audiences. He would like to see public TV producing more that is different from commercial TV.

I suspect Tom Curtis will be around a while—and busy.

OMB PHANTOM STRIKES

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, one element of the debate over the Office of Management and Budget is that too often that Agency's decisions are made without any public light being shed on those decisions whatsoever.

In my remarks to this body on OMB, I have made such a point on several occasions.

A front page article in the Saturday, February 17, edition of the Washington Post discloses vividly the truth of my past complaints. The article, by Post writer Peter Braestrup, tells the harsh story of OMB's role in trying to cut back disability payments to amputee veterans of the Vietnam war.

The most frightening aspect of this story of OMB trying to save money at the expense of those men who have sacrificed so much is even President Nixon was not aware of OMB's plans. If such secrecy continues to result in political embarrassment to the administration, I would not be surprised to see the President down on this end of the avenue urging passage of the OMB control bills that have been introduced.

Also to be noted is the fact that officials of the Veterans' Administration are taking the blame for this snafu, and one official, Olney B. Owen, has been relieved of duty. Meanwhile, the backroom boys at OMB continue to scheme against fulfilling the domestic needs of this Nation.

At this time, I insert the article from the Washington Post in full in the RECORD:

OMB ORDERED VETERANS CUT

(By Peter Braestrup)

The White House Office of Management and Budget—rather than the Veterans Administration—ordered a \$160 million cut in veterans disability benefits that was withdrawn amid public uproar this week.

The actual history of the plan contrasts markedly with the public version. The VA took full responsibility for the proposal when it was circulated among veterans' groups and on Capitol Hill last week, and VA Administrator Donald E. Johnson defended the scheme as a matter of "equity."

And after critics protested that the chief losers would be Vietnam amputees, it was the VA that withdrew the plan on Wednesday—saying it was doing so on orders from the White House.

An examination of how the proposal was fashioned and implemented offers some insight into the workings of the OMB and the faceless federal bureaucracy, and into who suffers when things go wrong.

The story, as garnered from congressional and Nixon Administration sources, is complex, and some of the principal characters are unavailable to discuss their roles. Johnson was unreachable at a VA senior staff meeting held at the Hunt Valley Inn outside Baltimore. OMB officials were either unreachable or refused to discuss it in detail. And the White House said Thursday the snafu was purely the VA's fault.

However, the chief players in the bureaucratic drama appear to be these:

Veterans Administrator Johnson, 48, Iowa-born feed dealer, World War II infantry officer and former national commander of the American Legion (1964-65). Johnson, by all accounts, did not contest OMB's order last December for a \$160 million cut in overall disability benefits. Last week he publicly defended the proposed cuts as both economically "equitable" and medically justified.

James H. Cavanaugh, assistant director of the White House Domestic Council. According to OMB officials, veterans policy is one of his major concerns but his exact role in the VA budget process is cloudy. Cavanaugh could not be reached for comment yesterday.

Four men in the OMB, faceless to the public, who dealt with Johnson and his top aides on VA budget matters leading to the disability cuts. These are Paul O'Neill, the top policy-maker, and staff members William Fisher, James Tshiergi, and Fred Fletcher.

Olney B. Owen, 57, Kentucky-born Air Force veteran, a Republican and VA employee since 1946. He developed and sent up the proposed cuts to Congress Feb. 6, at Johnson's request, and was fired Wednesday as chief of VA's benefits department. Owen said yesterday that Johnson had given him no explanation for his dismissal from the \$31,000-a-year post. The Veterans of Foreign Wars said Owen was "apparently the scapegoat" for the snafu.

As Johnson emphasized earlier this week—before the cuts were withdrawn—the law allows the administrator to make periodic revisions of disability ratings which now affect 2.3 million ex-GIs, most of them pre-Vietnam veterans.

In 1968, the VA, with the help of the Census Bureau, did a study comparing the 1967 incomes of 500,000 physically or mentally disabled veterans of all wars and 14,000 non-disabled veterans. This study was to be the basis of any change in ratings.

(Congressional sources argue that any 1967 data had to underemphasize Vietnam veterans, since most of that group came home later.)

The data indicated that it was harder for a mentally ill veteran or an epileptic to get or hold a job than for an amputee. Thus—analyzed unemotionally on economic grounds—the amputee's impairment was considered less and therefore he should get a lower disability rating. On the other hand, the mentally ill should get a higher rating.

As a VA official privately emphasized, these ratings were "standards" to be used not for budget purposes but for judging relative "impairment" among the disabled, from 10 per cent up to 100 per cent for such things as total blindness or mental incapacitation.

The changes in ratings were slowly made. The VA's Disability Policy Board, consisting of lawyers, doctors and other specialists, reviewed the new mix under the aegis of James T. Taft Jr., director of VA compensation and benefits. Preoccupied with details of several thousand changes, no one in Taft's office "grasped the real magnitude" of the impact on Vietnam veterans, one source said.

In fact, however, the ratings changes meant sizeable cuts in monthly benefits for 200,000 Vietnam veterans. Most pre-Vietnam veterans were exempt from cuts since Congress imposed a freeze on any disability rating held 20 years or more.

For example, a Vietnam veteran whose leg is amputated at the hip currently has a 90 per cent rating, and gets \$275 a month. Under the changes he would get a 40 per cent rating, \$106 a month, losing \$169. If he happened to be married with a child, he would lose another \$53 monthly. Other benefits, tied to his 90 per cent rating, would also disappear with the change.

In 1971, VA officials including Owen testified on Capitol Hill on the administration's behalf. They urged congressmen to hold off

pressing for added disability benefits pending completion of the VA study.

Finally, on March 1, 1972, the proposed ratings changes—the same ones contained in a 200-page package that was sent to Capitol Hill on Feb. 6 of this year—were put together, at Johnson's urging.

Later that month, according to VA sources, Johnson was briefed on the changes by subordinates, including Owen and his deputy, Charles Peckarsky. The VA administrator was told three things:

The impact on the disabled Vietnam combat veterans—because of the drop in ratings for "bone and muscle" damage—would be considerable.

While \$100 million, under present payment schedules, would be saved by reducing amputee benefits, higher payments to 350,000 mentally ill would add \$286 million. Hence, the rating schedule would add \$186 million to the overall benefit payout.

The public uproar—from the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars and other groups—would be disastrous.

Later that Spring, Johnson and his top aides briefed Paul O'Neill and other OMB officials on estimated costs and impact.

But, at that point, it was strictly a "theoretical exercise," according to VA sources. Johnson by all accounts let the ratings change lie fallow. He ordered that outside medical consultants review the document.

In mid-December, however, as the annual tug-of-war over the next VA budget began with OMB, Johnson ordered that the ratings changes be made ready for public comment, bypassing the normal intra-agency review, under a schedule that would make the changes effective by late October instead of Jan. 1, 1974.

In early January, VA sources said, as Owen and his subordinates were reading the rating change document, Johnson told them to base it on the 1967 medical study. But he also said it would mean a \$160 million saving, ordered by OMB. Warren McDonald, Johnson's executive assistant, brought Owen's group illustrative OMB charts.

Ironically, however, the final document that went up at Johnson's order to Capitol Hill on Feb. 6 was essentially the March 1972 document and did not embody a \$160 million saving as had been "estimated" by OMB in the President's 1974 budget message. It embodied, according to VA sources, the same overall increase of \$186 million forecast a year earlier, even though 200,000 physically handicapped Vietnam GIs would lose benefits.

As public clamor broke Feb. 9, Johnson defended the medical and technical basis of the study and the \$160 million "cut." But, according to VA sources, Fletcher and other OMB officials this week "raised hell" because Owen's group had not revised the ratings to produce a \$160 million cut.

It appeared to VA sources that Johnson had promised OMB more than he could ask Owen and Co. to deliver without telling them to disregard VA's own technical study.

The document sent to Capitol Hill at Johnson's order caused an uproar with its sharp slashes in benefits for physically disabled Vietnam GIs. But by VA sources accounts, the slashes were a good deal less severe than those which were calculated by OMB to produce a \$160 million saving—but which never saw daylight.

Yesterday, Sen. Vance Hartke (D-Ind.) chairman of the Senate Veterans Committee, ordered preliminary investigation into Johnson's dismissal of Owen Wednesday and the sudden transfer of his deputy, Charles Peckarsky, to Johnson's office.

Johnson has already ordered an inquiry on why there was a difference between what OMB ordered and what the VA delivered to Capitol Hill—a difference which he apparently did not perceive earlier.

EUROPEAN SECURITY CONFERENCE AND ITS POSSIBLE ADVERSE EFFECTS ON LITHUANIA

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there are many houses in the American mansion. Not the least of them are inhabited by Lithuanian-Americans, who, last week, celebrated the 55th anniversary of their homeland's establishment as a republic.

I am happy to pay tribute to them as Americans and to join with them in marking the anniversary of their independence. Unfortunately, it has been taken from them again, and, for this, I also join them in mourning.

Here is a printed discussion of Lithuania's currently unhappy status as provided by the Lithuanian-American Community of the U.S.A., Inc:

EUROPEAN SECURITY CONFERENCE AND ITS POSSIBLE ADVERSE EFFECTS ON LITHUANIA

On February 16, Americans of Lithuanian origin and descent commemorated two anniversaries—the 722nd anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian State, and the 55th anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918.

Lithuania's independence lasted only until 1940, when the Soviet Union invaded and occupied Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and forcibly annexed these Baltic States into the Soviet Union. The United States and other great western powers have steadfastly maintained a policy of non-recognition of this forceful incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Empire. This non-recognition policy must continue, especially, in view of the Soviet proposed 'European Conference on Security and Cooperation'. As indicated in the published preliminaries of the Conference the Soviet concept of the security of the European States has one primary prerequisite: That the territorial integrity of the states and inviolability of their frontiers be maintained.

The recognition of the territorial "status quo" in Europe would violate the right of self-determination of the peoples and the nations of Eastern Europe. It would be tantamount to world ratification of the infamous 'Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of 1939', and would extinguish for all time the small candle of hope in the darkness of totalitarian oppression.

Today, the United States stands on the threshold of the most meaningful and potentially rewarding era in the history of mankind. For the first time in the last fifty years, global peace is attainable. However, global peace is only the first great objective of our nation, we must also seek the attainment of freedom and justice for all oppressed nations. For even if the countries of the world cease hostilities toward one another, the unresolved legacies of the Second World War must be confronted; the status of the Baltic Nations must be once and for all—equitably resolved. Furthermore, let us not be fooled that world peace can be attained by offering the inalienable rights of the people of Lithuania and the other Baltic Nations upon the altar of appeasement.

Even now, Lithuanians raised under the yoke of communism are risking and sacrificing their lives in defiance of the Soviet regime, seeking religious and political freedom for their country. The unsuccessful escape at-

tempt of the Lithuanian sailor, Simas Kudirka, the self-immolation of Romas Kalanta, and the subsequent demonstration by thousands of young Lithuanians, and the petition of 17,000 Lithuanian Roman Catholics to Kurt Waldheim of the United Nations, demonstrates their thirst for freedom at any price.

The 89th U.S. Congress during its second session adopted House Concurring Resolution 416, urging the President to direct the question of the status of the Baltic countries in the United Nations and other international forums.

The time is now, to present to the public at large and the government of the United States the grave concern shared by Lithuanian Americans and the people of Eastern and Central Europe over the approaching Soviet proposed 'European Conference on Security and Cooperation'.

FREEDOM CHALLENGING MARYLAND RACE EXPERIMENT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the liberals in Maryland now complain because free people use their freedom to do what they know is necessary for the education and safety of their children.

The local free press fails to understand freedom and criticizes parents who remove their children from racially balanced Federal schools in favor of independent schools, thus recreating unbalance and upsetting the Federal judges' master plan.

The race mixers will never learn. Having destroyed any possibility of racial balance in Washington, D.C., and many large cities, they now force destruction of public education. The coup d'etat is about to occur. People refuse to be put into a bag, shook up, and realigned. That is what freedom is all about. And people who are willing to pay the price of freedom will continue to flee and make their life regardless of the disgust of perfidious news media and political judges.

I include a related news clipping:

PRIVATE SCHOOLS PERIL RACIAL BALANCE

(By Charles A. Krause)

"This place is all right, but I'd rather be back in public school," said Kenneth Roberts, 14, as he unwrapped a sandwich in the lunchroom of the Riverside Baptist School in Avondale.

Roberts was one of 500 former Prince George's County public school students who attended their first day of classes yesterday at the Riverdale school's expanded campus in the former LaSalle College.

He had switched to the Baptist private school for the second semester, the youth said, "because of racial problems, I guess . . . my mother took me out of public school." Roberts, a 9th grader, went to Martin Luther King Junior High school in Beltsville.

Gina Petrillo, 11, a sixth-grader who went to Margaret Brent Elementary in New Carrollton, said she "loved" the new school but was afraid of being paddled by the school authorities "They wouldn't do it," she said, but after a moment's pause added: "Maybe they would. I'm going to be good."

The Riverdale Baptist School reflects the no-nonsense educational and religious phi-

losophy of its founder and chief architect, the Rev. R. Herbert Fitzpatrick, who says his Riverdale Baptist Church is one of the fastest growing churches in the country. Mr. Fitzpatrick was overseeing the start of the LaSalle campus yesterday before leaving last night for a trip to Israel.

Larry Evans, 32, the school's principal, said yesterday that Riverdale Baptist had doubled its enrollment this semester and added the Avondale campus—a former Catholic seminary—as a result of a court-ordered desegregation plan for the county's public school system that went into effect Jan. 29. The plan involved the transfer of about 33,000 students, including the busing of 12,000 students who had walked to school.

"Busing was the straw that broke the camel's back," Evans said. "I think that people are just fed up with all the problems in the public schools."

"I think busing is a religious issue," Evans said. "Until the love of the Lord is in everyone's heart, you can't legislate morality."

Both Prince George's school officials and Evans agreed yesterday that the shift of 500 virtually all white students from the public schools to Riverdale may affect the makeup of some public schools and lead to additional changes in the desegregation plan next fall.

U.S. District Court Judge Frank A. Kaufman has retained jurisdiction over the county's public school system and will review the desegregation plan in early March to insure that the school system has complied with his court order.

If certain schools are not within general guidelines issued by the court—that is, no more than 50 per cent black and no less than 10 per cent black enrollment in each school—Kaufman has the right to order further changes to bring all county schools within the guidelines.

Paul M. Nussbaum, attorney for the county's school board, said yesterday he could not be sure what effect the 500 new Riverdale Baptist students would have on the public schools to which the students had been assigned.

"If they all come from one school, obviously that would throw the plan off balance," Nussbaum said. "But if they come from 10 different schools, I don't know."

Evans said that a majority of the students newly enrolled at Riverdale come from the Lanham-New Carrollton area, the center of antibusing sentiment in the county.

William Paca Elementary in Landover, formerly a virtually all-black school to which white New Carrollton students from Robert Frost and John Carroll elementary were to have been bused, may not reach its projected racial composition due to the opening of Riverdale Baptist, a school administration spokesman said yesterday.

Paca had 330 white children and 304 black children on Feb. 2 when the last county-wide attendance count was taken. If 30 Riverdale students were to have gone to Paca, Nussbaum said, more white children might have to be brought into Paca next fall.

The new Riverdale Baptist school is an old, stone building on a hill overlooking 23 acres of wooded land less than a mile from the District of Columbia line. Evans said he hoped to expand to accommodate another 500 fourth through ninth-grade students next fall. The school charges \$500 a year, and offers classes in kindergarten through ninth grade for its current enrollment of 1,000 students.

Evans said that Riverdale Baptist should not be blamed for throwing the desegregation plan off balance. "We've had people threaten to leave the county if they couldn't get their kids in our school," he said.

"We feel that any stability we can offer has got to be a relief to the county as a whole," Evans said.

VEYSEY LEADS DRIVE TO ENFORCE STIFFER CALIFORNIA SMOG LAWS

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to guarantee California's right to continue taking the lead in fighting air pollution, and to continue enforcing State pollution standards which are more stringent than Federal standards. My legislation, which is co-sponsored by 39 of my colleagues from California, would simply clarify existing law to avoid administrative misinterpretation in the future.

It would prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from negating stiff California statutes in favor of weaker Federal regulations.

Mr. Speaker, Congress plainly recognized the need for California to have this option, when it passed legislation to that effect in 1967. That bill, known as the Murphy Amendment to the Air Quality Act, directed the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to grant California a waiver from Federal regulations when California's provisions are more stringent. The statute clearly says:

The Secretary shall, after notice and opportunity for public hearings, waive application.

It does not say:

The Secretary may waive.

However, during the past 2 years, with the Environmental Protection Agency administering the war on pollution, this statute has been misinterpreted to allow the EPA to deny requests from California for a waiver. Requests have been denied because California wanted to be stronger against air pollution—not because our State was weaker.

To me, this does not represent the direction in which the EPA should be going. Further, the real irony in this situation lies in the fact that most of the Federal air pollution regulations are ones which were inspired by California years ago. California has plainly been the leader in the antipollution field, and rightfully so. We have had the problem the longest and the worst. And today, our problem demands treatment and sacrifice which could not be imposed on the Nation as a whole. Sweeping, general air pollution regulations, which might be practical for the Nation, are grossly insufficient for California.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a report of the Senate Public Works Committee on the Air Quality Act, which was issued on July 15, 1967. It leaves no doubt as to the legislative intent of Congress when it passed the Murphy amendment. I quote:

On the question of preemption, representatives of the State of California were clearly opposed to displacing that State's right to set more stringent standards to meet peculiar local conditions. The auto industry conversely was adamant that the nature of their manufacturing mechanism required a single national standard in order to eliminate undue economic strain on the industry.

The committee has taken cognizance of

both of these points of view. Senator Murphy convinced the committee that California's unique problems and pioneering efforts justified a waiver of the preemption section to the State of California. As a result, the committee incorporated in section 202(b) a waiver amendment offered by Senator Murphy. It is true that, in the 15 years that auto emission standards have been debated and discussed, only the State of California has demonstrated compelling and extraordinary circumstances sufficiently different from the Nation as a whole to justify standards on automobile emissions which may, from time to time, need be more stringent than national standards.

The situation may change. Other regions of the Nation may develop air pollution situations related to automobile emissions which will require standards different from those applicable nationally. The committee expects the Secretary to inform the Congress of any such situation in order that expansion or change in the existing waiver provision may be considered.

Until such time as additional problems of this type arise it seemed appropriate that the waiver provision of subsection (b) should be limited solely to California. This approach can have several positive values:

1. Most importantly California will be able to continue its already excellent program to the benefit of the people of that State.

2. The Nation will have the benefit of California's experience with lower standards which will require new control systems and design. In fact California will continue to be the testing area for such lower standards and should those efforts to achieve lower emission level be successful it is expected that the Secretary will, if required to assure protection of the national health and welfare, give serious consideration to strengthening the Federal standards.

3. In the interim periods when California and the Federal Government have differing standards, the general consumer of the Nation will not be confronted with increased costs associated with new control systems.

4. The industry, confronted with only one potential variation, will be able to minimize economic disruption and therefore provide emission control systems at lower costs to the people of the Nation.

The intent and the benefits to the Nation are clear. But today somehow the tables have been turned. The Environmental Protection Agency now places the burden on California to show cause why its new improved standards should not be disappointed.

The intent and the benefits to California and the Nation are clear. Yet, during the past 2 years, EPA has begun to challenge this statute, saying the burden should be on California to show why its stronger statutes should be allowed. And although congressional pressure forced the EPA to reverse several denials of waiver requests, we can be assured that more denials are ahead unless Congress reasserts its intention.

In California, our struggle against pollution is a struggle for survival. People are dying because of the smog, and it is imperative that State and local governmental bodies in California have the ability to prescribe and enforce remedies designed to combat our particular ills.

Our problem is unique. Our combination of topography, sunlight, atmospheric inversions, low wind speeds, and heavy concentrations of people gives us the most severe photochemical smog in the world.

One of every nine cars in the United

States, and one of every 18 cars in the world is in California. Current estimates predict that our automobile fuel consumption will be tripled in the next 30 years.

Today children in Riverside, Calif., in my congressional district, cannot safely play outside on many summer days. High school and college athletic teams in southern California often practice inside because of smog alerts.

Smog is not only killing people—it is killing our economy. Last year, smog killed over \$200 million worth of California's agricultural production.

No one can argue that California does not need the strictest antipollution regulations in the country. And likewise, no one can argue that California's pioneering effort in the battle against smog has not provided the foundation for the Nation's antismog programs.

My legislation would simply assure that California continue out in front in the fight to end pollution. It would assure that California have the capability to take vitally needed measures in that fight—measures which might not be needed in other parts of the country.

We must have this kind of assurance. We must be able to take decisive action, and set rigid air quality standards, without having to wait for the Federal Government to tell us how to and when to implement our own innovations.

A BILL TO PROTECT CONFIDENTIAL SOURCES OF THE NEWS MEDIA

HON. WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to reinforce the absolute constitutional protection of the people's right to a free press. The legislation I am sponsoring would permit journalists to keep confidential their sources of information as well as material gathered but not used. Specifically it would prohibit Congress, Federal courts, grand juries, or Federal administrative agencies from demanding such information of journalists.

When American reporters must choose between divulging confidential information and going to jail, all American citizens lose because the flow of information is curtailed. If potential sources cannot be assured that their identities will be protected, they will not communicate with the press. In addition, reporters may choose to avoid controversial stories because they would not want to betray their source. In turn, the public would be served only favorable news derived from "handouts."

Any curtailment of a free flow of news is a first step in usurping power from the people. The basic necessity of a free people is the ability to determine the course of their government. Preservation of that power requires free dissemination of information and opinions. Our forefathers insisted upon including a Bill of Rights

in our Constitution. The first amendment specifies that—

Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press.

Today, we need to reinforce this right of free speech and the press. I, therefore, urge the passage of this legislation to guarantee journalists the right to keep their sources confidential.

LOOKING BEFORE WE LEAP

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the news media is under attack on several fronts—newsmen are being imprisoned, public television is shying away from "topical" subjects, Dr. Clay Whitehead wants the local stations to monitor the national networks. Many liberals are going overboard, saying that freedom of the press itself is threatened. I say that we should look before we leap, because we have never had a free press in this country as far as minority groups are concerned.

Last year, the Congressional Black Caucus held hearings on the mass communications media. In the course of these hearings, we learned that employment discrimination runs rampant throughout the news industry. Minority employment in public television dropped from 12 percent to 8 percent between 1970 and 1971; the percentage of black employees in the newspaper industry is only 4.2 percent with only 1.5 percent as professionals; and in the broadcast media, nearly half of the service workers are black while only 2 percent of the officials and managers are black.

Furthermore, the media have been deficient and discriminatory in reporting the news of the black community. The effect of this practice, on a national and long-range basis, has been to calcify prejudices and attitudes in the mind of the American people.

On January 12, 1973, an editorial in the Boston Globe gave several examples of how the media not only underwrote people's prejudices, but created them.

Freedom of the press must be defended to the limit, but first we must work to make the press free.

The Boston Globe article appears below:

AN INSENSITIVE PRESS

The tragic nightmare of murder in New Orleans last weekend has, like the Attica prison revolt, raised new doubts about the ability of the news media to report sensitive stories that involve black people and crime.

The five days of coverage have been marked by confusion, contradictory stories and unanswered questions, and, in a vacuum of evidence, the news media have disseminated a good deal of aspersion, insinuation and innuendo. What we were led to believe on Monday we were told, may not be true on Tuesday, and what was accepted as a certainty on Sunday became an impossibility by Thursday.

The sniper, Mark Essex, 23, of Kansas, was black, and that fact, it now seems, was exaggerated by the news media in their

treatment of the story. The press was willing perhaps eager, to accept, without evidence, the suggestion that the shootings were part of a national conspiracy to kill policemen.

A N.Y. Times story said, for example: "The police superintendent could not say flatly that Essex was part of a national conspiracy to kill policemen, as has been asserted by other officials in Louisiana." What other officials? What evidence of national conspiracy? The story did not say.

The mere mention of an unsubstantiated charge such as that nurtures the fears of racists, and who can measure the damage to black-white relationships in Los Angeles, St. Louis, Boston or New York?

On Tuesday, the National Broadcasting Company telecast a report of the burial of a policeman, followed immediately by an interview with a southern Ku Klux Klansman who urged white people to mobilize under the Klan because law and order was breaking down in the United States. How do we know what impact that sort of drivel would have in a black-white neighborhood? NBC's insensate juxtaposition, inadvertent or not, is certain to stimulate racial antagonisms and retard racial understanding.

Similar problems occurred in coverage of the Attica prison revolt. On the basis of unsubstantiated statements by the prison administration, the news media printed and broadcast false stories that the hostages, who were white guards, had been brutally slain by the inmates, most of whom were black. Ten hostages were killed, not by the inmates, but by bullets from an all-white State Police contingent which stormed the prison. In addition to the 10 hostages killed by State Police, 29 inmates also were shot by them.

Last November, when three pirates hijacked an airliner and demanded \$10 million, one headline on the story read: "Ten Blacks Hijack Airlines." In the first 13 paragraphs of the story, there were three references to the hijackers as black. The next day, in stories and in captions under pictures, the hijackers were identified as "three black fugitives," or "young black hijackers."

Not all such racist reporting is direct. Some of it is subtle, but no less invidious.

Last Spring, at Harvard University, there was a forum on national priorities, sponsored by the Congressional Black Caucus, three newspapers, and Harvard's Institute of Politics. The final report made this critical point:

"In the America seen through the lens of the white-controlled mass media, blacks are either invisible or glimpsed in distorted focus. There is widespread, long-standing and deeply entrenched racism among the entire mass media. There is a clear pattern of systematic exclusion, distortion, deliberate mishandling of black people, communities and culture.

That stands as a more serious indictment of the press than anything Spiro Agnew has proffered, and its message is unmistakable. We can no longer turn our heads and pretend that we just don't hear it.

THE FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY MYTH

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a statement from the National Federation of Federal Employees, which should be of interest to my colleagues.

The material shows that the number of Federal employees has remained relatively constant, while the number of people they serve, and the range of services they provide has greatly expanded. Statistics also show that during this same time period the number of State and municipal employees has tripled.

While Federal employees are currently undergoing a series of unsubstantiated attacks, I think it important that we always remember the great contribution that they make to our society.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

NFFE NEWS RELEASE

The National Federation of Federal Employees charged today that "hard statistical evidence dramatically refutes slanted allegations by special interests and actions" by the Administration through the Office of Management and Budget of "bloated overstaffing" of Federal departments and agencies.

President Nathan T. Wolkowicz today released the results of an NFFE study which reveals that contrary to such allegations, "repeated endlessly by various commentators and media, the Federal work force has been declining not only numerically but, even more importantly, has been scanted in the light of the huge increase in the nation's population and in the volume and extent of services rendered."

Dr. Wolkowicz declared that "statistics can be dull and they can be twisted and slanted, but in the light of the present demagogic assaults on the Federal public services, these are neither. In fact, the contrary is true. While the national population has risen greatly, together with a huge increase in the volume and extent of services rendered by career employees, their numbers have either been stabilized or reduced . . . while the number of State, county, and municipal employees has soared astronomically. In other words, the increase in public employment has not come in the Federal sector but in all other jurisdictions."

"Let's examine the record, it will come as a surprise even to many presumably knowledgeable observers as, for example, the usually careful TV commentator who in a recent broadcast casually tossed off the figure of '5,000,000 Federal civilian employees,' which was literally millions off the mark."

"Here is the factual record."

"In 1952 there were 2,391,657 full-time employees of Federal departments and agencies. As of the 1950 census, the U.S. population was 150,696,361. In 1957, following the ending of the Korean conflict, Federal employment fell to 2,258,529, although our national population generally was mounting rapidly. In 1962 employment rose only slightly to 2,356,078, while the census of 1960, two years earlier, had shown that the Nation's population—and thus the need for additional services in volume—had leaped to 179,325,175."

"Largely as a result of the Vietnam war, Federal employment rose to 2,785,244 in 1967 but by 1972 harsh manpower ceilings and curtailment of certain services had reduced the total to about 2,499,000. At the same time we find that the U.S. population was soaring to the neighborhood of 210,000,000 . . . and still growing."

"Examine now some figures for the past three years, when U.S. population already was in the 200,000,000 zone. In 1970, full time Executive Branch employment was 2,552,571; in 1971 it had dropped to 2,520,318; and by 1972 was down to 2,505,745. For the same years, the Department of Defense totals were 1,159,939; 1,092,804; and now under 1,040,000. Interior, for example, went from 59,349 in 1970 to 56,892 in 1972. Agriculture shows 82,912 for 1970; 84,252 for 1971; and back down to 82,511 for 1972. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—the particular

scapegoat for the doom-sayers—had 102,297 employees in 1970; 104,283 in 1971; and a very slight rise to 105,764 in 1972."

"The Veterans Administration, predictably shows a modest increase in employment, traceable to the Vietnam conflict and the ever increasing patient loads going back to World War I days. VA employment figures are: 1970, 148,497; 1971, 158,635; and 1972, 163,179. That many VA hospitals and installations now are seriously understaffed in the light of the increasing patient and service load, is an inescapable and deplorable fact."

"As another example, just typical of many others which could be cited, take the Interior figures. Its employees have shown a constant decline, which is continuing, despite an enormous workload increase. Thus, typically, the National Parks are attracting many millions more visitors now than even a few years ago. Manpower available under the arbitrary ceilings imposed by OMB and the Administration is unrealistic in relation to the mission to be accomplished. It is being accomplished only through enormous exertions, dedication, and here as elsewhere throughout the Federal service, by a rate of productivity increase which substantially outstrips the private sector."

"The wage price control program—as a result of refusal of the Administration to provide adequate staffing—is not only admittedly ineffective in and of itself but its staffing policies have seriously impacted another vital agency, namely, the Internal Revenue Service. Several thousand highly capable and experienced IRS employees have been detached from IRS and are endeavoring to equitably administer a program affecting 210,000,000 Americans. Inevitably, IRS operations are bound to reflect the loss of those qualified employees . . . and at a time when the agency's workload will soon be at a peak and when the number of returns to be audited will be the largest in the nation's history."

"Compare the declining Federal work force, and the huge population increase, with the total number of State, county, municipal, and school district employees with whom too many observers who should know better the Federal work force statistics are indiscriminately lumped."

"In 1951 there were 3,643,000 full time local and State employees, and an additional 644,000 part-timers. By 1961, that total had jumped to 5,580,000 full-time and 1,036,000 part-time workers. And in 1971, the totals are 8,204,000 full-time and 2,240,000 part-time employees. Obviously, the big jump in 'public employment' has not come in the Federal sector—in fact the opposite is true—but in other public employees as populations have soared, suburbs have proliferated, and the public has demanded more and more services and protections."

"These typical figures are graphically instructive in many ways. They underscore the fact that the Federal service—with few exceptions—already is 'lean and productive' and that loose, undefined and undifferentiated charges of a 'bloated Federal bureaucracy' make easy headlines and resounding speeches but do not stand up under careful and reflective analysis."

"Incidentally, it might be noted in passing that of the present total full-time employment of about 2,500,000 in the Federal service, more than 650,000 are U.S. Postal Service workers. There has been a substantial decline in postal employment, with results which are too obvious to need spelling out. In applying the axe and manpower bludgeon to a new allegedly 'business-oriented' agency which handles billions of pieces of mail, the deterioration of service has become little short of a national scandal and it is not surprising that members of Congress of both parties are seriously reconsidering their action in putting that department virtually beyond its proper public jurisdiction, name-

ly, the representatives of the taxpayers who are entitled to reasonably prompt and accurate mail service."

"The smoke-screen of a 'bloated Federal bureaucracy,' which the figures effectually refute, also can be regarded as part of a concerted campaign for a huge further increase in costly, wasteful contracting-out to private corporations and the gutting of vital public services. In fact, the contractors' lobby already has kicked-off its all-out drive for \$20 billion in 'non-product' Federal services in addition to the billions the contractors already get in Federal contracts for products of all kinds, everything from pencils to aircraft . . . and often fat with cost over-runs."

"We believe the American people, who foot the bills, are entitled to know the facts . . . and to have irrefutable statistical evidence that most of the sounding-off about a 'bloated Federal bureaucracy'—is a VA nurse a bureaucrat?—is sheer demagoguery."

"The NFFE's position is clear now as in the past: we are just as opposed to overstaffing as we are to understaffing. After all, our members, and all Federal employees, pay taxes like every other wage earner. But we believe that those who talk about overstaffed agencies should cite chapter and verse . . . and relate the agencies' missions realistically both to the job to be done and the huge increase both in the nation's population and in the demands by the public for a broad range of services effectively administered."

"An outspoken lawyer from a small western town who came to Washington in a position in the present Administration—a job he still holds at this writing—recently said that when he came to Washington he figured his pay would represent 'a little raise' over what he had been earning; a fact of life which, he declared frankly, he learned was 'wrong as hell.'"

"He also said he was wrong about something else. 'I had the usual citizen's view that all these bureaucrats were just sitting around.' But in his first year, according to the recently published press report, 'I never got here later than 7:30 in the morning and never left before 7:30 at night, and didn't take a vacation.' And he still comes in on Saturdays to go over the mail."

"The operative phrase in this frank interview was the appointee's admission that his 'usual citizen's view' of Federal employees—those 'bloated bureaucrats'—was 'wrong as hell.'"

"The NFFE does not contend that all Federal employees work those hours or that they are necessarily all models of virtue and efficiency. But we do affirm on the basis of more than 55 years of day-to-day experience that Federal workers as a group, at all levels from top to bottom, are conscientious and hard-working American citizens performing vital public services . . . and that for the most part the departments and agencies have precious little manpower 'fat' in them. It is the cheapest of cheap shots for them to be made scapegoats for demagogues, political, editorial, or any others who believe and act on the premise that it is always open season for baseless assaults on Federal workers."

"It is an irresponsible practice which in some cases can be halted by a showing of facts. But we fear that the targets are too easy and the habit too ingrained for others to renounce. But the NFFE will keep on trying."

"An important point to bear in mind in connection with the new 'revenue sharing plan' is that the placing of additional functions on States and municipalities inevitably will result in further substantial increases in employees at the State and municipal level. There will be no manpower savings to the tax-payers over-all; just Federal outlays for other personnel which, as in the past, must be met by Congressional appropriations. To a large extent 'revenue sharing' will mean the

transfer of Federally-raised fiscal resources from one pocket to another; the already huge number of city, State and county workers will be further enlarged—often by inexperienced and/or politically named people—at the expense of trained and well qualified Federal employees under a merit system imbedded firmly in U.S. Government statutes."

STRUGGLE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I include the following: Although a peace settlement in Vietnam has been achieved, a crisis of another kind continues, for in South Vietnam, there are not nearly enough educational institutions, especially those for higher learning. It is worth noting that South Vietnam maintains only eight universities, five of which are private and three of which are public. The public universities have a total enrollment of over 45,000 students, and the private university enrollments are going up rapidly. Obviously, there is a dire need for additional educational facilities, and there is at least one man that I know of who is trying to rectify this problem, Senator Le-Phoc-Sang of the Republic of Vietnam.

It was recently my pleasure and privilege to meet Senator Sang, who, aside from his duties as an elected official, is also Chancellor of Hoa-Hao University in An-Giang province in South Vietnam. Originally founded as a rural teachers college in 1970, Hoa-Hao University is growing rapidly. Chancellor Sang started his university with \$300 and a heart filled with desire. His energy and enthusiasm has put his institution on a course of great expansion. Today, under Chancellor Sang's leadership, the still struggling Hoa-Hao University has a department of commerce and banking, a department of international relations and science management, a foreign language center, and a center for legal and public administration training. Chancellor Sang is also planning on developing a medical school and an agricultural college.

Chancellor Sang is doing much, far beyond the call of duty, to see that his people are given the opportunity to better themselves by means of higher education. We should commend Senator Sang for his efforts and I am, therefore, inserting for the consideration of my colleagues a brief history of Hoa-Hao University and what it has meant to the people of the Republic of Vietnam.

The history of Hoa-Hao follows:

HOA-HAO UNIVERSITY AN-GIANG, SOUTH VIETNAM

DEAR SIR: The very first words I would like to say are to ask for a few minutes of your time in reading through this letter and after that, for some action you may deem desirable to take with respect to it.

The writer of this letter is a Vietnamese who is now living in his suffering country, one torn by an endless war and beset with innumerable problems. As a spokesman for nearly three million peasants of the Western Mekong Delta of South Viet Nam, I ask for your concern over a bold yet necessary edu-

cational and cultural undertaking whose purpose is to better the lot of the inarticulate masses, living in the most unfortunate area in our country. This venture is Hoa-Hao University. In Vietnamese, Hoa means peace, harmony, concord, and Hao means good. As its name implies, Hoa-Hao University is an institution dedicated to the peaceful and harmonious advancement of all people regardless of social standing.

You may wonder why, in the midst of a debilitating and ferocious war, efforts have been devoted to founding a university. With 18 million people South Viet-Nam maintains three public universities whose enrollment tops forty-five thousand students, and five private universities with a maximum student body of ten thousand. It is uncommon occurrence that even in the face of destruction and poverty so many young Vietnamese have found such a faith in their future that they will continue higher education in spite of great personal sacrifice. Yet, overflowing as existing universities are, there are countless numbers of less fortunate boys and girls to whom all opportunities for college training are denied. For example, for the five million people in the Western Mekong, Delta, there is but one public university in Can-Tho, with the result that close to 90 per cent of high school graduates in An-Giang province and in neighboring provinces of Chau-Doc, Sadec, Kien-Phong, Kien Giang and Ha-Tien, are forced to discontinue their education because their families cannot afford to send them to distant Can-Tho or Saigon Universities. Responding to that crying need, we have taken the daring move to establish Hoa-Hao University in An-Giang province.

First conceived as a rural university with only one faculty of pedagogy, "a teachers' college", an initial student enrollment of fifty, and a faculty staff of about ten foreign-educated teachers, Hoa-Hao University was to be housed in a small borrowed building, or even worse, in a wooden hut with tin roofing. Fortunately, we were able to move a number of people. About fifteen young graduates from foreign and national universities got together to work without pay for five months, establish curricula, organizing staffs, setting up departments, making up a testing program, and recruiting students. All this was done without financial backing from the government but with much faith in the meager resources of a determined population and, above all, faith in a brighter future for posterity. The Ministry of Social Welfare, impressed by our disinterested effort, loaned us a 30 meters by 8 meters two-story building and a few shacks which it had intended as a community center, to house the administrative and academic facilities. In addition, the local government also donated a 10-hectare plot of ground on which to build our future campus.

After months of preparation, Hoa-Hao University came into existence with three Departments: Commerce and Banking, International Relations and Management Science, and Letters and Pedagogy, and a Foreign Languages Center and the Center for Legal and Public Administration Training. Each was conceived for a special purpose and with the needs of national and regional development in mind. The Department of Commerce and Banking trains future business leaders and disseminates business lore among the rural population of the surrounding areas. The Department of International Relations and Management Science prepares future managers with executive skills and an insight into international politics to enter business, industry and government. The Department of Letters and Pedagogy trains teachers for an expanding secondary school population, and helps perpetuate Vietnamese cultural values. Finally the Foreign Languages Center equips all students with an adequate knowledge of languages to carry on independent reading and research in their specialized fields.

A novel rule at our university is that all students must fulfill language requirement at the end of each year to qualify for the next, and that at the close of the fourth-year they must pass a language proficiency examination as a prerequisite for conferring the B.A. degree. This regulation aims at preparing our graduates for further research and communication with foreigners. Besides those organic schools, the university, facing the most urgent needs for middle-class economic and entrepreneurial cadres of the community, has ventured to establish a Center for Legal and Public Administration Training. This Center offers basic knowledge in practical legal and public administration matters to high school students with grade 9 level. In the planning stage are two more schools: the School of Medicine and the Agricultural College. Although these will meet some of the most pressing needs of the rural population, they have to wait for trained personnel and necessary equipment.

Hoa-Hao University opened in November 1970, and now after two years of operation, has an ENROLLMENT OF TWO THOUSAND STUDENTS. There is every indication that this figure will increase each year. What this signals to us is a challenging increase in demands for more and better facilities and faculty members, an increase we have tried to meet by exploring all known and available sources of assistance within our country. The question is, in the face of these demand upon our resources and capabilities, whether we should circumscribe ourselves to known sources of aid only, or whether we should widen our search for goodwill beyond our national boundaries. We have opted for the latter.

At the inauguration ceremony two years ago, the President of Viet-Nam, who came to preside over it, donated ten million piasters "25,000 US dollars" and the ministry of education has recently granted an annual subsidy of twenty million piasters "50,000 US dollars". Other national and international agencies have indicated or pledged support. In fact, a Board of Sponsors was set up with the President of the Republic as Honorary Chairman, and with, as members, ten Cabinet ministers, and such prominent figures as judges, civic and religious leaders, about eighty representatives and senators as well as provincial councillors in the Delta area. This Board is at once our pride and our moral and material support in the formative stage, and has played a vital role in sustaining our university through very difficult times.

We have been fortunate, too, in getting additional assistance from foreign embassies. The Republic of China donated ten million piasters (US \$25,000) to our venture, and the United States Agency for International Development gave 291 thousand dollars worth of excess property. Through their embassies the governments of Canada, the United Kingdom, Japan, the Philippines, Germany, Thailand, the Netherlands, Australia and New Zealand made known their willingness to contribute their aids in various amounts and forms. For example, we are receiving scholarships for faculty training from the Australian government and the Asia Foundation, and have been promised more of them from other governments. Other promised aid includes English teaching specialists from England and Fulbright lecturers from the United States, some building materials from the Thai forces and extended ties with universities in the Republic of China.

Yet in spite of these supports, Hoa-Hao University is still faced with a stupendous problem of surviving inflation, economic stagnation, and destruction which are the main staples of this war ravaged country. Among the many projects we have planned for the future, there are the construction of a campus for five thousand students with classrooms, library, offices, dormitories, lan-

guage laboratory and other supporting facilities; equipping them with furniture; acquisition of books bearing on social sciences, literature, language, linguistics, education, law, economics etc; equipping the languages laboratory with electronic machinery such as tape recorders, radios, movie projectors and T.V. sets. Above all we need a steady program of faculty development without which our activities would be seriously curtailed.

We ask for your forbearance in reading this lengthy letter, but distance has made the details necessary so that you may have a clearer idea of what we are trying to do here for the toiling masses of South Viet-Nam. We cannot entirely depend on our government or any government for continuing assistance. As you must have realized, procedures for obtaining governmental support are intricate, tortuous, and often sterile. Besides, with the war raging throughout the country and most of the available resources of the nation devoted to the war effort, it is not reasonable to expect too much from our government. Even foreign governments have their own constraints in helping a private university.

We have therefore taken an audacious and unprecedented decision on behalf of the poor peasants who are longing for a brighter future for their children to knock on every door where, in our estimation, there is a throbbing heart, a willing ear, and a merciful mind. We hope to gather, bit by bit, from near and far, enough material and spiritual aid with which to keep our education enterprise viable and thriving.

As founder and chancellor of Hoa-Hao University, I merely want to do something right, something beneficial to a large number of my compatriots. When I embarked on this educational project, I knew and accepted the demands on my time, but also knew that the good of others had to take precedence over the pleasures of my personal and family life. The future of thousands of students who have entrusted themselves to our charge is putting such a heavy responsibility on us that even a lifetime of toil and devotion will prove woefully inadequate. Yet I have accepted the burden because I do not want other youngsters to go through the kind of deprivation and despair which were the scourge of my youthful days. Although I have filled various responsible positions as a judge, Secretary of State at the Prime Minister's Office, Majority Leader in the Constituent Assembly, and now Chairman of the Senate Internal Affairs Committee working with the ministries of Interior, Chieu-Hoi (open arms), Rural Development, and Ethnic Minorities, I came from a family in a remote area of the Western Mekong Delta, lost my father at age seven, and had to do the farm work until age seventeen before going to school. It is for this reason that I have felt the duty to assist those whose situation and poverty have deprived of all opportunities to rise above their present fortune, and that I have accepted the arduous task of promoting a new life style even at my personal expense.

Now that Hoa-Hao University has survived the first two years, it remains our task to see it grow and prosper as a reliable and good institution of higher learning.

In closing, we wish you and your family lasting happiness and continued success in any of your endeavors. We are waiting for the favor of your response.

WOMEN VETERANS BENEFIT

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the 92d Congress, I was able

to win approval of an amendment to the veterans' education and training law which extended to the dependents of female veterans the same benefits as those accorded male veterans' dependents.

Now, after implementation of this legislation, we are able to see the good it has accomplished. More than half a million women veterans in Rhode Island and southeastern Massachusetts are now eligible for these dependent benefits and their immeasurable value to the recipients.

I am pleased and proud to have sponsored this legislation because it equalizes the benefits for both men and women veterans, and, more importantly, because it can help that many more people.

I include a press release on the program recently promulgated by the VA Regional Office in Providence, R.I.:

WOMEN VETERANS BENEFIT FROM NEW BILL OF RIGHTS

Some 537,000 women veterans, including 9,000 discharged from military service during the past fiscal year, will benefit from the new "women veterans' bill of rights" in the recent veterans' education and training law, according to Leon Fields, VA's Regional Office Director for Rhode Island and southeastern Massachusetts.

Women veterans now comprise 1.9 percent of the nation's veteran population, with 307,000, or 57 percent, with World War II service.

The new "Bill of rights" equalizes VA benefits for women veterans, allowing them to receive additional GI Bill payment for their husbands and making VA dependents' educational assistance, death pension, and GI home loan available to widowers of women veterans on the same basis as for widows of men who served in the armed forces, Fields stated.

Husbands of women veterans totally and permanently disabled by service-connected conditions are eligible for educational assistance.

"THE POWERS OF CONGRESS MUST BE PRESERVED"—SPEAKER ALBERT

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was most impressed by your recent remarks as carried in the New York Times with respect to the importance of maintaining our three coequal branches of Government.

As you so aptly put it, Congress must never again be put in the position of, in effect, accepting a philosophy of "only the White House knows best."

With leadership like that of Speaker ALBERT, I feel that Congress will meet the challenge and, hopefully, will reverse the trend of erosion of legislative power of the Congress to the executive branch.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in your most timely remarks, I place the article from the New York Times in the RECORD herewith.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 13, 1973]

THE DOMESTIC BALANCE

(By CARL B. ALBERT)

WASHINGTON.—The differences separating Congress and the President go to the heart

of our sustained experiment in self-government.

The historic separation of powers between the executive and the legislative branches of Government is being tested on many fronts and on four principal issues.

This country can never again accept without question the paternalistic dogma that "the White House knows best," as applied to war and peace.

Also at issue is the question of executive privilege and the power of the President to reorganize the executive departments when Congress has refused to act in this field.

Important as these matters are, the central and overwhelming issue at this time arises out of the impoundment of Congressionally appropriated funds. The great question confronting us today is, as it has always been in our Government based upon co-equal branches; where does Congressional power end and where does Presidential power begin?

No series of acts strike more directly at Congress' fundamental power over the purse than the usurpation of power by the President's impoundment of appropriated funds in the final months of the 92d Congress.

The President has interpreted his reelection as a mandate to strike down the domestic programs passed by Congress over the last thirty years. How such a mandate, if it is a mandate, is to be carried out in the Democratic 93d Congress, fresh from the people is a puzzle to me. Congress has received its own mandate—a mandate which our large and able majority will meet by safeguards and using our constitutional and exclusive power to legislate on behalf of the people.

How well are we equipped for the task of halting executive incursions?

The quality of members of Congress today, on both sides of the aisle, in both houses, is in my opinion higher than ever before in my experience. All of us are acutely aware that, to maintain its strength and vitality, Congress must continually retool and reorganize. All too often, however, our achievements in this direction are overshadowed by more dramatic events, such as the progress of the President's legislative program or the fall from grace of an individual member of Congress.

Modification of the seniority tradition, for example, actually has been under way in recent years in both houses.

In the House of Representatives we have limited the number of subcommittees senior members may chair and distributed these positions of influence among newer members. We are electing, in party caucuses, committee chairmen and ranking minority members.

Similarly, in a continuing process of adaptation, we have revitalized the caucus and strengthened the early leadership. We have opened up committee and voting procedures to provide for greater accountability.

This momentum will be sustained during the 93d Congress.

There is no reason why Congress should not do for itself what it has done for the Presidency, by providing for a transition from one Congress to another. We should authorize and fund a program that would enable the party caucuses to meet in the weeks after the election, nominate candidates for leadership and committee positions, and thus have most of this organizational work finished when a new Congress assembles on Jan. 3. We should be prepared to begin our substantive work in January, and not in March.

What the President is doing is creating a crisis that goes to the very heart of our constitutional system. This is the action which must be challenged by the other two co-equal branches. The courts should speak to the issue. The American people should insist that the balance of powers stipulated in the Constitution should be respected.

TO THE REAR, MARCH, ON HEALTH RESEARCH

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, for some weeks now, the media have been carrying reports of plans by this administration to cut Government's commitment to a variety of programs, many of which have been in fruitful operation for a number of years.

In the past week, some of our worst fears have been realized. One announcement after another has been made by the administration, each more dismaying than the last. All these moves and still others not listed here are shameful witnesses to the philosophical commitment of this President and his administration to a belief disproven many years ago.

In the 1920's, it was commonly accepted that Government had no business getting involved in programs benefiting large numbers of average citizens. When the Great Depression struck, President Hoover stood dazed amidst the collapsing ruins of our economy, still giving voice to that sincerely held belief; Government must not become involved.

FDR arrived with a series of constructive New Deal programs, each aimed at using Government resources to getting large segments of national life moving once again. While not a complete success, many such programs worked to significant positive effect. On that foundation, succeeding administrations built still more excellent programs, the list of which is too extensive to repeat here.

Some few programs failed. Others gave birth to security-minded, hidebound bureaucracies which did more to perpetuate themselves than they ever did to aid the people of our country. Yet no administration seriously considered dismantling this cumulative commitment, until this present Government came to office.

Obsessed with power, secrecy and suspicion, this administration views large Federal undertakings on behalf of the people as works of the devil. All such works, that is, except the staggering Pentagon budget and some corporate bailouts.

Still, no reasoning, compassionate man expected what has transpired recently. And no area of the Federal budget has shocked more people, or poses more of a menace to the Nation than drastic cuts in the HEW budget. What has been done to Federal aid to education programs deserves a piece all to itself. Suffice it to say that our commitment to educational excellence is expendable insofar as this President is concerned. Phasing out of Federal aid to vocational education alone is a national disaster of the first magnitude.

Yet it is our health budget that concerns me most at this time. I must confess that the recent cynical, callous evisceration of the Federal commitment to health and health research is utterly astounding. It is a death sentence for millions of our citizens over a period of years.

The administration seeks total abolition of community mental health centers, several hundreds of which have been created in recent years. These centers have been so successful that they have resulted in a 50-percent cut in State mental hospital admissions. Yet the argument advanced by the administration is that people who have gained by access to such centers are being singled out for special treatment, which in turn discriminates against the rest of America. Therefore, according to the logic governing this administration, the remainder of the proposed network of 2,000 such centers should not be created, and all Federal aid to existing centers should be terminated forthwith. It makes as much sense as a two-legged chair.

Regional health programs brought teams of health professionals into geographically isolated areas of America with up-to-date advances in treatment, saving lives, and changing lives which never before had access to decent health care. This program too is slated for termination under the President's budget proposals.

A decade-long program of Federal aid for hospital facilities is also on the list for early termination.

No more Federal funds for programs aimed at ending manpower shortages in medical and allied fields is another prominent feature of the President's budget. In this program, qualified students were admitted to professional schools for training in health professions. Federal money defrayed costs of their education. Many such students were qualified people who otherwise would have never had any chance for these kinds of education. If the President's proposals are accepted by Congress, these efforts to end America's shortages of qualified health professionals will be brought to an end.

It is worth noting that a significant percentage of foreign health professionals are now to be found manning American health facilities. How strange that vital programs aimed at aiding young Americans from underprivileged backgrounds to gain health professional status is to be wiped out.

The same fate awaits Federal aid to those entering health research. Many young professionals have been enticed into health research rather than earn large profits in private practice because Federal assistance adds to their incomes while they engage in research. This, too, will come to an end under the Nixon budget.

All down the line, Federal aid to our National Institutes of Health is cut in order to put extra dollars to several show projects. Research is an ongoing thing. You do not invest a certain number of dollars and get back a certified or guaranteed return on a given date. The Federal commitment to research in health has yielded major results. Polio and rubella have been conquered because of such work. Several Nobel laureates have been selected in recent years from the National Institutes of Health. All these arguments and more can be advanced on behalf of the Federal commitment to health research.

Yet all this goes by the boards as accountants at the Office of Management and Budget sharpen little pencils at expense of the health of the man in the street and his family.

There is plenty of money for more and more weapons. We must make ready for the next Vietnam or the next doomsday. But we dare not spend a few dollars for health research which will inevitably and eventually benefit all Americans. Our real health budget totals several billions of dollars. How does this compare to the swollen 80-billion-dollar-plus Pentagon arms bill?

Unless a man in a white coat comes dashing out of a laboratory waving a test tube and bellowing, "Eureka!" the program is not worthwhile? Would that the same criteria were applied to military hardware programs. Either it works or we withdraw support for it. Not another dollar until it functions or flies. Unfortunately, only health research gets such treatment. Well, why should these gentlemen in the administration care anyway. The poor will feel the pinch first and most painfully, and they suffer quietly. When the real impact of these health cuts comes home to middle-class Americans, this administration will be long gone from office. But not, Mr. Speaker, from memory.

It is the duty of this Congress to see to it that the vision of men like John Fogarty of Rhode Island and Lister Hill of Alabama does not perish under an accountant's pencil. We can and must restore budget cuts in health research. I truly believe this Congress has the votes to override any Presidential veto.

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, each year the Ladies Auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars conducts its national voice of democracy contest. This year almost half a million secondary school students participated in the contest competing for the five national scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes.

The winning contestant from each state will be brought to Washington early in March for the final judging.

Tennessee's winner this year is Miss Deborah Alford of Milan, Tenn., which is located in the Seventh Congressional District. A senior at Milan High School, Deborah is the daughter of Mrs. Oreathel Alford. She is a member of the National Honor Society and of the Beta Club, and she was a National Merit Scholar semifinalist. She is active in church work and plans next year to enter Lambuth College in Jackson, Tenn.

I insert Miss Alford's speech, which was judged best in Tennessee this year, at this point in the RECORD:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

(By Debbie Alford)

Mankind today has many privileges, but to attain these privileges he acquires respon-

sibilities. The youth of America are no different. We have many, many privileges and freedoms, yet along with them we also have responsibilities. One of our greatest responsibilities as American youth is to democracy, to freedom. You may ask, "Just what does responsibility to freedom mean?" Well, to me it means my duty to maintain a free government in this country. Just how can we accomplish this? Let's look at several different aspects. First: does the common, average, everyday American understand the constitution—and appreciate it? Though many youth of today can quote passage after passage of the constitution they still cannot tell you what rights and freedoms the constitution guarantees them. They do not appreciate the toiling and striving it took to write and enforce such a great document. They forget the many lives that were given on its behalf. Therefore, my first responsibility to freedom is to inform the American public of their constitutional rights. Though America is by far the most literate and learned nation in the world, most people are ignorant in this area. So it is our duty then, to teach the public about their country. To make sure they know of freedom of worship, of speech, of the press; as well as the articles that state no quartering of troops, the right to keep arms, and the right to trial by jury.

My second responsibility is to tell America about the duties explained in the constitution. The public, once informed of their rights, should be equally informed of their duties. Many duties, however, could be counted a privilege; such as the duty to vote, or to serve on a jury. We also have the duty to pay tax, and to obey the laws.

My third responsibility to freedom is to make sure that I know my responsibilities. Each and every person has these same responsibilities that I have previously listed. We must become aware of these so that we may perform them, in order that we ourselves may know what the constitution says, know what the Declaration of Independence stood for, and know the history of our country to appreciate it and support it.

As American youth therefore, it is our duty to keep this country free, to support the democracy and its policies, to perform our duties, but to enjoy our many privileges. We must support America and keep it alive or the greatest democracy in the world will have failed and died a premature death. Let us unite to fight against communism, socialism, and all the other forces that try to break our country down. We must be able to keep America free and say, in the words of John Paul Jones, "I have not yet begun to fight!" Life is a constant struggle, but by far the most important factor in that struggle is the fight to keep America free.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. DAVID TOWELL

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. TOWELL of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert into the RECORD a speech made by Miss Susan Mary Fitzgerald of Sparks, Nev., in the Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy Contest. Miss Fitzgerald's speech is the winning entry for the State of Nevada:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

(By Susan Fitzgerald)

Deep within each of us, there lives a reminder of the child we once were—a child of wisdom—a child of understanding—a child not unlike the hero of Antoine de Saint

Exupery's novel, "The Little Prince." In one chapter, the Prince compares the only rose he has ever known to the rosebush with which he converses. He says, "To be sure, an ordinary passerby would think that my rose looked just like you. But in herself alone, she is more important than all the hundreds of you other roses . . . because it is she that I have watered . . . because it is she that I have sheltered . . . because it is for her that I have killed . . . because it is she that I have listened to, when she grumbled, or boasted, or even sometimes when she said nothing. Because she is my rose . . . and my responsibility."

Like the Prince, I, too, have something unique—something beautiful—something priceless—the only freedom I have ever known. And, because it is my freedom it is my responsibility.

In upholding this responsibility, I first must recognize this rare and valuable freedom for nothing more than its simplistic beauty. In a world of over three billion people, only two hundred million of us have been blessed with the unalienable right to become whatever we wish to become without fear of criticism—without fear of retaliation. The children of such a society, the happy, well-adjusted, productive individuals that we have allowed ourselves to become, can do nothing but reinforce this concept of the inherent beauty that only a truly liberated nation can possess.

I have seen this nation grow throughout the pages of history, and it is my responsibility to preserve and perpetuate this legacy of individual liberty and choice. Time has erased the vestiges of every so-called "free" society, with one outstanding exception—America. It is my duty to see that time will continue to strengthen the convictions that form the foundation of our country, and that our dreams for the future will be the building blocks of the monument to freedom that we call home.

But even further, I am compelled to care for and protect this heritage that my fathers have left me. True, I have seen my brothers die on the battlefields of a nation half a world away, but I am deep in my conviction that even in death, new life shall be created. The Little Prince knew that some things must die, so that his rose might live. Who among us is so aware and so worldly that he can challenge a concept when he himself has never had to lay his life on the line—without question—without reservation—in order to maintain that ideal? It is neither my right nor my responsibility to challenge the choice of those who have done far more than I can ever hope to in preserving my freedom. Every treasure has its price, and such a price, we must be willing to pay.

But finally, I must learn to listen to my country and heed what it tells me to do. We see ourselves as a troubled nation, beset by violence and undermined with dissent. But such disturbance serves a useful purpose—it allows us to realize that our freedoms are more than just theories—more than just words on a piece of paper. Freedom is an idea—an idea in action—an idea subject to individual interpretation and capable of withstanding any challenge upon its strength. I must listen to the complaints of my people with an understanding heart—for only in silence is true freedom lost.

My country is so much like the little Prince's rose, and in his words, "To be sure, an ordinary passerby would think that my nation looked just like any other. But in herself alone, she is more important than all the hundreds of other nations . . . because it is she that I have sheltered . . . because it is for her that my brothers have died . . . because it is she that I have listened to, when she grumbled, or boasted, or even sometimes when she said nothing. Because she is my country . . . and her freedoms are my freedoms . . . and my responsibility."

AIR POLLUTION

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in Monday, February 12's Washington Post, there appeared an article regarding an unpublished Environmental Protection Agency report on the state of America's air. To say the least, the contents of this study are quite disturbing.

Obviously, when the health of our Nation's people becomes threatened by the soot and sulfur which corrupts our atmosphere, it is time to implement corrective measures. Hopefully, the task of cleaning up America's air will be a top priority issue during the coming session.

In lieu of the complete report which I trust the EPA intends to release in the very near future, I would like to insert the Post's article into the RECORD:

STUDY FINDS POLLUTION LAWS TOO LAX TO PROTECT HEALTH

(By Thomas O'Toole)

An unpublished report of the Environmental Protection Agency has concluded that the air pollution laws of American cities are not strict enough to protect the nation's health.

The report declares that sulfur standards across the country are weak enough that a number of diseases are aggravated, especially among the elderly.

The report's conclusion comes at a time when sulfur standards in at least six states have been relaxed to permit the burning of high-sulfur fuels during the current heating and diesel oil shortage.

The report is the unpublished verdict of a team of investigators working under a \$6 million-a-year program called CHESS (Community Health and Environmental Surveillance System). The report is being circulated among EPA officials for comment on "policy implications."

The first report of the investigative team since it began work three years ago, the CHESS studies are based on work done in New York City and nearby towns of northern New Jersey, Birmingham, Ala., Charlotte, N.C., and four Rocky Mountain cities, Magna, Kearns, Ogden and Salt Lake, Utah.

One of the report's basic conclusions is that the country must undertake a program to rid the air of sulfur dioxides, sulfate particles and the soot that comes from the incineration of trash and the burning of coal and oil in factories and electric power companies.

"The yearly costs of a five-year program are modest," the study says, "far less than one-tenth of the annual direct health costs, which can reasonably be attributed to the pollutant problem."

The EPA study, a copy of which was obtained by The Washington Post, estimates that current air pollution levels cost the country from \$1 billion to \$3 billion a year in health care alone.

"These estimates are probably conservative," the study states "since the calculations assumed that the costs of aggravation of chronic lung and heart disease amounts to no more than \$200 to \$300 per case; that asthmatic attacks cost only \$20 each; that the costs of acute respiratory disease have not risen in five years; and that each case of chronic bronchitis incurs an annual health cost of only \$200 to \$400."

The CHESS report supervised 23 separate studies, partly concentrating on long-term exposure to sulfur in the air and partly on short-term exposure to what the EPA calls

"episodes" of much higher than normal sulfur levels in the air.

In four recent pollution episodes in Birmingham, healthy children suffered "significant increases" in eye and chest irritations. In one of these four episodes, "acute decreases" in lung ventilation were witnessed, and during the worst of the four an "excess of acute irritation symptoms" was observed throughout the population.

Eight to nine years of exposure to normal city sulfur levels triggered decreases in lung ventilation in children and reduced the ability of asthmatics to cope with other diseases. Six years of exposure caused increases in croup and chronic bronchitis, diseases which can lead to far more serious illness.

Normal families exposed for three or more years to urban air pollution were found to suffer from more influenza than people living outside the cities, leading the EPA investigators to conclude: "If health intelligence needed to resolve this issue is not quickly sought, it would be prudent to control ambient sulfur dioxide much more stringently than is now planned. There is consistent, coherent, biologically plausible evidence that this problem may not be solved by the present air quality standards."

THE BITTER TRUTH

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, so many conflicting opinions have been expressed in recent days concerning the second devaluation of the U.S. dollar in a period of 14 months that there is little wonder the American layman in currency matters is totally confused.

He has been told by no less a putative authority than President Nixon himself that the new 10 percent cut will not affect the dollar's value "as far as the majority of American people is concerned."

Treasury Secretary George P. Shultz has termed the devaluation a "definite benefit" to our workmen, consumers, and businessmen on the presumption that it will make U.S. products more competitive abroad and foreign imports more costly at home.

But this is an obvious attempt to gloss the situation. Fortunately, we have economists and financial writers willing to grapple with and tell us the truth. The devaluation is not a feat of monetary magic. It is, in fact, a bitter defeat for this once sound and sagacious Nation in the unceasing contest with trading nations around the globe.

Little can be gained by lulling the American people on so serious an event. We have suffered a severe setback. And we will suffer more unless we regain our senses and correct the many mistakes which have been responsible for this dilemma. We must face up knowingly and honestly to what has happened to us.

First of all, through the 10-percent devaluation, we have lost, in the world's money scales, 10 percent of the value of our savings, 10 percent of the true value of our wages, 10 percent of our pensions, 10 percent of our dividends and other forms of income.

It will take some time, the economists tell us, for this 10-percent exaction to work its way fully into our domestic economy. But we must understand that this is inevitable. Our dollars in the future are bound to buy far less than they did before the devaluation was announced, and do at this subsequent moment.

And why, it needs to be asked, considering the erstwhile financial strength and the still vaunted affluence of our country, did devaluation become necessary in the judgment of the Nixon administration? The answers are both plain and tragic as far as the people's trust in their government is concerned. And they are not confined to the demonstration that foreign interests, overloaded with our dollars, have found our money weak by comparison with the currencies of other nations, notably West Germany and Japan, our supposed vanquished enemies in World War II.

We have spent far too much abroad. We have given away too many billions of our people's hard-earned money—and still are doing so in the long discredited foreign aid program. We have allowed too great a tide of foreign-made products to flow into our home markets, many of them the work of cheap labor and their low price the result of devious subsidies by overseas governments. We have blown away far too much of our substance in foreign wars and spent it in military adventures abroad for the assumed protection of others who have shown us little appreciation for the effort.

All this now must stop—either that or our country will continue to endure the spectacle of its slide from prestige and prosperity and into the plight reserved for the profligate. It behooves all of us in Government to pledge ourselves to halt the wholesale giveaways to defend our workmen and our industries against the unfair competitors from abroad, to fold up the costly military programs overseas which serve mainly to drain us of dollars and swamp others with them, and to end the general waste and extravagance.

As a Congressman deeply concerned over conditions in a district of heavy industry, I have seen coming the consequences of an age in which too often we have placed the interests of foreign nations above those of our own. I have seen jobs vanish from our steel mills as European and Japanese imports have increased. I have noted with alarm the statistics of our union people that imported steel had taken 180,000 union jobs in this country as far back as 1971. And I have warned Congress.

Now, certainly, is the time for action—belated as it may be in view of what already has taken place.

JOHN E. HIRTEN—MAN IN THE MIDDLE AT DOT

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the men most responsible for en-

lightening our national transportation policies is John E. Hirten, who was brought to Washington by former Secretary John A. Volpe to become Assistant Secretary of Transportation for Environment and Urban Systems.

Following Mr. Volpe's departure, and a reshuffling of Transportation Department responsibilities by his successor, Mr. Hirten was given a new post, as an assistant to Secretary Claude C. Brinegar.

Is this a promotion, or demotion?

And are the functions Mr. Hirten handled so capably in the Volpe regime going to receive the same priority treatment in the reorganized department under Secretary Brinegar?

These are questions of major public concern, since the answers will provide guideposts for our urban planners. Along with a number of our colleagues, I am trying to get reassurances from Mr. Brinegar.

Mr. Hirten has spent much of his career in San Diego, my home, and the city is justly proud of his many accomplishments. I attach at this point an editorial from Saturday's Washington Post, and excerpts from an article about Mr. Hirten in the December, 1972, issue of San Diego magazine:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 17, 1973]

SWITCHING TRACKS AT DOT

The Department of Transportation has just announced one of those internal shuffles that make people wonder what stands where any more. This month's series of moves, described as a "realignment," includes two which affect the ways in which environmental matters are handled within the department. First, the post of Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems, a job which has been performed valiantly by John E. Hirten, has been abolished. Mr. Hirten has been made an assistant to the secretary, and environmental affairs have been reassigned to the assistant secretary already in charge of safety and consumer affairs. Urban affairs have gone into another box. At the same time, the key authority for making environmental reviews of DOT-funded projects has been shifted from Mr. Hirten's old domain to such agencies as the Federal Highway Administration and the FAA, which fund the projects themselves.

The moves have understandably raised concern that the new Secretary of Transportation, Claude S. Brinegar, may be inclined to downgrade the environmental aspects of transportation policy which former Secretary John Volpe, to his lasting credit, emphasized. Such concerns were not relieved last week when Secretary Brinegar, appearing before the Senate Public Works Committee, was unable to explain very precisely what the realignment meant.

According to some DOT spokesmen, there is nothing sinister afoot at all. Someone's domain had to be broken up, they maintain, in order to free an assistant-secretary slot for congressional and intergovernmental relations. Environmental affairs just happened to be the easiest to move. More to the point, departmental loyalists assert that, thanks to the persistent work of Secretary Volpe and Mr. Hirten himself, the old-line transportation agencies have become so infused with an environmental conscience, and so tied to detailed review procedures, that a separate review office has become superfluous.

Well, we shall see. It is true that Mr. Hirten's office was established back in the dawn of environmental awareness even before enactment of the National Environmental Policy Act and long before the Nixon administration became fully committed to

flexibility in transportation planning and to the systems approach to urban transportation needs. But this is no time to back off from close review of specific projects, or from the broad assessment of alternate strategies. Who does this work at DOT is less important than ensuring that the work will be done. Sen. James L. Buckley (Con. R-N.Y.) and others are right in seeking such assurances from Secretary Brinegar.

[From San Diego magazine, Dec. 1972]

**WHY WE OUGHT TO LISTEN TO JOHN HIRTEN,
THE PLANNING BRAIN**
(By Herbert Fredman)

John E. Hirten, a tall, slim, 47-year-old professional planner, is the "eighth wonder of the world" in the careful estimate of a former close associate in San Diego. Another who was involved with Hirten considers him a glib promoter. Practically no one with even a passing acquaintance is neutral about the former executive vice-president of San Diegans, Inc., a private group of businessmen and land owners formed to rejuvenate the central city.

But the Hirten boosters outnumber his detractors by a large majority, and a growing Hirten fan club—in San Diego, in Washington, D.C., where he now lives and works, and in other cities—is evidence of the Hirten charisma. Many of his friends expect him to return to San Diego sooner or later.

Hirten, who is noted for his ability to produce provocative ideas, considers himself a worrier by profession. "A planner sees today's events in the light of tomorrow's problems," he says. In his present job, as assistant secretary of transportation for environment and urban systems, he worries about an astonishingly wide range of matters involving the nation's cities and the people who live in them. (By 1980, he points out, eight out of ten Americans will be living in cities and their surrounding metropolitan areas.) He tries to throw cold water on the nostalgic fantasy that so many people have, that there still exists a bucolic Norman Rockwell-type paradise somewhere, and on the idea's dangerous corollary, that one can ignore urban problems by hiding in the suburbs.

Instead, he declares, man's ability to create a decent urban environment "will determine the cultural, social and economic character of the societies which inhabit these cities, and our future civilization will reflect our success or failure."

During 1969 and 1970, when Hirten was managing San Diegans, Inc., he was aggressive in pushing many programs to revitalize downtown San Diego.

Hirten left San Diego to take his federal appointment in April, 1971. He was first named deputy assistant secretary in the transportation department, and 14 months later was elevated to assistant secretary. He works in a huge new office building in redeveloped Southwest Washington. The building, headquarters for DOT, was erected, oddly enough, by John Volpe, secretary of transportation, in his former incarnation as a contractor. Hirten's office and his adjacent conference room are somewhat smaller than a football field, and provide a vivid contrast with the meager cubbyhole he occupied with San Diegans, Inc., when he first arrived in San Diego.

Actually Hirten was considered for the job of urban renewal coordinator in San Diego in 1958, 11 years before he received his appointment with the San Diego central city group. When he was interviewed for the city job, he was told that his attitudes were too aggressive and were not acceptable. At the time, he saw the job as an opportunity to educate San Diegans in the pressing need for urban development and in the case for accepting federal funds. Today a large number of business and civic leaders in the community support the desirability of seeking federal money for redevelopment, but not

many years ago the idea was viewed with apprehension as a shocking heresy. "After being turned down for the local job in 1958, it was with some satisfaction that I came back as executive vice-president of San Diegans, Inc., in 1969," Hirten says.

Hirten has been active in planning organizations, and is a past president of the California chapter of the American Institute of Planners. He goes out of his way to avoid direct criticism of planners in San Diego. Some local planners, however, look at Hirten with a jaundiced eye. They complain that he is too oriented to action. A friend of Hirten's claims that "some bureaucrats don't like him because they are envious—he is articulate, persuasive and gets results. In addition, planners in San Diego tend to favor the suburbs in their thinking. They are less interested in the downtown area. And there is lots of negativism here—they really don't want new ideas. Newcomers have a tough time."

These days, of course, urban transportation problems and their relationship to the environment are Hirten's main concerns. He worries about San Diego's love affair with the automobile, an infaturation that is polluting the air, devouring vast amounts of land, making second-class citizens out of pedestrians and bicyclists, and causing incalculable physical, social and economic damage.

"It is no longer acceptable for the traffic syndrome to dictate our planning," he says. "We must challenge the idea that unlimited mobility is an end in itself. The private automobile is in fact a form of public transportation. It uses a public right-of-way, it is licensed by a public agency, it requires public space and public air, it makes noise which has an impact on the public and it pollutes the air which belongs to the public. The vehicle is privately owned but it would be of very limited utility without an enormous public investment."

While better transportation is the key to central city redevelopment (just as the lack of adequate transportation—along with the senseless cry that "We can't stop progress"—has been the key to decaying city cores and a wasteland of urban sprawl) Hirten stresses that outlying areas are just as dependent on good transport. "The suburbs today are like the central cities were 25 years ago," he says. "There is nothing in the future but problems for the suburbs. You see the suburban kids hitchhiking because there is no decent transit system. They want to get to the life and diversity of the city and away from the bland dullness of the suburb."

The emphasis that Hirten puts on the need for good transportation is difficult to overstate. "There is an old and very basic law of engineering which states: 'It works better if you plug it in.' That same law applies to people—they work better when they are part of the society and culture in which they live. Good transportation keeps us all plugged in," Hirten says.

What motivates Hirten?

Recently over a bowl of soup in his Washington office he talked about his approach to life. (He is a confirmed lunch-at-his-desk man; he makes up for the confinement by playing tennis as much as he can.) "I like to act as a bridge between the public and private sectors," he says. "I've tried to be the connecting link, for example, between the hard-nosed developer and the equally hard-nosed planner. I have a strong conviction that we can have economic prosperity and good planning at the same time; there is no need to sacrifice either one."

He realizes that he makes strong statements in order to get his points across, and that sometimes his way of putting things upsets people. "John certainly can't be called mealy-mouthed and he doesn't pussy-foot around," an acquaintance points out. "But he still has a remarkable record for getting people to work together. Probably it's because people realize he isn't hungry for per-

sonal gain. His concern is with the environment and with preserving the elements of a free society. He might be called a do-gooder—but what's wrong with that?"

Some of Hirten's San Diego friends think he might return here as a consultant when he ultimately leaves the department of transportation. They think his combination of enthusiasm, optimism and articulateness, combined with his talents as a gadfly, would be useful in dealing with government, business, and other institutions. Hirten himself says only that his goal is to find a challenge. "I feel the continual need to make a contribution—to a firm, to a community, to the government," he says, "I like to get in a difficult position and accomplish the job better than anyone did before."

**RESOLUTION FROM MAINE STATE
LEGISLATURE**

HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the National Oceanic and Atmosphere Agency recently announced its intention of permanently closing the National Marine Fisheries Service Facility, at Boothbay Harbor, Maine, by July 1 of this year. Because the Boothbay facility is vitally important to the continuation of both scientific services and general economic development of the Northeast, I have grave reservations about the wisdom of the agency's decision.

This concern is shared by members of the Maine State Legislature and expressed in a formal protest forwarded to me. At a time when there is a growing need for greater communication between the State and Federal Governments, particularly on such issues that involve both branches, I would like to insert this formal communication from the Maine House of Representatives and the Maine Senate into the RECORD for consideration by my colleagues in the House. I hope that the tradition of close cooperation on the part of all of us who have been given the responsibility of representing and protecting the interests of the people, regardless of what level of government in which one serves, will spur careful and thoughtful consideration of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I include this resolution in the RECORD:

STATE OF MAINE—JOINT RESOLUTION PROTESTING THE PROPOSED CLOSING OF THE NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICES AT BOOTHBAY HARBOR, MAINE

We, your Memorialists, the House of Representatives and Senate of the State of Maine of the One Hundred and Sixth Legislative Session assembled, most respectfully present and petition the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, as follows:

Whereas, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency has summarily and publicly announced the intention of permanently closing the National Marine Fisheries Services facility at Boothbay Harbor on or before July 1st of this year; and

Whereas, this incredible decision comes at a time when our commercial fisheries need the scientific capabilities that this, the only "cold water" fishery facility in the Nation can provide; and

Whereas, should budget cuts become necessary they should be planned and ap-

portioned equally among all fisheries research centers rather than arbitrary closure and the accompanying financial burdens to the State; and

Whereas, the maintenance and development of this fishery research center at Boothbay Harbor is vital to the future overall economic development of the northeast; now, therefore, be it

Resolved: That we, your Memorialists, do hereby respectfully protest said closure and request the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency to cease and desist in its efforts to close the said facilities; and be it further

Resolved: That the Members of the United States Congress for the State of Maine are hereby urgently requested to use every possible means to cause the decision to close said facilities to be reversed; and be it further

Resolved: That a copy of this resolution, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted by the Secretary of State to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States; the Honorable Frederick B. Dent, Secretary of Commerce; and to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress and to the members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this State.

SUSAN B. ANTHONY

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, throughout our history, this Nation has been blessed with towering figures who have left indelible marks of achievement on the quality and maturity of life in America.

Such a figure was Susan B. Anthony whose birthday we celebrated on February 15. Her lifetime of commitment to equal rights for women and for all people in our society takes on special meaning today.

With unshakable principles, rare courage and superb intellect, Susan Anthony began her years as a reformer and social activist in the temperance movement. She became an ardent supporter of the abolitionist movement, and until the end of the Civil War advocated and worked for the immediate and unconditional emancipation of black people in this country.

Her fearless dedication to equality and opportunity for all prepared her well for the earnest campaign for women's suffrage to which she devoted the remainder of her life. A controversial woman whose views and often dramatic and militant actions were the object of scorn and criticism, Susan Anthony was determined to demonstrate strength, self-reliance, independence, intelligence, and energy in the performance of duties and responsibilities—all qualities that in her day were thought to be solely the province of men.

To those who knew her and shared her dream which was realized with the enactment of the 19th amendment to the Constitution, Susan Anthony was a woman who combined high moral standards and a quick wit, unquestionable honesty and a hearty sense of humor. She died before being able to cast a ballot, but she died firmly convinced that

women would someday occupy vital decisionmaking positions in our Nation.

Susan Anthony was an American patriot in the finest sense. She worked zealously in behalf of her convictions, possessing a vision that went far beyond the goal of the right to vote for women. A true, honest comradeship between the sexes based on equality, a society in which freedom has but one definition for all citizens—these were the ideals of a pioneer activist woman. They remain the goals of all of us who continue to pursue the highest course of human development.

The contributions and wisdom of Susan Anthony are of sustaining value. They give us renewed vigor and enthusiasm for the important tasks that lie ahead.

GIVING CREDIT WHERE CREDIT IS DUE

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons why 20 years have passed and the promise of Brown against Board of Education remains unfulfilled in many parts of this Nation. Perhaps the most significant of these has been the unwillingness of many governmental officials to implement this Supreme Court decision. Brown against Board of Education tried to end unlawful segregation in the schools, but many people in positions of responsibility sought and used tactics to circumvent this order.

This is what occurred, for almost 20 years, in Prince Georges County, Md. Many officials were willing to incur elaborate expense and to perform intricate maneuvers so as not to have to end unlawful segregation in the county schools. Finally, the law caught up with Prince Georges County.

Many observers were then caught by surprise when students were bused to their new schools—virtually without incident. The credit for this goes not to the politicians, but to the parents and educators who worked quietly in the background, preparing the children for the transition. I would like to take this opportunity to commend and congratulate the many law-abiding citizens who came to respect the goal of equality of educational opportunity.

On January 23, 1973, Mr. Nicholas Blatchford's column in the Evening Star discussed one example of why the transition in Prince Georges County went so smoothly. He focused on the Lewisdale Elementary School and the school's administrators', teachers', and parents' willingness to make the changeover as pleasant as possible. Indeed, at this school, the entire experience for the children was one of learning, from which I am sure they will benefit enormously.

I would like to share Mr. Blatchford's column with my colleagues:

OUR TOWN: "I HAVE TO SAY IT WAS LOVELY"
(By Nicholas Blatchford)

With all the hand-wringing brought about by the massive school desegregation plan for

Prince Georges County, it's good to see that a lot of parents, teachers and children are quietly preparing to make the adventure work.

It seems to me this is our country at its best.

For instance, take Lewisdale Elementary School which is getting ready to receive 99 black children bused to it from the less-prosperous community of Cedar Heights, a subdivision of Fairmont Heights.

Lewisdale is a rather relaxed and friendly development of brick ramblers, Cape Cods and split-levels near the University of Maryland and it is just old enough (23 years) to be experiencing its first real turnover, original settlers beginning to move out of their houses (the range is roughly \$17,500 to \$37,000) to make way for younger families with younger children. It is, in the words of Grace Head, president of the citizens association, a community that has "kept itself up well."

The maturing of Lewisdale has led to that phenomenon which many neighborhoods like it are just beginning to experience—empty classrooms in the lower schools. And this explains why Lewisdale Elementary is going to be able to accommodate 99 apprehensive children from Cedar Heights with relative ease.

And, what's more, with warmth.

"We feel very strongly that our two communities need to be acquainted," Lewisdale Principal Mary E. Long wrote to Lewisdale parents, inviting them to an open house for the newcomers at the school, "and a warm and sincere feeling of mutual friendship must exist in the best interest of all, especially children."

She went on to mention plans for a "buddy family" program to assist the newcomers in case they might get sick, or hurt, or miss the bus, or want to stay after school to take part in Lewisdale activities, and she asked those families willing to help to say so.

Forty-six families promptly did.

"I'd be lying if I said that a few parents aren't a little uptight about this many, should I say, 'strange' children coming to our school," Mrs. Long said to me, "but I think the response at this stage of the game is very good. Lots of parents simply couldn't help out after school and told me so. But 46 were unqualified 'yes'—it was Y-E-S, with no qualification about it."

Last Friday's open house at Lewisdale was "a real nice time," Mrs. Long said. The black children arrived on two buses with about a dozen parents and several teachers. The Lewisdale student council took charge, the president gave a welcoming speech, the newcomers were presented with a pamphlet containing a floor plan of their new school, a map of the immediate neighborhood, and several friendly poems written by Lewisdale kids. Then the Lewisdale chorus sang "Let There Be Peace and Let It Begin With Me," and "Consider Yourself One of the Family" from Oliver Twist, and two other songs whose titles Mrs. Long forgets. ("We didn't do 'Getting to Know You,'" she said. "We kind of wear that one out in the fall.")

The Lewisdale kids then took their new friends on a tour of the school in small groups, followed by cookies and milk.

"I have to say to you that it was just a lovely visiting kind of experience," Mrs. Long said. "I think we are going to have a smooth transition."

She thought about this for a moment, and then she said, "I'm just as prejudiced as I can be as far as this school is concerned. This is my school. I've been with it from the start. I'm very fond of the community, and I love my work. And all I can say is we had a bright-eyed, pleasant, nice-looking bunch of kids out here on Friday. Children are children. We hope to receive them as such."

"We all feel that it's going to be strange for these youngsters coming here," Mr. Head said, "and we're not going to let them feel like outsiders. I think we're going to take a lot of

pride in making them feel welcome. After all, a friend is a friend."

LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1973

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I join today with my colleagues in paying tribute to our 36th President, Lyndon Baines Johnson.

His loss has a deep meaning to me. I feel that the Nation as a whole mourns his death with equal depth. To me Lyndon Johnson was indeed a big man who rose up to meet the challenges which might have gone unresolved by one without his character.

This man's accomplishments were many; they have been elaborated on already. His deeds were brought about by an uncanny insight and the determination to overcome stumbling blocks, regardless of their size or stature.

My first direct contact with the legislative ability, particularly the persuasive ability of Lyndon Johnson, came when I was a member of the Select Committee on Space. Shortly after October, 1957, the initial flight of a sputnik forced this country into an emotionally charged space program. Speaker Rayburn directed the committee's effort at writing the Space Act and establishing NASA. Leo O'Brien of New York and I, added a rather substantial amendment to the proposed legislation. The amendment met with considerable opposition in the Senate, and leading the fight was the Senate majority leader, Lyndon B. Johnson.

At the suggestion of Mr. O'Brien, we arranged a luncheon with Mr. Johnson to see if we could work out our differences. We did meet. We did compromise. And, for the first of many times, I was allowed to see the great legislative ability and persuasive know-how of Lyndon Johnson.

The outcome of the meeting was predictable. Mr. Johnson's practical approach to the differences led to a compromise, which at that time moved the project forward toward the goal we were all seeking. It is this type of ability that allows progress, and Lyndon Johnson was a master of the art of compromise.

The measure of the man was again vividly shown to me in 1960 when some of my California colleagues and I attended the Democratic Convention as Johnson delegates. As a group we worked very closely with him on his campaign. We felt and saw the pressures building, on Mr. Johnson as well as ourselves. When John F. Kennedy was selected as the party nominee, Lyndon Johnson showed another one of his rare gifts. He willingly accepted the nomination as vice president, and, in my opinion, this was done for love of country and dedication to the party—the high principles in which he believed.

Needless to say many felt his position as majority leader of the Senate was more powerful than that of the Vice-

Presidency, but Lyndon Johnson did his job, and he did it well.

The same was true again after he assumed the Presidency. Again, to cite an occasion, let me go back to the troubled times surrounding the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. As a member of the House Rules Committee, I and some of my colleagues were invited to the White House to discuss in broad terms the controversy surrounding the legislation. It was a great personal honor for me to be there. It was in this meeting where some of the very necessary understandings were reached in the manner in which the act was promulgated.

In this particular instance I had the experience of realizing that indeed Lyndon Johnson had a rather short fuse; but, at the same time, he had the capacity to control his temper and thereby make his point under what were sometimes very trying circumstances.

Later in his career, I watched the agony he suffered over Vietnam. But at no time could I not believe that he was carrying out the policies which he believed to be in the best interests of this country.

I became fully convinced that no man was more dedicated to bringing about peace in Vietnam than President Johnson. His entire life and full effort during the latter part of his tenure as President was devoted to that cause. He sought, as I think most of us did, peace with honor.

Lyndon Baines Johnson was a doer of great deeds. He always had a goal. He fought hard. And he fought hardest for that in which he believed and for the things which would improve the lot of all Americans. In the course of accomplishing this oftentimes difficult task he stepped on toes and he took steps which became controversial. But, I firmly believe his heart was in the right place and his singlemost objective was to serve all the people and improve the conditions of all the people.

To Lady Bird, the Johnson daughters and their husbands, and to the grandchildren I offer my deepest condolences.

WATER

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a joint resolution directing the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Interior to study the economic and engineering feasibility of acquiring riparian rights from the Republic of Mexico to water in the Gulf of California. This would be for the purpose of piping and pumping such water from the gulf to Arizona, and to acquire a permit to locate a desalinization plant within the territorial limits of the Republic of Mexico.

This resolution relates generally to the water and energy shortage problems of the American Southwest, and specifically to the salinity problem of the Colorado River.

The treaty between the United States and Mexico involving the Colorado River provided only that a certain quantity of water, 1,500,000 acre-feet of water per year, would be delivered at the international border. Nothing was said about the quality of water to be delivered.

Nevertheless, the desirability of lowering salt content is undeniable. In an attempt to accomplish this, the United States has constructed a ditch to take the waters which drain from the Wellton-Mohawk project in Arizona and introduce them back into the Colorado River at a point below Morelos Dam, which is the Mexican point of diversion. Actually these waters amount to a windfall to the Mexicans, since the water is not charged against the one million and a half acre-feet which Mexico obtains under the international treaty. This additional water assists in efforts to keep the mainstream water below undesirable salt levels.

In addition, President Nixon and President Echeverria of the Republic made more headway on the salinity question in their discussions early last summer. As a result, further efforts are being undertaken to dilute the water Mexico receives.

It should be emphasized that these improvements were undertaken as a matter of international comity, and not as an assumption of any legal liability on the part of the United States to provide water of any given quality at the international border.

Despite what has already been done, the Colorado River salinity question still could be an extremely delicate issue between the nations; or, it could be a means of cementing the friendship between our two Republics.

Although, as I mentioned before, the United States has no legal duty to improve the quality of water obtained by Mexico from the river, I feel it is to our own best interest to do so if we can without irreparable injury to our people.

The best manner by which to improve the quality of this water is by augmentation; introducing additional water which is better in quality than the water which flows across the international boundary. And, the best means of doing this is by the construction of a desalinization plant to be located somewhere in the littoral of the Gulf of California. Power to operate this plant would be provided by a nuclear plant built in the United States, near the Mexican border.

This scheme would provide pure water to dilute the waters of the Colorado River to the desired degree. It would also provide surplus water which could be used in the Colorado River, either by water exchange or by direct application. The surplus power which would be produced by the nuclear plant would be readily marketable, possibly in northwestern Mexico and certainly in the southwestern part of the United States, which faces imminent power shortages.

I have specified a nuclear plant, rather than a conventionally fired plant because there is no adequate supply of fossil fuel in that region. Also, I feel that the undertaking of a project of this magnitude would appeal to our friends in Mexico, not only as a source of water supply, but as a prestigious scientific

undertaking. The two countries would be advancing technologies in nuclear power production, desalinization, and surely in the related areas for the protection of our environment. After all, we would want this undertaking to epitomize sound environmental planning.

As its part of the undertaking, Mexico would furnish a site or sites on or near the Gulf of California for the withdrawal of water. It would also give whatever riparian rights are necessary for the legal use of waters of the Gulf of California, and rights of way for canals, waterways, and the like. Of course, insofar as possible the United States and Mexico should be reimbursed for their expenses from the sale of excess power.

It should also be noted here that the Colorado River Basin Project Act took the burden of providing water to satisfy the entire Mexican treaty burden upon the Government of the United States. At some time in the future, the task of providing 1,500,000 acre-feet of water to satisfy this burden must be assumed. The Colorado River is far short of producing the amount of water to satisfy the needs of the States of the basin, even without regard to the Mexican burden. This, then, might be a manner in which the United States could discharge the burden it has assumed, establish better international relations with Mexico, and aid in ending a power shortage in the southwestern part of the United States.

This plan is not new to Mexico. It has been broached in numerous talks between officials of the two Governments over the last few years.

If passed my legislation would direct the Department of State and the Interior to undertake negotiations which are necessary if this plan is to be developed further. The time is right with the increased Mexican concern over the salinity problem. I hope my resolution will be given early consideration.

LEE HAMILTON'S FEBRUARY 19, 1973,
WASHINGTON REPORT ON THE
1974 BUDGET

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my February 19, 1973, Washington report on the 1974 budget:

1974 BUDGET

The President's budget is the single, most important political document he submits to the Congress. It outlines his view of the needs of the country, and what the federal government should do to meet them.

President Nixon's budget for Fiscal Year 1974 estimates receipts at \$256 billion, an increase of \$31 billion over 1973, and budget outlays of about \$268.7 billion, an increase of \$19 billion over the 1973 budget. Within that fiscal framework, the President has expressed his strategy of a full employment balance, no tax hikes, reduced social programs, and the decentralization of the federal government's functions. The highlights of that budget include:

No tax increase, and a planned deficit of \$12.7 billion.

A \$4.2 billion increase in defense spending, A plan to require Medicare patients to pay

more than twice as much as they do now for the average hospital stay.

A dismantling of the education programs, Increased assistance for minority businessmen, energy research, drug abuse control, law enforcement, mass transit and the arts,

The abolition or reduction of more than 100 programs, such as those for community action, hospital construction, rural conservation and electrification, mental health centers, housing and public employment.

The 1974 budget also calls for the consolidation of many functions now scattered across many departments into four new departments (community development, human resources, natural resources and economic affairs). Seventy narrow-purpose programs will be consolidated into four block programs, transferring both federal money and spending responsibility to state and local governments in such areas as education, law enforcement, manpower training and community development. The change proposed here is from specific grants, which channel funds into specific programs reflecting national concerns and priorities, to broad purpose grants, giving discretion to state and local officials to distribute and administer federal money.

Federal programs often are ineffective because they are too centralized, and corrections are needed. I have supported a combination of categorical grants and revenue sharing to give flexibility to the federal system and to promote responsibility by the states and cities. Under the President's proposal, there is likely to be fierce competition among the states and cities for federal money.

In his budget message, the President renewed his call to the Congress to join him in putting a ceiling on spending. While the Congress agrees with that objective, and apparently with the specific figure he recommends, substantial disagreement can be expected over the priorities for the use of the money.

Congress is ill-equipped to challenge the President on his national priorities until it sets its own house in order to better control its budgetary and revenue procedures. Under the present appropriations procedure, in which spending bills are shaped without reference to a total budget limit, Congress cannot handle the budget systematically or effectively. Fortunately, the Congress is beginning to make the necessary changes to improve its handling of the budget.

The defense budget of \$79 billion, despite all of the explanations, strikes me as being mighty high. The Congress is obligated to scrutinize the defense requests to reduce, for example, the excessive ratio of support to combat troops and the overblown general officer class, to close unneeded bases, and reduce cost overruns on several weapons systems.

The President undoubtedly is correct in trying to end some long-overdue excesses in federal assistance programs, but several other features of the budget concern me:

Some people really do need help, and to reduce programs without proposing alternatives could work real hardships on them.

The budget abandons the long-held goal of getting unemployment down to 4 percent, and fails to propose ways of creating jobs.

Education programs, such as aid to libraries and schools, are threatened.

No changes are proposed to make income and property taxes more equitable.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States must begin to ex-

ercise greater responsibility in its fiscal and budgetary operations. Our appropriations process, rather than operating within a budgetary framework, deals separately with a number of funding bills. This approach can result in an overall spending level that exceeds projected full-employment revenues.

In order to enable Congress to reassert its role in developing fiscal and budgetary policies, I have sponsored the Federal Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1973. The bill would require Congress to set an overall expenditure limitation within 45 days after the President's annual economic message. By setting such a limitation, Congress would be forced to consider the appropriation bill in the light of limited dollars and competing priorities.

The bill would also move the Federal fiscal year from July 1 to January 1, thus giving Congress more time to consider budgets properly and reducing the need for "continuing resolutions" which are now used to permit agencies to spend at their old budget levels when their new budget has not been approved by the July 1 deadline.

The Federal Fiscal Responsibility Act also deals with the matter of Presidential impoundment of funds. Once the Congress has reassumed the responsibility of relating outlays to available resources, it has the duty to preserve its constitutional prerogative to determine national priorities. The Executive must not be allowed to assume legislative responsibilities. Once the legislative branch has appropriated funds, they should be spent, unless circumstances have significantly changed in the period following passage, and the Congress agrees not to spend them.

Mr. Speaker, the time to bring order and reason to the budget process has come. We all have our personal priorities and we should all continue to fight for those priorities. We must recognize, however, the constraints of a spending framework that is determined, in part, by our revenues.

I insert the text of the Federal Fiscal Responsibility Act in the RECORD at this point:

H.R. 2672

A bill to provide greater assurance for fiscal responsibility

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 Federal Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1973.

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

The Congress declares, that in light of the increasing complexity of the Federal Government, and in light of the constitutional requirements for congressional involvement as an integral partner in the budgetary process and because of the recent modernization of the Executive departments' budgetary procedure that:

(1) the Congress should consider the Federal budget and other fiscal policies in a systematic and analytical manner;

(2) the Congress should re-establish its primary role in developing the monetary and fiscal policies of the Government of the United States;

(3) the Congress should examine alternatives to present budgeting and appropriations procedures to insure that it may consider budgetary and fiscal policies in a systematic and analytical manner;

(4) the Congress should consider the

budget in a comprehensive manner so that competing programs and departments can be considered in a unified budget strategy which recognizes the increasing demands on the Federal tax dollar; and

(5) the Congress should establish budgetary and fiscal procedures which will assure the orderly and timely channeling of funds from the Federal Government to the States.

TITLE I—MODIFICATION OF THE FISCAL YEAR

SEC. 101. Effective with the second calendar year which begins after the date of enactment of this Act, the fiscal year of all departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States shall be the calendar year.

SEC. 102. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget is authorized to make provision by regulation, order, or otherwise for the orderly transition by all departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States affected by the fiscal year in effect on the date of enactment of this Act to the use of the fiscal year prescribed by section 101 of this title.

TITLE II—ESTABLISHING CONGRESSIONAL EXPENDITURES LIMITATIONS

SEC. 201. Except as otherwise provided in this title, the expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during each fiscal year shall not exceed that amount which the Congress shall fix by concurrent resolution no later than forty-five legislative days, as that term is used in title II of this Act, after the latest day set by law for the budget message of the President with respect to such fiscal year. In fixing such limitation, the Congress shall consider relevant economic indicators, programs goals and budgetary considerations which will be helpful in establishing a comprehensive budget strategy.

SEC. 202. The limitation set by section 201 of this title shall be increased by an amount equal to any net increase in total expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) during such fiscal year with respect to relatively uncontrollable outlays under then existing law, open-ended programs and fixed costs.

SEC. 203. The limitation set by section 201 of this title shall also be increased by an amount equal to the net increase in receipts over the estimated receipts upon which such limitation was fixed.

SEC. 204. Not later than fifteen days after the sine die adjournment of each session of the Congress the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the net effect of action or inaction by the Congress on total expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) recommended by the President for the fiscal year following such session. If such estimate indicates that total expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) for that fiscal year would be in excess of the limitation established by section 201 of this title, as adjusted in accordance with sections 202 and 203, the Director shall specify in such report, for each activity for which he estimates expenditures and net lending to be in excess of the amount recommended therefor by the President, the pro rata reduction in expenditures and net lending required to comply with that limitation, as adjusted. Expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) for any such activity for that fiscal year shall not exceed the amount which would have been permitted by the amount specified in the Director's report.

SEC. 205. In the administration of any activity as to which (1) the obligational authority is reduced in order to effectuate reductions in expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) required by section 204 of this title, and (2) the allocation grant, apportionment, or other distribution of funds among recipients is required to be determined by the application of a formula in-

volving the amount appropriated or otherwise made available for distribution, the amount remaining available for obligation after such reduction shall be substituted, in the application of the formula, for the amount appropriated or otherwise made available. Neither the United States nor any of its officers shall be liable for any part of the difference between the amount appropriated or otherwise made available for any activity and the amount as so reduced.

TITLE III—ESTABLISHING A FEDERAL IMPOUNDMENT PROCEDURE

SEC. 301. (a) Whenever the President impounds any funds appropriated by law out of the Treasury for a specific purpose or project, or approves the impounding of such funds by an officer or employee of the United States, he shall, within ten days thereafter, transmit to the House of Representatives and the Senate a special message specifying:

- (1) the amount of funds impounded;
- (2) the specific projects or governmental functions affected thereby; and
- (3) the reasons for the impounding of such funds.

(b) Each special message submitted pursuant to subsection (a) shall be transmitted to the House of Representatives and the Senate on the same day, and shall be delivered to the Clerk of the House of Representatives if the House is not in session, and to the Secretary of the Senate if the Senate is not in session. Each such message shall be printed as a document for each House.

SEC. 302. For purposes of this title, the impounding of funds includes—

- (1) withholding or delaying the expenditure or obligation of funds (whether by establishing reserves or otherwise), appropriated for projects or activities, and the termination of authorized projects or activities for which appropriations have been made, and,
- (2) any type of executive action which effectively precludes the obligation or expenditures of the appropriated funds.

SEC. 303. (a) Except as provided for in section 304(c), the President shall cease the impounding of funds specified in each special message within sixty calendar days of continuous session after the message is received if such impounding shall have been disapproved by either House of Congress by passage of a resolution stating in substance that that House does not favor the impounding.

(b) The provisions of this section and section 304 shall be considered as an exercise of rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such they shall be deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of resolutions described by this section; and they shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(c) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

(d) For purposes of this section and section 304, the continuity of a session is broken only by an adjournment of the Congress since die, and the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain shall be excluded in the computation of the sixty day period.

(e) Any resolution of disapproval as provided for in subsection (a) of this section and in subsection (c) of section 304 shall be referred to the committee in each House whose responsibility includes the authorization of appropriations for the department or agency whose funds have been impounded.

SEC. 304. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c) of this section, the Presi-

dent shall not impound any funds from appropriations made by the Congress for any appropriations categories of any department or agency of the Federal Government unless such impoundment is made in all appropriations categories of that department or agency on the basis of equal percentage impoundment among appropriations categories.

(b) Variations of up to 10 percentage points in the impoundment of funds between individual appropriations categories within a department or agency shall not be deemed as unequal percentage impoundment among appropriation categories for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section.

(c) In the event that the President desires to impound funds for a particular appropriations category within a department or agency without reference to the limitations established in subsections (a) and (b) of this section he shall submit a Presidential message as provided for in section 301 of this Act prior to any such impoundment. Either House of Congress shall have thirty days of continuous session, from submission of the message, to disapprove by passage of a resolution stating that that House does not favor the proposed impounding in contravention of subsections (a) and (b) of this section. After such time the President shall be allowed to impound that appropriations category without regard to provisions in that section.

(d) For the purposes of this section, the term "appropriations category" means each designation of a use or program in the acts of Congress appropriating funds.

SEC. 305. Any costs which are incurred by the recipient of Federal funds as a result of delay, in disbursing such funds, in excess of sixty days after the date on which such recipient was to receive such disbursement according to notification from the appropriate Federal authority shall be reimbursed by the Federal Government. The district courts of the United States shall have exclusive original jurisdiction to hear and determine cases brought under this section. This shall not apply to any costs incurred by the recipient of Federal funds as a result of delay consequent to the impounding of such funds under this title.

ENRICH LIVES OF OUR OLDER AMERICANS

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, older Americans have contributed much to their country, and this Nation owes them more than a barren, marginal existence: Their "golden years" should be rich, meaningful, and rewarding.

In my Sixth Congressional District of Florida live more than 134,000 older Americans 65 years of age and older. I am personally familiar with their problems and am proud to represent them. They have served their Nation and society, and now they are entitled to some basic services in return.

For this reason, I have cosponsored H.R. 1483, the Older American Services bill which amends the Older Americans Act of 1965 and provides increased funds to the States for a variety of services directed to the special problems of the aged.

This bill would establish an Administration on Aging under the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, headed

by a Commissioner on Aging appointed by the President. The Administration would have the responsibility of carrying out the programs authorized by the bill.

Also, a National Information and Resource Clearinghouse for the Aging would be created to collect, analyze and distribute information on the needs and interests of our older Americans.

H.R. 1483 would establish a Federal Council on Aging composed of 15 members appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, to assist and advise the President on the needs of older Americans.

The Administration on Aging would work with the States to develop statewide plans for delivering services to older Americans. The bill authorizes \$100 million for fiscal year 1973 for grants for State and community programs on aging; \$200 million for fiscal 1974 and \$300 million for fiscal 1975.

In addition, qualified personnel would be attracted into the field of aging and trained to help meet the needs of older Americans. For this purpose, \$15 million would be appropriated for fiscal year 1973; \$20 million for fiscal 1974, and \$25 million for fiscal 1975.

Older Americans often cannot afford their own automobiles, or have difficulty driving, and must rely on public transportation to get about. Such transportation many times is either unavailable or inadequate. For this reason, H.R. 1483 would provide \$7½ million to help meet the transportation problems of older Americans in fiscal year 1973; \$15 million for fiscal 1974 and \$20 million for fiscal 1975.

This legislation also would provide for senior centers to serve as a focal point for delivering social and nutritional services. Federal grants or contracts would be available for up to 75 percent of the cost of such centers, with \$35 million appropriated for each fiscal year from 1973 to 1975. To staff these centers, \$10 million would be appropriated for each of the same 3 years.

For older Americans who enjoy being with children, the Older Americans Community Service and Foster Grandparents program would be expanded. And for older Americans of low income, the Community Service Employment program would provide 40,000 to 60,000 jobs.

These and other programs under the Older American Services bill would provide increased opportunities for elderly, and go far toward helping enrich their lives.

NATIONWIDE SUPPORT FOR SELECT CRIME COMMITTEE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer, for the benefit of my colleagues, these expressions of support for the continuance of the House Select Committee on Crime.

Since the House will soon be considering H.R. 205 which extends this select

committee for 2 years, it seemed appropriate that my colleagues should have some idea of the impact of the committee from the view of law enforcement officials, educators, and others interested in fighting crime in America.

It is significant that these expressions come from almost every level of the Nation's criminal justice system, as well as citizen organizations. In this era of heated debates over increased versus decreased federalism, such an outpouring of support for a Federal body must say something about that body's work.

Following are the comments:

METROPOLITAN CRIME COMMISSION.

OF NEW ORLEANS, INC.,

New Orleans, La., February 16, 1973.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge your leadership in support of House Resolution 205 for two year extension of activity of the House Select Committee on Crime. At a time when crime conditions have reached proportions which make them the predominant concern of the American people, we believe it would be a serious mistake to end the factfinding processes in which this select committee has been engaged. The recent national conference on criminal justice was a valuable means of broadening understanding of the complexity of crime, its causes, and the failures of existing corrective processes.

Congressional authority and capability is looked to by the citizenry as one of the major potentials for documenting the ingredients of the crime problem and providing guidance and legislation with realism. In our opinion, the House Select Committee on Crime has made valuable contributions in the past. It needs to be continued and strengthened to assure our citizens that Congress is fulfilling its obligation to reduce the degree with which crime victimizes and terrorizes people on the streets, in their homes, and in their businesses.

Respectfully,

AARON M. KOHN,
Managing Director.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

As Sheriff of Cook County and Chief Law Enforcement Officer for more than five and a half million people I am most deeply concerned about the passage of HR 205, which would permit the continuance of the House Select Committee on Crime. May I urge your immediate affirmative action to continue the work of this committee in the vitally important areas of Narcotics Control and Street Crime.

We have been most impressed by the work of this committee and hope to continue to cooperate with it and its chairman, Representative Claude Pepper in its final investigation and report.

I am sure that I speak for all concerned citizens in Cook County when I ask you to support this endeavor. I would appreciate hearing from you as to your action in this matter.

Sincerely,

RICHARD J. ELROD,
Sheriff of Cook County.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.,
February 15, 1973.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Chairman, House Select Committee on Crime,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your telegram addressed to Alexander F. Sceresse in regard to the Select Committee on Crime.

I am sorry to inform you that Mr. Sceresse passed away on September 5, 1972 and I have

been elected District Attorney. Enclosed please find copy of the telegram which I sent to the Honorable Carl Albert. I am sure that Al would have wanted the committee to be continued for two more years and I am of the same agreement.

Very truly yours,

JAMES L. BRANDENBURG,
District Attorney.

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Los Angeles, Calif., February 16, 1973.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I have just learned of House Resolution 205 which will allow for the continuance of the House Select Committee on Crime.

Today in our schools more than at any time in my 23 years of service to the District, violence in the community poses a threat of such proportions that we are severely hampered in conducting and maintaining an educational environment conducive to learning. The present community unrest requires immediate and decisive attention.

The following figures indicate the seriousness and prevalence of crime in our community as it reflects itself in our schools:

Assaults on school personnel.....	30
Assaults on school personnel with weapons.....	37
Assaults and attempted rape of school personnel.....	2
Assaults on pupils.....	71
Assaults on pupils with weapons.....	57
Assault and rape of a pupil.....	3
Possession of weapons.....	37
Murder of a pupil.....	8
Possession or sale of narcotics.....	8
Arson.....	1

These figures are for only a part of the first semester of school year 1972-73.

In addition the Los Angeles Police Department has identified 881 hard-core gang members (these gang members are all school age youngsters). The Los Angeles Police Department has defined hard core as meaning 10 or more arrests of which 5 include felony arrests. The 881 gang members reflect 9,515 arrests. The Los Angeles Police Department made 6,412 applications for petition to the Probation Department to bring these youngsters to court.

In the first 10 months of 1972 there were 504 arrests for murder in the city of Los Angeles, 96 of which were juveniles, reflecting an increase in juvenile arrests for murder of 62.7%.

Personally, I have been impressed with and heartened by the efforts of the House Select Committee on Crime. The activities of that Committee have served as a hope for the improvement of conditions that presently confront the 700,000 young people in my District.

I sincerely hope that you will actively support the continuance of the House Select Committee on Crime.

Respectfully,

Dr. WILLIAM J. JOHNSTON,
Superintendent.

SEVENTH STEP FOUNDATION,
Sacramento, Calif., February 16, 1973.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We strongly urge your approval of House Resolution 205, which would continue for two more years the invaluable work of the House Select Committee on Crime.

You are aware that it is most difficult to legislatively respond to the many ramifications of crime in America. That, more than any other factor, makes the work of the House Select Committee on Crime an immeasurable tool that can be utilized by every Member of Congress.

JAMES TESTA,
Executive Director.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.,
February 15, 1973.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We feel that House Resolution 205 should be adopted so that the Select Committee on Crime will be continued for two more years.

JAMES L. BRANDENBURG,
District Attorney.

ANAHEIM UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Anaheim, Calif., February 16, 1973.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

For your information the following day letter was sent to Carl Albert, Speaker of the House of Representatives, pertaining to the interests of this district in the continuous work of the House Select Committee on Crime:

"I wish to indicate to you my concern relative to the need for the continuing function of the House Select Committee on Crime. I feel that is very important for this committee to continue for at least two more years so that its work may have some impact on the problem of street crime and narcotics traffic in America. I urge you to take whatever steps necessary to assure two more years of life to this very important committee."

ROBERT BARK,
President, Board of Trustees.

JUNEAU, ALASKA,
February 16, 1973.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Earnestly solicit your support for continuation of the operations of the House Select Committee on Crime. I sincerely believe it is in the best interests of the Nation to continue the work already begun by this committee.

WILLIAM A. EAGAN,
Governor of Alaska.

HUNTINGTON NARCOTICS
GUIDANCE COUNCIL,
Long Island, N.Y., February 15, 1973.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ALBERT: I have recently read that the House Crime Committee is up for reconstitution before the Congress and I hasten to write this letter to you for the continuation of this worthwhile organization.

The Huntington Narcotics Guidance Council has worked with the House Crime Committee for several years in an effort to reduce the output of "speed" on a nationwide basis. This combined effort has culminated in the successful effort of the House Crime Committee to date in reducing the overproduction of "speed" and other drugs.

I sincerely hope that the House Crime Committee will be permitted to continue its most worthwhile efforts on behalf of the people of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR GOLDSTEIN,
Chairman.

ARCHDIOCESE OF MIAMI,
Fort Lauderdale, Fla., February 17, 1973.
Representative CLAUDE PEPPER,
Chairman, House Select Committee on Crime,
Washington, D.C.:

The following is a copy of the telegram I sent to Speaker Carl Albert. "Sir, it is with strongest vigor that I support House Resolution 205. From personal experience as a drug abuse counselor it is my considered opinion that America (in this instance Congress) urgently needs to investigate street crime and narcotics traffic. To my knowledge the House Select Committee on Crime chaired by Honorable Claude Pepper is the only consti-

tuted committee with authorized jurisdiction to explore these areas of enormous public concern. I urge, implore support of House Resolution 205."

If my presence in Washington would assist in any way, please inform me and I will come at once.

Respectfully,
Sister THERESA MARGARET,
Drug Abuse Counselor.

SEED DRUG REHABILITATION PROGRAM,
Fort Lauderdale, Fla., February 17, 1973.
Re the House Select Committee on Crime.
Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER,
Washington, D.C.:

We are deeply disturbed to hear that the House Select Committee on Crime, led by the Honorable Claude Pepper is in danger of being phased out. On behalf of the 2,600 young people who have been through the seed drug rehabilitation program, and the thousands of parents and friends, I most humbly urge you to please not let this important body phase out. This is a vital key to the well being of our nation.

Respectfully yours,
ART BARKER,
President.

SALEM, OREG., February 16, 1973.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

House Select Committee on Crime has done commendable job in study of street crime and narcotics traffic. I urge that the life of the committee be extended for two years so it may complete its work.

Governor TOM MCCALL,
State of Oregon.

CONGRESS OF SENIOR CITIZENS,
OF GREATER NEW YORK,
New York, N.Y., February 18, 1973.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Congress of Senior Citizens of Greater New York an organization of 429 affiliated senior citizens clubs in the 5 boroughs of City of New York consisting of total membership of more than 250 thousand elderly the largest organized group of senior citizens in the nation. We are deeply concerned in re House Resolution 205 destined to continue its still incomplete investigation as street crime in America. We urge you support continuance of this vital committee. While this subject concerns all victims of crime in all age groups it is of particular urgency to the elderly who being defenseless are the obvious crime targets of violence in many instances. In the interest of all and particularly of our senior citizens we urge you to continue the House Select Committee for another two years. Respectfully yours,

WALTER NEWBURGER,
President.

MIAMI, FLA., February 17, 1973.

Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: We believe that it is very urgent to continue the investigations of the street crime in America. We older people are the most who are attacked. Many are now suffering with severe pain. We hope you pass Resolution 205. That will help to eliminate these most barbaric acts of violence, etc.

ROBERT SHARP,
President, American Federation of Senior Citizens, Northgate Chapter.

RHODE ISLAND STATE POLICE,
North Scituate, R.I., February 16, 1973.
Hon. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This letter is to express our ardent support for and to urge

the continuation of Representative Claude Pepper's Select Committee on Crime due to its tremendous impact in aiding law enforcement expose organized crime and corruption to the general public.

It was most gratifying to learn that the Rhode Island State Police was able to contribute significantly to assist the Select Committee on Crime to attain its goal by working with its investigators for months to expose organized crime as it applied to illegal gambling, and the fixing of horse races.

During my 40 year career as a police officer, I have had the opportunity of testifying before the McClellan Committee on several occasions and in 1963 I presented testimony which proved instrumental in the recognition of the existence of organized crime in New England and identifying Raymond L. S. Patriarca as its boss. Subsequently, investigations focused on the activities of these identified organized crime figures with the end result being that Raymond Patriarca and many other of his underworld associates have been and are presently incarcerated.

Therefore, I fully realize the importance of such congressional committees which have a tremendous impact on the public over and above that of state and federal grand jury investigations. I might add that the recent accomplishments and inroads gained by Chairman Pepper's Select Committee on Crime once again have proven their value to all law enforcement throughout the country. The loss of this vital committee would, in my opinion, deal a severe blow to law enforcement in its efforts to keep the public informed about such vital matters.

We are fervently hopeful that you will give the Select Committee on Crime your continued support and approval.

With warm regards and best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

WALTER E. STONE,
Colonel.

METROPOLITAN CRIME COMMISSION
OF NEW ORLEANS, INC.,
New Orleans, La., February 16, 1973.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Chairman, House Select Committee on Crime,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PEPPER: Attached hereto is a copy of our telegram addressed today to The Honorable Carl Albert, Speaker of the House of Representatives. This is pursuant to your telegram on this date.

Unquestionably, your Committee has contributed to documentation and better understanding of diverse levels of the narcotics problem. It also made some important contributions to the record concerning organized crime, and hopefully will have an opportunity to continue to do so.

I am looking forward to receiving copies of the hearing transcript and your Committee report with reference to organized crime in sports. I am most hopeful that it will contain strong recommendations for dealing with this extremely destructive problem in our society.

With my appreciation for your courtesies and best wishes.

Cordially yours,
AARON M. KOHN,
Managing Director.

METROPOLITAN CRIME COMMISSION
OF NEW ORLEANS, INC.,
New Orleans, La., February 16, 1973.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge your leadership in support of House Resolution 205 for two year extension of activity of the House Select Committee on Crime. At a time when crime conditions have reached proportions which make them the predominant concern of the American people, we believe it would be a serious mistake to end the factfinding processes in which this

select committee has been engaged. The recent national conference on criminal justice was a valuable means of broadening understanding of the complexity of crime, its causes, and the failures of existing corrective processes. Congressional authority and capability is looked to by the citizenry as one of the major potentials for documenting the ingredients of the crime problem and providing guidance and legislation with realism. In our opinion, the House Select Committee on Crime has made valuable contributions in the past. It needs to be continued and strengthened to assure our citizens that Congress is fulfilling its obligation to reduce the degree with which crime victimizes and terrorizes people on the streets, in their homes, and in their businesses.

Respectfully,

AARON M. KOHN,
Managing Director.

WICHITA COUNCIL ON DRUG ABUSE,
Wichita, Kans., February 17, 1973.

HON. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We recommend House Resolution 205 be passed. We understand this resolution will continue the U.S. House Select Committee on Crime for two more years. Hearings conducted by this committee have had a significant impact on the serious apathy among school administrators regarding the problem of drugs in our schools. Continued effort against this problem is of top priority for our society as a whole and for crime in particular. Knowledge on which to base legislative actions needed in relation to drugs and crime is seriously inadequate as it is in all other areas of need for responsible actions against drug problems. The members of the House Select Committee on Crime have made progress toward becoming informed and knowledgeable about the issues involved. It would be, in our estimation, a tragic loss if this committee were to discontinue its work before adequate legislative action is formulated. Recommend passage of House Resolution 205.

DEE HILL,
Executive Director.

JACKSON, MISS., February 19, 1973.
Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER,
Chairman, House Select Committee on Crime,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully urge the continuance of the House Select Committee on Crime. We feel this committee is urgently needed to perform a function unique only to Congress.

A. F. SUMMER,
Attorney General of State of Mississippi.

BATON ROUGE, LA.,
February 19, 1973.

Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We believe that House Resolution 205, continuing the House Select Committee on Crime should be adopted extending the life of this important committee so that it may continue its investigation of narcotic traffic and street crime in America. The committee urgently needs this additional time to complete its work. As you know the crimes in drugs are prime areas of concern to people of all the States today and this is the only committee with authorized jurisdiction to explore these areas.

I wish to express my deep concern in this matter and believe it will best serve the public interest for the House Select Committee on Crime to be continued for another two years.

WILLIAM J. GUSTE, JR.,
Attorney General, State of Louisiana.

COLUMBIA, S.C.,
February 16, 1973.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Washington, D.C.:

I would like to voice my support of House Resolution number 205 continuing for two more years the life of the House Select Committee on Crime. The continuance of this important investigative body is vital to primary areas of crime control in all of these States. Since crime control is of utmost importance at this time please give every consideration to the passage of this resolution.

JOHN C. WEST,
Governor, State of South Carolina.

DALLAS, TEX.,
February 18, 1973.

Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER,
Washington, D.C.:

H.R. 205 should be passed continuing the House Select Committee on Crime. The problems it is dealing with are at least as important as any domestic matters. This committee is nearing a point at which it will be able to propose powerful legislative solutions that will at once reduce crime to manageable proportions and reassert congressional authority as originating source of important legislation. The poor and helpless of this country will be the big losers if the committee's work now is interrupted, but it makes no sense from the standpoint of any concerned person to cut off a project with so much promise at a cost so small. Street crime will decline as organized crime is forced out of the heroin traffic and kept out.

WILLIAM J. FLITTIE,
Professor of Law,
Southern Methodist University.

U.A.W. RETIRED WORKERS COUNCIL,
Grand Rapids, Mich., February 19, 1973.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Capitol Hill,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge support House Resolution 205 for continuance Select Committee on Crime for 2 years.

DAVID R. SHERWOOD,
Chairman.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
SENIOR CITIZENS,
Peoria, Ill., February 19, 1973.

Representative CLAUDE PEPPER,
Capitol Hill, D.C.:

We urge in the public interest that the House Select Committee on Crime be continued for another two years.

KEN JOHNSTON,
Regional Board Member.

BISCAYNE TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION,
NORTH MIAMI BEACH, FLA.,
February 18, 1973.

Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER,
Capitol Hill, D.C.:

DEAR SIR: We the Biscayne Taxpayers Association of Senior Citizens of North Miami Beach numbering approximately 500 members believe that it is important to our welfare that resolution number 205 be passed. Crime on the streets is in many cases directed against the elderly who have no defense against this type of brutality. Once again we strongly urge that Resolution number 205 be passed.

Yours truly,

HENRY NELSON,
President.

H.I.D.E., Inc.,
Milwaukee Wis., February 19, 1973.

Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER,
Capitol Hill, D.C.:

I strongly encourage you to continue the House Select Committee on Crime. We need this important committee.

L. R. HESS, Ph. D.,
President.

HERE'S HELP, INC.,
Miami, Fla., February 19, 1973.

Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER,
House of Representatives,
Capitol Hill, D.C.:

Honorable Carl Albert I respectfully suggest that you permit Congressman Claude Peppers' Crime Commission to continue its important services for the betterment of our community as his investigation concerning the drug scene has been invaluable to all in the rehabilitation field. Thank you.

MARIAN SIEGEL,
Executive Director.

RUSS BRIDGE BAN

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most perspicacious writers is Orv Lifka, editor of the *Suburban Life*. In a column of Thursday, February 15, he discusses the ban announced by the Soviet Union on contract bridge and contract groups that had developed. It is an interesting commentary of the freedoms enjoyed within the Soviet Union.

The article follows:

NO JOKER IN RUSS BRIDGE BAN

Contract bridge has been labeled "socially harmful" by the Soviet Union, indicating someone trumped Premier Kosygin's ace once too often.

The edict was handed down by the sports committee despite muted protests about a stacked deck. Contract clubs caught the heaviest criticism; apparently the hierarchy's taste doesn't run to this type of bridge mix.

Bridge club sponsors face the same fate as advocates of free elections. They may be sent to Siberia because it's impossible to shuffle cards while wearing mittens.

Contract bridge players are being urged to turn to more productive pastimes such as piecing together jigsaw puzzles of the ruling troika, something Western diplomats have been trying to do for several years.

Bridge is a dangerous endeavor in this country also, as many a shin-scarred husband will attest. Some ask their wives to play in their stocking feet, only to have them fall to remove the darned needles.

Non-players believe wives resort to shyness to discipline their spouses, but this can be done by putting sand in their salad or staggering their shirt buttons so they don't match the holes. Kicking is a method of signalling, betrayed only by the recipient's look of pain or severe loss of blood.

Women's bridge clubs are notorious as gossip exchange centers, with participants bidding for attention. Top prize goes to the member with the most sensational news.

Men take their bridge more seriously than women, so much so that they have threatened to jump off another variety when the cards don't fall their way. But, as the Soviet leadership probably concluded, trouble must be anticipated in any endeavor involving tricks.

The Russian decree weakens contract bridge internationally; it was bad enough to have the Chinese turn to checkers. Tournament promoters may respond by having vodka removed from the refreshment list.

By chopping at the contract bridge the sports committee delivered a blow to its homeland. Russians adapted the game from whist almost 100 years ago and called it birch, although losers had other descriptions for it.

Members of the royalty and bourgeoisie liked to gamble, and contract bridge filled the bill when the roulette wheel was in hock. The peasants had their own game; every night they bet two slices of blackbread and a bowl of potato soup that they wouldn't get hungry before morning.

Whether auction bridge is more acceptable to the present regime is doubtful, but a contract bridge fan would refuse to be finessed into the less challenging pastime. That would be as bad as solitaire confinement.

Contract bridge isn't the only game that's been causing mumbles in Moscow; they've also had trouble with chess.

JOE: THE JUVENILE OPPORTUNITIES ENDEAVOR OF DAYLIN, INC.

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, Daylin, Inc., a southern California-based volume retailing company, has been involved in community service activities for many years, throughout the country. Recently, Mr. Amnon Barness, chairman of the Board of Daylin, Inc., launched a new phase in community involvement by introducing JOE, Juvenile Opportunities Endeavor, a project of volunteerism which is designed to offer guidance, counseling, and attention to young people in our Nation.

JOE is the culmination of an 18-month study by Daylin which sought a means of utilizing the energies of the corporation's 16,000 employees in a significant community project. With the directional and organizational assistance of the National Council of Crime and Delinquency, JOE provides volunteers to work with both juvenile offenders and with youths in danger of becoming delinquents if not helped.

Utilizing NCCD's division, VIP, Volunteers in Probation, and other community groups of volunteers throughout the country, the JOE program aims at an extremely broad range of assistance. Services vary from one-to-one relationships serving as listening posts for troubled young persons to some 300 other job areas providing support services to help youths.

Juvenile delinquency is clearly one of the major challenges which faces our way of life today, and the efforts of all citizens will be required to encourage young people to pursue creative and useful activities in society. Therefore, I would like to acknowledge and salute the efforts of the Daylin people for their pioneer attitude in developing a means for private industry to make significant contributions toward the solution of community problems.

I would like to offer my personal congratulations to Mr. Amnon Barness, who conceived the idea of JOE and spearheaded its implementation. Serving as chairman of the Juvenile Opportunities Endeavor Foundation, he has created within his company a viable program

which will serve as an example to other corporations, thereby multiplying the effectiveness of the program.

Other Daylin people who have been instrumental in setting up JOE are Mr. Max Candiotti, president of Daylin, and Mr. Dave Finkle, chairman of the Executive Committee of Daylin, both of whom gave their unwavering support and encouragement to employees on every level to participate in this program of volunteerism. Mr. Charles "Chic" Watt, senior group vice president of Daylin and current president of the JOE Foundation, has served as the coordinator of JOE at the executive level and has traveled to all parts of the country in order to stimulate volunteers for JOE. Mr. Bernard Kritzer, vice president of Daylin, has helped in organizing recruiting centers in Daylin companies throughout the country. Mrs. Lillian Candiotti, president of the women of Daylin, and Mrs. Diane Watt, senior vice president of women of Daylin in charge of JOE, have both given the strong support of their committee to this program and have served in various capacities in connection with JOE. Mr. Peter Grant, director of communications; Mr. Ronald Rieder, associate director of communications; and Mrs. Ruth Frauman, director of women of Daylin, have also been instrumental in the development and continuing implementation of the JOE program.

My congratulations go also to those selfless individual volunteers who, through their tireless devotion, have done so much to make JOE both a reality and a success.

INDEPENDENCE IN LITHUANIA

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the last weekend, the people of Lithuania, and the Americans of Lithuanian ancestry, observed the 722d anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian State, and the 55th anniversary of the establishment of the model Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918.

Lithuania's independence lasted until 1940, when the Soviet Union invaded and occupied Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and forcibly annexed these Baltic States to the Soviet Union.

As we celebrate that period of Lithuanian independence, it is fitting that we demonstrate once again to the world at large the feeling for independence held by the American people. For us of the free world, this is a compelling moral duty, for those less fortunate than we must keep their patriotic tributes locked within the solitary sanctuary of their grief-stricken breasts.

In the darkening days of world crisis in 1939-40, the Soviets imposed upon the Lithuanian nation an arrangement, illegal and immoral, and one that breached the sovereignty and independence of the Lithuanian people.

The entire Lithuanian nation has long since suffered with unmeasured pain and sorrow from its consequences. During the intervening years from that fateful summer of 1940 to this very hour, there has been visited upon the Lithuanian people a vast number of injustices that would make the most vigorous nation feel its enduring burden. Suppression of political freedom; unwarranted restrictions upon economic life; destruction of cultural ideals and the persecution of religion—all are a part of the cross that presses so heavily upon the Lithuanian nation. These are great burdens for a great nation of courageous people to bear. The time will come and let us hope that it is not too far off, when the Lithuanian people will once again stand upon the native soil of their great land and breathe the atmosphere of freedom.

Lithuanian Americans are to be congratulated upon the excellent work they are doing to further the Lithuanian cause. Representing more than 1 million loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent in our country, they have formed various councils who have demonstrated splendid organizational ability.

I urge this Congress to continue to do the utmost in behalf of the people of this valiant nation and to take the proper steps to bring about the formulation of a vigorous policy program for the liberation of these people.

I sincerely hope that our interest in their great and proud nation will not end in our profound expressions of sympathy and admiration. I think the Lithuanian people are entitled to more than that. I sincerely hope that we will, by positive action, demonstrate that we do not recognize those acts which deprived the people of their freedom, and that we are determined to work toward the goal of restoring the independence which they acquired on February 16, 1918.

I pay my respects to the courage, patriotism, and the love of freedom of the Lithuanian people. I share the fond hopes and prayers of those who express faith in the restoration of freedom and liberty to that gallant nation.

The United States and other great Western powers have steadfastly maintained a policy of nonrecognition of this forceful incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet empire. This nonrecognition policy must continue, especially in view of the Soviet proposed European Conference on Security and Cooperation. The concept of the security of the European states has one primary prerequisite: that the territorial integrity of the states and the inviolability of their frontiers be maintained.

The recognition of the territorial "status quo" in Europe would violate the rights of self-determination of the peoples and the nations of Eastern Europe, and would extinguish for all time the small candle of hope in the darkness of totalitarian oppression.

On this occasion, let us, as citizens of the greatest democracy on earth, unite in rededicating ourselves to the cause of universal peace, never forgetting that the preservation of liberty and freedom is everybody's business.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST
WINNERS

HON. TRENT LOTT

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conduct a Voice of Democracy Contest. This year nearly 500,000 secondary school students participated in the contest. The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington, D.C. for final judging. This year the winning speech from my State of Mississippi was delivered by Clovice A. Lewis, Jr., of Biloxi, Miss. I am so proud of Clovice and I would like to share his views on his responsibility to freedom. As long as we have fine young men like this coming along, we do not have to worry about the future of this young Republic.

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

"Who so would be a man must be a non-conformist. He who would gather immortal palms must not be hindered by the name of goodness—but must explore—if it be goodness. Nothing is at last sacred but the integrity of your own mind, absolve you to yourself and you shall have the suffrage of the world." These words were written by Ralph Waldo Emerson in his famous Self-Reliance essay, which was written over a hundred years ago. This monumental thought is one which still echoes through the corridors of time because of the profound message which it carries. That message being the importance of self-reliance in our relationships to ourselves and those around us.

Our responsibility to freedom can be directly tied in with Emerson's philosophy, which he called "Transcendentalism". First an adequate definition of the terms "Responsibility" and "Freedom" is essential to our understanding of the theme and its relationship to Emerson's Transcendentalism. Responsibility can be termed as the ability to answer or account for something under one's power of choice or control. It is also something under one's management or use. Freedom can be properly defined as personal liberty as opposed to bondage or slavery. Exemption from external control, interference, or regulation, and the power of determining one's or its own actions.

Freedom is the key word to my interpretation of this theme. The word itself cannot be specifically defined because of the many applications of its meaning. But, the basic thought behind any definition of the word is that of the ability to determine one's own actions in any given situation. Therefore, in my opinion, the best interpretation of my responsibility to freedom is to be able to answer, or account, for the ability I have to determine my own actions. I must be responsible for my actions, regardless of whether they be right or wrong.

In a society such as ours, we are stupefied by the happenings of the moment—headlines in morning newspapers and blared on radio broadcasts. As a result, many people cannot see the real world around them or the actual condition of our Nation. This is tragic because we rely so heavily on the opinions of others rather than searching for the basic truths within our own minds.

We must strive for a greater sense of independence in order to bring about a more effective society. Self-reliance strengthens our abilities to function as individuals. In our country, our Government is based on the principle that every man is a separate in-

dividual. By being so, we are all held responsible for our actions. To stress the importance of self-reliance, through individualism, is the best way to preserve our democracy. That is why I feel that we must continually question the ever-increasing trends toward socialism.

A challenge has been set before us. That challenge is, "Can we continue to survive as free men in a world that is turning more and more to its leaders than to the common people?" I believe that we can confront and conquer this challenge. However, before we do so we must be willing and able to accept everyone as a separate member in our society. We must recognize everyone's right to think and speak freely.

My responsibility to freedom is to be self-reliant, actively functioning member in my community. I must become stronger in my ability to make the right decisions concerning what is best for myself and others. Freedom is a precious thing, which I must be determined to kindle in my own conscience. I can only do this by being self-reliant, by accounting for my actions, and by striving to preserve the freedoms that I enjoy for the betterness of other people's lives.

If these responsibilities are recognized by all, then we can truly say that this Nation and our society is the best which can be produced by any democratic institution. If we all uphold the principle of self-reliance through individualism, then we can be assured that the world will continue to be open to anyone who has anything to offer it. I believe that by self-reliance through individualism our responsibilities to freedom will be fulfilled.

JUDICIAL DECISIONS AND THE
IMMORALITY OF LEADERSHIP

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the recent Federal judge's ruling that HEW must take steps to bring 16 States—mostly Southern—into compliance with the 1964 Civil Rights Act is classic judicial blindness.

That a judicio-politician signed such a blanket order while sitting in Washington, D.C.—site of the world's most segregated educational system is a cruel joke. In our Nation's Capital, 133,700 of the public school enrollment of 140,000 students, or 95.5 percent, are Negro. As late as 1969, 170 of the 190 Washington schools had no white children in attendance, yet the Washington court did not order HEW to cut off Federal funds to the District of Columbia school system, because of racial imbalance.

Likewise, the same Federal judge who would use HEW as the tool of judicial compliance among Southern schoolchildren was silent on the racial imbalance of HEW. HEW's employees are 22.6 percent Negro, but the Federal judges have not demanded cutting off salaries and operational funds at HEW, because of excessive desegregation.

Little wonder many Americans continue to lose confidence in those who sit in judgment in our Federal courts. They can see racial imbalance a thousand miles away, but cannot see under their noses.

I recently introduced House Congressional Resolution 13, which would make it the sense of Congress that each Federal official or employee—including judges and HEW bureaucrats—residing or living in the District of Columbia, voluntarily do unto their families what they would force on others by voluntarily placing their children in the public schools of the District of Columbia. Those who govern or judge must themselves follow their commandments.

I have received no support for this legislation and cannot even get a fair explanation of the bill from the news media.

Truth may be a stranger in our land, but hypocrisy and double standards are accepted *modus operandi*.

I insert in the RECORD a related news article and the text of my bill:

MIXING ACTION AGAINST LOUISIANA, NINE
OTHERS ORDERED

WASHINGTON.—A federal judge Friday ordered the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) to begin desegregation proceedings against all public school systems of 10 states and some school systems in six others.

U.S. District Judge John H. Pratt ruled that HEW must take steps to bring the 16 states into compliance with the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Pratt ordered desegregation proceedings begun within four months against all public school systems in Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, North Carolina, Florida, Arkansas, Pennsylvania, Georgia, Maryland and Virginia.

He ordered similar action begun within two months against some school systems in Kentucky, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia and Missouri.

The school systems involved include those of Baltimore and Kansas City, Mo.

Pratt ordered HEW to enforce provisions of Title VI of the 1964 law, which forbids use of federal funds in segregated school systems.

HEW would have to hold hearings before it cut off any federal aid.

HEW had found the school systems in the first 10 states to be segregated during the 1969-70 school year and found some school systems in the other six segregated during the 1970-71 school year.

Pratt also ordered HEW to begin desegregation proceedings against state vocational schools throughout the country "without unreasonable delay."

Under the terms of his order, HEW will have to report back to him within the stated period of time showing that the school systems have taken steps to comply with the 1964 act.

Of the 10 states found operating segregated school systems, five had submitted desegregation plans that HEW found unacceptable.

HEW declined to comment officially on the plans.

Among the other large school systems affected by Pratt's orders are Asheville, N.C., and San Antonio and Galveston in Texas.

H. CON. RES. 13

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that each public official or employee of the Federal Government who is residing and/or working in the District of Columbia and who has a child qualified to attend an elementary or secondary school should voluntarily send such child to an elementary or secondary school in the public school system of the District of Columbia.

NEWSMEN'S PRIVILEGE

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, recently, this country has been faced with growing evidence of a dangerous attitude by the present administration toward the freedom of our citizens to participate in the decisions of Government. Nowhere is that attitude more evident than in the administration's treatment of the press. Responsible participation in Government requires an informed citizenry. To be informed, our people must have a strong and independent press, free to probe into the workings of Government without fear of harassment. Constant harassment would tend to undermine the capacity of the press to publish all of the information we must have about our Government, and, more insidiously, would erode the quality of journalism which itself protects the exercise of our first amendment rights. The administration says that it recognizes the need for an independent press, yet, on occurrence after occurrence, the actions of its officials belie its words. The recent incident involving the arrest of Les Whitten is another example of the tendency to disrespect the independence of the press. I include here an editorial printed last week in the Washington Post, discussing the Whitten incident, and relevantly observing that the incident raises important questions about the administration's support of freedom guaranteed by the first amendment:

THE ARREST OF LES WHITTEN

There have been some suspicions around that the press has been too thin skinned in recent months, too quick to holler foul, when, indeed, things haven't changed all that much. Well now, consider the case of Leslie Whitten, an associate of columnist Jack Anderson. Mr. Whitten was arrested the other day by the FBI. The circumstances of his arrest are as follows:

An Indian leader named Hank Adams began some time ago to negotiate the return of some of the documents and materials stolen from the Bureau of Indian Affairs last November. Apparently he effected the return of some of the material last December because he has a receipt from the FBI saying that he did. He also notified the FBI in private that he was negotiating for the return of the material and he made a similar statement of his intentions at a press conference in January.

On January 31, Mr. Adams called Mr. Whitten—whom he knew because the Indians had made information contained in the stolen files available to the Anderson column—and told him that several cartons of documents were to be returned that day. Apparently, unknown to Mr. Adams, Dennis Hyton, the FBI agent with whom he had been dealing, was notified that Mr. Whitten would be—if not actually involved in the transfer—at least around to witness it. When Mr. Whitten met Mr. Adams, he found that Mr. Adams needed transportation—apparently because the man who had promised the use of his car was a police informer and was too busy informing the FBI of what was going on.

So, at 10:15 a.m. on the 31st of January on a public street in the District of Colum-

bia as Mr. Whitten and Mr. Adams were loading the documents into Mr. Whitten's yellow Vega, a squad of FBI agents descended on Mr. Whitten and Mr. Adams. Mr. Whitten, ever the journalist, whipped out his note paper and his pencil to take notes on the whole thing. The first thing he knew, the note paper and pencil were out of his hands and handcuffs were on him.

Almost eight hours later, Mr. Whitten, having been formally charged with receiving, concealing and retaining three boxes of government documents with the intent to convert them to his own use, was brought before a federal magistrate and released on his own recognizance. Now, he's free and all he faces is a trial, at the end of which, he could be sentenced to ten years in prison and fined \$10,000.

So what? you might ask, and here a little background may help. It happens that in addition to publishing information from the Indian papers, Mr. Anderson, with the help of his associate, Mr. Whitten, tried, during the J. Edgar Hoover regime, to help the public understand the FBI a little better, by writing extensively about it. In addition, he also published excerpts of government memos some time ago which told a good deal more about the internal workings of the mind of the United States government in the India-Pakistan dispute than the United States government was comfortable with just then. The Anderson column's contention in the face of governmental claims of secrecy is that such information belongs to the people, not solely to the government. Nevertheless, those who conduct business behind closed doors, only to find some of their quiet efforts exposed to the light of day, become discomfited and not just a little surly.

Given all of that, one might wonder whether prudence and professionalism might not have kept Mr. Whitten from taking so active and intimate a part in the transfer of boxes full of stolen documents. Even assuming, however, that Mr. Whitten should have been more cautious, we are left with a number of nagging questions. Would one of the most sophisticated reporters in town be carting around stolen documents in the street in broad daylight if he were engaged in some clandestine activity? Would Hank Adams, who had notified everybody in sight that he was going to act as an agent for the return of the property have been wandering around the streets with cartons of documents if he had some clandestine purpose to accomplish? If the undercover agent knew the documents were in Mr. Adams' apartment prior to 10:15 on that particular day, why did the FBI wait until Mr. Whitten was there to spring the trap? If Mr. Hyton had already received some of the material from Mr. Adams—more than a token earnest of Mr. Adams' good faith—why then did Mr. Hyton decide to arrest Mr. Adams and those with him on the 31st?

The fact that there are no ready answers to those questions would trouble us far less if the Whitten affair were an isolated incident. But it is not; rather, it is only the latest in a series of unhappy contretemps between the government and the press which started with the Caldwell case, and includes the Vice President's sustained campaign against the press, the calculated and spirited White House attacks on some segments of the news media and Mr. Clay Whitehead's blunderbuss accusation that television news is biased.

In this larger context, the questions raised by the performance of the FBI and the police in the Whitten affair are much harder to dismiss as circumstantial or trivial. On the contrary, the arrest of Les Whitten becomes yet one more cause for serious concern about this administration's belief in, and respect for, First Amendment freedoms.

POLITICS AND MEDICINE

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt we are all concerned about the current controversy surrounding the medical profession and the effects it is having on the American public.

A recent editorial in the January 8, 1973, issue of *Modern Medicine* magazine points to a growing concern among members of the medical profession over the increased politicizing and federalizing of medicine.

As Dr. Irvine H. Page, editor of the magazine points out in his editorial entitled, "Promises, Politics and Medicine," scientific and medical achievements should stand on the quality of those achievements, not the publicity and political influence they may generate.

I commend the editorial to my colleagues for consideration:

PROMISES, POLITICS AND MEDICINE

(By Irvine H. Page, M.D., Editor)

Few doubt that (1) the basic science content of the medical curriculum is under attack because of the desire for more practicing physicians more quickly, (2) medicine is being slowly politicized and federalized, (3) the philosophy of the research on which medical progress depends is being altered, and (4) drastic change is slated for the practice of medicine. Pressures to consummate these changes have come chiefly from the press, politicians, a minority of the public, and a few politically hungry physicians. Bewildered and frustrated, most physicians foresee the time, rightly or wrongly, when they will have given their heritage to opportunists. This, then, is a time for candor, an uncommon commodity nowadays.

Do we really need basic science taught in medical school and beyond as postgraduate continuing education? If medicine is merely diagnosis, prevention, prescribing, proscripting and "delivering health care" it could be taught in two years as a trade. But all medical progress depends upon science. Without solid understanding practice of medicine becomes arid indeed. Diagnosis and treatment could be prescribed better by a computer.

This in simple terms is why a physician's assistant is not a physician and why politicians and the public do not understand the nature of medicine or science. Medicine without science is like the ministry without a transcendent goal.

Why my deep concern for the politicizing and federalizing of medicine? Chiefly because politicians and the government want to pay for medicine, and what they pay for they control. I wish I were not so lacking in faith in bureaucratic promises, but long experience has made me so. I need look back only 30 years to see vast changes, each promised as another step toward medical Utopia. Much good has been done but the price being paid in loss of character and money is steadily rising.

If I believed that National Health Insurance would be no more than a federally administered—and therefore costly—insurance for all, I would not object, but would favor it as a part of a pluralistic approach. But judging by the words of even its more sensible proponents, it seems to be an important key to creeping federalization of medical practice.

I am equally dubious of the changes being made in the conduct and financing of re-

search. To over-simplify, I see in the not distant future medical research being directed from on political high in a highly sophisticated manner but not unlike the Russian system in principle. Is not the cancer crusade a small beginning? And does anyone doubt that heart disease and mental disease are next? Or sickle cell anemia because of its political expediency? I am obtuse enough first to want scientific achievement to stand on its quality, not on the publicity and the political influence it may generate. Does anyone believe that the concurrent announcements made within weeks of three viruses as the causes of cancer were without any political significance?

Many view it as inevitable that medicine will be treated as a public utility, paid for and closely regulated by government. I do not recall a time when so many well-meaning people have so thoughtlessly endorsed this position in spite of the ambiguous position in which they personally would find themselves. One need not take sides on the British experiment in medical practice to know that it has not evolved into a Utopia, or anything resembling it. Discussion of such governmental controls in Sweden, England and Germany has unfortunately only obscured the core of the problem for the United States.

It has been sad to note that the contribution of the universities to government during the war was superb technically, but it left much to be desired on political grounds. When confronted with social and political problems, academicians unknowingly turned out to be all too human. The infighting, selfishness and snobbery were fully the equal to many politicians but the latter had the saving grace of recognizing it in themselves.

So we move steadily toward all-embracing federal authority, urged on by those who seem unaware of the ultimate consequences. The extraordinary efficiency of the government's "forgettery" is impressive. The promises made today are unheard of tomorrow. For those who doubt the turns and the twists of government leadership, try to follow the peregrinations of the Regional Medical Program. To count on the durability of a government promise is to be ingenuous.

The demand for drastic and often untried ways of practicing medicine, or "delivering health care," has been stimulated by crisis psychology. Lay speakers and writers have indulged in massive hyperbole. Threats and scare tactics have made many physicians lose sight of desirable changes that could, and probably should, be brought about. The onslaught has at times been so vitriolic as to engender a closed-minded ultraconservatism in them. Many issues have, unfortunately, become so highly partisan politically that the clarifying action of thoughtful debate has been lost.

If public dialogue is rejected, then we must look to representation at the decision-making levels. There, indeed, do physicians perform badly. Within our ranks, the power struggle goes on among the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, and the Association of American Medical Colleges on the medical front and the National Academy of Sciences, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the specialty societies on the research front. There is nothing wrong with competition but out of it must come not one voice but an orderly pattern of voices providing options to be decided upon by politicians and the people in relation to all the other options of our vast society. Decisions should not be made in ignorance of the views of those with the knowledge and the experience.

It is to be hoped that the new Institute of Medicine can become sufficiently representative of medicine and of biomedical sciences to help in formulating such options. This will depend on the care with which its membership is constituted, their dedication to hard work, and the standards of quality and of

relevance set. Perhaps some of the larger specialty societies will increase the institute's clout by lending a hand.

The alternatives to the building of adequate and thoughtful representation are not attractive. Unionization is one and further fragmentation caused by warring factionalism is another. Elitism has shown itself to be ineffective and outdated. The dangers of sycophancy were never greater.

It is such divisionism that is an invitation to governmental hegemony, and government has not failed to see this.

Nothing is harder than having to accept some compromise for the sake of maintaining sound principles. There is nothing glamorous about the individual who is a "middle of the road," but if he is in the middle because facts, logic and imagination have put him there, he is a true asset to society.

However, we need as well those indomitable individuals whose adherence to the truth is usually painful. Russia does not deserve all of the beleaguered writers like Solzhenitsyn.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, last Friday was a bittersweet day for persons of Lithuanian descent in America. For Friday marked the 55th anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918; but since 1940, Lithuanians have lived under Soviet rule.

It is ironic that the only Lithuanians not allowed to celebrate the historic anniversary of their Declaration of Independence were in Lithuania itself.

The persons of Lithuania may not have been able to gather in celebration, but neither have the Soviets been able to quell the Lithuanian spirit. This remarkable spirit is the source of much deserved pride in all Lithuanians.

A recent petition to the United Nations, signed by 17,000 Lithuanian Catholics living in the occupied country, charging the Soviets with religious persecution, coupled with the demonstrations in Lithuania last May, reflect the spirit of the Lithuanian people.

Ceremonies aimed at supporting Lithuanian freedom are also occurring in our country. Last Friday, Americans of Lithuanian descent held a flag-raising ceremony in front of the Los Angeles City Hall to call attention to the Lithuanian's tragic plight.

The history of Lithuania tells much about her people.

Lithuania was under German occupation at the time of the Russian revolution in 1917, but, undaunted, Lithuania declared its independence on February 16, 1918.

Lithuania became a democracy with a President and a Parliament.

Under the threat of war, Lithuania signed a mutual security pact with Russia in October 1939.

In June 1940, the Russian army marched into Lithuania. The Lithuanian Government was overthrown and a Communist government was instituted. After rigged elections were conducted, Lithu-

ania was annexed as one of the Soviet republics.

German troops invaded and occupied Lithuania in 1941, staying for 4 years. After the Soviets returned to Lithuania in 1944-45, Lithuania was again made a Soviet republic.

The United States has steadfastly maintained a policy of nonrecognition of the 1940 forceful incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union.

Our support of these Baltic peoples must continue.

Many citizens of the three Baltic nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have decided that they can no longer live in a satellite Communist nation and have applied for permission to emigrate.

Soviet authorities have almost put an end to emigration by imposing an "education tax" which can amount up to \$18,000 per person depending upon the level of education attained by the proposed emigrant.

To resolve the intended emigrants dilemma, I joined with over 250 of my colleagues in the House of Representatives on February 7 in introducing H.R. 3911, a bill suspending trade with the Soviet Union until such a time as that country does away with its arbitrary and discriminatory methods of limiting the right of emigration.

Mr. Speaker, as Members of the U.S. Congress, we must encourage the Lithuanians and other Baltic citizens to retain their spirit. In addition, we must help to make emigration a viable alternative for them.

NEW JUSTICE DEPARTMENT REGULATIONS TO IMPLEMENT THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT (5 U.S.C. 552)

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as Members of the House may recall, the Committee on Government Operations last year issued a report entitled "Administration of the Freedom of Information Act." This report (92-1419) resulted from intensive hearings held by the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, which fully explored Government information policies under the act.

As part of the report, a number of recommendations were made to the various departments and agencies in the Government. These recommendations were designed to improve the administrative efficiency of information act programs so as to increase the flow of information to the public.

Along with the administrative recommendations contained in the report, the committee outlined a number of legislative objectives which will be necessary to meet the goals of freedom of information. Legislation was introduced by me and cosponsored by 16 other Members of the House last year to meet these legislative objectives. We expect to reintroduce a revised bill shortly.

I am pleased to inform the House, however, that almost all of the Federal agencies have informed me that they will take immediate steps to implement the administrative recommendations contained in House Report 92-1419. In this connection, new Department of Justice Freedom of Information regulations were announced on February 14, 1973. These new regulations, when properly implemented, will go far to effectuate the intent of the Freedom of Information Act. Since the Department of Justice has a major role in the Government information program, it is heartening to see that it is taking the lead in the promulgation of new information regulations. I hope that each Federal department and agency will closely study these new Department of Justice regulations as a guide to the proper implementation of the Freedom of Information Act.

As I noted earlier, however, last year's hearings clearly indicated the need for legislative amendments to the Freedom of Information Act irrespective of administrative improvements. This legislation will be introduced shortly, and we will welcome the support of all Members of Congress who share our objective in strengthening this important law which helps protect the American people's right to know about the activities of their Government.

At this point, I include the text of the new Department of Justice Freedom of Information regulations:

[Title 28—Judicial Administration]

Chapter I—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

[Order No. 502-73]

PART 16—PRODUCTION OR DISCLOSURE OF MATERIAL OR INFORMATION

SUBPART A—PRODUCTION OR DISCLOSURE UNDER 5 U.S.C. 552(A)

This order revises the regulations of the Department of Justice which prescribe the procedures for making and acting upon requests from members of the public for access to Justice Department records under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552).

By virtue of the authority vested in me by 28 U.S.C. 509, 510, 5 U.S.C. 301, 552, and 31 U.S.C. 483a, Subpart A of Part 16 of Chapter I of Title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, is revised, and its provisions renumbered, to read as follows:

Sec.

- 16.1 Purpose and scope.
- 16.2 Public reference facilities.
- 16.3 Requests for identifiable records and copies.
- 16.4 Requests referred to division primarily concerned.
- 16.5 Prompt response by responsible division.
- 16.6 Responses by division: Form and content.
- 16.7 Appeals to the Attorney General from initial denials.
- 16.8 Maintenance of files.
- 16.9 Fees for provision of records.
- 16.10 Exemptions.

AUTHORITY: 28 U.S.C. 509, 510; 5 U.S.C. 301, 552; 31 U.S.C. 483a.

§ 16.1 Purposes and scope.

(a) This subpart contains the regulations of the Department of Justice implementing 5 U.S.C. 552. The regulations of this subpart provide information concerning the procedures by which records may be obtained from all divisions within the Department of Justice. Official records of the Department of Justice made available pursuant to the requirements of 5 U.S.C. 552 shall be furnished to members of the public as prescribed by

this subpart. Officers and employees of the Department may continue to furnish to the public, informally and without compliance with the procedures prescribed herein, information and records which prior to enactment of 5 U.S.C. 552 were furnished customarily in the regular performance of their duties. Persons seeking information or records of the Department of Justice may find it useful to consult with the Department's Office of Public Information before invoking the formal procedures set out below. To the extent permitted by other laws, the Department also will make available records which it is authorized to withhold under 5 U.S.C. 552 whenever it determines that such disclosure is in the public interest.

(b) The Attorney General's Memorandum on the Public Information section of the Administrative Procedure Act, which was published in June 1967 and is available from the Superintendent of Documents, may be consulted in considering questions arising under 5 U.S.C. 552. The Office of Legal Counsel after appropriate coordination is authorized from time to time to undertake training activities for Department personnel to maintain and improve the quality of administration under 5 U.S.C. 552.

§ 16.2 Public reference facilities.

Each office listed below will maintain in a public reading room or public reading area, the materials relating to that office which are required by 5 U.S.C. 552(a) (2) and 552(a) (4) to be made available for public inspection and copying:

U.S. Attorneys and U.S. Marshals—at the principal offices of the U.S. Attorneys listed in the U.S. Government Organization Manual;

Bureau of Prisons and U.S. Board of Parole—at the principal office of each of those agencies at 101 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20537;

Community Relations Service—at 550 11th Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20530;

Internal Security Division (for registrations of foreign agents and other pursuant to 26 CFR Parts 5, 10, 11, and 12)—at Room 458, Federal Triangle Building, 315 Ninth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20530;

Board of Immigration Appeals—at Room 1138, 521 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20530;

Immigration and Naturalization Service—see 8 CFR § 103.9;

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 683 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20530, and Regional Officer as listed in the U.S. Government Organization Manual;

All other Offices, Divisions, and Bureaus of the Department of Justice—at Room 6620, Department of Justice, 10th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20530.

Each of these public reference facilities will maintain and make available for public inspection and copying a current index of the materials available at that facility which are required to be indexed by 5 U.S.C. 552(a) (2).

§ 16.3 Requests for identifiable records and copies.

(a) *Addressed to Office of Deputy Attorney General.* A request for a record of the Department which is not customarily made available, which is not available in a public reference facility as described in § 16.2, and which is not a record maintained by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Bureau of Prisons, or the Board of Immigration Appeals shall be addressed to the Office of the Deputy Attorney General, Washington, D.C. 20530. Requests for records of the Bureau of Prisons or of the Board of Immigration Appeals shall be sent directly to the Director, Bureau of Prisons, 101 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20537, or the Chairman, Board of Immigration Appeals, Department

of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530, respectively. Requests for records of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, including aliens' record files temporarily in the possession of the Board of Immigration Appeals, shall be made and processed pursuant to the provisions of Part 103 of Title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

(b) *Request should be in writing and for identifiable records.* A request for access to records should be submitted in writing and should sufficiently identify the records requested to enable Department personnel to locate them with a reasonable amount of effort. Where possible, specific information regarding dates, titles, file designations, and other information which may help identify the records should be supplied by the requester. If the request relates to a matter in pending litigation, the court and its location should be identified.

(c) *Form may be requested.* Where the information supplied by the requester is not sufficient to permit location of the records by Department personnel with a reasonable amount of effort, the requester may be sent and asked to fill out and return a Form D.J. 118, which is designed to elicit the necessary information.

(d) *Categorical requests—(1) Must meet identifiable records requirement.* A request for all records falling within a reasonably specific category shall be regarded as conforming to the statutory requirement that records be identifiable if it can reasonably be determined which particular records come within the requests, and the records can be searched for, collected, and produced without unduly burdening or interfering with Department operations because of the staff time consumed or the resulting disruption of files.

(2) *Assistance in reformulating non-conforming requests.* If it is determined that a categorical request would unduly burden or interfere with the operations of the Department under paragraph (d) (1) of this section, the response denying the request on those grounds shall specify the reasons why and the extent to which compliance would burden or interfere with Department operations, and shall extend to the requester an opportunity to confer with knowledgeable Department personnel in an attempt to reduce the request to manageable proportions by reformulation and by agreeing on an orderly procedure for the production of the records.

(e) *Requests for records of other agencies.* Many of the records in the files of the Department are obtained from other agencies for litigation or other purposes. Where it is determined that the question of the availability of requested records is primarily the responsibility of another agency, the request will be referred to the other agency for processing in accordance with its regulations, and the person submitting the request will be so notified.

§ 16.4 Requests referred to division primarily concerned.

(a) *Referral to responsible division.* The Deputy Attorney General shall, promptly upon receipt of a request for Department records, ascertain which division of the Department has primary concern with the records requested. As used in this subpart, the term "division" includes all divisions, bureaus, offices, services, administrations, and boards of the Department, the Pardon Attorney and Federal Prison Industries except as otherwise expressly provided. He shall then promptly forward the request to the responsible division and notify the requester of his action. The Deputy Attorney General shall maintain or be furnished with a file copy of each request received, and records to show the date of its receipt from the requester, the division to which it was forwarded, and the date on which it was forwarded. For all purposes under this subpart the Board of Immigration Appeals and the

Bureau of Prisons shall be considered the responsible division with respect to requests sent directly to them pursuant to § 16.3 hereof.

(b) *Deputy Attorney General shall assure timely response.* The office of the Deputy Attorney General shall periodically review the practices of the divisions in meeting the time requirements set out in § 16.5 hereof, and take such action to promote timely responses as it deems appropriate.

§ 16.5 Prompt response by responsible division.

(a) *Response within 10 days.* The head of the responsible division shall, within 10 working days of its receipt by the division and more rapidly if practicable, either comply with or deny a request for records unless additional time is required for one of the following reasons:

(1) The requested records are stored in whole or in part at other locations than the office in receipt of the request;

(2) The request requires the collection of a substantial number of specified records;

(3) The request is couched in categorical terms and requires an extensive search for the records responsive to it;

(4) The requested records have not been located in the course of a routine search and additional efforts are being made to locate them;

(5) The requested records require examination and evaluation by personnel having the necessary competence and discretion to determine if they are (1) exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, and (2) should be withheld as a matter of sound policy, or disclosed only with appropriate deletions;

(6) The requested records or some of them involve the responsibility of another agency or another division of the Department whose assistance or views are being sought in processing the request.

When additional time is required for one of the above reasons, the head of the responsible division shall acknowledge receipt of the request within the 10-day period and include a brief notation of the reason for the delay and an indication of the date on which it is expected that a determination as to disclosure will be forthcoming. A copy of each such acknowledgment shall be furnished to the Deputy Attorney General. An extended deadline adopted for one of the reasons set forth above will be considered reasonable in all cases if it does not exceed 10 additional working days. The head of the responsible division may adopt an extended deadline in excess of the 10 additional working days (i.e., a deadline in excess of 20 working days from the time of receipt) upon specific prior approval of the notice to the requester of the extension by the office of the Deputy Attorney General where special circumstances reasonably warrant the more extended deadline and they are stated in the written notice of the extension.

(b) *Petition if response not forthcoming.* If the head of the responsible division does not respond to or acknowledge a request within the 10-day period, if the head of the responsible division does not act on a request within an extended deadline adopted for one of the reasons set forth in paragraph (a) of this section, or if the requester believes that an extended deadline adopted pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section is unreasonable, the requester may petition the Deputy Attorney General to take appropriate measures to assure prompt action on the request. In order for a requester to treat a failure to respond by the head of a division as a denial and file an appeal, he must have filed a petition with the Deputy Attorney General complaining of delay under this subsection.

(c) *Action on petitions complaining of delay.*—(1) *Prompt action.* Where a petition to the Deputy Attorney General complaining

of a division's failure to respond to a request or to meet an extended deadline does not elicit a response to the request from the head of the responsible division within 10 days, or where a petition complaining of a division's adoption of an unreasonable deadline fails to elicit an acknowledgement of the petition within 10 days and a response to the request from the head of the division within a reasonable time, the requester may treat the request as denied, and he may then file an appeal to the Attorney General.

(2) *Copies maintained by Deputy Attorney General.* Copies of all petitions complaining of delay, and records of all actions taken upon them shall be supplied to or maintained by the Deputy Attorney General.

(d) *Removal by Deputy Attorney General.* The Deputy Attorney General may remove any request or class of requests from the division to which it is referable under these regulations and, in such event, shall perform the functions of the head of such division with respect thereto.

§ 16.6 Responses by divisions: form and content.

(a) *Form of grant.* When a requested record has been identified and is available, the responsible division shall notify the requester as to where and when the record is available for inspection or copies will be available. The notification shall also advise the requester of any applicable fees under § 16.9 hereof.

(b) *Form of denial.* A reply denying a written request for a record shall be in writing signed by the head of the responsible division and shall include:

(1) *Exemption category.* A reference to the specific exemption under the Freedom of Information Act authorizing the withholdings of the record, to the extent consistent with the purpose of the exemption a brief explanation of how the exemption applies to the record withheld, and, if the head of the division considers it appropriate, a statement of why the exempt record is being withheld; and

(2) *Administrative appeal and judicial review.* A statement that the denial may be appealed within 30 days to the Attorney General, and that judicial review will be thereafter available either in the district in which the requester resides or has a principal place of business or in which the agency records are situated.

(c) *Record cannot be located or does not exist.* If a requested record cannot be located from the information supplied, or is known to have been destroyed or otherwise disposed of, the requester shall be so notified.

(d) *Copy of responses to Deputy Attorney General.* A copy of each grant or denial letter, and each notification under paragraph (c) of this section shall be furnished to the Deputy Attorney General.

§ 16.7 Appeals to the Attorney General from initial denials.

(a) *Appeal to Attorney General.* When the head of a division has denied a request for records in whole or in part, the requester may, within 30 days of its receipt, appeal the denial to the Attorney General, Washington, D.C. 20530. The appeal shall be in writing.

(b) *Action within 20 working days.* The Attorney General will act upon the appeal within 20 working days of its receipt, and more rapidly if practicable, unless novel and difficult questions are involved. Where such questions are involved, the Attorney General may extend the time for final action for a reasonable period beyond 20 working days upon notifying the requester of the reasons for the extended deadline and the date on which a final response may be expected.

(c) *Form of action on appeal.* The Attorney General's action on an appeal shall be in writing. A denial in whole or in part of a request on appeal shall set forth the exemption relied on, a brief explanation consistent with the purpose of the exemption of how

the exemption applies to the records withheld and the reasons for asserting it.

(d) *Copies to Deputy Attorney General.* Copies of all appeals and copies of all actions on appeal shall be furnished to the Deputy Attorney General.

§ 16.8 Maintenance of files.

(a) *Complete files maintained by Deputy Attorney General.* The Deputy Attorney General shall maintain files containing all material required to be retained by or furnished to him under this subpart. The material shall be filed by individual request; and shall be indexed according to the exemptions asserted; and, to the extent feasible, according to the type of records requested.

(b) *Maintenance of file open to public.* The Deputy Attorney General shall also maintain a file, open to the public, which shall contain copies of all grants or denials of appeals by the Attorney General. The material shall be indexed by the exemption asserted, and, to the extent feasible, according to the type of records requested.

(c) *Protection of privacy.* Where the identity of a requester, or other identifying details related to a request, would constitute an invasion of personal privacy if made generally available, the Deputy Attorney General shall delete identifying details from the copies of documents maintained in the public file established under paragraph (b) of this section.

§ 16.9 Fees for provision of records.

(a) *When charged.* User fees pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 483a (1970), shall be charged according to the schedule contained in paragraph (b) of this section for services rendered in responding to requests for Department records under this subpart unless the responding official of the Department determines, in conformity with the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 483a, that such charges or a portion thereof are not in the public interest. Such a determination shall ordinarily not be made unless the service to be performed will be of benefit primarily to the public as opposed to the requester, or unless the requester is an indigent individual. Fees shall not be charged where they would amount, in the aggregate, for a request or series of related requests, to less than \$3. Ordinarily, fees shall not be charged if the records requested are not found, or if all of the records located are withheld as exempt. However, if the time expended in processing the request is substantial, and if the requester has been notified of the estimated cost pursuant to paragraph (c) of this section and has been specifically advised that it cannot be determined in advance whether any records will be made available, fees may be charged.

(b) *Services charged for, and amount charged.* For the services listed below expended in locating or making available records or copies thereof, the following charges shall be assessed:

(1) *Copies.* For copies of documents (maximum of 10 copies will be supplied) \$.10 per copy of each page.

(2) *Clerical searches.* For each one quarter hour spent by clerical personnel in excess of the first quarter hour in searching for and producing a requested record, \$1.25.

(3) *Monitoring inspection.* For each one quarter hour spent in monitoring the requester's inspection of records, \$1.25.

(4) *Certification.* For certification of true copies, each, \$1.

(5) *Attestation.* For attestation under the seal of the Department, \$3.

(6) *Nonroutine, nonclerical searches.* Where a search cannot be performed by clerical personnel, for example, where the task of determining which records fall within a request and collecting them requires the time of professional or managerial personnel, and where the amount of time that must be expended in the search and collection of the requested records by such higher level personnel is substantial, charges for the

search may be made at a rate in excess of the clerical rate, namely for each one quarter hour spent in excess of the first quarter hour by such higher level personnel in searching for a requested record, \$3.57.

(7) *Examination and related tasks in screening records.* No charge shall be made for time spent in resolving legal or policy issues affecting access to records of known contents. In addition, no charge shall ordinarily be made for the time involved in examining records in connection with determining whether they are exempt from mandatory disclosure and should be withheld as a matter of sound policy. However, where a broad request requires Department personnel to devote a substantial amount of time to examining records for the purpose of screening out certain records or portions thereof in accordance with determinations that material of such a nature is exempt and should be withheld as a matter of sound policy, a fee may be assessed for the time consumed in such examination. Where such examination can be performed by clerical personnel, time will be charged for at the rate of \$1.25 per quarter hour, and where higher level personnel are required, time will be charged for at the rate of \$3.75 per quarter hour.

(8) *Computerized Records.* Fees for services in processing requests maintained in whole or part in computerized form shall be in accordance with this section so far as practicable. Services of personnel in the nature of a search shall be charged for at rates prescribed in paragraph (b) (6) of this section unless the level of personnel involved permits rates in accordance with paragraph (b) (2) of this section. A charge shall be made for the computer time involved, based upon the prevailing level of costs to governmental organizations and upon the particular types of computer and associated equipments and the amounts of time on such equipments that are utilized. A charge shall also be made for any substantial amounts of special supplies or materials used to contain, present, or make available the output of computers, based upon prevailing levels of costs to governmental organizations and upon the type and amount of such supplies or materials that is used. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to entitle any person, as of right, to any services in connection with computerized records, other than services to which such person may be entitled under 5 U.S.C. 552 and under the provisions, not including this paragraph (b), of this subpart.

(c) *Notice of anticipated fees in excess of \$25.* Where it is anticipated that the fees chargeable under this section will amount to more than \$25, and the requester has not indicated in advance his willingness to pay fees as high as are anticipated, the requester shall be promptly notified of the amount of the anticipated fee or such portion thereof as can readily be estimated. In appropriate cases an advance deposit may be required. The notice or request for an advance deposit shall extend an offer to the requester to confer with knowledgeable Department personnel in an attempt to reformulate the request in a manner which will reduce the fees and meet the needs of the requester. Dispatch of such a notice or request shall toll the running of the period for response by the Department until a reply is received from the requester.

(d) *Form of payment.* Payment should be made by check or money order payable to the Treasury of the United States.

§ 16.10 Exemptions.

(a) 5 U.S.C. 552 exempts from all of its publication and disclosure requirements nine categories of records which are described in subsection (b) of that section. These categories include such matters as national defense and foreign policy information; investigatory files; internal procedures and communications; materials exempted from disclosure by other statutes; information given in confidence; and matters involv-

personal privacy. The scope of the exemptions is discussed generally in the Attorney General's memorandum referred to in § 16.1.

(b) The Attorney General will not withhold any records of the Department over 10 years old on the ground that they are classified pursuant to Executive Order No. 11652 or its predecessors without notification from the Department review committee established in accordance with the Executive order and Subpart G of Part 17 of this chapter, by its Chairman, that continued classification is required by the Executive order.

Previous regulations superseded. This order supersedes order No. 381-67 of July 5, 1967, as amended, 28 CFR Part 16, Subpart A (1972), effective March 1, 1973.

Dated: February 9, 1973.

RICHARD G. KLEINDIENST,
Attorney General.

[FR Doc. 73-2970 Filed 2-13-73; 8:45 am]

CONCERN OF MOST AMERICANS ABOUT STREET CRIME, ORGANIZED CRIME, AND NARCOTICS TRAFFIC

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, in view of the present uncertainty as to the continuing existence of the House Select Committee on Crime, I wish to share with my colleagues a sampling of communications being received daily by the chairman of that committee, the Honorable CLAUDE PEPPER.

These messages, being sent by a wide variety of law enforcement officials all across the country, reflect the deep concern of most Americans about street crime, organized crime, and narcotics traffic. More importantly, the messages convey immense confidence in the manner in which the committee has spotlighted and investigated these problems during the past 4 years. Common in every text is the plea that the work of the committee not be interrupted at a time when so much progress is being made.

The messages follow:

MIAMI BEACH, FLA.,
February 16, 1973.

CLAUDE PEPPER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly urge the continuation of the House select committee on crime through passage of House Resolution 205. The House select committee on crime has been of invaluable assistance to professional law enforcement agencies. To terminate a committee with authorized jurisdiction to explore street crime and the wide spread traffic in narcotics in America today would not appear to serve the public interest.

ROCKY POMERANCE,
Chief of Police.

BRONX, N.Y.,
February 16, 1973.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Member of Congress,
Capitol Hill, D.C.:

I have this day sent a telegram to Honorable Carl Albert Speaker House of Representatives urging his efforts to pass your House Resolution 205 for extension of time to complete the vital essential work of the House select committee on crime.

MARIO MEROLA,
District Attorney, Bronx County.

MIAMI SHORES, FLA.,
February 16, 1973.

Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER,
Capitol Hill, D.C.:

I would like to go on message with the Miami Shores Dept. to recommend that the House Resolution No. 205 be continued for 2 more years. In our opinion they have just started with inspection and investigation on street crimes and narcotic investigation.

Chief WAYNE H. THURMAN.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
February 16, 1973.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Washington, D.C.:

The Illinois drug abuse program supports House Resolution 205 which continues the House Select Committee on Crime for 2 more years. We believe the committee serves the public interest.

Dr. EDWARD SENAY,
Director, Illinois Drug Abuse Program
and Dennis Heston Block Council,
Illinois Drug Abuse Program.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
February 16, 1973.

CLAUDE PEPPER,
Capitol Hill, D.C.:

You are urged to extend the life of the House Select Committee on Crime for an additional 2 years so it may convene its investigation of street crime and narcotics traffic in America.

CHARLES W. BOWSER,
Philadelphia Urban Coalition.

YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO,
February 17, 1973.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
Capitol Hill,
Washington, D.C.:

Do not drop your fight to get HR-205 legislated, feel your committee particularly urgent for elderly who cannot defend themselves on our streets. Entire Nation should be concerned with crime as we become a nation of people afraid to walk our streets or leave a door unlocked. Even locked doors fail to stop crime against our older Americans. In this area many robbed or beaten badly because they have no money to steal.

I. H. RYAN,
President, Northeastern Ohio Senior
Citizens Council.

MOORESTOWN, N.J.,
February 17, 1973.

Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I urge your favorable consideration of House Resolution 205 which would allow for the continuance of the House Select Committee on Crime. Having testified personally before this committee and kept abreast of its outstanding and beneficial work, I can attest that this committee of the House of Representatives has been one of the finest and most welcomed committees by all persons interested in safer streets and law enforcement. We in Florida hope that this committee will not be disbanded so that it may continue its fine work and help not only all Floridians but all Americans.

ROBERT L. SHEVIN,
Attorney General, State of Florida.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 17, 1973.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Washington, D.C.:

As a member of the D.C. Advisory Council on Aging and also a member of the Executive Board of the National Council of Senior Citizens Incorporated I urge you to use every means in support of House Resolution 205 (to continue House Select Committee on Crime) for two more years. Senior citizens are gravely concerned about street crime and completely support Senator Claude Pepper

and his committee in this very important work.

WALTER A. JONES.

MIAMI, FLA.,
February 16, 1973.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I consider Congressman Claude Pepper's House Select Committee on Crime one of the most important tools available in our continuing effort against criminal elements and urge congressional authorization for its further investigative activities.

RICHARD E. GERSTEIN,
State Attorney.

YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO,
February 17, 1973.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
Capitol Hill, D.C.:

Crime number one problem our nation today with no apparent solution yet found. Older Americans pay heavily in loss of badly needed money, life, or health through severe beatings to get money from them. Unable defend themselves due age and also many become victims of crime artists. Urgent you continue your efforts through your H.R. 205. Mr. and Mrs. ERVIN RYAN.

YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO,
February 17, 1973.

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
Capitol Hill, D.C.:

Urge you not to drop your efforts to continue committee on crime. Elderly crime targets in our area and throughout nation. Our senior groups always seeking to support legislators who will work for them on legislative matters.

SENIOR CITIZENS CLUB OF LOCAL 1307,
USWA, McDONALD, OHIO.

DENVER, COLO.,
February 16, 1973.

Hon. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I respectfully urge the continuation for two years of the House Select Committee on Crime to allow them to continue and complete their investigation of street crime and narcotics traffic in America.

Mayor W. H. McNICHOLS, Jr.

MARTINEZ, CALIF.,
February 15, 1973.

Hon. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SPEAKER ALBERT: May I urge the continuance of the House Select Committee on Crime chaired by the Honorable Claude Pepper. I personally attended the sessions in San Francisco approximately three years ago. I was most impressed and have followed the committee since that time and in its recent visit to San Francisco, I was able to supply its investigators with informational material.

Because of the unique status of this committee, and its ability to air crime and narcotics problems, I strongly urge that you continue the life of this committee.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM A. O'MALLEY,
District Attorney.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 16, 1973.

Hon. CARL ALBERT,
Speaker of the House,
The Capitol.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I would like to express my support for H. Res. 205, to continue the House Select Committee on Crime.

As you know, the crime problem is far from being solved. Anything you can do, therefore, to assure the continuance of this Committee would be very helpful.

Thank you very much.
Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 16, 1973.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.:

Following message sent to Hon. Carl Albert today. "The House Select Committee on Crime, under the chairmanship of the Hon. Claude Pepper is making a significant contribution to the cause of effective law enforcement through its investigation of street crime and narcotics traffic in America. Those of us engaged in law enforcement at the State and local level hope that the committee will be permitted to complete its work and I therefore urge the continuance of this important investigative body."

EVELLE J. YOUNGER,
Attorney General of California.

PROVIDENCE, R.I.,
February 16, 1973.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Member of Congress,
Chairman, House of Select Committee on
Crime, Capitol Hill, D.C.:

I understand that the continuation of the House Select Committee on Crime of which Honorable Claude Pepper, Chairman, will be considered in the very near future. I consider the work of that committee to be of vital national interest.

Respectfully,

RICHARD J. ISRAEL,
Attorney General, State of Rhode Island.

TRENTON, N.J.,
February 16, 1973.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
House of Representatives,
Capitol Hill, D.C.:

The following message was sent to Honorable Carl Albert, Speaker of the House: "I know of no more important problem in this country than street crime and narcotics and the work being done by the House Select Committee on Crime is in my view highly significant. I urge the passage of House Resolution 205 continuing that committee for two more years."

EVAN WILLIAM JAHOS,
Director, Division of Criminal Justice
Department of Law and Public Safety,
State of New Jersey.

MIAMI, FLA.,
February 16, 1973.

Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Continuation of House Select Committee on Crime is essential to vital national interest from my personal experience.

DAVID T. KENNEDY,
Mayor.

WESTPORT, CONN.,
February 16, 1973.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Capitol Hill, D.C.:

I have been advised that the leadership of the House of Representatives is currently giving consideration to H.R. 205, which would extend for 2 years the life of the House Select Committee on Crime. As a former police chief still active in the law enforcement community, I am familiar with the valuable work of this committee in exploring the critical problems of crime in America. Spectacular rise in recent years of street crime and drug abuse has placed a crushing burden on our fragile institutions of criminal justice and has contributed heavily to the atmosphere of fear and repression which now surrounds any discussion of the issue. The danger is that if our law makers fail to act for constructive solutions to the problems of crime

and criminal justice, we may soon be tempted to act out of fear. And this can have only the most dire consequences for the future course of this nation. I strongly urge you and your colleagues in the House to support the continued efforts of the Select Committee on Crime during the next 2 years.

JAMES F. AHERN,
Director, Insurance Crime Prevention
Institute.

THE COSTS OF A NEW CHINA POLICY

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, we hail the newest diplomatic feats of Nixon's modern Metternich, Henry Kissinger. It is evident that the movement toward normalization between the United States and Mainland China took several forward strides during his latest meetings with Messrs. Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai. We know that a joint communiqué will issue soon and we welcome the revealing of details of the latest improvements. At the risk of anticipating erroneously the contents, let us here, Mr. Speaker, suggest that whereas the early indications have stressed what advantages there are for the United States, that is, in agreeing on a ministerial presence in Peking, more contacts for trade, wider acceptance for exchange in press representatives and a continuing increase in cultural missions, I have the belief that our most critical awareness should be directed to the concessions we in the United States must make and the conditions which should perhaps be attending such concessions.

Clearly, one of the priorities for the Chinese will be a request to unfreeze and make available to someone like the Bank of China the funds impounded by the United States when diplomatic relations were severed following the creation of the Peoples Republic of China in 1949. The funds belonging to the official government of China and its agencies—which in 1950 totaled in excess of \$105 million—could serve much of the need the Chinese have for purchasing the new generations of industrial machinery and tooling. We believe this accommodation should be made as soon as possible. However, we would remind the Nixon administration that there are a substantial number of verified and legally approved claims of U.S. citizens for property confiscated without compensation by the present Chinese Government. Surely these claims—certified in 1972 at \$196-plus million—should be urged for recognition and payment during negotiations to release Chinese impounded accounts.

Again, since trade must be a two-way street, if the United States hopes to benefit from Chinese buying, we must be prepared to make our markets available too on a competitive basis. This means including China on the most-favored nation list. My belief is that it is in our national interest for the President to propose and Congress to approve this move.

Finally, it is inevitable that the Chinese should request a change in our military

commitment to Taiwan. This move should be most cautiously undertaken. We are still in the bifurcated posture of having commitments to the Republic of China even as we seek détente with the People's Republic of China. In a sense by our actions we have developed an implicit two-China policy without addressing the rhetorical explicit position that prevailed in the United Nations posture we so long followed.

It appears to me that we will be urged by Chou to take a position somewhat closer to a one-China policy which shows, for the first time, a preference for mainland China. This is a very sticky-wicket indeed. Given our oft repeated assurances to Taiwan, it will take some fancy footwork to justify a quick adjustment of our posture. I suppose that we will see a tradeoff of some kind making trade and military concessions to counterbalance the removal of our military presence from Formosa. Some special combination a la Korea would probably be the most likely policy.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, we would like to make clear that at least some of us here in Congress are painfully aware that the Chinese are not about to invite us to a free lunch. Nor should they. However, we must look very carefully at the cheque; even as we are entranced by the items offered on the menu. Two things strike us as worthy of our constant recall during our negotiations. First, a Chinese dish always seems more filling than time proves to be the case and, second, one cannot be sure of the ingredients simply by knowing the name of the dish. The Chinese will have respect for us not only when we move where we should be moving but also when we indicate politely, but firmly, that there are price ceilings which our own interests dictate.

We in the Congress should be prepared to support legislative measures which contribute to a healthier and happier relationship with mainland China. We must do so with a constructive and responsible attitude. A generation, even a century of peace is possible if carefully plotted and painstakingly achieved. In this regard, the patience—characteristic of Asian culture—has much to offer. That which is done with care will have a greater likelihood of lasting.

COMMEMORATION OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, February 16 was the 55th anniversary of Lithuania's Independence Day but the country's history reaches back into the 11th century. Throughout this long history Lithuanian independence was thwarted time and again. Long incorporated into the Russian czarist empire it only gained independence in modern times at the close of the First World War. The Bolsheviks invaded the newly established state but after a bitter struggle the

Lithuanians drove them back and forced the Bolshevik Government to sign a peace treaty on July 19, 1920, in which it "voluntarily and forever" renounced "all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and their territory."

During the period between the two world wars Lithuania knew peace and independence. It was a period of national revival when Lithuanian literature and culture blossomed. But the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact and the resulting partition of Poland sealed the fate of the new Republic, now isolated and at the mercy of its traditional enemy. The Soviet Union demanded permission to put 20,000 troops in the country and established military bases on Lithuanian soil. Eight months later the Soviet Army entered the country in force and installed a puppet government. A national assembly was chosen in an election in which only Communist Party members were allowed to vote. In its first session this packed assembly voted unanimously to ask the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. to admit Lithuania into the Soviet state as one of its federated Soviet Socialist Republics. During World War II the Lithuanians exchanged one tyranny for another when the German forces overran the country, but in 1944 the Soviet occupation of the country was firmly reestablished. Since that time Lithuania has not known independence.

The undiminished longing in Lithuania for independence has been demonstrated tragically in this past year. In June 1972, a Lithuanian worker doused himself with gasoline and burned himself to death to protest the Soviet occupation, the third immolation in Lithuania in a 7-week period. In May the suicide of Roman Kalanta, a 20-year-old student, touched off 2 days of rioting by thousands of youths shouting "Freedom for Lithuania."

These tragic incidents can only reinforce our conviction that Lithuania should be free. We must take satisfaction in the fact that our Government has refused to recognize the illegal annexation of the Baltic States by the Kremlin. For the same reason I welcomed a resolution introduced into the 91st Congress which called on the President to take steps to place the question of human rights violations, including genocide, in Soviet-occupied Lithuania on the agenda of the United Nations Organization.

MICHIGAN MASONIC WEEK

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, February 18-28 has been proclaimed by Michigan Gov. William G. Milliken as Michigan Masonic Week. Detroit Mayor Roman S. Gribbs has proclaimed February 28, 1973, as Metropolitan Detroit Masonic Day. On that date, a brotherhood celebration will be held at the Fountain Ballroom of the Detroit Masonic Temple, hosted by Craftsman

Lodge No. 521 as Host Lodge, along with Perfection Lodge No. 486, Daylight Lodge No. 525, Mosaic Lodge No. 530 and Oak Park Lodge No. 591. The celebration is intended to promote not only brotherhood throughout the State but among Masons, particularly, in the metropolitan areas of Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb Counties. At this time, I would like to insert into the Record the proclamations of the Governor of Michigan and the Mayor of Detroit:

EXECUTIVE DECLARATION IN OBSERVANCE OF FEBRUARY 18-28, 1973, AS MICHIGAN MASONIC WEEK

Through the improvement and strengthening of the character of the individual man, Freemasonry seeks to improve the community. It impresses upon its members the principles of personal responsibility, enlightens them as to those things which make for human welfare, and inspires them to translate principle and conviction into action.

The Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of the State of Michigan is composed of 540 constituent lodges throughout Michigan whose members have dedicated themselves to the principles of truth, justice, fraternity, and liberty.

Therefore, I, William G. Milliken, Governor of the State of Michigan, declare February 18-28, 1973 as Michigan Masonic Week, and encourage all citizens to give recognition to the principles and activities of the Free and Accepted Masons of Michigan.

Given under my hand on this fourteenth day of February in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred seventy-three and of the Commonwealth one hundred thirty-seventh.

WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN,
Governor.

METROPOLITAN DETROIT MASONIC DAY WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1973

MASONIC BROTHERHOOD CELEBRATION

Freemasonry is a charitable, benevolent, educational and religious society which seeks to improve the community through strengthening the character of men.

It teaches and stands for the worship of God, for truth and justice, for fraternity and philanthropy, for enlightenment and orderly liberty, charging each of its members to be true and loyal to his lawful government.

Of the 540 constituent lodges comprising the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of the State of Michigan, five: Craftsman Lodge No. 521, Perfection Lodge No. 486, Daylight Lodge No. 525, Mosaic Lodge No. 530 and Oak Park Lodge No. 591, have formed INTER-LODGE to continue Freemasonry's ideals and principles.

Therefore, I, Roman S. Gribbs, Mayor of the City of Detroit, issue this proclamation honoring and recognizing the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of the State of Michigan, Metropolitan Detroit Masons and INTER-LODGE on the occasion of the Masonic Brotherhood Celebration.

ROMAN S. GRIBBS,
Mayor.

THE 55TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, today I ask each of us to join with Americans of Lithuanian descent in commemorating

two important anniversaries—the 55th anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania and the 722d anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian state.

Lithuania's independence observed officially last Friday, lasted only until 1940, when the Soviet Union invaded and occupied Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and forcibly annexed these Baltic States into the Soviet Union. Even now, Lithuanians raised under the yoke of communism are risking and sacrificing their lives in defiance of the Soviet regime, seeking religious and political freedom for their country. The unsuccessful escape attempt of the Lithuanian sailor, Simas Kudirka, the self-immolation of Romas Kalanta, and the subsequent demonstration by thousands of young Lithuanians, and the petition of 17,000 Lithuanian Roman Catholics to Kurt Waldheim of the United Nations, demonstrates their thirst for freedom at any price.

Today, the United States stands on the threshold of the most meaningful and potentially rewarding era in the history of mankind. For the first time in many years, global peace is attainable. However, global peace is only the first great objective of our Nation, we must also seek the attainment of freedom and justice for all oppressed nations. For even if the countries of the world cease hostilities toward one another, the unresolved legacies of the Second World War must be confronted; the status of the Baltic nations must be once and for all—equitably resolved.

Let us hope that soon the Lithuanians will again witness the restoration of their great nation and enjoy once more the freedom and independence of a democracy.

The Lithuanian-American organizations deserve our support in commemorating these anniversaries.

NATIONAL INVENTORS WEEK

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, February 11, the birthday of Thomas Alva Edison, has been designated by action of the Congress and the President as National Inventors Day. In Oregon, in honor of the outstanding contributions of Oregon inventors to progress in the United States, the Governor designated the week of February 11, 1973, as Oregon Inventors Week.

It is most appropriate that all of us reflect upon the many advantages we take for granted in our daily lives. We should pay more proper tribute to the persons who, through dedication and creative genius, make our lives easier.

At this point, I insert a copy of Oregon Gov. Tom McCall's proclamation on Oregon Inventors Week in the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY GOV. TOM MCCALL

Even in our grandfathers' days American inventiveness was a topic of conversation and wonder all over the civilized world.

CCIX—301—Part 4

One of the first acts of the Congress of the United States was to establish the patent system under which American inventors have made outstanding contributions to the world's engineering, manufacturing, and scientific projects.

Both the Senate and the House of the United States Congress have now passed and the President of the United States has now signed a resolution officially designating the birthday of Thomas Edison, February 11th, as National Inventors Day.

As Governor of the State of Oregon, I do hereby proclaim the week of February 11, 1973, as "Oregon Inventors Week" in commemoration of the contribution made by the inventors of the State of Oregon to the progress of the useful arts within the United States and to the contributions made by all inventors to progress within the State of Oregon.

In this way, the State of Oregon expresses thanks to her inventor-citizens for their contributions to the economy and welfare of this State and our Nation. Additionally, we pay to the contributions made by all tribute to the United States Patent system by acknowledging and recalling the quotation of Abraham Lincoln: "The Patent System adds the fuel of interest to the fire of genius."

TOM MCCALL,
Governor of Oregon.

NAVAL UNDERWATER SYSTEMS CENTER, NEWPORT, R.I.

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the significant way the Naval Underwater Systems Center in Newport, R.I., is benefiting small business in my 10th Congressional District of Massachusetts.

Last year, nearly 60 percent of the prime contracts awarded by the center went to small businesses. This, together with the fact a great many residents of my district earn their living at the center, demonstrates the great value of this facility to southeastern Massachusetts.

I sincerely hope that in contemplating any so-called economies in the Defense Establishment, the Pentagon budget cutters take a very long careful look at the Newport Naval Base.

I include an Underwater Systems Center press release detailing its small business activities:

NAVAL UNDERWATER SYSTEMS CENTER PURCHASING POLICY PUMPS \$4 MILLION TO SMALL BUSINESS

Small business in the Rhode Island, Connecticut and Massachusetts areas is benefiting from a program being implemented by the Naval Underwater Systems Center to encourage more Navy procurement from small concerns.

As a result of the program, NUSC has been commended by the Naval Supply Systems Command for surpassing its goal in awarding 58.8 percent of the dollar value of prime contracts to small business in 1972. NUSC's goal for this period was 45.75 percent.

In dollar value, the 58.8 percent represents slightly more than \$4 million in small business procurements completed last year through actions at the center's Newport and New London laboratories. The 1972 achievement is a significant increase over the \$2.3 million in small business contracts placed by the center in 1971.

In the citation, Rear Adm. K. R. Wheeler, commander, Naval Supply Systems Command, Washington, commends the center's purchasing and technical personnel for their efforts in increasing small business participation in Navy procurement, under guidelines stressed by the Department of Defense.

NUSC first received the small business performance plaque in 1970, and was cited for the award a second time in 1971.

Lt. Cdr. Alan S. Brown of 507 Middle Road, Portsmouth, NUSC supply officer, accepted the "add-on" award to the plaque. It was presented at Newport recently by Lt. Cdr. David C. Eppling, Newport assistant officer in charge, acting in behalf of Rear Adm. Wheeler.

In line with the accomplishment, letters of appreciation were presented to the following personnel of the purchasing division by Capt. Milton C. McFarland, commanding officer of the center.

Lt. Cdr. Brown, Ronald Martin, 77 President Ave., Albert J. Robichard, 111 Cedar Ave., both of Portsmouth, Philip G. David, 60 Hazard St., New Bedford, Mass., William G. LeBlanc, 38 Taylor St., Mary L. Tyrrell, 257 Tecumseh St., both Fall River, James G. Edward, 15 Circle Drive, Carol A. Anderson, 16 Spruce Ave., both Middletown.

Arthur J. Levesque, 4 Channing St., Martha L. Merriwether, 6 Hoffman Place, both Newport, John E. Clarkin, 125 Pawtuxet Ave., Cranston, Thomas J. O'Rourke, 37 Twin Pond Road, East Greenwich.

Lt. Daniel E. Moser, assistant supply officer, Harry P. Palagi Jr., NUSC procurement officer, Josephine P. Metcalfe, Ann H. Rudyk, Henry W. Chandler, Richard S. Higham, all of the New London lab.

ALCOHOLISM

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, in these days of great public concern over the myriad problems of drug abuse, we all too often tend to forget that alcoholism remains one of the single most seriously abused drugs. It is estimated that there are over 9 million alcoholics in America whose lives, and the lives of their entire families are ruined by their serious disease.

In their preface to a report on an HEW symposium on alcoholism, Dr. Nancy K. Mello and Dr. Jack H. Mendelson, both with the National Center for Prevention and Control of Alcoholism, state that prior to the late 1960's, very little work involving alcoholism was supported by the Government. The Doctors observed that:

This historical lack of Federal encouragement of the support for alcohol related research paralleled a general tendency to view alcoholism within the context of moral transgression and social deviancy.

Fortunately, and wisely, Federal policies have undergone quite a change since the 1960's, recognizing alcoholism more and more for what it is—a very serious, but treatable disease. Yet, with all of our progress, much remains to be changed, particularly in terms of the public attitude. Drs. Mello and Mendelson state that:

Even today, general acceptance of alcoholism as a disease, a medical problem, is proceeding slowly.

It is at this point, then, when local citizen involvement can play its vital role, not only to the alcoholic and his family, important as that role may be, but also in helping to enlighten the community as to the real nature of alcoholism.

It is in this light I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the formation of the Alcoholism Council of Maryland Citizens of Montgomery County, Md. This group of local citizens was organized in order to meet the dual role I have just mentioned—assisting the alcoholic through promotion of adequate clinical facilities for their diagnosis and treatment and through development of a well-rounded community program to combat alcoholism and by educating the public.

At this point in my comments, I would like to include the statement of purposes of the Alcoholism Council, for they reflect the importance and value of its work:

PURPOSES

1. To promote and increase public awareness of and concern for the nature and scope of the problem of alcoholism; to establish, maintain, conduct, and operate such educational programs and/or facilities as will be conducive to and designed for greater public understanding of said problem; to engage in research and study projects to develop increased knowledge, both lay and professional, of the various aspects of the problem of alcoholism and of alcoholics; to devise, through such projects, new and improved methods of treatment for this disease and those afflicted therewith.

2. To remove the stigma of alcoholism from those so afflicted and to encourage public realization that alcoholism is a disease and must be so treated; to cooperate in every convenient and desirable manner with the medical profession and with all other persons and organizations interested in and concerned with this problem. To publish, or cause to be published, and to distribute, in any lawful manner, books, articles, magazines, tracts, pamphlets or other publications dealing with this subject and allied subjects; to solicit and accept grants, gifts, donations or other sums of money or property to further the purposes of the corporation, and to hire such persons as shall be necessary or desirable in accomplishing the purposes of the corporation.

3. To encourage and promote the establishment of adequate clinical facilities for the diagnosis and treatment of alcoholics and to further and develop coordination of all efforts in this area by other groups and organizations, and with governmental agencies and institutions, in order to achieve a well-rounded community program to combat this problem.

There is absolutely no question as to the inherent and desperate need for this type of organization. According to the National Institute of Mental Health, present estimates indicate that treatment of most of today's alcoholics, with present techniques, would fill every existing hospital bed and require the full-time service of every physician in the Nation. With such staggering facts as this in mind, it becomes clear that those involved in this important work have indeed taken on an enormous task.

It is also in the face of these facts that we must all become involved to the fullest extent possible with joining the effort to advance knowledge about the disease, and to push for only the best possible programs for its treatment.

YAF OPPOSES AMNESTY!

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when more and more voices are being heard urging amnesty and forgiveness for those young Americans who deserted from the armed services or who fled the country in anticipation of being called to service, other voices are being heard in opposition to such a policy.

One of these is Young Americans for Freedom, an organization of thousands of young men and women who believe that those who did not fulfill their obligation of citizenship during the Vietnam war should pay a price for their actions.

Young Americans for Freedom, which is composed of more than 60,000 young Americans in more than 600 communities and colleges, has launched a nationwide campaign in opposition to a policy of amnesty. More than 70 Members of Congress serve on the national advisory board of this organization. Discussing the campaign against amnesty one board member, my distinguished colleague from Texas (Mr. FISHER), noted that:

Over 50,000 brave young men didn't desert this country when she called them and they paid the ultimate sacrifice for their loyalty to freedom. Their memory is an inspiration to all of us. Some 300,000 casualties who returned wounded and now face rehabilitation served their country proudly and honorably. They did not desert. Must we tarnish the memory of these patriotic Americans by granting amnesty to those radicals who have refused to serve?

Speaking before the Republican Party Platform Committee in Miami on August 16, 1972, Ronald F. Docksai, national chairman of Young Americans for Freedom, discussed the question of amnesty.

At that time he urged that the administration express its unequivocal opposition to amnesty for deserters and exiles who consciously excused themselves from the military obligations most young Americans were not afraid to face.

To further acquaint my colleagues with the views of Young Americans for Freedom on this subject, I am inserting into the RECORD that portion of Mr. Docksai's statement to the Republican Party platform committee dealing with the question of amnesty.

That statement follows:

(2). That the administration express its unequivocal opposition to amnesty for deserters and exiles who consciously excused themselves from the military obligations most young Americans were not afraid to face. Though there are some young Americans whose parents never introduced the virtues of sacrifice and obligation until their eighteenth birthdays, all of the young men I talked with while in Vietnam and most of those I know are not of this breed.

Irrespective of their views on the war, these young men donated some prime years and sometimes their lives in service of their country. And especially now, as the Vietnam conflict is fresh in their memories, unemployment remains a reality and these young men return home in search of jobs which are in many cases already filled by those who refused to serve, it would be a travesty to pardon those who willingly sought to make

suckers out of those who obeyed the law. The law is not merely an option or a suggestion which we can either accept or reject with impunity. When this becomes the case, anarchy prevails and freedom and order are set off balance. We believe that no government can afford to make it profitable to disobey society's laws.

AMERICA'S POOR—DOES ANYONE CARE?

HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, thousands of citizens have come to Washington today from all parts of the Nation, to register their strong disapproval of the administration's scaling down of domestic programs and to challenge Congress to redress their legitimate grievances.

Many of the people who are here today have fought for the enactment of valuable human services, such as the poverty program and its community action agencies. Many of them have worked tirelessly to bring at least some modest assistance to people in need. Many have organized in their communities to alleviate some of the suffering inflicted on the millions of poor Americans.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that poor people are shocked and angered by the cutbacks, impoundments, and dismantling of programs duly authorized and funded by their Representatives in the Congress? Is it any wonder that they are asking if anyone cares about oppression and misery?

I think that the people who are here today are doing more than protesting against executive policies. I think they are presenting a very serious challenge to Congress, not only to restore the good programs and services which are being so callously swept away, but also to restore the rights, powers, and responsibilities of the Congress to serve all the people of America as their elected representatives. This is a challenge to reestablish representative government in the Nation.

To underscore the protest and challenge here in Washington today, many thousands of citizens who remained at home have written of their deep concern about the threatened loss of federally supported services. As examples of these expressions, I include in my remarks just a few of the letters I have received in recent days. In their own moving words, the writers of these letters tell how various programs have made life better for so many people in need.

ATLANTA, GA.,
February 14, 1973.

HON. ANDREW YOUNG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. YOUNG: As you are doubtless aware, many anti-poverty programs now funded through the Office of Economic Opportunity are in danger of losing their financial support. Economic Opportunity Atlanta (EOA) is one such program. While I do not maintain that EOA has succeeded in its every endeavor (what program has?), I do feel that it offers special help to Atlanta's

disadvantaged that would be missed if EOA discontinued its activities. To say the least, there would be painful disruption in the lives of many of our fellow citizens who look to EOA for much needed assistance.

I realize that the Congress is only one of many participants in the formulation of policies affecting the anti-poverty programs. Nevertheless, you and your Congressional colleagues have unique opportunities to influence such policies. Therefore, I respectfully solicit your favorable consideration of the reasons documented above for continuing Federal support to EOA.

Sincerely yours,

CLIFF HENDRIX.

ATLANTA, GA.,
February 13, 1973.

HON. ANDREW YOUNG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. YOUNG: This Senior Citizens Organization that is being sponsored by the EOA is one of the greatest things that has ever happened to the elderly people ranging from ages 65 on up. I am 80 years young and have become active in doing things that I never dreamed that I could do. We are a group of very happy people. My mind has become more receptive. I look forward to going to my class every week. I even feel younger than I did many years ago. This happened since I became affiliated with the Senior Citizens Activities.

I think we could surprise many people should we put on a show and present just a few of the many beautiful things that has been done by Senior Citizens in ceramics, knitting, crocheting, liquid embroidering, hat making and now we have begun making things out of leather such as belts, change purses, billfolders and bags and also upholstery.

This is indeed the greatest contribution that has ever been created for Senior Citizens. May the EOA continue to be a blessing to senior citizens. Please help us keep this great organization alive. Thanking you in advance for your efforts in helping to keep the EOA alive. I speak the sentiments of all senior citizens.

IDA L. SIMON.

ATLANTA, GA.,
February 15, 1972.

DEAR SIR: With a co-ordinated effort from my people and myself, I appeal to you to help save the OEO and EOA.

These agencies are needed very badly in the underprivileged areas of the United States. Our young people have had a chance to be more helpful to their community with guidance from EOA. Our elderly and people in dire need of other type of help has been assisted by the EOA. I feel as if it is every man and woman's responsibility to do all we can for those whom are less fortunate than ourselves.

Sincerely yours,

KAY F. COE.

ATLANTA, GA.,
February 13, 1973.

HON. ANDREW YOUNG,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN YOUNG: We, The Major Family, wish to express our regret because of President Nixon's recent decision to cut back funds for the organizations which benefit poor people most. I am certain the President is not aware of the error he is making. The Economic Opportunity Atlanta, Vine City Urban Development, the Child Development Centers are very much needed. The Public Housing Authority is also needed greatly.

If it had not been for the Vine City Urban Development and the Economic Opportunity Atlanta, this family would still be living in a

substandard, rat infested, unsanitary basement.

There seemed to be no hope until they negotiated with the Housing Authority. We were expecting our third child and we didn't want to bring an innocent baby home to a place unfit for grown people. They not only helped us get into the government project, but helped us get furnishing for the children and the baby after she arrived. My second child has constant upper respiratory infections and ear infections. Living in that basement caused him to stay sick quite a lot.

That wasn't so bad until our oldest child received an electrical burn from the faulty wiring. Being emotionally disturbed this set him back more. The child development center at Bethune Elementary brought him out of his shell and now he's talking. He's four years old. We are just one family, but many people have been benefited by these organizations. Please help us keep them.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. ISAAC MAJOR and FAMILY.

COLLEGE PARK, GA.,
February 10, 1973.

DEAR MR. YOUNG: Will you please help to save the E.O.A. People will be out of jobs. These people (E.O.A.) are needed to help other people who are in great need. It has been too many laid off from jobs. So how can it be expected for poverty to end. How can it be expected for people to stop robbing banks, prostitutes to get off the streets, people to stop selling dope. Eliminating these E.O.A. centers will only make these problems and some I haven't named worse. So its up to you and all that's involved to keep these problems from happening.

Mrs. B. GAINES.

PLACER COMMUNITY ACTION COUNCIL, INC.
Auburn, Calif., February 6, 1973.

HON. ANDY YOUNG,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. YOUNG: This letter is to share my concern and enlist your support for the War on Poverty Program. It's patently obvious that the Administration is declaring war on the poor people. The attempt to dismantle OEO must be resisted to the end. On the same day of the signing of the cease-fire in Vietnam, the President announced his budget with a \$5 billion increase in military spending and the proposed dismantling of OEO.

There is something tragic about the Administration's sense of priorities. There are between thirty-five and forty million people living in poverty in a land of plenty. Over \$125 billion has been spent on Vietnam already. (It will take another \$75 billion to fill the bomb holes.) To tell people to lift themselves up by their bootstraps is a hoax. Without basic tools of education, encumbered with the crushing weight of past failure, lack of opportunity, apathy and despair, the President's work ethic exhortation is like telling a man to climb Mount Everest without oxygen tanks.

Revenue sharing is a rip-off and a fraud. Six billion dollars a year is offered to local government and the responsibility of making program decisions. At the same time, the Administration is chopping off \$10 billion in program monies at the other end, resulting in a \$4 billion net loss in funding in Manpower, Education, Housing, Health and Agriculture programs.

It is up to Congress to reclaim its Constitutional role in legislation and appropriation. The people will respond to strong leadership. The appointment of Roy Ash to OMB is like asking the fox to guard the chicken coop. (If ever a company was on "Welfare", it was Litton Industries.) The removal of Phil Sanchez and the appointment of hatchet-man H. Phillips is an affront to Mexican-Americans and every Community Action Program in America.

There are over 1,000 CAP's in America with a constituency of thirty-five to forty million poor people. It is time to separate the men from the boys or else simply to hand over the country to King Richard. It will take vision, organization and guts to turn this country around—but it can be done.

Combatively but cordially,

The Rev. E. GENE VOSSELER,
Executive Director.

A FREE PRESS HELPS DR. MILTON MARGOLES WIN PRESIDENTIAL PARDON

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, at a time when fears are being raised about the vitality of the press, special tribute should be given to a small, diverse group of journalists who are testimony to the vigilance and perseverance of their profession. These men were a significant factor in finally winning justice in the bizarre tax case of Dr. Milton Margoles, through the granting of a Presidential pardon. They assisted our colleague from Iowa (Mr. Gross) and me in our own investigation of the case. Their news articles and columns raised questions about the doctor's ordeal and kept this worthy cause in the public eye until the right thing was done, and a just solution was realized.

Mr. Speaker, most prominent among these distinguished journalists are Willard Edwards, columnist of the Chicago Tribune; Clark Mollenhoff, Washington Bureau Chief of the Des Moines Register; Morton Kondracke, of the Washington Bureau of the Chicago Sun-Times; Steve Rothman, of the Waukegan News-Sun; Jerry Landauer, of the Wall Street Journal, and Dave Zweifel, of the Madison, Wis., Capital Times. Others who brought the Margoles case to national attention are Columnists James J. Kilpatrick, Jackson Anderson, Nick Thimmesch, and Washington Post Associate Editor Merlo Pusey.

A special tribute is due our colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross), who since 1966 has repeatedly called the Congress' attention to the articles written by these men and the need to correct this injustice.

Mr. Speaker, in the March 27, 1972, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Gross in an Extension of Remarks included several noteworthy news columns written by Willard Edwards, Morton Kondracke, and James J. Kilpatrick. In addition, he attached an index to numerous articles which had appeared in the press relating to the Dr. Margoles case. At this time, I am pleased to attach an index of subsequent articles relating to this subject, and which bring to a conclusion the long fight by Dr. Margoles, his devoted and talented son, Perry Margoles, as well as the interested, alert, and persistent newsmen who contributed in large measure to the final success of winning a full and unconditional pardon in this historic case.

SECOND INDEX TO CROSS SECTION OF RECENT ARTICLES ON THE MARGOLES CASE AND RELATED MATTER

(NOTE.—The first index to the Margoles case, with reference to newspaper articles, and entries in the Congressional Record through 1971, was published in Vol. 118, No. 47 of the Congressional Record, Monday, March 27, 1972, at E3117. These cross sections are not intended to represent a complete compilation of recent articles on the Margoles case and related subjects.)

NAMES OF NEWSPAPERS, ARTICLES, TITLES, AND DATES OF PUBLICATION

45. (Syndicated column)
 - a. Chicago Sun-Times, Clark Mollenhoff, "James Hoffa, the model prisoner" (1-9-72)
 - b. Des Moines Register, Clark Mollenhoff, "Watch on Washington: Hoffa's Assault on Court System" (1-9-72)
46. Congressional Record, H. R. Gross, "Whatever Happened to the House Judiciary Committee?" (letter to Chairman Emanuel Celler of the House Judiciary Committee from Atty. Owen W. Crumpacker about the impeachment petition against Milwaukee Federal Judge Robert E. Teahan, Sr., previously filed with the committee by the Woodmar Realty Company of Hammond, Indiana, reporting the discovery of additional patterns of judicial misconduct in the Seventh Federal Judicial Circuit) (3-23-72)
47. (U.P.I. from Washington)
 - a. Gary (Ind.) Post Tribune, "Area man asks probe of judges" (3-25-72)
 - b. Indianapolis Star, "Investigation of 2 Judges Is Requested" (3-26-72)
48. Congressional Record, H. R. Gross, "How Long Must Dr. Margoles Wait?" (3-27-72):
 - a. Chicago Tribune, Willard Edwards, "Capitol Views: Why Hoffa and Not Dr. Margoles?" (12-30-71)
 - b. Chicago Sun-Times, Morton Kondracke, "New Decade Hints an End to Dr. Margoles' Years of Woe" (12-27-70)
 - c. (Syndicated column) James J. Kilpatrick, "Tragic Miscarriage of Justice" (1-3-72)
 - d. "(First) index to cross section of recent articles on the Margoles case and related matters"
49. (Syndicated column)
 - a. Washington Post, Jack Anderson, "The Washington Merry-Go-Round: 2 U.S. Judges Play Musical Chairs" (4-10-72)
 - b. Chicago Daily News, Jack Anderson, "The political cronyism of Kerner's colleagues" (4-10-72)
 - c. Santa Barbara (Calif.) News-Press, Jack Anderson, "Report on court corruption" (4-10-72)
 - d. New York Post, Jack Anderson, "Judging From . . ." (4-10-72)
 - e. Detroit Free Press, Jack Anderson, "Judicial Musical Chairs: Federal Judges Swap Cases To Keep Lid on Scandals" (4-10-72)
 - f. Madison (Wis.) Capital Times, Jack Anderson, "'Odor of Corruption' Comes From Milwaukee Court" (4-11-72)
 - g. Nashville Tennessean, Jack Anderson, "Judicial 'Swaps' With Hot Cases" (4-11-72)
 - h. Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Journal, Jack Anderson, "Corruption in Federal Court-houses" (4-11-72)
 - i. Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press, Jack Anderson, "Two Midwest U.S. Judges Swapped 'Hot Potato' Cases" (4-10-72)
 - j. Baltimore News-American, Jack Anderson, "Some Judges Play 'Swamps'" (4-10-72)
 - k. Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger, Jack Anderson, "Midwestern Demo Judges 'Swap' Some of Most Sensitive Problems" (4-10-72)
 - l. Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Jack Anderson, "Judges Play Musical Chairs" (4-10-72)
 - m. San Antonio (Texas) Express, Jack Anderson, "2 Judges Playing 'Swaps'" (4-10-72)
 - n. Denver Rocky Mountain News, Jack Anderson, "Midwest courthouse corruption smells" (4-10-72)

- o. Las Vegas (Nev.) Review-Journal, Jack Anderson, Judges swap cases in 'musical chairs'" (4-10-72)
- p. Atlanta Constitution, Jack Anderson, "Judges Who Play 'Swaps'" (4-10-72)
- q. Indianapolis Star, Jack Anderson, "Two Judges Seen Playing Legal Musical Chairs" (4-13-72)
- r. Orlando (Fla.) Sentinel, Jack Anderson, "Judges Who Play 'Swaps,'" (4-10-72)
- s. Alton (Ill.) Evening Telegraph, Jack Anderson, "Courthouse stink worse than pollution" (4-10-72)
- t. Mexico City (Mexico) News, Jack Anderson, "Merry-Go-Round" (4-13-72)
50. Chicago Tribune, Willard Edwards, "Faces Loss of Hospital in Tax Case" (4-17-72)
51. Congressional Record, Robert McClory, "Dramatic Review of Dr. Margoles' Plea for Clemency" (Insertion of newspaper series) (5-8-72):
 - a. Waukegan (Ill.) News-Sun, Steve Rothman, "Zion doctor's story: a study in futility" (4-25-72)
 - b. Waukegan News-Sun, Steve Rothman, "The Margoles story: tax trouble and jail" (4-26-72)
 - c. Waukegan News-Sun, Steve Rothman, "The Margoles story: starting all over" (4-27-72)
 - d. Waukegan News-Sun, Steve Rothman, "The Margoles story: a fight for justice" (4-28-72)
52. Waukegan News-Sun, Steve Rothman, "No shortcut for Margoles: U.S. Justice Department" (5-4-72)
53. Waukegan News-Sun (5-5-72):
 - a. "McClory to seek pardon for doctor"
 - b. (letter to editor) Congressman Robert McClory, "Lauds series"
54. Waukegan News-Sun, "Ogilvie asks Nixon to pardon Margoles" (5-8-72)
55. Milwaukee Sentinel, "Nixon Asked To Pardon Margoles" (5-9-72)
56. Milwaukee Journal, "Ogilvie Asks Nixon to Aid Margoles" (5-9-72)
57. Indianapolis News, Ralph Kramer, "U.S. 7th Circuit Judge Pleased With Record" (5-9-72)
58. Waukegan News-Sun, Steve Rothman, "Hoogasian appeals for Margoles" (5-10-72)
59. Waukegan News-Sun, editorial, "Enough of the double-shuffle" (5-11-72)
60. Waukegan News-Sun, "Zion mayor asks Nixon aid in Margoles case" (5-13-72)
61. Chicago Tribune, Willard Edwards, "Capitol Views: Justice in a Presidential Year" (7-25-72)
62. Milwaukee Journal, "Reporter, Journal Co. Face Suit" (8-19-72)
63. Waukegan News-Sun, "Two staffers win AP awards" (10-2-72)
64. (Syndicated column)
 - a. Syracuse (N.Y.) Herald-American and Post-Standard, Jack Anderson, "Groucho 180,000 on Secret Service list" (11-26-72)
 - b. El Paso (Texas) Times, Jack Anderson, "Secret Service Thorough; Measures Often Excessive" (11-26-72)
 - c. Madison Capital Times, Jack Anderson, "Critique the President? You May Be in the Files" (11-25-72)
 - d. St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press, Jack Anderson, "Secret Service Sometimes Excessive in Surveillance" (11-26-72)
 - e. Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, Jack Anderson, "Even Groucho's In Secret Service File As Nixon Critic" (11-26-72)
 - f. Atlanta Journal and Constitution, Jack Anderson, "They Eye The Unlikely Assassins" (11-26-72)
 - g. Denver Rocky Mountain News, Jack Anderson, "Secret Service protection sometimes overdone; Unlikely assassins under surveillance" (11-26-72)
 - h. Toledo (Ohio) Blade, Jack Anderson, "Secret Service Excessive At Times" (11-26-72)
65. Congressional Record, H. R. Gross, "The Case of Dr. Milton Margoles" (2-8-73):
 - a. Chicago Tribune, Willard Edwards, "Dr. Margoles Given Pardon by Nixon" (12-22-72)

- b. Chicago Today, "President Pardons Doctor in Tax Case" (12-22-72)
- c. Des Moines Register, "Nixon Gives Full Pardon to Margoles" (12-21-72)
- d. Madison Capital Times, "Nixon Pardons Margoles; He's Doubtful He'll Return" (12-23-72)
- e. Chicago Sun-Times, "Nixon decides to pardoning Dr. Nargoles" (12-21-72)
- f. Waukegan News-Sun, Steve Rothman, "Zion doctor given pardon; Nixon pardons Margoles" (12-21-72)
- g. Chicago Daily News, Robert Gruenberg, "Zion medic pardoned by Nixon" (12-22-72)
- h. Chicago Tribune, Willard Edwards, "Capitol Views: Campaigns to correct injustices (12-28-72)
66. Milwaukee Sentinel, "Nixon Pardons Dr. Margoles" (12-22-72)
67. Milwaukee Journal, Dr. Margoles Gets Presidential Pardon" (12-22-72)
68. Waukegan News-Sun, "Pardon official" (12-23-72)
69. Zion-Benton (Ill.) News, "McClory wins pardon for Dr. Margoles" (1-4-73)
70. Waukegan News-Sun, (letter to editor) Congressman Robert McClory, "Praises effort" (1-10-73)
71. Congressional Record, "A Tribute to Willard Edwards" (Testimonials in the House of Representatives marking the semi-retirement of Willard Edwards as Capitol Columnist for the Chicago Tribune) (1-18-73)
72. Chicago Tribune, (letter to editor) Perry Margoles, "Willard Edwards praised" (1-19-73)
73. Waukegan News-Sun, (letter to editor) Mrs. William Bauman, "Lauds three 'others'" (1-24-73)

THE 55TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in the observance of the 55th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. It is very fitting that the Congress of the United States devote time to commend the Lithuanian people and to remind the world that Lithuania and its people will continue to fight for the reestablishment of complete independence and self government.

On February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian Nation declared its independence. This is a goal for which the Lithuanian people had been striving throughout a long period of Russian domination. After only two decades of independence, Lithuania again fell under Russian domination when it was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. on August 3, 1940. Then, following the German attack on the Soviet Union 10 months later, Lithuania was in Nazi hands until reoccupied by the Soviet Army in 1944. Since that time, Lithuania has been considered by the Soviet Union as a component republic.

Propaganda from the U.S.S.R. would try to assure the West that the Lithuanian people are delighted with their satellite status and the Soviet methods of farming and industrial techniques have brought about economic growth never dreamed of in Lithuanian history. The citizens of the free world know that

this is a sham. We know that the people of this proud land are struggling in bondage, yearning to be free.

The spirit of Lithuanian independence is not dead, nor does it even lie dormant. It exists as an indestructible flame in the hearts of its people. We honor and salute these brave people, with the hope that they will again know the joy of human liberty.

JAPANESE POLITICS AND U.S. TRADE

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I detect the ominous rumblings of potential trade war between the United States and Japan. I deplore such developments and will vigorously oppose legislation and proposals which encourage trade restrictions. However, it will serve all concerned to air some candid observations relative to the politics which influences the decisions in both Japan and the United States.

At this moment Japan is enjoying a large surplus of incoming goods to the United States. These goods represent value added to basic resources originating here and other places outside Japan and include plywood and steel components selling below our own comparable goods; they represent soft goods like clothing and shoes; they include manufactured consumer products like televisions and automobiles. In all these classes of imports there is direct impact on some component of U.S. labor. Granting that new labor may be associated with imports, competition by these imports for existing production in the United States does adversely affect jobs in certain sectors. These are the sectors which put political pressure on Representatives in Congress and upon the President.

In Japan the politics are quite different and we in the United States must understand this. The imports most active in Japan are of raw resources such as lumber and coal and basic foods such as grains and meat. Where we seem to have the greatest hope for increase of U.S. imports—estimated as high as \$500 million—is in fresh fruits and some lightly processed foods for fast service or specialty items such as dried nuts. As clear as consumer acceptance and need are, the resistance in Japan is formidable. The reason for frustrating and exasperating obstacles lies 10 percent in bureaucratic stubbornness and 90 percent in the farm-oriented politics of Japan.

Unlike the United States, Japan does not apply the one-man, one-vote rule. The distribution of Representatives in the diet in geographically described districts called prefectures gives the farmers a loaded vote advantage. When one reviews the latest election in which the Liberal Democratic Party and Mr. Tanaka retained the continuity of leadership which has been unbroken since the military government of occupation

left Japan, one sees the heavy reliance on the farm vote. The Liberal Democratic Party lost in most of the metropolitan cities. What this means is that the Tanaka government is now most sensitive to the farmers. They in turn are the most reactionary to the very kind of trade increase from the United States which would serve the big blocks of consumers in the cities. Realistically then the most sensible and practical improvement Japan could offer the United States is exactly what the present leadership is least likely to do.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge Mr. Tanaka, Mr. Nakasone, Mr. Ogiya, and Mr. Fukuda, all leaders of the majority party, to bite the bullet and approve a limited liberalization for food products. The risk is real but not as formidable as the alternatives. Actually, Japanese farmers are far more protective than they need be. The impact of our food items in fresh citrus juice concentrates, specialty foods and convenience package foods are more apt to expand the marketability of Japanese produce and improve the Japanese choice of diet.

It is ironic that the Japanese have urged their market impact logic on us for almost 10 years in regard to manufactured goods and refuse to listen to or to apply the same logic themselves in relation to agricultural products. If the present majority party is as concerned over a possible trade war as it should be, it will seek some alternative to the present unsatisfactory pace of liberalization for food. How can they expect our Congress and our President to take the heat of our labor elements in manufacturing, when they are unwilling to face the heat of their farmers and farm labor?

A second longer range problem for Japan is the political implications of their distribution system. During all of the prewar period the Japanese have followed a policy of early retirement, that is, age 55. Since there is no social security and retirement annuities are small and subject to inflation pressure, as here in the United States, this has encouraged a plethora of "mom and pop" stores where retirees seek to augment their stipend for retirement. It takes care of a social problem but creates such a crazy fractionalized retail distribution system as to defy all attempts at efficiency. This means consumer prices are higher and consumer dollars do not go far. It also encourages small units of production particularly in the food industry and only the big cooperatives have a handle on a workable interface with the multiplicity of outlets.

Mr. Speaker, with our politics in the United States being dominated by big cities, big unions and consumers and Japanese politics being dominated by rural farmers and small distribution outlets the resolution of the present impasse is formidable. It fairly invites the conclusion that a rash of protectionist actions will come from the United States with little regard for the political dilemma faced by the present administration in Japan. But in all fairness and seeing the problem in its entirety, conditions call for a Japanese move in

liberalization on food products. Our politicians have lived for too long a time under the pressures from those who feel Japanese imports unreasonably disadvantaged them. It is time Japanese politicians joined us in this exercise of pressure and heat from their agricultural sector. The ball is in the Japanese court and their giving it a good "swat" could do much to alleviate the trade tensions which currently are mounting. The alternative is the start of action the end of which is predictably undesirable, unpleasant and, for all involved, economically disastrous.

ROBERT KOCH, OUTSTANDING MARYLAND VETERAN OF THE YEAR

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Robert Koch of Baltimore, Md., has been selected Outstanding Maryland Veteran of the Year.

Mr. Koch is a veteran of World War II where he served with the 29th Infantry Division and participated in the landings on Omaha Beach on D-Day. On July 15, 1944, he was seriously wounded in action during the drive on St. Lo, France, and was hospitalized for a year.

After the war, Mr. Koch continued his service to his country and his fellow man by accepting a job as a service officer for the Maryland Veterans Commission in August 1946. The Maryland Veterans Commission is a State agency where veterans can obtain guidance and assistance. The commission aids veterans and their dependents in obtaining VA benefits, furnishes information about State and Federal agencies which may provide additional services, and assists veterans with other problems they face. The commission also helps veterans appeal decisions of the Veterans' Administration concerning individual benefits. Mr. Koch has served as executive director of the commission since May 7, 1968.

Mr. Koch originated the idea of statewide service to veterans by having service officers in towns throughout the State on a weekly, biweekly, or monthly basis so that veterans could place claims for compensation and other benefits and file appeals without having to travel to Baltimore. He has also worked closely with the National Service Officers Association in suggesting revisions in compensation laws and regulations.

This Thursday, the Joint Veterans Committee of Maryland is holding a testimonial dinner-dance to honor Mr. Koch. The committee represents the 90,000 members of the American Legion, Catholic War Veterans, Disabled American Veterans, Jewish War Veterans, Marine Corps League, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Veterans of World War I in Maryland. The Joint Veterans Committee has made an excellent choice in selecting Robert Koch as Outstanding Maryland Veteran of the Year.