

H. Res. 229. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 230. Resolution to express the sense of the House with respect to peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 231. Resolution calling upon the Voice of America to broadcast in the Yiddish language to Soviet Jewry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 232. Resolution to provide for equitable and effective minority staffing on House standing committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California (for himself and Mr. Reuss):

H. Res. 233. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H. Res. 234. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Res. 235. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 182; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WALDIE (for himself, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. REID, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CULVER, Mr. BERGLAND, Miss JORDAN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. YOUNG of Georgia, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. YATES):

H. Res. 236. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALDIE (for himself, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. GUDE, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. STARK, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. REES, and Mr. McCLOSKEY):

H. Res. 237. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the

jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALDIE (for himself, Mrs. BURKE of California, and Mr. CAREY of New York):

H. Res. 238. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California:

H. Res. 239. Resolution Canal Zone Sovereignty and Jurisdiction Resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

43. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to exempting prisoners of war returning from Southeast Asia from the payment of Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BIESTER:

H.R. 4574. A bill for the relief of the Newtown Presbyterian Church; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 4575. A bill for the relief of Filippo Sardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 4576. A bill for the relief of Rodolfo S. Guadiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4577. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosita I. Ines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4578. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Angulo-Rocha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4579. A bill for the relief of Meyer Weinger and Fay Weinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 4580. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Modesta Ugalino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 4581. A bill for the relief of Victor Conte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 4582. A bill for the relief of the Andrew Jackson Lodge No. 5, Fraternal Order of Police, of Nashville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 4583. A bill to provide for the free entry of five carillon bells for the use of the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAZEN (by request):

H.R. 4584. A bill for the relief of Peter M. Spanner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARAZITI:

H.R. 4585. A bill for the relief of Tai Kwon Jang and Man Kwon Jang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 4586. A bill to incorporate in the District of Columbia the National Inconvenienced Sportsmen's Association; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 4587. A bill for the relief of Maria La Valle Arrigo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 4588. A bill for the relief of Maria Giovanna Loyero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4589. A bill for the relief of Roger Stanley, and the successor partnership, Roger Stanley and Hal Irwin, doing business as the Roger Stanley Orchestra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 4590. A bill for the relief of Melissa Catambay Gutierrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4591. A bill for the relief of Milagros Catambay Gutierrez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4592. A bill for the relief of Abbey Ogolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H. Res. 240. Resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 3539) entitled "A bill for the relief of Robert A. Carleton" to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H. Res. 241. Resolution for the relief of William H. Spratling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

53. The SPEAKER presented the petition of the city council, San Leandro, Calif., relative to dissatisfaction with the U.S. Postal Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

JIM LYNCH, BROOKLINE'S POPULAR RECREATION DIRECTOR, RETIRES AFTER 48 YEARS

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat of a painful duty that has evolved upon me today as I afford myself the privilege of announcing through CONGRESSIONAL RECORD columns the formal retirement of my good friend, James J. "Jim" Lynch, as director of recreation in the town of Brookline, Mass. This distinguished and popular recreational leader is a lifetime citizen of that

great township which is virtually bounded by the city of Boston. He will long be remembered as part of Brookline's glorious history, especially the progressive chapters he wrote in its physical fitness and recreational endeavors. But he will also be more easily recalled as a man of deep compassion and understanding—a man whose generous heart and humanitarian spirit hails him as one of the most remarkable examples of true charity that was ever evidenced.

I felt a keen personal loss when the town of Brookline was removed as part of my congressional district in the 1972 Massachusetts reapportionments. But be assured that nothing in such a geographical constituency shift caused me to lose my many fine friends there. It goes without saying that foremost amongst the many friendships I boast in that town,

one of the most cherished is that which I enjoy with Jim Lynch.

I recollect the happy experience when meeting with his wonderful family for the first time. I met his 10 splendid children and his beautiful and devoted wife, May, enjoying a huge outdoor party on a lovely summer's Sunday in 1970. It was a typical Brookline get-together—wholesome and carefree. At that time it was so becoming of Jim Lynch to make everybody in attendance feel warmly greeted and made comfortably right at home—like a guest of honor. My invitation—a pleasant surprise—and my participation at this affair will ever be cataloged in my memory of wonderful and joyous celebrations as long as I live. It is my distinct recollection that I never met so many fun-loving and friendly

people at a gathering of neighbors and families in my entire career.

One might ask, What is there so unusual about this recreational director and community leader in his selective profession of working with so many people? My answer is the clear evidence that he has always been in the forefront of initiating lively interest in projects for the young and the not-so-young. To chronicle some of the important—

His early manhood is remembered by his intimates as always endeavoring to develop organizations and associations that fostered friendly athletic competition in the neighborhoods of the town. From this personal initiative the great Athenian Athletic Club was begun.

His athletic career at Brookline High was notably memorable by outstanding performances in all of its sports programs, and truly climaxed when he starred in the backfield as Brookline High won its first Suburban League football championship in 1926. On the strength of this great all-round career, he was tapped by many friends to attend colleges and universities of their selection. Following a couple of memorable years at Swarthmore (Pa.) Preparatory School, he decided that he would attend Brown University, in Providence, R.I., where he enrolled in the fall of 1929. After a few short years at that great institution, family circumstances compelled him to curtail his education, so he could not graduate with his class of '33. I simply mention this excellent demonstration of typical self-sacrifice as he now returned home to Brookline to assume family responsibilities which had been brought about through the untimely illness of his loving father, James J. Lynch, Esq., for whom Jim was named. His father, at that time, had been one of the most celebrated and able lawyers in Boston. About his wonderful and devoted mother, Mary L. Lynch, she did not wish for her son to make this choice. But both these parents were soon to be sustained and satisfied in the knowledge that Jim would never interrupt his burning desire to study and improve himself. He continued physical-education courses at Boston University even after he accepted full-time employment in the town's recreational system.

It was the starting point of his life's professional career. Actually, he had served since 1925 in some capacity of this great community's recreational division. He was employed during his high school summer months at its public swimming pool, and later as a playground leader. He filled in also as a physical instructor in the evening gymnasium programs. So, history clearly depicts 48 years' tenure in the town's athletic and recreational service—42 of them in full-time capacity. It developed clearly that this had to be his original decision; driven by an inspired ambition to go into full-time recreational service, and to continue his college education by undertaking the career that has now brought him to this high point that we celebrate March 4. As his hundreds of friends gather to pay him heartfelt tribute and extend their best wishes for a deserving and full life of future happiness with his beautiful

wife, they clearly understand and recognize that when they honor May and Jim they are honoring themselves.

I am informed that you will see photos of May and her fine family portrayed later in this program. I am sure they will all look proud and beautiful—truly sources of happy memories to this exemplary couple. It goes without saying that tonight's souvenir brochure will conclude with the loving countenances of May and Jim "smiling through" as always—life's companions.

THE PROBLEMS OF PEACE

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, an excellent editorial entitled, "The Problems of Peace," appeared in the February 1973 issue of *Sea Power* magazine.

This editorial points out that, while the Vietnam conflict fades into the background, our Nation is still faced with critical problems such as maintaining a strong Defense Establishment.

Key points are made as to the importance of rebuilding and modernizing our Navy, strengthening the American merchant marine forces, coping with the energy crisis and taking steps to reduce our balance-of-payments deficit.

The fact that foreign ships carry the majority of materials to and from our shores and the fact that we are now importing large quantities of oil both impact very unfavorably on our balance-of-payments equation. Adm. Hyman G. Rickover warns that, if the current trends continue, "we will run out of oil in less than 60 years."

Mr. President, this is an outstanding editorial and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the *Extensions of Remarks*.

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

THE PROBLEMS OF PEACE

Now it is almost over. At the end of the long, dark tunnel of Vietnam the nation finally has found peace—a just and enduring peace, let us all hope—and our men, our prisoners of war and some of those previously listed as missing in action, are coming back to the blinding light of freedom.

Freedom. After what for some have been agonizingly long years of captivity. For these men and their families there still looms ahead another long ordeal of rehabilitation and reconciliation as they build their lives anew. The rest of us can help, slightly, by kindness, understanding, sympathy. But the bulk of the struggle belongs to them and to their parents, wives, and children.

There are many who will not return, others who return maimed and scarred—and some of their emotional scars are far worse than any physical disfigurements they may also have suffered.

The nation at large also has been a prisoner of war in a very real sense, and must pass through a similar period of rehabilitation in the months and years ahead. Because, just as the longest-term prisoners are returning from Vietnam to a country far different from

that they left, the nation as a whole is returning to a post-Vietnam world considerably different from that of the early 1960s. It is sad that two of our stronger Cold War Presidents—whom history will, we believe, treat more generously than did their contemporaries—should have died within a month of each other, and before the cease fire in Vietnam. But their passing may be symbolic of the changes that have taken place in the world since their days of power.

We are, the President tells us, moving from an era of confrontation to an era of negotiation. But the Cold War is not yet over. We must maintain our strength and particularly, we would say, considering the long-range implications of the Nixon Doctrine, our strength at sea.

U.S. naval and military forces are battle-tested, but weary. While fighting a long, debilitating, and frustrating strange kind of war in a faraway place they have also been subjected to unrelenting attack on the home front from much of the press and many influential members of the legislative branch—whose vitriolic and enervating assaults on the U.S. defense establishment have not, in our opinion, reflected the general attitude of the American public. For our Armed Forces the war in Southeast Asia may indeed be over, but the battle on Capitol Hill and in the mass media is, sad to report, likely to continue for the foreseeable future. Such is the legacy of Vietnam.

But it's a battle which must be endured, and won. Because over the last decade the Soviet Union has improved its relative position vis-a-vis the United States in virtually every quantifiable area of naval and military strength. Russian ships, merchant as well as naval, now circumnavigate the globe on an equal footing with American vessels. Thanks to the accidents of geography, Soviet undersea missiles off the east, west, and Gulf coasts are closer to most U.S. cities than U.S. missiles are to the great cities of the U.S.S.R.

But let us assume that we have learned from history and do maintain our naval and military strength, thus assuring that the present uneasy period of peace will, indeed, endure for a generation or more. The nation, and the world, will still face numerous other complex problems of terrifying magnitude. The U.S. balance-of-payments situation and economic interrelationships with other world powers, for example, will be complicated and aggravated immensely by the fact that what should be the major U.S. economic weapon—the American merchant marine—is largely encased in rust. New and better ships are coming, but they are few in number and, although highly productive, will be unable to keep pace with the expanding trade requirements of a nation much more heavily dependent on imports and exports than most of the citizenry realizes. If many more U.S. ships are not built, and soon, it will be a loss not only to the U.S. domestic shipbuilding industry but to the U.S. economy as a whole, as foreign bottoms continue to carry the bulk of materials to and from U.S. ports, thus worsening an already serious balance-of-payments deficit.

And let us not forget the energy crisis, which in its embryonic stages already has meant the rationing of fuel in some areas, the closing of schools and factories in others. Be assured that the worst is yet to come. Department of the Interior studies indicate that by 1985 the United States will have to import 14.9 million barrels of oil per day—at a balance-of-payments cost, according to former Interior Secretary Walter J. Hickel, of \$25 billion per year.

That's the good news, relatively speaking. The bad news is that, even if U.S. ships (or foreign ships, for that matter) are there ready to carry it, and even if the U.S. economy is able and willing to pay for it, there soon may be no oil available in any case—if current trends continue, according to Vice

Admiral Hyman G. Rickover, "we will run out of oil in less than 60 years."

We could continue with a much longer list of problems: overpopulation, the ecology, world malnutrition, rapidly diminishing natural resources, to name a few. But to do so might seem alarmist. Besides, the point has been made, we think. We welcome this new age of peace, fragile though it may be. We hope and pray it will not also become an age of complacency.

CONVICTED CRIMINAL TREATED BETTER THAN ONE NOT CONVICTED

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken out here in this Chamber on many occasions over the past several months on behalf of the basic rights of a constituent of mine, Thomas Laffey of Williston Park who is currently incarcerated in the Tarrant County Jail in Fort Worth, Tex.

Mr. Laffey is being jailed under a civil contempt of court charge for refusing to answer certain questions posed by a grand jury sitting in the northern district of Texas. Of late, I have received disturbing letters from him and concerned inquiries from his wife and family about certain privileges being restricted to him such as work details, telephone calls and letter-writing.

Having visited Mr. Laffey in Fort Worth last July, I have personal knowledge that he is being held in facilities that are designed for short rather than lengthy stays. Thus, he is confined to a very small area and is greatly hampered by inadequate facilities.

Once again I feel compelled to protest this type of treatment in the case of a man who is charged with no crime. I have stated previously that convicted Federal prisoners receive better treatment than Mr. Laffey has.

I have asked the Attorney General to intercede in order to secure a transfer to a Federal facility. However, through one of his deputies, he has advised me that he is unable to affect the transfer, suggesting that Mr. Laffey's attorneys must request such an action from the court which has jurisdiction.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I insert an article from a recent issue of Parade magazine concerning the Fort Worth Federal Correctional Institute. I wonder why it is possible to extend such excellent treatment to convicted criminals while Mr. Laffey, who has been charged with no crime let alone be convicted of one, remains confined to the cramped cell of a short-term holding facility.

[From Parade magazine, Feb. 11, 1973]

A COED PRISON WITHOUT BARS

(By Carlton Stowers)

FORT WORTH, TEX.—They sat in the crowded cafeteria, laughing, eating lunch and talking as soul music poured from a transistor radio. There was Jim, 41, dressed in khakis

and a sport shirt, telling 28-year-old Janet, a pixie blonde in jeans and sweatshirt, about his recent visit with his family. Charlie and Hilda, young husband and wife, held hands at a nearby table.

Nothing remarkable, except that the four are inmates at the Fort Worth Federal Correctional Institute, the nation's only coeducational prison for adults; a dramatic year-old experiment in what Warden Charles F. Campbell calls "a search for better ways to make corrections work."

The prison operates in a low-pressure atmosphere, geared to rehabilitation and to preparing the 359 men and 81 women "residents," as they are called, for their eventual return to the outside world.

The main gate is always open, unattended, and only a 12-foot-high chain-link fence separates the 200-acre prison from the nearby residential and industrial neighborhood.

There are no prison-style uniforms. Rather, men wear slacks and sport shirts and women are taken to a department store upon arrival and allowed to purchase a wardrobe that ranges from shorts and miniskirts to pants suits and jeans. Residents live in private or semiprivate rooms and carry their own keys. Special weekend furloughs are granted many prisoners; there is color television in the recreation room, and no guns or nightsticks are carried by prison officers or other employees.

The prison is energetically involved in the community. There are 60 inmates who qualify for work release and study release programs, laboring at various jobs in Fort Worth or attending classes at nearby Tarrant County Junior College, Texas Christian University or several business colleges.

CONTACTS OUTSIDE PRISON

Also, the program has attracted the help of volunteers from the city. Forty members of Alcoholics Anonymous counsel prisoners with drinking problems, taking them to AA meetings. There are religious volunteers, others who donate their time to teach piano and handicrafts or just come to talk with the inmates.

"The relationship with people from the free world," insists Campbell, "is one of the most worthwhile aspects of our program."

"Men and women need each other," Campbell says. "Allowing members of the opposite sex to associate, to talk and relate to each other creates a wholesome, natural atmosphere."

The prisoners are allowed to dine together, go to weekend movies in the auditorium, stroll hand in hand across the quadrangle or just sit and chat outside at the tables and benches shaded by brightly colored umbrellas. Sexual intercourse, however, is forbidden, even for the three married couples currently confined at the institution.

"We tell those who come here," says Campbell, "that they have to buy that part of the contract or forget the whole thing." A veteran of 18 years with the Federal Bureau of Prisons, Campbell admits there are occasional infractions of the no-sex rule. To date, five women inmates have been transferred because they attempted to get sexually involved with men and 10 men have been moved elsewhere for various reasons, including inability to adjust to being around women.

STAY ABOUT 15 MONTHS

And since the October, 1971, opening of the prison there have been no cases of homosexuality, a major problem in many of the nation's federal and state prisons.

"When we opened the facility," Campbell says, "we were looking for offenders who were within two years of being released, who would not be serious escape risks, were not considered 'predatory', and were willing to accept the restrictions of the coeducational

concept and participate in intensive training and programming." The average stay of inmates is from 14 to 16 months.

IT'S ONLY "BRAGGING"

The prison and its revolutionary methods have drawn both praise and criticism during its first year of operation.

"Stories get back to us," says Campbell, "of prisoners who have been released, bragging about wild sex orgies. And, of course, there are those willing to accept such blatantly false statements as fact."

Recently the husband of an inmate filed a \$1,500,000 damage suit alleging that "an atmosphere of free love" exists within the prison and that the federal government had jeopardized his marriage and caused him needless mental anguish when it sent his wife to the coed prison.

While the prison has been derisively called a "country club for felons," Campbell is quick to insist that it is an unfair tag. "I believe in running a tough prison and we have strict rules here," he says. "We don't, however, deprive people of basic human dignity."

"We have a lot of the same problems that other correctional institutions have—thief, drugs, fights and keeping order—but our cases are on a far smaller scale. And, yes, we have had a few take advantage of the relaxed security and walk off."

Judy, convicted of transporting stolen goods across the state line talks about life in the coed prison:

"There is not the hate here that you find in other prisons. Here, people are allowed to still be human beings and learn respect for themselves and each other. Sure, we have a lot of freedom and things that other prisoners elsewhere aren't allowed, but this is no country club. Every privilege one gets here is earned."

"Prison is prison, no matter how much freedom you are allowed. Most of those here, however, are aware that they have it better than those elsewhere, so you won't find many willing to risk breaking the rules and getting sent back to some other prison."

Kathy, in prison for mail theft, says, "They told us when we came here that if we acted like ladies we would be treated like ladies. They have kept their word."

Jim has spent most of his adult life behind bars in various prisons for narcotic convictions. "I've been here nine months and have made some difficult personal adjustments. I'm more at ease now. You can't begin to imagine what it means to be able to feel free to walk into the administration building without a guard accompanying you or to stop the warden out on the grounds and just rap for a minute—about something important or maybe just the weather."

BETTER FAMILY LIFE

He points out that he has been able to reestablish a strong relationship with his family since arriving at Fort Worth. "At Leavenworth," he says, "you were allowed four hours of visits a month. Here, we can have visitors five days a week and we can sit out in the visiting area and have a picnic or just talk without guards standing around."

"The people here care about you. They have helped me learn to like myself again."

The 26-building facility includes four units for male prisoners (one for heroin addicts, one for those who have used other drugs, one for alcoholics and one for those with chronic medical problems) and one—which is locked at night—for women inmates.

VARIED COURSES

There is also a 25-bed hospital and buildings housing classrooms where subjects ranging from simple arithmetic to college-level courses are taught in addition to such vocational subjects as carpentry and iron-working. A cosmetology course for the women will soon be offered.

While the program is still undergoing alterations, Campbell and his staff of 236 are encouraged by the positive results they have seen in the last 15 months.

"We aren't ready to stand up and beat our chests and say, 'Hey, look at us, we're a success.' That remains to be seen. But we do feel we are making headway.

"I would like to think that this program will one day be looked back on as the pilot experiment that led to similar institutions throughout the country.

"The basic theory on which we operate is a simple one. We believe that people are people first and prisoners second. There is more about them with which we can identify than condemn."

FACING UP TO THE CHALLENGE TO OUR CITIES

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has stripped off the velvet glove and is threatening our cities with a mailed fist. His unprecedented impoundment of congressionally approved funds for vital social programs, his freeze on housing subsidies, his totally inadequate budget, and his disavowal of welfare reform represent key elements in a calculated, callous program to abandon urban America. This is a program which challenges our cities, and it is a program which challenges our entire constitutional system, for it is based on the premise that the Congress is not a full partner in establishing national priorities or budget policies.

How effectively Congress meets this threat will determine the future of our federal system for generations to come. And it will determine whether the cancer of urban decay which afflicts so much of our Nation will be allowed to spread unchecked, or whether we will, at long last, face up to those real human needs which have been met ineptly, or not at all.

I am introducing today legislation designed to give the Congress an opportunity to meet two serious aspects of the Nixon assault on urban America.

First, I am offering a package of 11 bills requiring that funds impounded by the President be spent according to the terms of the legislation which authorized and appropriated them. These bills cover the Departments of Housing and Urban Development, Commerce, Transportation, Health, Education, and Welfare, Labor, and Justice. They also cover the Veterans' Administration, the National Science Foundation, the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking Peoples.

I offer these bills as more than a symbolic gesture of opposition to the President's impoundment policy. I offer them as a means for the Congress to test Richard Nixon's respect for the laws of our land. For should these bills be enacted, the President could no longer assume to himself the power to impound funds without clearly and flagrantly breaking the law.

A companion measure to these bills is legislation I have drafted establishing the Office of Economic Opportunity as an independent agency and removing it from the Executive Office of the President. This bill is a response to the very immediate threat that OEO is about to be dismantled.

This step, which apparently is to be taken in the absence of a reorganization plan on which Congress would have an opportunity to vote, undoubtedly has been in the works for some time. It was heralded by SPIRO AGNEW's attacks on the legal services program and the spinoffs of OEO programs to other Federal agencies. It would now strike at the heart of OEO by killing the community action program, which was designed to give the poor some stake in their own destiny and in their society, and to increase their ability to help themselves. It has succeeded in this effort to a significant extent, and that success probably underlies the real rationale for Nixon's attack on OEO.

Today marks the start of a national effort to protect the OEO and other basic domestic programs. Delegates from community action agencies across the Nation have come to Washington to meet with their Congressmen. We cannot help but be impressed with their dedication to helping their fellow man and with their commitment to providing new hope to those who have despaired of ever breaking out of the vicious cycle of poverty which traps so many of our citizens.

I call upon my colleagues in the Congress to accept the challenge.

REDUCTIONS-IN-FORCE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, there is great speculation today over prospective reductions-in-force—RIF—for Federal Government employees. It is becoming more apparent everyday, however, that the only question remaining is not whether major reductions will occur, but of what magnitude they will be.

It is incumbent upon the Congress to do whatever it can legislatively to mitigate the very serious dislocation and disruptive effects of any reduction-in-force upon the families and economies of many local communities across this land.

Therefore, I am introducing a bill which will permit certain Federal employees, at their option, to retire with an immediate annuity once a major reductions-in-force has been announced by a Federal agency.

Under current law, an employee who has 25 years of service or who has 20 years of service and has reached age 50, may retire on a reduced civil service annuity, if he is involuntarily separated from his job—usually because of a reductions-in-force by his agency.

But presently, an older employee cannot volunteer to retire under the cir-

cumstances indicated above—an employee is eligible for retirement only after a RIF has resulted in his termination.

Because of the seniority system, RIF's oftentimes never reach the older employee. This bill is designed to save the jobs of younger workers, by giving senior employees who have 25 years of service, or 20 years and have reached age 50, the option to voluntarily retire once a RIF is announced, but before it is actually effected.

If an eligible employee chose to retire under these conditions, his annuity would be reduced by 2 percent for each full year he is less than 55 years of age at the time of his retirement. The Civil Service Commission would be authorized to determine what constitutes a major reductions-in-force and to designate which geographic areas of Federal employment shall be included within the purview of the RIF.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is essential that this legislation be passed immediately and be enacted into law—before major RIF's begin to be effected. I will continue to work for more generous retirement provisions for Federal employees, but under the pressure of time, certainly this is one bill with which few can disagree. At this point, I insert the text of the bill in the RECORD:

A bill to permit immediate retirement of certain Federal employees

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8336(d) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) An employee who is separated from the service—

"(1) involuntarily, except by removal for cause on charges of misconduct or delinquency; or

"(2) during a period when the agency in which he is employed is undergoing a major reduction in force, as determined by the Commission, and who is serving in such geographic areas as may be designated by the Commission:

after completing 25 years of service or after becoming 50 years of age and completing 20 years of service is entitled to a reduced annuity."

NEW WAYS TO RESOLVE COMMUNITY DISPUTES

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems that confronts us in our cities today is the resolution of community disputes. As our society has grown more complex and intricate in recent years, it has become increasingly important that differences between groups within a community be resolved as quickly and peacefully as possible. We are all aware of what can result when conflicts between two parties go unsettled.

Basil A. Paterson, a former State senator in New York, has devoted a great deal of his life to the resolution of these conflicts. Living all his life in Harlem, he

learned of the problems that can exist within our communities at a very early age. His leadership in the State senate between 1965 and 1970 resulted in his being named one of the two outstanding legislators in New York State by the Eagleton Institute of Politics. He is a member of the National Panel of Arbitrators and the American Arbitration Association. In 1970, he became president of the Institute for Mediation and Conflict Resolution.

As president of the institute, he has continued his worthwhile efforts in the field of community mediation. In a New York Law Journal article, which he coauthored with Henrietta Schilit, Mr. Paterson examines the special problems that exist for the mediation of community disputes.

I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of those interested in this relatively new approach to solving some of the conflicts that occur in our cities. Basil Paterson's article merits the attention and careful consideration of each Member of this body:

[From the New York Law Journal, Jan. 24, 1973]

COMMUNITY DISPUTES: A WAY TO RESOLVE THEM

(By Basil A. Paterson and Henrietta Schilit)

When the Institute for Mediation and Conflict Resolution and the National Center for Dispute Settlement began to mediate community disputes some three years ago, both acknowledged their debt to labor-management experience and the conflict resolution systems which that experience had evolved.

Both the Institute and the National Center are funded by the Ford Foundation. The Institute was founded by Theodore Kheel perhaps the country's foremost labor mediator, while the National Center was begun through the efforts of the American Arbitration Association, a recognized impartial labor management organization.

Since their beginnings both organizations have not only become acutely aware of the great differences between labor-management disputes and community disputes, but have also begun to sense some of the lessons that the older arena might learn from the newer. This article is an attempt to set down some of the differences and similarities of the arenas and to suggest those lessons.

THE BACKGROUND

In the riot-scarred 1960's conflict erupted between racial or minority groups and established institutions, between tenant groups and landlords, between students and colleges, between consumers and providers of services. As the 60's came to an end, concerted action by organized groups became almost routine, with many groups employing the techniques utilized in labor-management disputes—picketing, boycotts, sit-ins and strikes—to achieve their ends. When police and military force were employed to suppress conflict even such nonviolent techniques often led to bloodshed and rancor. Parallels were drawn with the strife-ridden period of the early labor movement and many began to look to American labor history for a mechanism through which such violence could be reduced and organized into more constructive channels.

Social scientists Indik and Smith expressed the thinking of many theorists and practitioners that an alternative to force lay in the institutionalization of conflict—"the development of a social mechanism which per-

mits free expression of hostile points of view, allows for a non-violent test of strength, provides channels for negotiating an accommodation acceptable to both sides and establishes an apparatus for enforcing the resulting agreement and adjudicating disputes over its interpretation."¹ Such an alternative, they observed, evolved thirty years ago on the battlefield of industrial conflict.

SETTLING DISPUTES

Violent conflict between labor and management today is, for the most part, resolved at the bargaining table. In the more than thirty-five years since the passage of the National Labor Relations Act, labor and management have developed and improved an impressive system of dispute settlement. National policy charges both labor and management with the responsibility for finding solutions to labor disputes and for maintaining industrial peace. The government defines the base lines and makes available facilities for recognizing differences.

Many questioned to what extent industrial relations experience with collective bargaining and mediation was transferrable and useful in community disputes. One person who did not question the analogy was Theodore Kheel. Then head of the Institute of Collective Bargaining and Group Relations, Mr. Kheel expressed the connection this way:

"Collective bargaining," he said, is particularly designed for the reconciliation of group differences that are not susceptible to solution through the dictates of law. Although law can set guidelines, it cannot resolve the claims of competing groups that fall within the framework of these legal standards. In such circumstances, the conflicting demands can be resolved only by an accommodation that is mutually acceptable. The alternative is total defeat for one side or the other; hardly a desirable outcome where claims are legal and interests are legitimate."²

He reasoned that the accommodation process was equally applicable in both fields.

FUNDED BY FOUNDATION

At the same time that Mr. Kheel was outlining his views, the American Arbitration Association was sponsoring the formation of the National Center for Dispute Settlement in Washington, D.C. Shortly thereafter, both the National Center and the Institute were funded by the Ford Foundation to determine whether industrial relations experience was adaptable to the community disputes field.

Has experience proved the impartial conflict resolution procedures that evolved in labor-management relations to be applicable to the complex and volatile area of community and campus disputes? How does the community disputes mediator differ from his labor-management counterpart? Are there any lessons which labor-management can learn from recent experiences in community disputes resolution? The authors will draw on the experience of the Institute for Mediation and Conflict Resolution and its predecessor organization, the Board of Mediation for Community Disputes, to explore these questions.

In both fields, mediation does not replace negotiations between two parties. Rather, mediation supplies the assistance which is often necessary to ensure that the parties do negotiate. A mediator is a third party, who assists them in reaching a mutually acceptable settlement of their difficulties. The transferability of negotiation and mediation experience from labor-management to community dispute situations has been tested in a variety of community disputes throughout the nation. Success has been varied, but experience has demonstrated its potential.

Footnotes at end of article.

THE DIFFERENCES

Labor-management disputes in settled, well-organized industries differ radically from community disputes. In the former, bargaining relationships are governed by law and thirty-five years of practice. Most private sector labor management disputes are highly structured, involve established parties with exclusive jurisdiction, and a clearly defined and jointly accepted framework of legislation and tradition. The labor-management agreement, enforceable for a specific period of time, also provides a quasi-judicial process for the settlement of other disputes arising out of that agreement.³

Community disputes are likely to feature multiple parties, without legislation to guide them, without exclusive jurisdiction and often without prior relationships. Lack of power to impose sanctions for non-compliance in honoring an agreement further limits the acceptability of the negotiating process.

COMMUNICATION BREAKDOWN

To understand why community disputes frequently reach an impasse and necessitate mediation or third-party intervention, one must also recognize that the bargaining resources employed by community and racial groups to bring established organizations, are mainly coercive. Once coercive pressure is employed, communication is likely to break down. Since community or minority groups have little in the way of positive inducement to offer in return for concessions, their attempts to apply pressure will usually be of a negative nature. Rather than offering to do something for them they will agree not to do something or to discontinue actions such as demonstrations, boycotts, disruptive confrontations.

Although either threatened or actual violence and disruption are likely to create a situation in which the superordinate power agrees to negotiate, the use of coercive bargaining resources frequently makes communication between the parties difficult once the negotiations begin. The different life styles of the parties and inexperience of the participants further complicate communications. Mediation may therefore play a more important role in community disputes than in typical labor-management disputes where coercive pressures are usually employed as a threat to be imposed when positions become irreconcilable and negotiations break down.

NEUTRALITY AND THE ADVOCATE MEDIATOR

The mediator of community disputes is much more of an advocate than his present-day industrial relations counterpart. He is, of course, not an advocate for either side, but he is not, strictly speaking, a neutral, for by his very presence and his support of group bargaining, he advocates a radical departure from the standard process of social allocation. The analogy therefore, is not with the present labor scene.

The two factors which determine bargaining ability are the relative power of each side as perceived by the other, and the goals of the contending groups. If the goal is revolution or repression, then bargaining will not take place because neither goal is negotiable. If the power equation is such that one side's power is overwhelming in relation to the other, the dispute will terminate not in a negotiated settlement, but in defeat or repression of the challengers or capitulation of the challenged.

Bargaining has a chance only if the power equation is right and the goal of a community group is non-revolutionary, i.e., the redistribution of decisionmaking authority or the re-allocation of resources. In such a conflict (assuming that the goal of the Institution is not repression), termination is likely to be a mutually acceptable accommodation—a bargain or compromise representing less than 100 per cent of either side's objectives or demands.⁴

Mediators of community disputes must not only be advocates, in the sense stated above, because of the special circumstances of the community disputes environment, it is often that environment which necessitates their assuming the advocate role. Mediation in labor-management disputes is generally required by statute, leaving mediation agencies with no choice but to intervene.

VOLUNTARY MEDIATION

The situation in community disputes is quite different. Mediation is not required and must, therefore, be completely voluntary. By the same token, the lack of compulsion also means that the mediator can refuse to intervene. If the dispute is not ripe for mediation, if the parties' goals are something other than settlement, if the dispute can be more effectively resolved in another forum, if the mediator is really being asked to act as an "agent-of-defeat," he can refuse to go in. Extensive pre-entry data-gathering gives him the basis to make these judgments and helps formulate a picture of the issues and actors and the extent to which the parties must be "educated" in the negotiating process.

MULTIPLE ROLES OF COMMUNITY MEDIATOR

The effective community disputes mediator does not attempt a wholesale transfer of his labor relations experience. Knowing both fields, being aware of the differences between them, and being sensitive to the limitations of the labor-management analogy is what makes him particularly useful, for while the environments may differ, the skills and techniques remain the same. Precisely the same interpersonal skills and techniques of mediation are used in community disputes as are used in labor-management disputes. It is now evident however, that the narrow role of the mediator in the classic labor relations model fails to explain the many services and inputs that the community disputes mediator is required to provide.

A mediator, by assuming a degree of responsibility for a community protest organization, may be able to reassure an established institution as to the group's "rationality" and its willingness to halt overt actions and abide by agreements reached. The willingness of a third party, a mediator, to talk with and vouch for a protest organization confers, in the eyes of the establishment, a degree of stature it may not have perceived before. Even where an institution is willing to recognize the community's right to participate, it may be uncertain as to which organization has the greater interest or power. A knowledgeable community-disputes mediator may be able to assist in sorting this out.

Where the parties are not talking to each other for other reasons (emotional heat, hostile actions, etc.), the mediator, through his intervention, often opens the channels and begins to get the parties talking.

Sometimes the parties are talking but not understanding each other. They might not only come from different backgrounds or different cultures, but might also have a "differential perception" of the problem. Here, the mediator can act as a *translator* between the groups as well as a transmitter of information.

Often, although the parties are talking, their talk is nothing more than a procedural wrangle—a neutral meeting place or turf question, when the meeting should take place, who should be there, etc. Here, the mediator acts as a *facilitator*—providing a neutral ground, offering to chair the meetings, helping to shape the agenda, etc.

CHANGING ENVIRONMENT IN LABOR RELATIONS LESSONS FOR MEDIATOR

Having highlighted the differences between community disputes and labor-management disputes and the consequent differences in the mediator's role, it is nevertheless my contention that labor-management disputes are becoming more like community disputes and

that labor mediators must behave more like their community disputes counterpart.

Collective bargaining in the labor-management arena, like community disputes, relies on "group talk," the technique of communicating through a spokesman. While the National Labor Relations Act outlines procedures for the periodic election of a single bargaining unit with exclusive rights to speak for the employee group, with selected representatives then having the responsibility for bargaining for the best deal and making sure that the union or association is satisfied, the flexibility of a leader at the bargaining table is often dependent on his security within his own organization.

The process is further complicated by the need to communicate the results of the bargaining to the larger group and, when necessary, to gain their acceptance. Group communications tend to be more difficult when the leadership is inexperienced or insecure. This has been perceived to be a major problem in community-dispute negotiations where leaders are usually newly emerged and others are eager to replace them. There is growing evidence, however, that leader-constituent relationships in unions and associations are experiencing some of the instability commonly associated with community groups.

It is our personal observation that community leaders despite their transience may be more representative of their group than present union leadership. The failure rate of ratification votes and the proliferation of rank and file law suits are indicators of division in union ranks. Though most unions don't follow a strict seniority system in selecting leadership, most spokesmen are older, experienced men who have been around long enough to prove themselves. Their values, however, may differ from their membership. As homogeneity in union ranks breaks down, collective bargaining in the interest of total membership begins to take on some of the complexities of community disputes, and established leaders may no longer be representative.

Labor relations mediators have been reluctant to spell out what they do. Generally they tend to view mediation as an art rather than a science.¹ Considering the complexities of human interaction in mediated collective bargaining, this is understandable. Working in a new environment with a commitment to effecting economic and social change rather than promoting the status quo, has made community disputes mediators far more self-conscious. Analysis and documentation of the process is necessary to monitor and assess the value of intervention, to train parties naive to the negotiation and mediation process and to sell the idea of mediation to institutions and community groups.

What we are suggesting, of course, is that the labor-management field is becoming more and more similar to the community disputes field—more volatile than it has been, more concerned with value conflicts, more generational and more cross-cultural. As a result, today's standard labor-management mediator may no longer be adequate to the task. The new mediator in the field, and he will surely come, must be more sensitive, more culturally aware, perhaps even from a different culture, and above all, more an advocate of change. Without the new mediator, we will see a deterioration of the collective bargaining process in the labor-management arena where, until recently, it held the most promise.

FOOTNOTE

¹ Bernard P. Indik and Georgina M. Smith, "Resolution of Social Conflict Through Collective Bargaining: An Alternative to Violence?" *George Washington Law Review*. Vol. 37, No. 4, May, 1969.

² Theodore W. Kheel "Collective Bargain-

Footnotes at end of article.

ing and Community Disputes," *Monthly Labor Review*, January, 1969.

³ George Nicolau and Gerald W. Cormick, "Community Disputes and the Resolution of Conflict: Another View," *Arbitration Journal*, Vol. 27, No. 2, 1972. (George Nicolau is Vice President of the Institute for Mediation and Conflict Resolution, Gerald Cormick, the Institute's former Research Director, is now with Washington University in St. Louis).

⁴ Gerald W. Cormick, "Power, Strategy and the Process of Community Conflict: A Theoretical Framework," Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1971.

⁵ *Business Week*, "Trouble Plagues the House of Labor," Special Report, Oct. 28, 1972.

WELCOME HOME, PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, certainly we are all pleased and relieved by the return of our American prisoners of war from North and South Vietnam.

I want to take these means of paying tribute to the valor, courage, and patience of these patriotic Americans who have endured the rigors of prison camps and have still maintained their dignity, their loyalty, and their dedication to the United States of America.

We commend these prisoners of war for their courage and we wish them the very best of good luck and success as they return to their homes and families.

In this connection I place in the *Record* herewith an excellent editorial from the *Tennessean* in Nashville, describing the release of the prisoners of war as a memorable day in American history.

The editorial follows:

[From the *Tennessean*, Feb. 13, 1973]

POW RELEASE MEMORABLE DAY IN AMERICAN HISTORY

The first POWs released under the Vietnam ceasefire agreement arrived at Clark Air Base in the Philippines yesterday to an enthusiastic but low-key welcome by U.S. civilians and military personnel.

Those released in Hanoi were flown directly to Clark base in three planes. Those freed by the Viet Cong in the South were sent by a more indirect route through Saigon.

Those from the North were picked up in Hanoi by three Air Force hospital planes. They were escorted on their flight to freedom by U.S. military personnel including Lt. Col. Richard Abel, an information officer who later furnished newsmen with details on the men's initial reaction to their release.

Colonel Abel said that on the 2½ hour flight from Hanoi to Clark Air Base the men talked of food, politics, women's fashions and sports.

As the men stepped from the planes at Clark, the emotional charge was uncontainable, even though authorities had tried to keep the welcoming ceremony as subdued and free of fanfare as possible.

The first man off each plane was an officer who had been designated as spokesman for the men on his plane. Each stepped forward to respond to the welcome.

Each spokesman thanked "the President" or "our commander-in-chief" and the American people for bringing the POWs out to freedom. One included the families of the POWs in the expression of gratitude. Two

said it had been a privilege to serve America during their years of captivity.

"During this time our faith in God, our country and our families never wavered," said one. Another ended his speech by saying, "God bless America."

It was a dramatic hour in American history and a gratifying one for the entire nation.

Most of the prisoners appeared fit and healthy. Some were limping or on crutches, but all seemed in good spirits. Four were on stretchers.

The prisoners and those still to be released have a long way to go before they will be able to return to normal life. The society has changed since they have been gone. The wives and girl friends of a few have given up hope, parents have become old and young children have grown up.

If the men are to travel the road back with a minimum of grief and frustration, they will need much help and patience. But it is good that they have made the start.

ENDANGERED SPECIES ARE PART OF NATURE'S BALANCE

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, early in this session I joined with over 70 other Members of the House in the introduction of the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

H.R. 470 is a proposal to strengthen and clarify existing acts and extends protection to species and subspecies of fish and wildlife not only threatened with extinction, but also those likely to be threatened within the near future.

The bill provides for civil and criminal penalties for violations of the act and prohibits not only the importation of listed endangered species, but also for their exportation.

I should point out that 47 wildlife species have been driven to extinction only since our country was founded, and more than 120 species have vanished throughout the world since 1600 A.D.

We now know that all of nature is a delicately balanced system. If one species of plant or animal ceases to exist, strains are brought to bear on other species. Even such physically unattractive members of the system as snakes or amphibians have their part in keeping this balance because they contribute to control of rodents and disease-carrying insects.

Man is at the top of what is called the food chain. As past events have shown, it is hard for civilized man to consider himself a part of nature's balance and fit himself and his inventions into the overall framework. If wild animals, fish, or birds have trouble surviving because of man's fashion, sports, or factories, it is evident that humans eventually will have trouble.

The general health of our environment reflects directly on the general health of humankind. This bill is an important step in restoring nature's ecological balance.

Mr. Speaker, the consideration in Congress of the Endangered Species Act

of 1973 coincides with an international conference scheduled by the State Department this month. An editorial from the Washington Post, February 19, 1973, entitled "Saving the World's Wildlife," follows. Unfortunately, this is not only a national problem but a world problem and I request my colleagues most urgently to consider this bill favorably and promptly:

SAVING THE WORLD'S WILDLIFE

An important and needed international conference aimed at protecting wildlife in danger of extinction is now in progress in Washington. Long preparations have gone into the three-week meeting—to be held at the State Department until March 3—and some 60 nations have sent delegations. That such a large number have come for such a long meeting is itself an impressive fact; for years, many governments, including our own, have cared little or not at all for the protection of wildlife. As a result, more than 900 bird, fish and mammal species are now in danger of extinction. According to Russell E. Train, head of the U.S. delegation, more than half of the total number of animals exterminated since we began recording history have vanished in the last 50 years. The rate of loss is increasing today faster than ever. In America, nearly 15 per cent of our mammals and birds are considered rare or endangered. The only consolation—a grim one—this country may have is that other nations have been equally destructive and careless.

The goal of the conference is to negotiate and sign a treaty to regulate international trade in endangered animals and plants. Reports from the conference already indicate that quibbles, stalls and evasions have surfaced. This is disappointing but not surprising. Big money is at stake for many nations that trade in wild animal skins, in whale oil for cosmetics, in supplying wildlife for zoos, pets and medical research. To its credit, Kenya is taking a position of leadership at the conference; evidently, the Kenyans realize that wildlife is a valuable national and cultural asset.

It is desirable that the conference produce a strong, no-loophole agreement. Public sentiment is clearly on the side of rigid controls for protecting endangered species. Opponents should not be allowed to have their way, especially when that way has proven so obviously destructive and cruel to so many species of wildlife. The most irrevocable law of nature is that once a species is extinct, there is no getting it back.

MRS. ANNIE L. WALKER

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the city of Cleveland has recently lost a true and dear friend: Mrs. Annie L. Walker. Mrs. Walker passed away on January 29, 1973, at over 100 years of age. This cheerful, kind, and generous lady will be sorely missed by all those who were fortunate enough to know her and to love her.

Mrs. Annie Walker was born shortly after the Civil War in Greensboro, Ala. Some years later, she moved to Selma, Ala. where she met and married Alex Walker. Mr. Walker was a prominent businessman who operated Walker's Cafe in Selma until his death in 1939.

It was Selma's loss and Cleveland's great gain when Annie Walker decided to settle in Cleveland, Ohio. In Cleveland, she became known for her wide-ranging activities at the Mount Zion Congregational Church. She will always be remembered as a woman who gave quietly of herself to countless important causes. This fine gentlewoman, whose memory will live on, will be deeply missed.

Surviving Mrs. Walker are two of her seven children, Mr. William O. Walker and Mrs. Josie Waller; one daughter-in-law, Mrs. Naomi Walker; one son-in-law, Mr. George Waller; one sister, Mrs. Mamie Gray of Chicago; seven grandchildren: Mrs. Alice Reagin, George Waller, Jr., Mrs. Alexenia Mynatt, Mrs. Janet Thomas, Mrs. Renee Marshall, Mrs. Vivian Marshall, Mrs. Cynthia Henderson; and 15 great-grandchildren.

CHASE MANHATTAN DIVERSIFIES WITH RUBLES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the day before the second devaluation of the dollar, the news was out that Chase Manhattan Bank of New York City had opened an office in Moscow. No mere coincidence, since its chairman, Mr. Rockefeller, has been soliciting Communist support in Yugoslavia and Poland like a magazine salesman working his way through college.

Or, it could be that the instability and uncertainty of the U.S. dollar has now forced the "one worlders" to diversify their holdings by investing in what they feel is the stable Soviet ruble.

I include in the RECORD a related news clipping:

SOVIET-AMERICAN TRADE

The third largest bank in the U.S.—Chase Manhattan—whose chairman is David Rockefeller—has become the first bank in more than 50 years to receive permission from the Soviet Union to establish an office in Moscow.

Alfred R. Wentworth, a senior vice president, will become Chase Manhattan's representative in the Soviet Union.

Following President Nixon's summit conference in Moscow last May, the Soviet Union and the United States signed a comprehensive trade agreement. But to date, relatively few deals have gone through.

In addition to the sale of U.S. wheat to the Soviets, a necessity for them, there have been the Swindell-Dressler Company's deal to supply \$10 million worth of foundry equipment for the Soviet Kama River truck plant and International Harvester's \$40 million sale of specialized tractors for laying pipelines.

Donald Kendall, head of Pepsi-Cola and one of President Nixon's most ardent political backers, was awarded the right to sell Pepsi-Cola in the Soviet Union in exchange for selling vodka in the U.S. But to date that's been the extent of the new trade deals.

The tremendous potential in swapping U.S. know-how for unlocking the vast natural resources in Siberia has not as yet been realized—most probably because the Soviets were compelled politically to reassess their

basic relationship with the U.S. after Nixon renewed the bombing of Hanoi and Hal-phong in December.

The U.S. Department of Commerce, however, has set up an East-West trade bureau, and our government plans to establish a commercial office in Moscow some time this year.

The Soviet Union is in desperate need of Western technology in order to increase its labor productivity and provide its citizens with a minimum of creature comforts. It is short of dollars, however, and needs liberal credit to finance purchase of American goods. It is selling some of its gold through Swiss banks, a share of which business Chase Manhattan hopes to capture.

**VAN WATTS: FATHER OF THE
NAVY'S SAILOR OF THE WEEK,
MONTH, AND YEAR PROGRAMS**

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the fine work done by my constituent, Van Watts, "The Father of the Navy's Sailor of the Week, Month, and Year Programs."

These morale programs which Van Watts created have won accolades from admirals throughout the Navy for their contributions to incentive, leadership, and recruiting, and frequently to Navy-community relations.

The idea of involving homeports and hometowns in honoring outstanding Navy men occurred to Watts while he was a teenage sailor. While he found the Navy uninterested at first, he was encouraged by editors in Navy towns who were publishing his writings, and thus never lost belief in the potential of his idea.

Watts chose to come up through the enlisted ranks, and as the youngest warrant officer in the Navy, he remained linked with the enlisted men whose morale had preoccupied his thoughts to such an extent that he became a consultant regarding morale matters to commanding officers on virtually every ship on which he served.

Twelve years after the idea had occurred, Watts, now an officer stationed in Norfolk, devoted his evenings and weekends to produce, with the help of the press, radio, and television, the Navy's first Sailor of the Week program. Basically, the idea behind these programs is to involve—through the timing of leave with press releases—media, city chambers, and other activities in hometowns and homeports in honoring outstanding Navy men. Many have been honored and welcomed to town with big picture posters, and other flattering gestures.

The Navy Department gave the program Navy-wide coverage. Today there is scarcely a command which does not have a Sailor of the Week, Month, or Year program.

Although Watts retired in 1962 after 25 years of active service, he continued from Hollywood his drive to expand the now worldwide programs. The Army and

Air Force requested copies of the "blueprints" of these highly successful programs, and in 1972, commander in chief, Pacific, Adm. Noel Gaylor, wrote that he was aware these Navy programs sparked developments of benefit to all the services.

Acclaimed "the father of an important part of today's people-oriented Navy," and made an honorary life member by the Alumni Association of the Navy Supply Corps, he was recently advised by the Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. E. R. Zumwalt, that the Navy plans to commemorate, in 1977, the program's 25th silver anniversary. Watts' contribution to a happier, stronger Navy can be assessed further by the fact that the Navy Recruiting Command is currently contemplating a documentary film, while the Navy Department looks forward to honoring, in 1973, its first All-Navy Sailor of the Year.

**RODINO DEPLORES IMPACT OF
BUDGET CUTS ON NEW JERSEY**

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I do not personally quarrel with the notion that we—the Congress and the President—have to demonstrate greater fiscal discipline and responsibility in preparing the Federal budget so that over some extended period of time a sufficient amount of resources is generated to fund legislated programs. However, what I do object to strenuously is the President's self-asserted right to pick and choose which congressionally approved programs he will release moneys for and which funds he intends simply to impound. The thesis underlying this practice is the President's belief that he knows better than the Congress and the American people what is best for America. What we have here is not only a constitutional issue, but also a practical political issue: In what direction America is going to move in the decade of the seventies. In his scheme of priorities, the President has no room for programs for the people. The majority of the Members of Congress, on the other hand, are imbued with the tradition and objectives of the New Deal of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the New Frontier of J. F. Kennedy, and the Great Society programs of Lyndon B. Johnson. I for one do not intend to sit by passively while the President attempts to impose his priorities on the Congress.

Accordingly I have joined my colleagues in the Congress in introducing legislation which will require the President to notify Congress whenever he authorizes the impoundment of funds appropriated by the Congress. If at the end of 60 days the Congress has not approved such impoundment, the President would be required to cease the withholding of those funds.

While the President is busy impounding congressionally authorized funds, there is a grave problem in this country

of unemployment and underemployment. Some estimates run as high as 25.6 million people. There is also a serious lack of adequate public services at the State and local levels. In order to deal with these two problems jointly, the Congress in 1971 passed an Emergency Employment Act permitting the federally funded employment of over 130,000 workers in public-sector jobs. Now, the President's proposed budget threatens to cut off this source of employment and public service relief. In my home city of Newark, N.J., alone where the effects of unemployment and underemployment are severe, some 12,000 federally assisted jobs are threatened by the President's budget cuts. For a city which already has 30 percent of its population on the welfare rolls, the President's program will only serve to further inflate that number. This is all the more ironic in that the President rationalizes his budget cuts as a step in the direction of greater local initiative and responsibility at the local level.

The response of Congress to this action will also be clear. Already, my colleagues and I in the Congress have introduced legislation which will not only extend such public service employment for another 2 years, but will also expand it to permit the employment of 1.15 million people in public sector jobs. A special feature of my bill is the establishment of a SEED program which would reserve 25 percent of the funds provided for areas with unemployment of greater than 6 percent. This legislation would also provide special preferences in job-hiring for Vietnam era veterans, aerospace workers, those on the welfare rolls, older persons, and those of limited English-speaking ability.

Vietnam era veterans, as well as the many other poverty segments of our Nation will be hard hit by the administration's projected cutbacks in fiscal 1974. Currently, some 61,000 veterans are employed in the Federal public service employment program. The President's fiscal 1974 budget cuts this program from 1.36 billion in fiscal year 1973 to 407 million in fiscal year 1974.

The recent congressional uproar over the Veterans' Administration proposal to cut \$160 million from physical disability payments primarily affecting Vietnam veterans, including amputees, has now resulted in a White House decision to rescind the move. Other cuts, however, in the area of veterans educational and health benefits are still anticipated by the administration. To meet this growing crisis of helping to put Vietnam era veterans back on their feet, I have introduced legislation to establish a National Commission on Veterans Benefits which will review the entire structure of our level of commitment to these brave men who have sacrificed so much for their country. The commission is to report to the Congress on its proposals for overhauling the benefits and the machinery of the VA in order to assure adequate aid to returning Vietnam veterans.

Lastly, I am shocked at the President's budget proposal to terminate the Office of Economic Opportunity. The net effect of this meat ax approach is to allow OEO

programs to rely on State and local governments for their survival—the very levels of Government that most need help from the Federal Government. UCC, the Newark delegate office in the war on poverty, will be out of business in 6 months if something is not done to counteract the administration. This means that senior citizens will lose the very programs they rely on to help themselves. This means that Neighborhood Legal Service programs will dry up and the poor will be deprived of the protection of legal advice and aid. This means that OEO-sponsored health services in poverty areas will be stopped—transferred to another agency with the future of such services in grave doubt. This means that work training, youth development programs, and all the social services provided by neighborhood centers will be lost. Clearly, the Congress must move to head off these inhumane budget cuts that tear into the fabric of social and economic programs built up over the years by hard legislative effort. I pledge my best efforts in the days ahead when we in the Congress will be called on to meet the challenges forced by this administration's insensitivity to the needs of the poor.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE EUGENE L. WYMAN

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on occasion, there lives among us individuals who are loved and respected by all who come to know them. Such an individual was the late Eugene L. Wyman.

A personal friend of our family for many years, Gene was a constant source of inspiration, wise counsel, and support.

Both he and his wife "Roz" were our valued coworkers over the years; and their children—Betty, Bobby, and Brad—are also a delight.

His keen insight, decisive manner, and sincere empathy for the less fortunate, were assets that brought him fame as an attorney, and that attracted others to him for his knowledge.

Gene served the Democratic Party with dedication, devotion, and competence. He worked efficiently as chairman of the California Democratic Central Committee, and as a Democratic national committeeman.

But Mr. Wyman's credits extend beyond his law practice and political endeavors. He spearheaded a drive which raised millions of dollars for the Bonds for Israel campaign, the Hebrew University; and other philanthropic and cultural projects.

Included among Mr. and Mrs. Wyman's many honors and awards are B'nai B'rith's Mr. and Mrs. American Citizen Award, the Mt. Scopus Award of Jerusalem's Hebrew University this past December, and the naming of the univer-

sity's political science building for Roz and him.

A native of Du Quoin, Ill., Gene never forgot the importance of the average man. Much of Gene's joy in living came from his being able to help man or mankind. And much of our joy comes from having known Eugene Wyman.

He was a great man primarily because he cared. He cared about the underprivileged, the sick, the oppressed, the problems which confront the average family, the problems which face America, and the problems which plague the community of nations.

Our Nation needs more Eugene Wymans and the kind of spirit he brought to our society.

We shall all miss him, but, the world is, indeed, a richer place today because of the efforts and contributions of Eugene Wyman.

PROPOSED MASSIVE ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO NORTH VIETNAM

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, the February 17 edition of the Northern Virginia Daily included an excellent editorial on the subject of the proposal to extend massive economic assistance to North Vietnam.

The editorial sets forth in a concise way the heart of the argument against undertaking a major program of assistance to Hanoi. It points out that—

Peace that can be secured by an input of American dollars is tenuous at best and is likely to last only so long as the input of dollars continues.

The editor of the Northern Virginia Daily is J. J. Crawford. In my view, Mr. Crawford is one of the ablest editorial writers in Virginia. He presents his arguments clearly, effectively, and with conviction.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial, "It Will Take Some Selling," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

IT WILL TAKE SOME SELLING

The Nixon Administration may have trouble selling Congress on extending massive economic aid to North Vietnam. Many congressmen have already expressed themselves as being opposed to a rapid-fire economic aid and rehabilitation program for an enemy aggressor which, up to the signing of the cease-fire, resisted several years of serious efforts on the part of the U.S. to arrive at peace terms.

Many Americans feel that much of the damage which has been inflicted on the North Vietnamese was done in the same period during which North Vietnamese troops wrecked equally grievous damage on South Vietnam, troops which, even now, Hanoi has refused to admit were ever present south of the demilitarized zone.

Yesterday, at his news conference, Secretary of State William P. Rogers attempted to make a case for the Administration's plan

to pump approximately \$7 billion into the rebuilding of North Vietnam. The secretary made this plea:

"In view of the tremendous investment in resources and lives that we have made since 1965 and before . . . we think that the small investment that Congress will be called upon to make to help reconstruct and rehabilitate and provide cement for the agreement, the continuation of the cease-fire, and eventual settlement by peaceful means in Vietnam, is a very good investment."

What the secretary is saying in effect is that the best way, perhaps the only way, to keep peace in Vietnam is to buy it by placating Hanoi with a massive aid program. He may be right. But, a peace that can be secured by an input of American dollars is tenuous at best and is likely to last only so long as the input of dollars continues.

The thing that bothers Americans most is the fact that at the same time the Administration is asking for large-scale aid for rebuilding and rehabilitating North Vietnam it also plans to terminate or slash over a hundred social service and public service programs here at home all in the name of budget cutting. Programs that are designed primarily for low-income families.

Congress, listening to the rumbling back home, is understandably troubled by this conflict of aims and will probably not rush in too fast with economic aid for North Vietnam.

RIGHT TO KNOW AND RIGHT TO PROTECT SOURCES

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, in light of the current hearings of the Judiciary Committee on the various newsmen's privilege bills before the House of Representatives, I would like to take this opportunity to call the attention of my colleagues to Mr. Dick Turpin's second inaugural speech presented last week as President of the Greater Los Angeles Press Club.

Mr. Turpin's remarks not only refer to the issue of newsmen's privilege, but also to the more overriding issues of the role of the press in society, the current actions of the administration toward curbing the freedom of broadcasting, and the entire question of the public's right to know.

I urge my colleagues to take careful note of these remarks.

The speech follows:

REMARKS BY MR. TURPIN

Bill Farr may be temporarily out of jail but he is not out of jeopardy and he must never be out of our minds so long as the threat of further punishment hangs over him and until; the principle has emerged victorious that professional journalists have the absolute right to protect the confidentiality of their sources.

Bill's courageous defense of journalistic integrity did much to bring about the passage of a new law by the California Legislature, plugging the legal loophole by which Judge Older justified his jailing. This is the Bagley bill, and credit must go to its author, Assemblyman Bagley, to the other members of the Legislature who voted for it, and to Governor Reagan for signing it.

The Farr case also brought new impetus for the efforts of Senator Alan Cranston and

Congressman Jerome Waldie to establish the absolute right of news professionals to protect their confidential sources so far as the Federal jurisdictions are concerned.

The Press Club recently urged every member of the California delegation to Congress to support the Cranston and Waldie bills, which are identical, and suggested to other professional organizations that they do likewise.

Meantime, there is a new and perhaps even more sinister cloud drifting over the right of Americans to know the truth and to freely express their views, even if they are critical of government and of society.

Whether we like it or not, those of us who work in the print media must acknowledge that today most people derive their information and their views from broadcasting. This was demonstrated rather shockingly in the selection of the Ellsberg jury here in Federal court recently.

Only two of the jurors said they read newspapers. And this jury, at least so far as the court is concerned, is capable of deciding one of the most important cases in our history. It is a jury of our peers. But most of the jurors do not read newspapers.

I do not cite this as a failure of the press, although it does pose a question and a challenge to those who specialize in the use of the printed word. Rather, it shows what tremendous and fateful influence our sister media in electronic journalism have achieved in today's America.

But broadcasting, with its newfound power, is peculiarly vulnerable to political control. Stations must be licensed to use the public airways, and their licenses must be renewed periodically by the Federal Communications Commission, which is appointed by the President.

This broadcasters' heel of Achilles is well known and understood by those members of the White House staff whose dedicated duty is to preserve and build the image and the power of the President they serve. This includes at the highest level men who have made careers in the advertising profession, in the use of controlled item and space to sell products and ideas. They are trained and accustomed to the manipulation of media to eliminate the negative and accentuate the positive.

With this background, it must be galling to them to witness the uncontrolled flood of words conveying information and impressions to the public about the office and the actions of the Presidency and the administration, some of it chillingly penetrating and critical.

This frustration of the powerless opinion molder is understandable. Those of us who were brought up in the editorial end of the newspaper business know it very well. We respect and like our brothers on the advertising side. After all, they help pay our salaries. But we are fierce and unyielding in our determination to control the news columns assigned to us, to use our training and to respect the grave responsibility we have accepted toward our readers. News space on a respectable publication is simply not for sale. Advertisers and their agents must learn to respect this.

The sensitivity of those in power to criticism and even to advice is not new. Presidential resentment of questioners and critics is as old as the Republic. But never before has there existed such a tempting opportunity to do something about it—to destroy the probing gnats of public inquiry, to free the Presidency from the restraints of public accountability, to control the thoughts of the nation.

This comes about because of the sudden and contemporary confluence of the electronic mass audience and the new power of

the Presidency, fed by a trusting and confused Congress.

Sadly, there are signs that the present administration may be yielding to this temptation to seize a power never before achieved in a Republic.

Two recent moves are alarming and of great urgency. I believe they call for action by this Press Club and by all others who believe in freedom of inquiry and expression, in the public's right to the truth.

Both are blunt declarations by appointees of the White House, assigned to communications. One is the unvarnished announcement of Thomas Curtis and Henry Loomis of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting that they are taking over the programming of the nation's non-profit network of 230 public broadcasting stations, including Channel 28 here.

Particular targets of these Presidential hatchet men are two programs of news reporting and interpretation, William Buckley's "Firing Line" and the panel show of Washington correspondents called "Washington Week in Review".

Both of these public network programs have gained wide audiences because they are independent and expert. By the same token, at times they no doubt have infuriated those in the White House who do not believe in uncontrolled media and fiercely defend the President's image and power. In President Truman's words, they can't stand the heat. They are not used to the political kitchen.

Leaders of these 230 public broadcasting stations are vigorously resisting this attempted takeover, but it will be a losing battle unless the American public reacts strongly and now. There will have to be a tremendous upsurge of public and Congressional protest to prevent it. I recommend that the Press Club join this chorus of opposition immediately.

It is inconsistent with democracy that young zealots of the executive branch of our government should be permitted to tell 200 million Americans what news and discussion programs they shall be permitted to hear and witness over their own public TV stations.

The other current move against the freedom of broadcasting came with equally harsh candor directly from Clay T. Whitehead, director of the White House Office of Telecommunications Policy, last December 18.

He proposed that individual stations be made specifically responsible for the content of the network newscasts they carry, when they appear before the Federal Communications Commission petitioning for renewal of their licenses. I quote Mr. Whitehead:

"Station managers and network officials who fail to act to correct imbalance or consistent bias in the network, or who acquiesce by silence, can only be considered willing participants, to be held fully accountable at license-renewal time."

There it is. Right on the line. Conform to the administration's notion of balance in reporting or you have had it. Please the President and his censors or you lose your license to broadcast.

Nothing could be plainer. Nor could there be a louder call to arms by all those who believe that freedom of inquiry and of expression are the root of American liberty.

Whitehead's bid for power must come before the Congress, fortunately. It is to be couched in the seductive language of an administration bill. But this is not a measure for partisan consideration. It is a challenge to the survival of a republic built upon the Bill of Rights, on the public's right to know the truth about their government.

Which side shall the Press Club be on? I think there is only one answer to that question.

The bridle of thought control has been forged in the smithy of the White House basement.

We will not wear it.

MANDATORY SENTENCING BILL TO STOP CRIMINAL USE OF GUNS

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of S. 576, a bill to require mandatory consecutive sentences for criminals who use firearms in the commission of a felony. This is the kind of legislation we need to protect the rights of law-abiding citizens and to crack down on the criminal uses of firearms.

The premise of this legislation is quite simple. Carrying of a gun during commission of a crime would automatically require an additional separate sentence. No prison term imposed under this provision may be suspended. Probation may not be granted. No discretion is left to the courts.

I believe that if this bill becomes law, we will see a significant decline in the use of guns in the commission of crimes. I am strongly opposed to licensing and registration legislation which unfairly restricts legitimate uses of guns by law-abiding citizens and sportsmen. However, I believe mandatory sentencing legislation like S. 576 can get to the root of the crime problem by cracking down hard on criminals using guns to commit their crimes. This is the direction we should take to stop criminal use of firearms.

Mr. President, I request that the text of S. 576, introduced January 26 by the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK), be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 576

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 924(c) of the Gun Control Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-618; 18 U.S.C. 924(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Whoever—

"(1) uses a firearm to commit any felony for which he may be prosecuted in a court of the United States; or

"(2) carries a firearm during the commission of any felony for which he may be prosecuted in a court of the United States, shall, in addition to the punishment provided for the commission of such felony, be sentenced for the additional offense defined in this subsection to a term of imprisonment for not less than one year nor more than ten years. In the case of his second or subsequent conviction under this subsection, such person shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment for not less than two nor more than twenty-five years.

"The execution or imposition of any term of imprisonment imposed under this subsection may not be suspended, and probation may not be granted. Any term of imprisonment imposed under this subsection may

not be imposed to run concurrently with any term or imprisonment imposed for the commission of such felony."

OUT-OF-STATE ABORTIONS

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, since the Supreme Court decision on abortion of January 22, 1973, the Nation has been shocked into the realization of what has been happening across our land the past few years.

I have introduced an amendment to the Constitution, House Joint Resolution 261, which would guarantee the right to life to the unborn, the ill, the aged, and the incapacitated.

Proponents of abortion are fond of citing so-called back alley abortions as an argument in favor of legalized abortion. They contend that when abortion is legalized it can be handled in a strictly professional and ethical manner.

The facts contradict this argument sharply. The Arizona Republic carried a most informative editorial regarding this very question in its August 6, 1972, issue.

The editorial raises some very serious questions about what happened in States where abortion has been legalized. I think all of us should be aware of the facts.

Following is the editorial from August 6:

OUT-OF-STATE ABORTIONS

Local abortion referral from Arizona to California has become big business for many so-called counseling services. Planned Parenthood of Phoenix and Tucson, Tellus, Problem Pregnancy Information Service, and other agencies are sending hundreds of women to California each month for abortions, referring them either directly or indirectly to doctors or hospitals in that state.

In return, the Arizona agencies allegedly receive kickbacks of between \$30 and \$50 per patient for their referrals.

Los Angeles' Avalon Memorial Hospital is one to which many Arizona women are referred. Doctors at the 22-bed facility perform about 10 per cent of all abortions in California, or more than 1,000 abortions a month. But Avalon has recently come under fire from the Los Angeles County Health Department, which has charged that it is excessively overcrowded, unsanitary, and that its doctors have performed operations illegally on minors.

Marvin Brandon, the health department's supervising hospital inspector, recently had to seek a permanent superior court injunction to permit inspections of the facility because Avalon officials threw his inspectors out of the hospital last February. But before they left, Brandon told reporters, his team had uncovered at least 34 violations of hospital licensing laws resulting from the small facility's bustling abortion business.

Proponents of liberalized abortion laws in Arizona could conceivably argue that only Arizona's reluctance to follow California's enlightened lead has resulted in the need to refer women to out-of-state abortion mills like Avalon. But the evidence shows that such mills come into being wherever abortion laws are relaxed. Indeed, the New York state legislature recently repealed its

own liberal abortion statute (a repeal later vetoed by Gov. Nelson Rockefeller) because of this and other terrifying results of such laws.

This happens because some doctors are tempted to allow the lucrative abortion trade to become a racket that makes them wealthy. Dr. Edward Allred, resident surgeon at Avalon Hospital, recently told newsmen that he performs about 50 per cent of that hospital's abortions (about 500 a month). It is estimated that he made \$270,000 in the first six months of 1971 from these operations.

Dr. Allred is currently involved in litigation in which he and his hospital have been charged with questionable professional practices. He has declared under oath in depositions filed last March with Orange County Superior Court Judge J. E. T. Rutter that he paid \$7,500 in kickbacks to Planned Parenthood of Phoenix and Tucson for their referrals from October 1970 to October 1971, and more than \$45,395 to Problem Pregnancy Information Service affiliates from November 1970 to August 1971. (Joe Davis, executive director of Phoenix Planned Parenthood, denied any kickbacks had been made to his organization.)

If Arizona agencies have directly or indirectly referred women to Avalon and other hospitals guilty of overcrowding and unsanitary conditions, they are guilty of the worst form of negligence. Hopefully a full understanding of the true relationship between these local agencies and doctors involved in the mercenary out-of-state abortion business will result in some type of local action to protect Arizona citizens.

VOTE OF APPRECIATION TO MR. EDWARD D. FITZGERALD

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Edward D. Fitzgerald of Arlington, Va., retired last June from his position as Chief of the Production Division of the Publications and Document Office of the General Secretariat, Organization of American States.

Mr. Fitzgerald had served the OAS for 49 years at the time of his retirement, and the Permanent Council of the Organization paid tribute to his many years of devoted duty in a resolution expressing appreciation to him. As I believe this tribute will be of interest not only to Mr. Fitzgerald's friends but to all who would be interested to know of the loyal service of this fine man to the inter-American system, I insert the text of the resolution at this point in the RECORD:

VOTE OF APPRECIATION TO MR. EDWARD D. FITZGERALD

Whereas, As this Council has been informed by the Secretary General, Mr. Edward D. Fitzgerald, Chief of the Production Division of the Publications and Documents Office of the General Secretariat, will soon retire, and he is an employee who has distinguished himself by his efficiency, competence, integrity, and dedication, and especially by the exceptional fact that he has served the inter-American system for almost fifty years, which period covers most of the course of the evolution of the inter-American movement of today; and

In the performance of his duties Mr. Fitzgerald has been responsible for the printing

of the documents of the deliberative organs of the Organization and of its General Secretariat, many of which are of singular importance to the inter-American system,

The Permanent Council of the Organization of American States resolves:

1. To express its appreciation to Mr. Edward D. Fitzgerald for his exemplary and valuable work, done during many years of service to the inter-American system.

2. To request the Secretary General to transmit the text of this resolution to Mr. Fitzgerald.

THE POSTMASTER OF EHRENBURG

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, an excellent article written by Mr. Norman J. Pope, Postmaster, New Almaden, Calif., has recently been brought to my attention.

In his article, Mr. Pope contrasts our highly complex and regulated postal delivery system with the highly unorthodox practices of a small town Arizona postmaster in the late 1880's.

Though it is difficult to imagine postal service without long lines, computers, and the zip code, I respectfully submit this article for the attention of the Members.

The article follows:

THE POSTMASTER OF EHRENBURG

(By Norman J. Pope)

Ehrenburg, Arizona, now a ghost town, prospered in the 1880's as a shipping terminal on the lower Colorado River. About 125 miles north of Yuma, it received the steamboat freight for the scattered mining areas in western Arizona.

Into this frontier town arrived a hardrock miner named Jesus ("Hay-soos") Daniel, whose vocation—and avocation—was searching for gold. A big brusque man, Daniel was known to be a hardheaded individual. He believed a reasonable compromise was to state bluntly.

"We'll do it my way."

In 1883, Daniel was in the Plomosa mountains searching in vain for the elusive yellow metal. A roaming miner rode into his camp one day, and as custom dictated, Daniel invited him to stand down and have some grub.

The garrulous guest spilled over with news. When he volunteered that Postmaster James Burns of Ehrenburg had died, Daniel decided to break camp and head straightaway for Ehrenburg.

Burns, appointed postmaster by President Chester A. Arthur on March 20, 1883, served less than a year.

"I'm agoin' to git that there job," Daniel promised himself, "no one deserves it more'n me. I voted fer the 'Gentleman Boss' four times in 1880 and I worked hard to git him elected. Hadda beat up half a dozen of them barflies in the saloon at Fort Caspar fore I convinced 'em they should vote fer ole Chester."

Returned to Ehrenburg, Daniel did the necessary politicking and soon found himself installed as postmaster.

And so, on May 9, 1884 begins our story of Mr. Daniel's career in the Postal Service.

A MEMORABLE POSTMASTER

Let it be stated unequivocally that Mr. Jesus ("Hay-soos") Daniel has long been regarded as the most astonishing postmaster ever known to the Postal Service.

Tens of thousands of postmasters have passed this way since Daniel's term in office. Not one of the multitude comes close to challenging his unique status.

Now, it is true there are some snide souls in the Service who would infer Mr. Daniel has had some close competition. But let us ignore these canards and get on with our story.

Research discloses that Mr. Daniel's term of office extended from 1884 to 1894, but his term as postmaster should have ended in 1891. He continued on in his job for an extra three years by employing a simple expedient.

Thomas Hamilton was appointed postmaster of Ehrenberg on November 6, 1891, by President Benjamin Harrison. But, unfortunately for Mr. Hamilton, Postmaster Daniel was not ready to relinquish his job.

Knowing that Hamilton's commission from Washington, D.C., would be sent to Hamilton via registered mail through his office, Daniel kept watch for it. When a fat registered letter arrived in the mail for Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Daniel simply did not deliver it. He "lost" it behind a large wooden box of undelivered letters and there it reposed until 1894 when Postal Inspector Waterbury arrived from Denver.

OUT OF SIGHT—OUT OF MIND

Not much attention had been paid to the Ehrenberg postoffice by the postal officials at Denver. It was a case of "out of sight, out of mind." Mr. Daniel had not bothered the home office and the home office reciprocated by not bothering him. In fact, some disagreement arose amongst the postal officials in Denver. Doubt was expressed that a postoffice existed at Ehrenberg. To settle the question, Mr. Waterbury was dispatched forthwith.

Arriving, Mr. Waterbury did indeed find a postoffice. Locked. The front door bore a sign stating the hours the post office was open for business. This was required by postal regulations. Mr. Daniel circumvented the intent of this regulation, which would have tied him down to definite hours, by stating on the door sign,—

"This office is open when it is open and closed when it is closed."

AN INSPECTOR'S NIGHTMARE

Mr. Waterbury peeked through the windows. What he saw would bring tears to the eyes of any Postal Inspector of any era.

A large wooden box spilled over with letters. On the floor, two unopened bulging sacks of mail slumped against the box of letters. The post office safe hung open.

Mr. Waterbury hunted around town for the postmaster. Townfolk told him Mr. Daniel had taken to the hills to work his claim.

"Post office ain't open on weekdays," they informed him. "Dan'l usually gits in from his diggins' on Sataday. Opens fer a while in the afternoon, effen he ain't too t'ard. Opens on Sundays, too, effen he ain't too drunk."

Fortunately for Mr. Waterbury, Mr. Daniel did show up on the following Saturday. Starting his investigation of the office, Mr. Waterbury asked to count the cash on hand. "Ain't none," Mr. Daniel said.

To the request to see and count the stamp stock, he was informed, "Stamps run out in 1886."

Asked how he could run a post office without stamps, Mr. Daniel explained, "Found out I didn't need 'em. Just sent the mail down to Yuma without stamps. Marked the letters, 'Collect on the other end.' Worked fine. Less trouble, too."

"Why didn't you order more stamps when you ran out in 1886?" Mr. Waterbury asked.

"Dammit to hell," Mr. Daniel exploded, "you ask me why'n't I order more stamps? Lemme tell you this, mister, it's impossible. Would take a Philadelphia lawyer to figger

out how to do it. When I run outta stamps, I tried to order more from Denver, Sent 'em a postcard and told 'em. 'Send more stamps.'

TOO MANY FORMS

"They tole me I hadda order stamps on the right forms. I tried again and told 'em I didn't have no forms. Then they tole me I could order the right forms on another special form which I didn't have, neither. They tole me I hadda order small amounts of stamps from Yuma. But if I wanted mid-dlin' amounts, I should order from Denver. And if I wanted a big passel of the durn things, I should order from Washington. Damn if I didn't have to use a different form on a different day in a different month for the different amounts I wanted."

"Then I tried to order envelopes from Denver. Sent 'em another postcard tellin' 'em I wanted 'large and small envelopes.' But I got this'n right back tellin' me they didn't know what I wanted. Did I want 6 and 3/4's or Number 10's? What the hell did they mean, Waterbury?"

Mr. Waterbury did not answer the question. He felt a surge of sympathy for Mr. Daniel, but he plunged onward.

No quarterly reports had been received from Ehrenberg in over three years. Why not, Mr. Waterbury asked.

"Easy question," Mr. Daniel retorted, "didn't sell no stamps. Didn't rent no boxes. All the keys are lost. Didn't take in no money. Weren't nothin' to report."

Asked about the large wooden box of undelivered letters, Daniel explained this was the easiest method of distribution. When he first began as postmaster, he stacked the mail alphabetically on his counter. Invariably his customers mixed it up. This made him mad, so he dumped all the incoming mail in the wooden box. Now, when anyone called for his mail, he was told to look through the box.

UNOPENED MAIL

Next, Mr. Waterbury showed Mr. Daniel fifty-six pieces of official government mail, all addressed to the postmaster, and all unopened. Some of them had been mailed three years before. How come, Mr. Waterbury wanted to know.

"Course I don't open that there mail," Mr. Daniel told him, "the only one I open got my paycheck in it. I kin allus tell that'n. I usta open them but the last one I opened had nineteen pages of instructions tellin' me how to sort and stack mail on a riverboat going down the Mississippi. Why, the first sentence was one page long. I'll bet the varmint that wrote it don't know what he said. Read that there mail? I should say not. Think I'm crazy?"

Visibly shaken, Mr. Waterbury went on to the next item on his list of irregularities.

"Mr. Daniel, you have two full sacks of mail you haven't yet opened. This mail comes from Yuma by horseback and is many months old according to the postmarks. Why haven't you attempted to distribute and deliver this mail?"

"Good Gawdamighty, feller, you want I shoulda opened them there sacks? Can't you see the box of mail I got awready is full up? Want I should spill it all over the floor?"

"All right, let's get on with it," Mr. Waterbury sighed, "now here are seven registered letters I found behind your big box of mail. Tell me why they were there."

"Not 'sposed to mix up registers with ordinary mail," Mr. Daniel answered triumphantly.

"Well; tell me about this one. You received it three years ago and it is addressed to Thomas Hamilton, your legitimate successor. It's from Washington, D.C. and it probably contains his commission from President Harrison. Why wasn't this letter delivered to Mr. Hamilton three years ago?"

"Spector, you know damn well the answer

to that'n," Mr. Daniel replied. "F I'da gave that there letter to Hamilton in 1891, you know he woulda taken right over as postmaster. He woulda had the papers he needed right in that there register, wouldn't he? I wouldn'ta been postmaster no more, would I?"

WHICH WAY IS BETTER?

"No, you wouldn't," Mr. Waterbury sat gazing out the window. The thought went through his mind. He's nearly got me convinced his way was better.

"And see here, Mr. Waterbury," Mr. Daniel said, "effen you ain't satisfied with the way I been runnin' this post office, you can git some'un else. I don't take kindly to this here criticism of how I been doin' things. I'm gettin' a hankerin' to mosey along. I'm gettin' tired of Arizona. Im gettin' tired of bein' postmaster. And I'm already tired of you. G'bye."

This ends the story of the postmaster of Ehrenberg. Mr. Waterbury personally delivered the mail contained in the wooden box. He searched for and found Thomas Hamilton and delivered President Harrison's commission to him, and three years late, swore him in as postmaster of Ehrenberg on May 17, 1894.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arizona Department of Library and Archives, Phoenix, Arizona; Arizona Historical Society, Tucson, Arizona; United States National Archives and Records, Washington, D.C.; General Services Administration, Washington, D.C.; United States Postal Service; Arizona: The Last Frontier by Joseph Miller (The names and dates obtained from the book, "The Last Frontier" were largely incorrect when compared to the information supplied by the Postal Service and the National Archives and Records).

THE HONORABLE GEORGE COLLINS

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, in times that often seem beset with tragedy, the untimely death of the Honorable George Collins, of Illinois, is particularly saddening.

In just 2 short years as our colleague in the House of Representatives, Mr. Collins distinguished himself as a very capable legislator and representative of his constituents.

His dedication to his district and his country is clearly illustrated by his remaining on Capitol Hill long after the close of the last Congress. There were many Congressmen who had returned home much earlier for a long vacation, but Mr. Collins remained hard at work behind his desk in the Longworth House Office Building.

Indeed, the circumstances surrounding his passing are illustrative of the kind of man George Collins was. When the plane he was on crashed, Mr. Collins was returning home to his district to be present at a Christmas party for needy children which he had arranged. He had caught an early plane out of Washington, so that he could personally take a hand in selecting the presents.

These circumstances provide for us a concise biography of this fine man: Gen-

erous, dedicated, deeply concerned, loyal to his constituents, and more.

We will miss the kind, ever-smiling man from Chicago. I offer my deepest and most heartfelt sympathies to his courageous wife and son.

COUNCIL ON ENERGY POLICY

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, our country is currently in the midst of an energy crisis the like of which it has never seen before. America has never before had to curtail sales and service of energy to its citizens, and yet that is what we are faced with today.

The Midwest has suffered a winter much more severe than most and this in turn has served to aggravate the energy crisis even more, as people turn up their thermostats and spend less time away from home. Schools have even had to be closed because the primary source of their energy, the power companies, are forced to cut back to service more essential customers. The schools' secondary source, fuel oil, is also in short supply.

How can we best deal with this situation? How did it develop? What will the energy supply look like in 10 or 20 years? These are all questions which must be answered soon if we are to avoid a recurrence of this situation for winters yet to come.

As a member of the Republican Task Force on Energy and Resources and formerly a member of the Subcommittee on Communications and Power in the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I have had an opportunity to see firsthand how the Federal Government has operated in its approach to guaranteeing the American people an adequate supply of energy. I must say that I was most struck by the disorganization, the diffusion, and the disorientation of our national effort in this field. In the executive branch there are more than 60 separate agencies concerned with some aspect of the energy problem. In the legislative branch more than a dozen committees have claimed jurisdiction.

Accordingly, I am today reintroducing legislation that I sponsored in the last Congress to create a Council on Energy Policy to formulate answers to the critical questions concerning the supply of American energy resources and to provide the Nation with a unified, comprehensive policy for the best solution of this problem. It would be a policy that would give an overview of the energy situation in the United States, what it can be expected to be in the near and distant future, and how best to provide for the needs of the country and deal with this situation.

Briefly, the Council would be composed of a group of three experts in the energy field directed to be chief adviser to the

Congress and the President on all matters dealing with energy production, transportation, importation, and consumption. It would be directed to formulate a national policy with regard to all these matters. Its members would be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The council would not assume the responsibilities of any of the other existing agencies. What it would do, however, is to gather all the requisite information in one place and suggest to the President and the Congress the best way to go about solving the problem at hand. It would formulate, in effect, the general guidelines under which the existing agencies would be better able to carry out their tasks.

Finally, the Council would be responsible for transmitting a message to Congress at the beginning of each new fiscal year outlining the legislation it will propose, the energy fuel supply domestically and abroad, the availability of the supply to U.S. consumers, and projections for future demand and how best to meet it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is long past due for the American Government to begin thinking in terms of long-range goals and policy matters with respect to our critical resources. Not only energy, but all our natural resources have come to be threatened by man's constant desire for new goods and services. Hopefully, this legislation, if enacted, will reverse the trend of waiting until it is too late. Hopefully, the bill I am introducing today will take the first step toward guaranteeing the American people the energy they will need in the next 50 years to continue to build a prosperous and successful society.

We need this energy policy now. Schools are indeed being closed. I, therefore, urge the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to hold hearings on this proposal as swiftly as possible and to report a viable and effective piece of legislation to the floor of the House for its consideration.

CONGRESSMAN DANIELS HAILS MONTE IRVIN'S SELECTION TO THE BASEBALL HALL OF FAME

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Baseball Writers Association of America voted Monte Irvin, a son of New Jersey, into the Hall of Fame at Cooperstown, N.Y. All of us in Jersey City have a special affection for Monte Irvin because before he became a regular at the Polo Grounds, he starred with the Jersey City Giants of the old International League at Roosevelt Stadium in Jersey City.

Mr. Speaker, Monte Irvin came to the major leagues at the advanced age—for a ballplayer and not a Congressman—of 30. This was because Mr. Irvin is a

black American and blacks were not permitted to play in organized baseball until the late and great Jackie Robinson broke the color barrier in 1946 with the Montreal Royals, and years later became the first representative of his race to play in the majors.

Mr. Speaker, on this great occasion I salute Monte Irvin, one of New Jersey's greatest all-time athletes on his selection to the Hall of Fame. The people of the 14th District join with me in honoring a fine gentleman and gifted athlete.

LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1973

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I am burdened with great grief that the flag of our Nation again flies at half-mast on the loss of one of America's outstanding leaders—Lyndon Baines Johnson. As I join with citizens from coast to coast in rejoicing that a peace agreement has been signed to end hostilities in Vietnam and our prisoners of war are heading homeward, I am saddened that our former Chief Executive who had so sincerely endeavored for peace could not be with us to see the culmination of this goal.

If Mr. Johnson could not be among us to rejoice this long-sought peace, it is heartening to me to realize that he has left the United States and the world with a legacy of accomplishment in establishing the principle of equality of mankind and equal opportunity for all. From his early days in the U.S. Congress, Lyndon Johnson fought with complete dedication and determination to remove social and economic barriers to make way for an open chance at a better way of life for all citizens.

Those who never met with Mr. Johnson and were not deeply touched with his personal charm will still profit from his landmark programs to move America toward a truly Great Society. I am among the fortunate many who have lasting impressions of personal experience with L. B. J.

I recall my first trip to the White House to see the President. I had received an appointment to talk with him about impoundment of highway funds and to tell him of adverse effects involving deterioration of roadbeds in the state of Arkansas.

Being the first Republican since Reconstruction from Arkansas ever to make that trip down to the White House, I had apprehensive feelings about the reception I would receive. It was then that I learned of the President's real political and governmental understanding. I immediately felt the warmth of his personality and deep concern for problems we discussed. Incidentally, probably not because of my visit, substantial funds which had been impounded were restored within the week for continuation of the interstate system.

I am confident that history, in an ob-

jective or analytical treatment of the Johnson administration, will proclaim Mr. Johnson as an outstanding President with extraordinary vision and leadership ability. Despite criticism of many Great Society and war on poverty legislation, these programs were launched toward common national goals and constituted a major step in meeting our critical needs.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 set a precedent which, for years to come, will continue to unlock doors to progress for our country's disadvantaged and minority groups. Enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 marked the first time that Congress had approved legislation which authorized funds for general use in elementary and secondary schools. I have seen, during my tenure in Congress, this act enable major achievements in strengthening education and upgrading instruction throughout the Third District and the State of Arkansas.

As President, Johnson expressed strong convictions on the Government's obligation to insure that our older citizens are able to live a full and useful life in their later years. In this regard, he sought and received congressional passage of The Older Americans Act.

The elderly and the disabled throughout the Nation are now more adequately cared for due to the medicare program. The passage of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 climaxed a 20-year fight for a Federal health insurance program for the aged.

In addition to contributions for social programs, we must also attribute Johnson's leadership to enactment of economic development, water pollution, highway beautification, and veterans' legislation—all of which constitute a base for our current legislative activities.

My colleagues in Congress found that Mr. Johnson had an understanding and receptive ear, although he did not always agree. He was, however, a man with true and deep concern over the welfare of his fellow man. I consider it an honor to have had the opportunity to come into Congress during the Johnson years and learn his great depth of understanding and dedication to make this Nation a better place for us all.

A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT TO INCLUDE A DEFINITION OF FOOD SUPPLEMENTS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill providing for the definition of food supplements, and specifically regulations involving the marketing of vitamins and minerals. I am concerned about reports that the FDA will release regulations which would restrict the manufacturing and marketing of vitamins and food supplements. I strongly believe that it is not within the Gov-

ernment's right to limit the amount of vitamins and food supplements that a person takes. Every citizen should have the right to decide that for himself, as long as the substances he requires are not intrinsically injurious to health.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, do you think that an individual should be required to have a prescription in order to take vitamin C? Is it not his right to take 5 milligrams, or 50 milligrams, or 500 milligrams of vitamin C, as he sees fit as long as the product itself is not harmful, and as long as the product label accurately reflects the contents? We should have this right, and the Government should not be allowed to infringe upon it. For this reason, I am introducing this legislation today, so that, first, food supplements are properly defined, and second, so that any nonharmful natural or synthetic vitamin, or minerals can be obtained without formal prescription or Government limitation.

H.R. 4568

A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes

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 "Food Supplement Amendment of 1971".

Sec. 2. (a) Paragraph (f) of section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(f)) is amended by (1) redesignating clauses (1) and (2) as clauses "(A)" and "(B)", respectively, (2) inserting "(1)" immediately after "(f)", and (3) adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) The term 'food supplement' means food for special dietary uses.

"(3) The term 'special dietary uses', as applied to food for man, means particular (as distinguished from general uses of food, as follows:

"(A) Uses of supplying particular dietary needs which exist by reason of a physical, physiological, pathological, or other conditions, including but not limited to conditions of disease, convalescence, pregnancy, lactation, allergic hypersensitivity to food, underweight and overweight;

"(B) Uses for supplying particular dietary needs which exist by reason of age, including but not limited to the ages of infancy and childhood;

"(C) Uses for supplementing or fortifying the ordinary or usual diet with any vitamin, mineral, or other dietary property.

Any such particular use of a food is a special dietary use, regardless of whether such food also purports to be or is represented for general use."

(b) Paragraph (g)(3) of such section 201 is amended by striking out "(other than food)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(other than food or food supplements)".

Sec. 3. Title VII of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 371-377) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"LIMITATION OF AUTHORITY

"Sec. 708. In administering this Act the Secretary—

"(1) shall not limit the potency, number, combination, amount, or variety of any synthetic or natural vitamin, mineral, substance, or ingredient of any food supplement unless such article is intrinsically injurious to health in the recommended dosage, and

"(2) shall not require a warning label on any food supplement unless such article is intrinsically injurious to health in the recommended dosage."

THE "OLD CHINA HANDS" OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an event of major importance took place at the State Department January 30. At a luncheon sponsored by the American Foreign Service Association, members of the Foreign Service paid tribute to their colleagues who suffered so much abuse during the late 1940's and early 1950's for having the integrity to write honest reports on what they saw happening in China during World War II. In our national hysteria over the Communist takeover of China we found scapegoats in the "China hands" of the Foreign Service who consistently warned Washington from posts throughout China that the Chiang Kai-shek regime was losing to the Communists under Mao Tse-tung, and recommended that—at the least—the United States should reexamine carefully its continued commitment to the dying Kuomintang. The fact that this tribute took place at the State Department—the agency which drove the "China hands" out of the Foreign Service—is in itself significant. As one old China hand was quoted on Tuesday as saying:

I never thought I'd live to see the day.

In visits to foreign countries as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have been deeply impressed by the high quality of so many Foreign Service officers serving at our embassies. They represent the best qualities of the American people and feel an obligation to report back to Washington the truth as they see it from keen observation of the situation at their posts. We should expect nothing less of them, and if they were to tell us only what we want to hear in order to please us, they would be performing a disservice to our country. That is why I regard yesterday's tribute to the "China hands" as a reaffirmation of the integrity of the American Foreign Service.

I am placing in the RECORD remarks made at the luncheon by William Harrop, Barbara Tuchman, and John S. Service. Mr. Service, one of the most outstanding and most villified of the "China hands," received a standing ovation from the hundreds of his former Foreign Service colleagues assembled.

The remarks follow:

WHY POLICY MAKERS DO NOT LISTEN

(By Barbara Tuchman)

We have gathered to honor a group of foreign service officers—represented in the person of Jack Service—whom history has recognized as having been right; and not only history, but even, by act if not by acknowledgment, the present Administration. Can there be anyone among that group who reported from China during World War II who, watching an American president journey in person to Communist China in 1971, was not conscious of an irony so acute as to make him shiver? Could anyone remembering past attitudes, look at that picture of President

Nixon and Chairman Mao in twin armchairs, with slightly queasy smiles bravely worn to conceal their mutual discomfort, and not feel a stunned sense that truth is indeed wierder than fiction? When I was young the magazine *Vanity Fair* used to publish a series called *Impossible Interviews* by the artist-cartoonist Covarubbias in which he confronted Calvin Coolidge with Greta Garbo and John D. Rockefeller Sr. with Stalin, but last year's meeting in Peking outdid Covarubbias.

Yet it could have happened 25 years earlier, sparing us and Asia immeasurable, and to some degree irreparable, harm, if American policy had been guided by the information and recommendations of the staff of the Chungking Embassy, then acknowledged to be the best informed service group in China. It included the Ambassador, Clarence Gauss, the Counselor, George Atcheson, both deceased, and among the secretaries and consuls stationed all over China, besides Mr. Service, such men as John Paton Davies, Edward Rice, Arthur Ringwalt, Philip Sprouse, and alternately in the field and on the China Desk, Edmond Clubb and the late John Carter Vincent. Several had been born in China, many were Chinese-speaking, and some are happily here with us today.

For having been right many of them were persecuted, dismissed, or slowed or blocked in their careers, with whatever damage done to them personally outweighed by damage done to the Foreign Service of the United States. No spectacle, Macaulay said, was so ridiculous as the British public in one of its periodic fits of morality—and none, one might add, so mean and so self-destructive as the American public in one of its periodic witch-hunts. Your colleagues and predecessors were hounded because able and honest performance of their profession collided with the hysterics of the cold war manipulated by a man so absolutely without principles as to be sinister like the man without a shadow. I shall not pursue the story of what happened to them, however important it is to you and to every citizen, because what I want to get at is a problem perhaps more abiding, and that is, why these men were not listened to even before they were persecuted.

The burden of their reports at the time, though not always explicit, was that Chiang Kai-shek was on the way out and the Communists on the way in and that American policy, rather than cling in paralyzed attachment to the former, might be well advised to take this trend into account. This was implicit in reports from Chungking and the south which were united in describing the deterioration of the Kuomintang. It was made explicit by those who saw the Communists at first hand like Service in his remarkable reports from Yenan, and Ludden who journeyed into the interior to observe the functioning of Communist rule, and Davies whose ear was everywhere. They were unequivocal in judging the Communists to be the dynamic party in the country; in Davies' words, "China's destiny was not Chiang's but theirs." This was not subversion as our Red-hunters were to claim, but merely observation.

Any government that does not want to walk open-eyed into a quagmire, leading its country with it, would presumably re-examine its choices at such a point. That after all, is what we employ foreign service officers for: to advise policy-makers of actual conditions on which to base a realistic policy. The agonizing question is, why are their reports ignored, why is there a persistent gap between observers in the field and policy-makers in the capital? While I cannot speak from experience, I would like to try to offer some answers as an outside assessor.

In the first place, policy is formed by preconceptions, by long-implanted biases. When information is relayed to policy-makers they

respond in terms of what is already inside their heads and consequently make policy less to fit the facts than to fit the notions and intentions formed out of the mental baggage that has accumulated in their minds since childhood. When President McKinley had to decide whether to annex the Philippines in 1898, he went down on his knees at midnight, according to his own account, and "prayed to Almighty God for light and guidance." He was accordingly guided to conclude "that there was nothing left for us to do but to take them all, and to educate the Filipinos, and uplift and civilize and Christianize them, and by God's grace to the very best we could by them, as our fellow-men for whom Christ died."

Actually the main impulse at work was the pressure of the "manifest destiny" school for stepping stone across the Pacific but the mental baggage of a President in the 1890's required him to act in terms of Almighty God and the White Man's Burden just as the mental fix of his successors in our time has required them to react in terms of anti-communism. Closer observers than Almighty God could have informed McKinley that the Filipinos had no strong desire to be Christianized or civilized or exchange Spanish rule for American, but rather to gain their independence. This being overlooked, we soon found ourselves engaged not in civilizing but in a cruel and bloody war of repression much to our embarrassment. Failure to take into account the nature of the other party often has this awkward result.

The same failure afflicted President Wilson who had a mental fix opposite from McKinley's, in favor of progressivism, reform and the New Freedom. So fixed was his mind that when the reactionary General Huerta carried out a coup in Mexico in 1913, Wilson became obsessed by the idea that it devolved upon him to tear the usurper off the backs of the Mexican people so that Mexico might be ruled by the consent of the governed. "My passion is for the submerged 85 percent who are struggling to be free" he said, but the reality was the submerged 85 percent were cowering in their huts unable to distinguish a difference between Huerta and his rival Carranza. Wilson however sent in the Marines to seize Vera Cruz, an intervention that not only appalled him by costing American lives, but succeeded only in deepening the turmoil in Mexico and drawing the United States into further intervention two years later against that man of the people, Pancho Villa. Political passion is a good thing but even better if it is an informed passion.

Roosevelt's bias too was in favor of the progressive. George Kennan has told how, when the Embassy staff in Moscow began reporting the facts of the Stalinist purges of the 1930s, revealing a tyranny as terrible as the Czars', the President discounted the reports as the product of what he considered typical State Department stripped-pants mentality. It was not only inconvenient but disturbing to be in receipt of reports that would have required a change of attitude toward the Soviet Union—(foreign policy obeys Newton's law of Inertia: it keeps on doing what it is doing unless acted on by an irresistible force). Rather than be discomfited by these disclosures, which Roosevelt's own bias caused him to believe were biased, the Russian Division was closed down, its library scattered and its chief re-assigned. This desire not to listen to unhappy truths—"Don't confuse me with the facts"—is only human and widely shared by chiefs of state. Was not the bearer of bad news often killed by ancient kings? Chiang Kai-shek's vindictive reaction to unpleasant news as such that his ministers ceased to bring him any with the result that he lived in a fantasy.

Your reports must also pass through a screen of psychological factors at the receiving end: temperament, or private ambitions,

or the fear of not appearing masterful, or a ruler's inner sense that his manhood is at stake. (This is a male problem that fortunately does not trouble women—which might be one advantage of having a woman in high office. Whatever inner inadequacy may gnaw at a woman's vitals, it does not compel her to compensate by showing how tough she is.) You may cite Golda Meir in objection, but one gets the impression that her toughness is natural rather than neurotic, besides required by the circumstances.

Proving his manhood was, I imagine, a factor pushing President Nasser of Egypt into provoking war with Israel in 1967 so that he could not be accused of weakness or appear less militant than the Syrians. One senses it as a factor in the personalities of Johnson and Nixon in regard to withdrawing from Vietnam; there was that horrid doubt, "Shall I look soft?" It was clearly present in Kennedy too; on the other hand it does not seem to have bothered Eisenhower, Truman or FDR.

A classic case of man's temperament obscuring the evidence is brought out by John Davies in his recent book, "Dragon by the Tail." Stalin's greatest error, he points out, was to underestimate Chinese Communism. He was deceived by his own cynicism. He did not think Mao could make it because, astonishingly enough, of his own too little faith in the power of a people's war.

Of all the barriers that reports from the field must beat against, the most impenetrable is the capacity of policy-makers to disbelieve what they do not want to believe. All the evidence of a German right-wing thrust obtained by the French General Staff in the years immediately preceding 1914, including authentic documents sold to them by a German officer, could not divert them from their own fatal plan of attack through the center or persuade them to prepare a defense on the left. In 1941 when the double agent Richard Sorge in Tokyo reported to Moscow the exact dates of the coming German invasion, his warning was ignored because the Russians' very fear of this event caused them not to believe it. Examples from military affairs are particularly distinct but the principle operates equally in the diplomatic field, in fact dominated Washington's reception of the reports from China in the 1940s. No matter how much evidence was reported indicating that the collapse of the Kuomintang was only a matter of time, nothing could induce Washington to loosen the silver cord tying us to Chiang Kai-shek nor rouse the policy-makers from what John Service in a courageous report accurately called their "indolent short-term expediency."

National myths are another obstacle in the way of realism. The American instinct of activism, the Can Do myth, has lately led us into evil that was not necessary and has blotted the American record beyond the power of time to whiten. I notice that Stewart Alsop made the interesting point yesterday in the New York Times book review that American Presidents since Roosevelt have disliked the State Department and leaned heavily on the military because the military tend to be brisk can-do problem-solvers while senior foreign service officers tend to be "skeptical examiners of the difficulties;" and they worried uncertain presidents will prefer positive to negative advice. You will remark that Mr. Alsop's phenomenon coincides with the era of air power and has much to do, I think, with the enormous attraction of the easy solution—the idea that a horrid problem can be solved by fiat from the air, without contact, without getting mixed up in a long dirty business on the ground. The influence of air power on policy-making would make an interesting study.

Activism in the past, the impulse to improve a bad situation, to seek a better land, to move on to a new frontier, has been a

great force, the great force in our history, with positive results when it operates in a sphere we can control. In Asia that is not the case, and the result has been disaster. Disregarding local realities, and depth of motivation, disregarding such a lesson as Dien Bien Phu, we feel impelled to take action rather than stay out of trouble. It would help if we could learn occasionally to leave things alone and let them seek an indigenous solution.

The most baneful myth of our time has been the myth of the Communist monolith. We now discover happily if belatedly that the supposed Sino-Soviet unity is in fact a bitter antagonism of two rivals wrapped in hate, fear, and mutual suspicion. The error has been the costliest since the myth that appeasement could contain Hitler. It never had much to do with facts but was rather a reflection of fears and prejudices. Knee-jerk reactions to fear and prejudice are not the best guide to a useful foreign policy, which I would define as the conduct of relations and exercise of influence in the service of an enlightened self-interest.

The question remains, what can be done to narrow the gap between information from the field and policy-making at home. First, it remains essential to maintain the integrity of foreign service reporting, not only for the sake of what may get through, but to provide the basis for a change of policy when the demand becomes imperative. Second, some means must be found to require that preconceived motions and emotional fixations be periodically tested against the evidence. Perhaps legislation could be enacted to enforce a regular pause for rethinking, for questioning the wisdom of an accepted course of action, for cutting one's losses if necessary.

Failing that, I pass to a final suggestion which is not proposed as a joke: it is to abolish the presidency, because it seems to me that too much power and therefore too much risk is now subject to the idiosyncrasies of a single individual at the top who ever he may be. I would substitute a committee of five to be elected as a slate put forward by each party, and to have a single five-year term with a rotating chairman, each to serve for one year. The idea needs a little working out which I leave for the moment to anyone here who may want to consider it.

By a circuitous route I come to Jack Service, the focus of this meeting.

Mr. Service was born in China in the Province of Szechuan, the son of missionary parents serving with the YMCA. His youth was spent in China until he returned to the United States to attend Overland College from which he graduated in 1932. He also acquired a classmate as wife. Anyone who knows Caroline Service will recognize this as an early example of Jack's good judgement. After passing the Foreign Service exams, he returned to China because no openings were available during the Depression, and entered the Foreign Service by way of a clerk's job in Kunming. Commissioned as a Foreign Service officer in 1935, he served in Peking and Shanghai, and joined the Embassy in Chungking in 1941. During the war years he served half his time in the field, seeing realities outside the miasma of the capitol. This opportunity culminated when after being attached to Stilwell's staff, he served as political officer with the American Military Observers Mission to Yenan, the first official American contact with the Communists. His series of conversations with Mao, Chou En Lai, Chu Teh, Lin Piao, and other leaders, embodied in his vivid almost verbatim reports and perceptive comments, are a historical source of prime and unique importance. Equally impressive are the ex-

amples that show Service passionately trying to persuade and convince the policy makers, as in the brief prepared for Vice President Wallace in June 1944 and the famous Acheson telegram to the Department, largely drafted by Service—a desperate effort by the Embassy staff to halt the Hurley drift down the rapids with Chiang Kai-shek. If there was passion in this it was at least informed passion.

Following arrests in the Amerasia affair in 1945, Service was exonerated and cleared, and promoted in 1948 to Class 2 officer—only to be plunged back under all the old charges of 1949 when the Communist victory in China set off our national hysteria, and put Senator McCarthy, in strange alliance with the China Lobby, in charge of the American soul. If Chiang Kai-shek were to keep American support it was imperative that the "loss" of China so called, should be seen as no failure from inside but work of some outside subversive conspiracy. That spectre exactly fitted certain native American needs. Along with others, Service suffered the consequences. Despite a series of acquittals, he was pinned with a doubt of loyalty and dismissed from the Foreign Service by Secretary Acheson in 1951, as Davies and Vincent were subsequently dismissed by Secretary Dulles. Six years of pursuing redress through the courts finally brought a unanimous verdict in his favor by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1957. He rejoined the Foreign Service but was kept out of any assignment that would use his knowledge and experience of China. When it was clear that the Kennedy Administration would offer no better, Service resigned in 1962 and has since served with the Center for Chinese Studies at the University of California in Berkeley.

Fortunately for the record and the reputation of the Foreign Service, the reports of Service and his colleagues from China in the 1940s are now where anyone can consult them—in the published volumes of *U.S. Foreign Relations, China Series*. Under the inflexible verdict of history, they stand up.

I am honored to present to you Mr. John Service.

OPENING REMARKS BY WILLIAM C. HARROP, CHAIRMAN, AMERICAN FOREIGN SERVICE ASSOCIATION

I am pleased to welcome all of you on behalf of the seven thousand members of the American Foreign Service Association. We are indeed honored that so many distinguished Americans wished to participate in this occasion.

For 55 years, this Association has helped build and maintain a strong operating arm of United States foreign policy. Foreign Service Officers and supporting Foreign Service staff personnel man our 250 diplomatic and consular missions. We are commissioned by the President. The Foreign Service of the United States is responsible for the conduct of the international programs of the entire government. We serve the Secretary of State, but we also serve and help staff other federal agencies and departments. The President may take advantage of our expertise in whatever way he finds most useful. We are proud of our record, of our service to our country, of our dedication to the constitution of the United States.

I believe that over the years the Foreign Service has consistently demonstrated that greatest loyalty a political leader can demand from a career service: complete and honest professionalism.

One of the best examples of this kind of loyalty was the performance of so many Foreign Service Officers in China during World War II, and of others concerned with Chinese matters back in Washington.

I believe we have much to learn from the example of these men and from the history of their era. I am delighted to see a number of them in this room—Edmund Clubb, Robert Barnett, Fulton Freeman, John Service, Arthur Ringwalt, Walton Butterworth, and others. I am especially pleased that Mrs. John Carter Vincent could be with us. I wish others such as John Paton Davies, Edward Rice, Raymond Ludden, John Melby, James Penfield, and Philip Sprouse could have joined us also.

President Nixon has opened a new and hopeful phase in the relations between the United States and China. This is a fitting moment to honor a generation of Foreign Service Officers whose dedication and professional honesty was ill-paid by many of their countrymen.

To help us learn from the lessons of history, we are greatly honored to hear today from Barbara Tuchman and John Service. Mrs. Tuchman, as you all know, has twice won the Pulitzer Prize for her brilliant books, *The Guns of August* and *Stilwell and the American Experience in China, (1911-45)*. She will introduce Mr. Service.

Let me close by telling you what one of our honored guests, one of the China hands, said to me in response to our invitation to this luncheon: "I never thought I'd live to see the day".

The American Foreign Service Association is pleased that we have been able to make this day possible.

Ladies and Gentlemen, Mrs. Barbara Tuchman.

REMARKS BY JOHN S. SERVICE

Let me, first of all, say simply that my family and I appreciate your invitation to be here.

In a sense, though, I'm here in the wrong role. As an old and continuing member of this Association, I should be introducing Barbara Tuchman.

There have been some very kind remarks about us "old China hands." I particularly appreciate the mention of John Carter Vincent. We all knew him as a staunch friend, and as a capable, courageous and loyal chief. He was the man who should be standing here today.

The group of officers you are remembering today have some things in common—beyond shared experiences in China and in post-China. One of these is that in China we were primarily political reporting officers. But another is that we are all strong-minded individuals. To pretend to speak for this group would be foolhardy—and presumptuous. I speak, then, for myself alone.

If, by some miracle, the clock could be turned back and I had my life to relive, I would still wish to be a Foreign Service officer. But if denied that choice, my second wish would be a career as a foreign correspondent. The link, of course, is the absorbing quest to observe, understand, and report in depth what is really happening in a foreign society: to get beneath the superficial, pick up the important, underlying trends—and from that basis to try to look into the future.

Classified policy matters aside, this common reporting goal often makes natural allies of the FSO and press abroad. Many of the best brains I've picked have been those of newspapermen: American, Chinese, and foreign. A junior officer, nebulously assigned to the American Army in Chungking, would be told to "get lost" if he sought interviews with august figures such as T. V. Soong or Generalissimo Chiang. The same questions might just as well—or even better—be put by a representative of the world press, who could get a private interview. It was my good fortune that we had a remarkably able group of

correspondents in Chungking during the war: my debt to them, as friends and colleagues, is immense.

Obviously, reporting is not merely a glamorous, exciting pastime. It is utterly basic to the intelligent formulation of a realistic foreign policy. And to keeping it up-to-date. Without facts, and an understanding of those facts (which may often be tenuous and largely intangible because they involve people and attitudes rather than quantifiable items in the national balance sheet), our policy makers are flying blind. And even being hard-nosed in a condition of blindness is not to be recommended.

Of course, the Foreign Service officer has many functions other than political reporting: you can name them as well as I. I submit, though, that none is more vital to the country, or more rewarding to the individual, than reporting. It was the best, most satisfying part of my own career. But, again, I was fortunate in having some unusual opportunities.

Twenty-three hundred years ago, a Chinese scholar of strategy said: Know your enemy, know yourself; a hundred battles without danger. Much of our policy toward China and Vietnam since World War II has been a negative example of Sun Tzu's wisdom. Of course, the other side has also had some problems knowing us.

But the value of reporting is far broader than "knowing the enemy." We must also know and understand the problems and attitudes of friends, and neutrals—if we are to continue to have cooperative friends and non-antagonistic neutrals.

Reporting obviously varies. From some countries (such as the developed, free press countries of Western Europe), the flow of information is so great that Foreign Service reporting may play a relatively unimportant role. Elsewhere, reporting may have to be done from a distance, or under severe limitations. Kremlinology, refugee interviews, the piecing together of rumors try to fill the gap. History and social science research can make a contribution, but may often apply more to the past than the present.

Foreign Service reporting becomes vital as we move toward countries that may be small, less developed, non-white, or with cultures and institutions drastically different from our own.

I have yet to learn of a computerized prediction that Mao's people-based forces would defeat the vastly larger, better-equipped, American-trained armies of Chiang Kai-shek; or that Mao would turn against his party and carry the country with him in the astonishing Cultural Revolution. There is a limit but also much truth in Mao's idea that man and his spirit are more important than machines.

I recently heard a talk by a man who has spent many years, up to the present, as a China-watcher in Hong Kong. His gist was that all the recent American visitors to China since ping-pong diplomacy and the President's visit had learned little that was not already known to his craft in Hong Kong. When the chance came for questions, I had two: Had he applied for a visa to China? And, if granted, would he go? The answer to both was an unqualified affirmative.

Confucius seems not to have said: "One picture is worth a thousand words." But perhaps one can coin another phrase: One close look is worth a thousand distant guesses. There is no real substitute for being on the ground. The briefings and lectures I listened to during my recent trip to China meant less than being able freely to walk city streets and country paths and to travel some 6500 miles—with eyes and ears open.

Political reporting, if worthy of the name, is nonpolitical. My two chiefs, Ambassador Gauss and General Stilwell, both anathema to the China Lobby, were both—so far as I

know—staunch, life-long Republicans. But their views and reports of the facts in China were inseparable from those of their subordinates whose inclination in American affairs might be Democratic or plain liberal.

We who served in China during the 1940s have awaited—for what has seemed an excessively long time—the publication of the annual China volumes in the fat, red-bound series, *Foreign Relations of the United States*. They have just reached 1947. The product has been worth a wait. These are an admirable, objective, and complete presentation of the historical record. There has been no attempt, so far as I can see, to doctor that record, to make it look better than it actually was. Everything is there: Including reports and views that pointed in directions other than the policy finally adopted. Perhaps I may be bold here with a collective "old China hands" word of appreciation for the uncompromising honesty and high professional quality of these works of the Historical Office. Personally, I shall also look forward with anticipation—hopefully before 1990—to reading what Foreign Service officers on the ground in Vietnam were actually reporting in 1963, 1964, and 1965.

One notable thing about the record shown in the *Foreign Relations* volumes is the broad unanimity in the Foreign Service political reporting from China. A few of us (like John Davies, Ray Ludden, and myself) may have been more ready to propose policy conclusions and recommendations. But in substance, our reports, though they received publicity and unmerited notoriety, were not different from those of the many other Foreign Service officers reporting from the Embassy and all over the country. I say this, of course, not to spread the onus; but to suggest that any credit for being "right" must be widely shared.

Successive volumes extend the picture. When the "first generation" of reporters became unacceptable to the fixed ideas of Ambassador Hurley, new men were brought in: Men with "fresh minds"—supposedly without "bias" or "preconceptions." To meet these standards, it was obviously necessary to assign men who had not been recently in China. Many were assigned without any previous experience in the country. But very soon the reports of all these men came to sound very much like those of the men they had replaced. The "truth" of China did not change.

There's more to reporting, of course, than merely being on the ground. In October 1946 I arrived in Wellington, New Zealand, as Deputy Chief of Mission. It was just before a national election. Ambassador Avra Warren, an old professional, had assigned a young, new-minted third secretary the task of making an analysis and electoral prediction. Fouch day was upon us—our last chance to get a prediction to Washington. The Ambassador thought the third secretary a capable young man—"likely to do well in the Service"—but had grave reservations about his prognosis. The third secretary conceded that the election would be close, but firmly concluded that Labour (the incumbents) would win by certainly three, and probably four seats. "Hell," said the Ambassador, "almost all the press supports the Tories; everyone I know outside the government is going to vote Tory; and everyone tells me the Tories are going to win." Furthermore, the Ambassador had a theory (call it history or political science) that democracies change parties after a long war. The Democrats, he pointed out, lost in 1920; and Winston Churchill in 1945.

My immediate task was to read the report and advise whether it should go forward. I knew nothing about New Zealand politics. Having transferred direct from Tokyo, there had not even been the chance for a briefing by the country desk. So I talked to the

understandably up-tight third secretary about his sources, and how he had gone about collecting the information for what appeared to be a superbly documented, realistic analysis. On this basis, I told the Ambassador that I thought we should send it. In contrast to at least one other Ambassador I have known, he took my advice.

The wait seemed long but election day finally came. Labour did win by four seats, but one seat was so close that for a while it seemed that the margin might be only three.

A few comments. Most important, the report was right—right on the button. That's what the game is all about. But more. The officer had a talent for developing contact among the right people—though in this case the right people were clearly to the left of the Ambassador's circle. Furthermore, those contacts led to the development of useful information; we've all seen high-powered social types who "know everybody" but somehow lack a nose for news. And finally, he knew what to do with the information. Some officers accumulate a terrific amount of data in their heads or personal files; but it doesn't mean a thing in the Department if they can't organize it to produce a cogent and timely report.

Also the reporting officer had done his work so well that he had the courage of his conclusions—despite the intimidating effect (even if not intended) of the Ambassador's doubts. The Ambassador deserves credit, too, for a broad concept of reporting, and for willingness to trust the judgment of the reporting officer.

Incidentally, the young third secretary was Marshall Green. The Ambassador's early judgment, that he was a man of promise, was indeed correct.

We have been looking at reporting from the American angle. Perhaps a New Zealand echo of this story may not be irrelevant. In 1948, as some of us will recall, everyone (and I mean everyone) was sure that Truman was going to lose. In a conversation with an officer from New Zealand External Affairs a few weeks before the election, I was surprised to have him say: "What are you chaps so excited about? Our Embassy in Washington tells us that Truman is going to win."

Obviously, to be most effective, the reporting officer needs some freedoms. If his reporting is to get beyond clipping newspapers and collecting published statistics, he should not be overly tied to a desk. If he is going to be able to travel about the countryside and succeed in getting close to people, he may need time, encouragement, and facilities for intensive country specialization and language training—and some assurance that the time committed to gaining such in-depth specialization will not penalize him in the competitive rat-race for promotion. Finally, he needs freedom in his contacts in order to get beyond the local elites and the particular party that, for the time being, may be holding (or monopolizing) power.

My assignment at the Embassy in Chungking and later for two years with the Army gave me these freedoms in what—for the Foreign Service—was perhaps an almost unprecedented degree. Without those freedoms, my reporting would have been much more limited—and you probably would not have invited me here today.

It is interesting, though, to recall that when I first suggested in January 1943 that the Kuomintang-Communist struggle for power was going to engulf all policy considerations in China, and that the only adequate way to inform ourselves on the attitudes and strength of the Communists was to send Foreign Service reporting officers to Yenan, my proposal was met in the top echelons of FE with much tongue-clucking and grave head-shaking—in a negative direction. I and others did, of course, eventually get to Yenan. But only because there was a change of guard

in FE (with men recently in touch with the actual situation in China—such as John Carter Vincent—taking over). And also because, while State approved and desired our going there, it could be done under the convenient guise of our working for the U.S. Army.

There are still countries—in Latin America, Africa, and parts of Asia—where the situation is not unlike that in China during the 1940's. If we keep ourselves in ignorance and out of touch with new popular movements and potentially revolutionary situations, we may find ourselves again missing the boat. The proper measure of such reporting should not be popular sentiment in the United States as reflected in some segments of the press, or by some Congressional committees not charged with foreign relations. The legacy of Senator Joe McCarthy still needs, in some respects, to be shed.

Sometimes, of course, the reporting is in vain. It may, for various reasons be ignored—or, in effect, rejected—by the President and policy-makers in Washington. This has been well discussed by Barbara Tuchman. But, from the viewpoint of the Department, this should not reduce the value of reporting.

There are many countries, as I have noted, where—despite the information explosion of modern news media and academic research—the Foreign Service reporter is still in a position to be the best, most current, and only steadily available source of reliable information. For State to reduce its flow of sound, reliable reporting from the field is, I suggest, a sure method of slow suicide.

Where does the reporting officer stand in all this? First of all, he has his responsibility to State and the American government. That responsibility is to report the facts conscientiously as he finds them. If the government dislikes or ignores his reports, that does not relieve him from his responsibility as a reporting officer. When Ambassador Hurley resigned in 1945 with strong charges against the reporting of some of us in China, Secretary of State Byrnes replied:

"I should be profoundly unhappy to learn that an officer of the Department of State, within or without the Foreign Service, might feel bound to refrain from submitting through proper channels an honest report or recommendation for fear of offending me or anyone else in the Department. If that day should arrive, I will have lost the very essence of the assistance and guidance I require for the successful discharge of the heavy responsibilities of my office."

But the reporter is also in a sense, writing for himself—for his own conception of what good reporting should be, and for his own integrity. Most definitions of good reporting would suggest that it involves more than a mere recital of facts: it also means an ability and willingness to draw conclusions from those facts. If one shirks from having to write reports that may lead to unpopular conclusions, then perhaps reporting is not your line.

The reporter owes something, too, to history. He watches history being made, wherever he is. It may be a relatively quiet backwater. Or he may be very close to momentous events—as I was to the World-changing revolution of a half a billion people—that make insignificant his role as an individual. But whatever the magnitude of the events he observes, or his distance from their vortex, the reports he writes today will be part of the history of tomorrow. And if he writes them when he is young enough, he may see that tomorrow come.

I wish I could say, after all this, that the Foreign Service itself has always supported the value of reporting and area expertise. I imagine we can all think of negative examples: they have not been few. Let me take an example from my own branch of the service.

When the Sino-Japanese War commenced and the Japanese occupied Shantung in 1937 and 1938, our consul in Tsingtao was Samuel Sokobin. He was a capable, conscientious officer—a China specialist of long experience. As often the case, he had come to have a genuine liking and respect for the Chinese. Eventually, Chinese guerrillas began to be active in Shantung. Soon the Chinese press was carrying dramatic accounts of heroic exploits in crippling the Japanese-held railways and denying the Japanese the important agricultural and mineral resources of the province. In his post at the main port, and making intelligent use of excellent contacts in shipping and business circles, Sokobin came to realize the gross exaggeration in these claims. The Japanese were maintaining and even increasing the flow of these strategic materials to Japan.

Sokobin did not consider that a responsible officer needed to be told when (or what) to report. He commenced a series of reports thoroughly documenting the success of the Japanese in countering the guerrillas and in exploiting the resources of their occupied territory. He should, of course, have been commended; but the reaction his reports received was very different. He was upsetting the picture, then the accepted line, of a Chinese resistance not only brave but also effective. Sokobin's reports were harshly depreciated. He was cruelly and ridiculously accused of being "pro-Japanese." And, with a perverted idea of justice, his transfer was arranged to Kobe, Japan. He was never, thereafter, returned to service in China.

Sokobin's career might never have reached the heights—one can never know. But in 1947 he finished 33½ years of loyal service as Class 3 and consul in Birmingham.

This was long before McCarthy had become a senator. The United States was neutral in the Sino-Japanese War, and there was no outside high level pressure. It was entirely an internal State Department affair: in fact, it was done by the China branch to one of their own. Perhaps, in this matter of valuing the integrity and honesty of field reporting, few of us are beyond reproach.

THE 55TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN STATE

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Lithuanian descent who observed the 722d anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian state and the 55th anniversary of the modern Republic of Lithuania on February 16, can take hope that a new thrust for freedom will emerge from the promised generation of peace that lies ahead.

Lithuanians have fought for freedom and justice since the founding of their Republic. They have fought for it in America—for Americans and free people everywhere. They have fought for it for those restricted in their homeland under the steel boot of communism.

Lithuanian Americans will never cease in the fight for freedom. We who know freedom well will fight beside them until final victory. Mankind will settle for no less; this Congress of the United States should and must affirm that it will stand for no less—total freedom for those denied it today.

LEGISLATION CALLING FOR THE INVESTIGATION OF PRICE IN- CREASES IN LUMBER AND PLY- WOOD

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would seek permission to enter a resolution in the House of Representatives calling for an immediate investigation into the continued increase of lumber and plywood for domestic use. Lumber and plywood prices increased despite the controls of phase II; and under the controls of phase III these same prices have soared to limits without regard to quality, fairness, or equity. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the domestic market balance is being upset by the tremendous demand that is being exerted by foreign buyers upon the lumber production in our country.

In the past 6 months the average price of homes in our country has risen an additional \$1,200 on an average scale. I ask who is to bear this burden, and the answer is quite simple. The prospective homebuyers in our country, who must bear this additional cost in purchasing homes, can ill afford to bear the effects of the continued rate of price increase that is prevalent in the construction industry for the price of lumber and plywood.

Due in large part to the volume of lumber exports to foreign nations, lumber prices have and will continue to soar at unchecked rates. Mr. Speaker, the great increase in lumber prices in the last year, and in particular the last few months, threatens the homebuilding industry and the homebuilding public. The problem, Mr. Speaker, is quite clear and requires our immediate attention. The ramifications that may occur to our Nation require that we achieve a solution to this problem quickly.

For this reason, I wish to insert a resolution calling for immediate investigations into the disastrous state of affairs of the lumber and plywood market.

The resolution reads as follows:

H. RES. —

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and requested to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the high price of lumber and plywood.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary; except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee

designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House on or before June 1973 the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

NEWSLETTERS

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the Extensions of Remarks my March 1, 1973, Newsletter, which is mailed on a monthly basis to constituents in Florida's Third Congressional District:

MARCH 1, 1973.

DEAR FRIENDS: The figures are now in on the amount of federal aid that has come to our area in the last fiscal year. During Fiscal Year 1972, federal money came to Duval County through 28 federal agencies, in the amount of \$556,878,554, an increase of \$82,818,230 over the money obtained in Fiscal Year 1971. The per capita return of federal dollars to Duval County during the last fiscal year was \$1053. Seventy-two per cent of all funds received was from the Department of Defense and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Nassau County received a total of \$25,708,262 in federal money during Fiscal Year 1972 from 14 agencies. This is an increase of \$6,398,205 over the previous fiscal year. Eighty-three per cent of all federal funds received in Nassau County came from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Transportation. The per capita return of federal dollars to Nassau County during the last fiscal year was \$1246.

MY MAJOR LEGISLATIVE THRUSTS

Fiscal reform—My bill, H.R. 302 will require that both the House and Senate prepare their own budget recommendations to be compared with the President's budget request. Presently, we can only whittle away at the President's budget with information supplied largely by the White House. I believe a legislative budget could force the Congress to hold spending to available receipts, thereby saving billions of dollars.

Volunteer Army—More than 125 Members of Congress are now co-sponsoring my bill, H.R. 2644, the Voluntary Military Special Pay Act. This bill will provide incentives encouraging top quality men, working in critical areas, to make careers in the active military and reserves. The program will help insure a strong national defense and will save money by eliminating current ineffective military retention programs.

Lobbying reform—I have already requested reports and hearings on my bill H.R. 303. This bill would require more careful reporting by lobbyists and provide stiff penalties for inaccurate reporting.

Environment—More than 100 Members of Congress have joined me in my archeological preservation bill, H.R. 3582. The bill sets aside limited amounts of money for studying the past of an area before a federal project disrupts the terrain.

Votes by your Congressman since the beginning of the 93rd Congress: for Carl Albert, for Speaker of the House; for the new Rules of the House; against considering the cre-

ation of a new committee to study House committees; against the R.E.A.P. agriculture bill; for an amendment that would have reduced the money in that bill to current expected needs and for restricting that bill to low income farmers.

Gratefully,

CHARLES E. BENNETT,
Member of Congress.

"MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM," 26TH ANNUAL VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, the voice of democracy scholarship program sponsored by the VFW and its ladies auxiliary is conducted annually in our Nation's secondary schools during the fall term. It is a national broadcast scriptwriting program which provides an opportunity for 10th-, 11th- and 12th-grade students in our public, private, and parochial schools to think, write and speak up for freedom and democracy.

"My Responsibility to Freedom," theme for the VFW's 26th annual voice of democracy scholarship program, focuses the attention of youth on the principle that freedom is a responsibility and not a license. It calls upon the youth of America to make a personal evaluation of their responsibility in preserving our freedom heritage.

Participating students prepare and transcribe on magnetic tape a 3- to 5-minute broadcast script addressing their remarks to the theme "My Responsibility to Freedom." At each level of judging—school, community, district, State, and national—winners are selected from the evaluation of the judges using three basic criteria. These criteria and the maximum point value assigned to each are: content, 45; originality, 35; and delivery, 20.

Upward of 500,000 students from over 7,000 secondary schools participated in this year's 26th annual voice of democracy program.

Each State winner receives an all-expense-paid trip to Washington, D.C., March 2-7, 1973, and competes for one of five national scholarship awards provided by the VFW. The first-place winner receives a \$10,000 scholarship to the school of his or her choice; second place, \$5,000; third place, \$3,500; fourth place, \$2,500; and fifth place, \$1,500. In addition, the monetary value of scholarships and awards presented by the VFW and its ladies auxiliary to the winners at the post, county, district, and department levels will be in excess of \$300,000 this year.

During the 5 days in Washington, D.C., the State winners have an opportunity to meet their U.S. Senators and Representatives, visit the shrines and monuments in our Nation's Capital, and observe firsthand the workings of our Federal Government.

The voice of democracy program was originated by the broadcasting industry and the U.S. Office of Education 26 years ago, and for over a quarter of a century now it has had the continuing support of the National and State associations of broadcasters and secondary school principals. Broadcasters and educators alike have been enthusiastic in their endorsement of the voice of democracy program and have contributed generously of their time and expertise in the program's development.

This year's winner in Delaware is Sheila McBride, of Wilmington. She is a senior at the Ursuline Academy and hopes to continue her studies at the Immaculata College. I think her winning essay shows a deep understanding and appreciation of democracy. At this point in the Record I would like to insert her comments because I think they eloquently remind us of our precious heritage.

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

My responsibility to freedom is similar to the creation of a flame. A small twig placed in the darkness is lit, casting forth a minute but definite light. After a brief glistening, it flickers and blackness slowly creeps in. Again an attempt is tried—and a single twig is lit. Yet this time, it is set afire along with many others. Working as one, the twigs create a strong and blinding flame that shatters the darkness to radiate light and warmth. As twigs are supplied as kindle, the flame grows stronger and stronger—but if it is neglected, the once brilliant flame will diminish and only a charred gray pile of ashes remain.

Freedom is similar to that flame. For if it is to flourish and shine forth in America, responsibility is the essential fuel for its life. Like each small twig, each individual has a responsibility to that freedom.

As an individual, I must do my part in order for freedom to survive. To do this, I must first consider my freedom a privilege and not something that can be taken for granted. In the past years of our United States' history, some men have gone to battle and lost their lives in order that freedom may be insured. Although I won't be an infantryman, fighting in a far away land, I can do my share while remaining in my own country.

My responsibility to freedom begins at home and in the community. Involvement is the key for freedom to exist. Like all Americans, I realize the problems that have arisen and I must become involved in their solving. If freedom is to glow in our country, all Americans must follow through in their responsibilities. For, if any person, including myself, turns his back in neglect, our country will change into a pile of charred gray ashes.

Responsibility to freedom includes the spreading of equality and abolishing of injustice; the working towards world harmony, and the aiming toward the insured freedoms of speech, press, and religious worship. Besides this responsibility to the human race, we have a responsibility to our environment. We must clean up our lands and waters in order to insure the continuation of life.

I cannot accomplish all of this throughout the entire world, but I can do it on a smaller scale while working in my community. I am able to treat men as equals and I am capable of controlling the litter in my community. Finally, I can preserve my freedoms of speech, press, and religion by choosing to use them maturely and respectfully.

If I can accomplish this in my lifetime, then freedom can be passed on to our next generation. Like the flame, freedom will illuminate America's way, and if all Americans

work together, that freedom will become blinding in force.

"MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM"

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for the 26th consecutive year, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies auxiliary with the support of the National Association of Broadcasters and secondary school administrators throughout the Nation, have conducted the voice of democracy scholarship program. More than half a million 10th, 11th and 12th grade students in public, private and parochial schools in every State have participated in this year's program by preparing short speeches on the subject of "My Responsibility to Freedom."

This year's Wisconsin State winner is Debra Hartkemeyer, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Lester A. Hartkemeyer, 1503 Fairway Street, Eau Claire. Debra is a senior at Eau Claire Memorial High School and will be attending the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire next fall to prepare for a career in special education. She has been active as a board member of the youth association for retarded children and won awards for her musical and forensic talents.

Debra's prize-winning entry demonstrates her personal commitment to extending to others the personal freedom which she has so appreciated in her life. I commend her special thoughts to the Members of the House and to all Americans concerned about the present and future health of democracy and freedom in the United States. Our cherished ideals and institutions for which many have sacrificed so much are in safe hands with Debra Hartkemeyer and the youth of our country today.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY—"MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM"

(By Debra Hartkemeyer)

I had a dream, and in my dream I found myself standing before a little girl with tears in her eyes, crying out for help. I was told she had been in a traffic accident and had lost a large quantity of blood. But, she was a rare blood type and I was the type she needed. Her little hand reached out to me and she beckoned me, calling, "Please, take my hand, help me." But, I was afraid, so afraid that I awoke leaving the dream unfinished. And I realized that what I dreamt held a deeper meaning.

I had been reading just the day before the words of the late John F. Kennedy, when he told us, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." And I thought to myself, "What am I doing here? What is the purpose of my life in America?" I knew that the conception of this country had been brought about for one reason, and that reason was freedom. Then I realized what the dream meant.

Freedom is the lifeblood of America. If we cut off that blood America will die, just as the little girl in my dream needed blood to live; and it was up to me to give her blood,

just as it is up to me and everyone else like me to see that the blood of America, freedom, is kept flowing.

But, this is not where my responsibility ends, for I am only one link in the chain. My life is only one cycle of a never ending circle. I must help everyone realize their responsibility and make sure this responsibility to freedom does not die with me. I hold the key, the key to open the door of hope and faith for all those people who do not know freedom. Just as Moses led his people to the land of milk and honey, it is up to each of us to lead the others to the land of freedom. We must keep freedom a reality for all time, for all people, not just for one short lifespan. The authors of the Constitution recognized this when they set the guidelines for governing our country. And we recognize our responsibility today, for there is a new individualism sweeping the country. We are standing up to be counted in the move toward the new realization. Collectively, as one large mass, we are telling the world, we want to keep our country alive with the same basic principles that America was born with—freedom. If this means defending our country we will do so, and with the great emphasis put on women and their rights in the world today we are now able to have a greater share of this responsibility as women.

Charles Reich, in the Greening of America, summed up this new awareness. "There is a revolution coming. It will not be like revolutions of the past. It will not require violence to succeed. Its ultimate creation will be a new and enduring wholeness and beauty, a renewed relationship of man to himself, to other men, to society." We recognize our responsibility and are willing to accept it.

I never knew exactly why I was afraid to take that little girl's hand. Perhaps I've grown up a little since then, perhaps I've finally come to realize part of an ideal I've always had but could never before voice, but I had that dream again. The little girl called out to me, "Please, take my hand, help me." And I took her hand.

WHY NOT WOMEN?

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the late Dr. Alice Hamilton, a great American that dedicated her life to improving the standards of occupational health safety. Frank Wallick, Washington Report editor, stated concerning President Nixon's "token" women appointment:

The late Dr. Alice Hamilton was the founder of the occupational health movement in this nation, and there are many outstanding women scientists, lawyers, trade union leaders, and government officials who could make the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 work for the good of the working people.

The number of women presently holding top level administrative positions within the administration is far less than acceptable for today's standards. Within the Labor Department, only 10 out of 146 top civil service positions are held by women. One can no longer assume that there are not qualified women, who easily handle administrative responsibilities.

ity. Educational institutions all over the Nation are awarding graduate degrees to women in areas ranging from electrical engineering to biophysics, and more and more women are gaining experience in a broad range of American and foreign industries.

Within the field of occupational safety, it is especially appalling that the women who worked so hard for protective legislation are now found unacceptable to fill positions in the safety administration. Dr. Alice Hamilton is a prime example. From 1910 to 1919, she was an investigator of industrial poisons for the U.S. Department of Labor. Her work included industrial toxicology in many dangerous industries, such as lead smelting, painting, printing, the manufacture of white and red lead, storage batteries, pottery, rubber goods, aniline dyes, as well as the mining of copper and mercury.

Dr. Hamilton was involved in numerous other government-oriented safety and health work directed toward promoting legislation; yet during that period her position remained nonsalaried. To this day, there is not one woman in a grade over a GS-15 within the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

Women make up a tremendously large portion of America's work force. Many of them are not only well educated but equally as qualified for high level private and Government positions as their male counterparts.

KOREANS: THE INVISIBLE AMERICANS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a rather eloquent article written by Mr. Ken Wong, a widely respected journalist for the San Francisco Examiner. The article deals with the problems that many Korean-Americans face in the course of being assimilated into the American way of life and still retaining a sense of cultural identity.

It is a paradoxical situation in which Korean-Americans find themselves due to the image that many Americans have of Japanese or Chinese-Americans. Many of our citizens automatically assume upon viewing a person with predominant oriental features that he or she is of Japanese or Chinese lineage. What happens is that many of our Korean Americans find themselves isolated from other segments of our society due to the principal fact that they are of Korean lineage.

Yet, Mr. Speaker in the last 5 years many advances have been made to ease the problem of assimilation, yet retaining the sense of ethnicity that has played such an important role in the history of the settlement of our country. I urge that my colleagues peruse the article, while referring to comments that I made in

the RECORD of February 1 relating that a specific need existed that should be fulfilled in the creation of a Cabinet Committee on Asian-American Affairs. The creation of such a committee will enable citizens of all oriental backgrounds to realize their full potential as human beings and as citizens of our great Nation.

The article reads as follows:

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Dec. 18, 1972]

KOREANS: THE INVISIBLE AMERICANS

(By Ken Wong)

The rain must fall before the bamboo grows—a line from a Korean folk song. Really the blues.

Quick, name three Koreans.

Okay, the Kim Sisters.

After the dynamic musical trio, the names come harder.

Dr. Henry Moon, head of the pathology department at the University of California Medical Center, is one of 3000 Koreans in San Francisco. He has been chief pathologist at the Coroner's Office for 25 years.

Yet a police reporter on the beat for 26 years was under the impression, all this time, that Dr. Moon is Chinese. And that's the way the tanso (a bamboo flute) blows. No one knows the Koreans are around.

If the Japanese are the quiet Americans, the Koreans, who have resided here since the turn of the century, must be the invisible Americans.

Yet significant changes have come to the Korean community in the past five years. Its population has climbed dramatically. Korean-owned businesses have proliferated. Korean activities are growing.

Tom Kim, a 30 year old third generation Korean-American, is one of several persons trying to bring the community together.

"Koreans in America have always been loners, relying on personal strength," says Kim. "But to get things done nowadays, you need group action."

The emerging Koreans face an identity problem. Classified by the census as "other non-whites" along with Eskimos and Samoans and others, fragmented as a community and isolated as individuals, the Koreans are generally strangers to others and among themselves.

Many, because of their looks, are taken to be Japanese. Or because of their monosyllabic names—Whang, Chung, Choy, Kim—others are mistaken for Chinese.

There are 120,000 Koreans in the United States, according to Korean Consul General Chan Yoon.

The breakdown: Honolulu, 40,000; Los Angeles, 40,000; New York, 8000; Washington, D.C., 8000; Chicago, 6000; the Bay Area, 6000.

The early Korean immigrants here came mostly from Pyongan and Hwanghae provinces (north of the 38th parallel). Encouraged by missionaries to emigrate, a group of 93 contracted laborers went to Hawaii to work on sugar plantations in 1903. By 1910 some 11,000 were working there for 75 cents a day.

Later, those who had the \$28 steerage fare went to the mainland, where they worked on the railroads. They were paid \$1.20 to \$1.50 per day. Others worked on farms in Dinuba and Reedley in the San Joaquin Valley.

Anti-Asian feelings, always smoldering, flared in 1913 at Hemet Valley in Southern California. A local mob herded 100 or so Koreans and railroaded them out of town.

They were chased out because they were thought to be Japanese. A wry shot of irony. When the Russo-Japanese war ended in 1905, Korea became a protectorate of Japan and in 1910 was annexed outright. Koreans were cut off from their homeland.

CXIX—316—Part 4

Exiled intellectuals and patriots who managed to flee the country came here to organize their countrymen at home. They worked by day as hotel, restaurant and factory workers and at night plotted the overthrow of Japanese rule.

Then, as now, the Koreans in this country were small in numbers and disorganized. No Koreatown, no family associations, no lodges. The center of social life was the Korean Methodist Church, founded in 1906 with 50 members—total population of Koreans in The City at the time.

The church on California Street served as a clandestine headquarters for the Korean independence movement. Money was raised and sent home. Demonstrations drew attention to their struggle for freedom. The protest included violence.

On March 24, 1908, The Examiner headlined, "Durham W. Stevens, American Diplomat, Shot by Assassin."

Stevens, an American adviser appointed by the Japanese to the Korean court, was in The City. In an interview he praised the Japanese rule as "benevolent and in the best interest of the Koreans who are unable to govern themselves."

At the Ferry Building, Stevens was approached by Ming Woon Chun, a Korean student, who poked a revolver in front of the diplomat's face. The would-be assassin pulled the trigger. Nothing happened. He smashed the gun against his victim's head.

Stevens, a stout man, struck Chun, who began to run. Stevens grabbed his assailant.

From behind the crowd, In Whan Chang, another Korean student, fired a shot. The bullet struck Chun. Chang fired two more shots and hit Stevens in the back.

More bitter irony. The two Koreans were taken to be Japanese, by the crowd, with shouts of, "Lynch the Japs! They've killed a white man."

Chun recovered, but Stevens died two days later. Chang was found guilty of second degree murder and sentenced to prison for 25 years—but released in 1919. His case was a cause celebre for Koreans in the U.S. and Hawaii.

The Korean National Association (Kung Min Hoe) was organized in 1913 to unite diverse groups throughout the U.S. to join the independence movement.

There were other political and military moves. Men like Syngman Rhee and Ahn Chang-ho jockeyed for leadership. Guerrilla units were trained to link with those in Korea, but little happened.

On August 15, 1945, at the end of World War II, a divided Korea gained her independence, only to be plunged in 1950 into a civil war. It split the country near the 38th parallel after three years of bloodshed involving U.S. and Chinese armies.

Until 1960 only 300 Koreans were living in San Francisco. Like other Asians, they lived quietly, making no waves. Immigration laws were relaxed in 1967, and the influx began. Last year 14,000 Koreans entered the U.S.

One man who keeps track of the newcomers is the Rev. Charles C. Song, pastor of the Korean Methodist Church. Today it stands at 1123 Powell St. next to the Chinatown Public Library.

"Most of the newcomers head for New York. And many are students. We are proud of one thing. Over 70 percent of our people are college graduates," the Rev. Mr. Song said.

He finds the problem of adjustment the biggest for the newcomers. "Many suffer a loss of dignity. Here they are, educated and trained to be professionals, and they are selling kimchee in a grocery store," he said.

"It takes about two years for adjustment," he figured. "By and large, within five years

most are able to establish themselves. There are few failures."

South Korea is the most Christian nation in Asia with 2 million Protestants and 600,000 Catholics.

Song's Methodist Church is the largest Korean church in The City, with 300 members. Next are the Presbyterians at 1074 Guerrero St. with about a hundred.

There are some 50 Korean Catholics attending the St. Francis Xavier Mission for Japanese and Koreans at Pine and Octavia Streets. Here mass is said in Korean on the last Sunday of the month.

Among the parishioners at St. Francis Xavier is Mrs. Corona Shinn, the sister-in-law of Richie Shinn, a former lightweight boxer.

Shinn fought his way up from The Examiner's Golden Gloves in 1939 to the pro ranks and met the best of his time. A classmate of lightweight Ray Lunny at Commerce High School, he was Lunny's sparring partner before joining the Army in World War II.

Shinn retired shortly after a TKO loss to Art Aragon in 1948. Today, he is a mail carrier and teaches boxing to CYO youngsters.

There is Dolly Rhee, who was former San Francisco Chronicle editor Scott Newhall's personal secretary for 30 years. Her brother is Dr. Sammy Lee, the former Olympic diving champ and now a Santa Ana eye-ear-nose specialist. They are related to Syngman Rhee, the late Republic of Korea president. Miss Rhee admitted, "Most of my friends are Caucasians."

Likewise Jason Har's friends are mostly non-Koreans. The secretary-treasurer for S & C Motors spends most of his spare time with fellow Shriners. He lives in St. Francis Wood.

On the other side of the tracks are some 50 students, aged 20 to 30 at the Alemany Adult School. They work nights and weekends to support themselves. Most hope to go on to college. Their command of English is at a fourth grade level.

One student is Chan Woo Song, 26, a custodian at the San Francisco Baptist Theological Seminary. He hopes to teach Christian history. He has a fiancée at home in Seoul.

Great changes have occurred in the local Korean community the past five years.

The Korean House on Post Street was the only Korean restaurant in the Bay Area in 1965. Today there are 22. In 1965 there were only 50 Korean-owned businesses. Today there are some 300.

It is the newcomers who keep Korean tradition and culture going. Most local-born Koreans do not speak their parents' native tongue.

The new immigrants boosted the circulation of the Korea Times (Hankook Il Bo) to 12,000.

There is little contact between the American-born Koreans and the newcomers. Tom Kim, staff worker with the Development Project for Asian Americans, a government funded agency, tries to bridge the gap.

Kim's first move calls for a Bay Area Korean Coalition. Out of the coalition, Kim hopes, will come a Korean Service Center, including a day care center.

The day care center is mostly for the Korean War brides.

"I don't have figures. But they do have problems with an inability to deal with the system. It's a matter of acculturation. They come here and find they are not accepted by the husband's parents. Next thing, the marriage blows up," Kim said.

The coalition supported Mrs. Lenore (Ock Soon Kim) Blank's successful bid for a regular teaching position with the San Francisco Unified School District. She has been a substitute teacher for two years. Substitutes are paid less. She became the first Korean teacher in the school district.

MR. DOUGLAS K. RAMSEY RETURNS FROM CAPTIVITY

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Peter Arnett, which appeared in the New York Times on February 14, should be of general interest. It concerns the recent release by the Vietcong of Mr. Douglas K. Ramsey, a foreign service officer. Mr. Ramsey was captured by the Vietcong more than 7 years ago, while on a mission consistent with his concern about the civilian side of the conflict in South Vietnam. It is good to know that his protracted ordeal is now over.

CIVILIAN PRISONER, OBJECT OF BIG SEARCH, SHUFFLES BACK TO FREEDOM

(By Peter Arnett)

CLARK AIR BASE, THE PHILIPPINES, February 13.—He came off the plane shyly like most of the 26 other Americans released by the Vietcong yesterday.

He blinked in the glare of the television lights. His tall frame was slightly stooped and his face hollow and he walked a little unsteadily. But a small, happy smile came to his face when an American official clasped his shoulders to help him along the red carpet to a waiting hospital bus.

This was Douglas K. Ramsey of Boulder City, Nev., and the many other addresses, including Washington and Saigon, befitting a career officer in the United States State Department. The 38-year-old Mr. Ramsey's address for seven years has been somewhere in the jungles of South Vietnam.

The shy smile he revealed as he reached freedom late last night hid an inner fortitude and endurance that sustained him through the most terrible years of the Vietnam war.

Some spectators thought he was almost obsequious in his manner, particularly when he seemed to bow to the line of American officials. Doug Ramsey was always a polite, gentle man. His stoop could be attributed to the cruel existence in the jungles, living in tunnels and forever on the run with his captors.

It was Mr. Ramsey's fate to be captured by the Vietcong on the lonely road to a ranger training camp at Trung Lap, northwest of Saigon, on Jan. 5, 1966. As a reporter covering the war then, I had come to know and respect Mr. Ramsey for his quiet confidence, his proficiency in the Vietnamese language and his success in winning the people's confidence.

Just the day before his capture Mr. Ramsey, then an area development officer with the United States aid mission, had expressed concern about the increasing use of firepower by the American infantry then pouring into Vietnam.

It was this concern that took Mr. Ramsey up the lonely dirt road to Trung Lap. He wanted to urge the American brigade commander using it as a command post for a major field operation to be more cautious with his artillery because of the population density.

FRIENDS PURSUED SEARCH

Mr. Ramsey never did reach the camp. His pickup truck was stopped by a guerrilla roadblock and he was led into the jungle.

He disappeared, but his friends did not. In fact, the search for him became one of the legends of the Vietnam war.

Mr. Ramsey was blessed with the friendship of most of the brilliant American Govern-

ment field operatives attracted to Vietnam then. His closest friendship was with the late John Paul Vann, the energetic, volatile former military officer who was to rise to fame as the war grew longer.

Mr. Vann had been Mr. Ramsey's boss in Hau Ngia Province. They day he disappeared Mr. Vann rounded up several other Americans, and they began a week-long search of every hamlet in the province.

"We rode with grenades on our laps," Mr. Vann related. "We drove over paths that had not seen a vehicle in 10 years. We found Vietcong lazing on roadsides. We were shot at. But we did not get a hint of Doug's whereabouts."

As the months rolled on and the war widened, Mr. Vann became almost obsessed with the search for his protégé.

"He's like a son to me," Mr. Vann said, explaining why he was offering tens of thousands of dollars as a reward.

By late 1966 Mr. Vann had learned that Mr. Ramsey was in the hands of a battalion operating along the Saigon River. Later he learned that the Vietcong were using Mr. Ramsey as a teacher. Then there was solid information that he was seriously ill.

An effort to buy his release, in which the captured wife of a Vietcong province leader was to be used as an intermediary, failed.

Until Mr. Vann's death last June in a helicopter crash, he never lost hope. When Mr. Ramsey's name appeared on the prisoner list, provided by the Vietcong, my heart and, I know, that of many others jumped at the thought that Mr. Vann's faith had been justified.

When Mr. Ramsey stepped out of that hospital plane and the harsh lights picked up his gaunt features, his shuffle and his shy smile, I felt that at last the war might finally be over and that decent things could survive the worst kind of travail.

LITHUANIA

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join my colleagues in observance of the 55th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Since the 13th century, Lithuania has had a record of identity as a sovereign state. Her people have resisted all efforts to force them into a cultural and political mold that is foreign to them.

Invaded, fought over, conquered by brute force and larger numbers on many occasions, they nevertheless have always kept alive the memory of freedom.

They seized their chance for independence again when the czar's armies disintegrated, and on February 16, 1918, they proclaimed their republic. It was not their good fortune to be given many years of freedom. In 1939, they became a pawn of the grim struggle between the Nazi and Soviet empires. They were fought over in the savage years that followed. They have not yet been able to reestablish their independent government, but they have established their right to freedom.

The first land-reform law of modern Europe was a Lithuanian law. An education program was launched which reduced illiteracy to 15 percent after generations of foreign rule had left

two-thirds of the people unable to read and write.

Unfortunately, it is not possible for the Lithuanians on their farms and in their cities to celebrate this anniversary day, thanks to the Soviets. But it is with good cause that our State Department has refused, all through these years, to recognize as legal and right the Kremlin's claim that Lithuania has been swallowed up and extinguished, incorporated into the vast Communist empire.

Nations do not die merely because some other nation decimates or drives out their leaders and puts quislings and puppets in their stead. The love of freedom is powerful and enduring; the spark of liberty is not easily put out. Wherever the children of the Lithuanian people dwell today, they have the right to work in all proper ways toward independence for us to recognize this day of commemoration for the land of their fathers. It is proper ration.

ABOUT WHAT IS RIGHT WITH AMERICA

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Americans are continually barraged by complaints about what is wrong with this Nation. This constant carping and endless criticism—aimed not at improving but rather at destroying—dominate our airwaves and take up much of our newspaper space.

Most of us know that it is easier to knock than to praise, and if a politician wants a cheap headline, the wilder his accusation the better play the story will receive.

So the time is long overdue that we started reminding ourselves what is good about America, what has made this the greatest Nation in the history of the world.

Native Americans sometimes tend to take for granted the freedoms and other great benefits that make this Nation what it is. They need to be reminded of what is right about America—by those who are Americans not by birth but by choice.

This was brought home to me in a recent article in my hometown paper, the St. Petersburg Times. The article was written by a naturalized American, and carries a message that should be etched in the hearts of all Americans. Here is what he had to say:

ABOUT WHAT IS RIGHT WITH AMERICA

(By Arpad Kadarkay)

In recent weeks we have lost two presidents, but apparently won a peace, however fragile and uncertain. At once we weep with joy and sadness, and wonder what the future holds.

In his inaugural address, President Nixon noted that the time has come for all Americans to "renew our faith in ourselves and in America." As a naturalized citizen, such renewal of faith is a privilege for me.

I am American, not by birth, but by heart, by choice. I am in debt to America. To repay my debt, partly in small coin, I would like to

speak to those who find so very much wrong with America and so very little that is right.

Of late, America, Europe's child—her Cinderella brought to bloom by a kindly magic—has been declared ugly. The pathology of American society fills the pens of our best writers with paradox, irony, pathos, even poetry. They find the American illness so great that the most high-minded doctors have been called to diagnose and write the death certificate.

I want to speak on behalf of Cinderella.

Her mourners say that America is dead, her dream a patchwork of racial-urban strife, poisoned by self-interest, rotted by surfeit and indifference, maimed by violence. I am told that the great aspiration is spent; America is only another crowded nation, not even able to maintain order. America is only a power, not a society, not a culture. We have gone, I am advised, from primitiveness, from childhood and innocence, to decadence—a far poorer record than that of Rome.

These gloomy soothsayers are as old as the nation. They thundered in Jefferson's time, in Lincoln's time, in Roosevelt's time, in Truman's time. Every society has its share of doomday prophets who convince themselves that they sit at the edge of Babylon and thus must cry that judgment day is at hand.

Well, this is not it. Not yet. Rather, this country is a vast experimental laboratory of human relations for the 20th Century. We are, in a sense, defining and creating the 20th Century for much of the world.

Unless seen in this light, America cannot be understood at all. It is not a sick society, but merely a bewildered society. And rightly so. For we are the first mass society where three revolutions have converged simultaneously, the industrial-scientific revolution, jamming us together and thus increasing the tension of daily living; the communication revolution, bringing us face-to-face contact; and the educational revolution, raising our level of expectations and demand for freedom and mobility.

Just consider the impact of these revolutions. For generations Europe had sharpened its appreciation of beautiful things and trained itself to reflect on the meaning of human existence. The result? A thin layer of Europeans achieved a cultured leisure—the old world "douceur de vivre." The American way is different.

We are not becoming less democratic, but more democratic. Perhaps there are too many people—too many untrained cooks in the kitchen. Yet Americans are the most natural workers-together in the world. We claim to live by the system of private enterprise, while in fact we are the supreme cooperative society. The Communist countries, founded on cooperation, have to coerce their people to work.

Our standards of expectancy have risen. But since Americans are perfectionists, dissatisfaction will continue, as well it should. We have lifted the massive center of ordinary people. Mass society, so often abused, and widespread affluence, so often mocked, are living examples of this. Yet no one pretends to be fully satisfied—a sure sign of health.

Our common health hinges on the complex chemistry of individual freedom. I am unable to understand the thrust of the sufferings and strivings of western man over the last centuries save in terms of this kind of achievement. We have not managed to journey all this way for nearly three centuries—across oceans and continents and, more recently, through space—because we are made of sugar candy.

I am a teacher. Loudly and persistently I am told that American education is in crisis. What a compliment! To me this is the unique character of free education—not in the money sense but in the real sense. It enables us to measure progress by enumerat-

ing short-comings and by drawing critical attention to failures.

Its very purpose and subject matter are crisis-prone. This is part of the creative process. Crisis in education is an unbroken western tradition—the root of its strength. Since creativity proceeds from the known to the unknown, education will always be in crisis until the well runs dry.

Some say that America has pursued a tragic course, having tried in vain to realize the dream of a free society. But in so vast an undertaking, success cannot be measured in absolutes. We are only mortal, not gods.

As mortals, we are always shackled by our own failures. One glaring mistake has been Vietnam, but it was not typical of America—and now we have gotten out from under its yoke. Another failure has been racism—much more difficult to overcome. But I believe it will be, for the simple reason that whereas most of the older generation regarded racial equality as only logical, the younger one considers it perfectly natural.

SUDDEN INFANT DEATH SYNDROME

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I put before the House of Representatives a resolution which takes a clear stand on the problem of sudden infant death. My resolution provides for a broadly based but concentrated attack upon the phenomenon of sudden infant death.

Known in medical terms as the sudden infant death syndrome—SIDS—it is said to be the leading cause of death in infants from the age of 1 month to a year. According to the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress, the syndrome is second only to accidents as the largest cause of death to children under the age of 15. But exactly what its cause is is not known, much less its cure.

The resolution I propose is needed legislation. I feel it is up to the Congress to provide the leadership and establish directions which will insure that top priority attention is given and will continue to be given to research into the cause and prevention of sudden infant death. Congress also needs to affirm other essential directives associated with the very meaning and scope of this "thing" which, without warning, kills our children, some 10,000 a year, in the dead of night.

The sudden infant death measure received strong support in the Senate last year, where it was introduced as Senate Joint Resolution 206 by Senator MONDALE and cosponsors and approved by the Senate. However, no action was taken upon the resolution in the House. Interest in the measure and in the testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth sparked much public comment and even kindled interest in spending more money than ever before at NIH to tackle this specific problem. Approximately \$3.5 million has been set aside for 1973 for the SIDS program at

NIH. But if sudden infant death is the No. 1 killer of infants from the age of 1 month to a year, is this enough? If autopsies are not being performed on children suspected of dying from SIDS because of lack of funds, is this enough? Should we not as a Congress indicate that we regard the cure of SIDS, or at this point, even its cause, a priority which cannot be overlooked? We call it "crib death," know it exists, but until it strikes someone near us, we do not realize how little is known about the syndrome.

As I have said, among other things we need to see that prompt autopsies are performed, not put aside by municipalities because of lack of funds and inconclusive results reached because SIDS is not recognized as a disease, and hence a cause of death. These autopsies must be performed when SIDS is suspected, regardless of the socioeconomic status of the parents. If SIDS is the killer of the child, it should be listed as such and the parents must, in their grief, be treated with kindness and understanding. They must not be subject to inquests and "foul play" questions which sometimes arise from ignorance about sudden infant death, even on the part of those as close as the family doctor.

Two such examples were outlined last year at Senate hearings by the fathers of children who had died of SIDS. One father recounted the experience of having to attend a coroner's jury inquest which had to decide whether or not the child had met with "foul play." The father testified that he felt a medical examiner's system should be instituted in place of an elected coroner, as is the case in his home city of Chicago. He stated he thought such an examiner's system, incorporating qualified and knowledgeable pathologists, would save hundreds of parents from "unnecessary and unwarranted criminal investigations."

Another father testified that he and his wife had waited 10 agonizing months for the autopsy report on their child which, in the end, listed an obscure and inconclusive cause of death with the words "sudden, unexpected death" in parentheses.

Dr. Abraham B. Bergman, president of the National Foundation for Sudden Infant Death, testified that he receives hundreds of letters every month from such parents, asking for help. One woman, he explained to those at the hearing, told him her own doctor refused to speak to her and, she told him, her baby's death certificate also had listed an obscure and inconclusive cause of death. Dr. Bergman stated—

Such letters break my heart because it is all so needless. The fact that survivors of crib death victims in the United States are treated like criminals is a national disgrace.

We readily see that specific research into the cause, cure, and prevention of the sudden infant death syndrome is needed, at top priority. But further, my resolution directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop, publish, and distribute literature to be used in educating and counseling

coroners, medical examiners, nurses, social workers and similar personnel, parents, future parents, and families whose children die, to the nature of the sudden infant death syndrome and to the needs of the families affected by it.

In addition, HEW is directed to work toward the institution of statistical reporting procedures that will provide a reliable index to the incidence and distribution of sudden infant death cases throughout the Nation.

Further, my resolution calls for working toward the availability of autopsies of children who apparently die of sudden infant death syndrome and for prompt releasing of the results to parents.

Lastly, the resolution calls for the adding of the sudden infant death syndrome to the International Classification of Diseases. I have been told by a spokesman at NIH that it is expected that SIDS will appear as a disease in the ninth edition of the International Classification of Diseases due in 1975, but my resolution surely will add the pressure and the interest of Congress to those pushing for this end.

The sudden infant death syndrome is a serious problem, one which needs the attention of Congress, the continued and renewed attention of HEW and NIH, and the attention of the Nation.

Saul Golberg, president of the International Guild for Infant Survival, Inc., of Baltimore, Md., summed it up last year as he spoke before the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth:

We cannot keep silent and watch more children die in vain without lifting a finger. We cannot ignore what is happening before our very eyes seeing these lovable babies slip through our hearts and homes. We cannot stick our heads in the sand in the mistaken belief that somehow all this tragedy will disappear. And America can no longer afford to sit idly by while millions of hours of manpower and talent which could be put to peaceful and productive purposes are buried forever.

GUN CONTROLS

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Raleigh M. Neville, 302 North Lincoln Street, Arlington, Va., recently sent me a copy of a letter he had addressed to WMAL radio in response to a number of editorials that station had broadcast urging passage of gun control legislation by the Congress. As Mr. Neville hopes that all our colleagues who have heard these editorials will also consider his point of view, he has asked that I insert the text of his letter in the RECORD.

His letter reads as follows:

ARLINGTON, VA.,
January 31, 1973.

EDITORIAL RESPONSE,
WMAL Radio,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I share your outrage over the tragic shooting of Senator John Stennis.

However, I do question the propriety of your using this and similar incidents to bludgeon Congress into enacting posthaste the gun control legislation you so ardently favor. As you should know, good laws are not made in angry reaction to events, nor are they made as a result of pressure, nor should they be made in response to a radio station's hysterical editorials.

In your most recent statement on the subject, you stressed the point that "poll after poll indicates that the majority of the American public wants stronger gun control legislation." I feel very certain (from the polls I have seen), that this is just not true and that in fact, the majority of the American public wants fewer restrictions, more intelligently applied. Would you, by any chance, be able to produce some of these polls you allude to or is this just another calculated ploy to get your way? If such polls exist, I challenge you to produce them.

I have absolutely no connection with any gun lobby, but I am vitally concerned about the way in which the media exercises its awesome power to influence, mold, and frequently create "public opinion." Irresponsible use of this power poses a far greater threat to our society than do guns.

Sincerely yours,

RALEIGH M. NEVILLE.

SALUTE TO FFA

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I commend the Future Farmers of America—FFA—on the occasion of National FFA Week, February 17-24.

As one who has worked closely with the FFA chapters throughout the 13 counties of Ohio's 10th Congressional District, I can appreciate the fine work and agricultural contributions these young people have made to our way of life.

On this occasion, I would like to bring an editorial appearing in the Noble County, Ohio, Journal-Leader—published in Caldwell, Ohio—to the attention of my colleagues:

FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

The 1973 observance of National FFA Week will fall during the period of February 17-24. The theme this year is, "FFA Unites Youth With Opportunities."

In coming years, young people will find agricultural careers more personally satisfying and more rewarding and productive in terms of providing the food and fiber for the nation than ever before. In FFA, young people gain experience in modern agricultural techniques and prepare themselves to explore and take advantage of the vast, varied and exciting career opportunities in agriculture today. Within the national FFA organization, 432,000 students study vocational agriculture in 8,000 public schools. FFA members learn by doing, and they are encouraged to develop their individual potentials, interests and skills in agricultural work. From this experience, they are able to choose their courses of study and activity to best prepare themselves to be the agricultural leaders of tomorrow.

The United States has the most productive agricultural system in the world—the work of the Future Farmers of America helps assure that it will stay that way.

CONFERENCE ON CAREER EDUCATION IMPLICATIONS FOR CHINESE-AMERICANS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, recently here in Washington a conference was held on career education implications for Chinese-Americans. The culmination of the conference was a resolution which, at this time, I would like to place in the RECORD. The resolution, which was sent to me by Prof. Francis Shieh of Prince George's Community College, calls for the implementation of programs and goals that will enable the great segment of our society that is of oriental background to realize the opportunities and dreams that many have not been able to achieve because of the cultural and linguistic barriers that presently exist. I urge that my fellow colleagues take note of the resolution and the prime necessity of its proposed actions.

The resolution reads as follows:

CONFERENCE ON CAREER EDUCATION IMPLICATIONS FOR CHINESE-AMERICAN MINORITIES

Historically, Chinese-Americans have been a traditional people, conservative in outlook and law-abiding in nature. Because Chinese-Americans have abhorred militancy and advocated self-help, we have been denied equal participation in the rights and privileges accorded other minority groups. In fact, a myth has evolved that Chinese-Americans do not need help.

However, with the revision of the immigration law in 1965, Chinatowns are experiencing a heavy influx of Chinese immigrants, men, women, and children who do not know the language or understand the culture and who are completely cut-off from the mainstream of American life. Chinese-American communities find themselves taxed beyond their capacity to help their own. Chinese-American communities need help.

CHINESE-AMERICAN CAUCUS RESOLUTION

Whereas, Chinese-Americans have historically been responsible citizens who have by tradition been law abiding in nature and who have abhorred militancy while following a non-violent approach in solving our problems through self reliance, and

Whereas, a heavy influx of Chinese immigrants have resulted from the revision of the immigration laws of 1965, and

Whereas, these new immigrants because of language barriers in English and a lack of familiarity with American customs and culture are compelled to congregate in Chinatown communities thereby cutting themselves off from the American mainstream; and

Whereas, this heavy concentration of Chinese young and old have caused a multiplicity of new social, economic and cultural problems far beyond the capabilities of the Chinese-American community to resolve independently as it previously could accomplish,

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Chinese-American Caucus of the National Conference of Career Education; Implications for Minorities requests that all future minority legislation in every area shall statutorily define "minority" to include "oriental" similar to that found in Public Law 92-318 passed by the 92nd Congress on June 23, 1972 as "Education Amendments of 1972"; and

Be it further resolved that the Chinese-

Americans support the concept of Career education and the objectives and goals it seeks to achieve; and

Be it further resolved that to insure the successful operation of Career Education we deem it essential that the maximum use of qualified Chinese-American personnel be utilized at every level of decision making positions including but not limited to planning, development, operation, administration, funding and evaluation of said Career Education programs; and

Be it further resolved that Career Education programs shall include English As A Second Language, bilingual and bicultural programs so that Chinese having English language and cultural barriers will maximize their potential in availing themselves of Career Education opportunities; and

Be it further resolved that programs to train bilingual Chinese in health, technical and social services skills be implemented through scholarship and funding to meet the Chinese-American community needs; and

Be it further resolved that training programs be established in business and industry where Chinese may become Career Education candidates; and

Be it resolved that we encourage equal employment opportunity for the hiring and utilization of Chinese-Americans in all high level policy and decision making echelons in Government, Private Industry, and labor including the Office of Education and the National Institute of Education for example to open job opportunities to those qualified who can contribute their services to the continued growth of America.

THE 55TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1973, 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 join with the Americans of Lithuanian descent in the commemoration of this day and would like to express my deep concern over the plight of the Lithuanian people today in striving for freedom from Soviet suppression.

It is surprising that the only country in which Lithuanians will be unable to observe this historical event will be in Lithuania itself, because of the continuing occupation and subjugation of that country by the Soviet Union. However, the Soviets are unable to suppress the aspirations of the Lithuanian people for freedom and the exercise of their human rights as recently demonstrated by a petition to the United Nations, signed by 17,000 Lithuanian Catholics in the occupied country. As a concerned American, I recognize my duty to protest this infringement of religious freedom and human rights.

With admiration for the aspirations and strength of the Lithuanian people, I share in commemorating their independence day and call for all Americans to denounce the suppression of human rights which has no place in a world striving for peace.

DR. WARREN M. ANGELL

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, in Shawnee, Okla., today, one of our country's truly dedicated musician-educators, Dr. Warren M. Angell, is being duly honored.

At the end of the current academic year Dr. Angell will retire as dean of the Oklahoma Baptist University College of Fine Arts, a position he has held for 37 years. The special events in his honor are on OBU Founders Day.

Under his leadership the college of fine arts has grown from modest beginnings to its present enrollment of some 300 students with 29 music faculty members. The Bison Glee Club and other musical groups have performed throughout the country. Less than 2 years ago the college moved into its outstanding new facilities in the Mabee Fine Arts Center on the bottom floor of Raley Chapel.

I have counted Dean Angell as a friend during most of those 37 years he has spent at OBU. His inspirational qualities as a teacher are great. Shawnee and Oklahoma are proud of him and his talented wife, Evelyn Wells Angell, who have contributed to the community as well as the university.

It is impossible to think of Warren Angell in quiet retirement, and it is good to know he plans to continue his career in music and in teaching.

The article that follows, by John Parrish of the Oklahoma Baptist University news service, gives some of the highlights of his career.

DR. WARREN M. ANGELL

(By John Parrish)

If Dr. Warren M. Angell had followed "his own" ambition in life, he might have been the world's greatest engineer.

Instead, he followed his talent for music which has led him to become one of the best-known personalities in the music world and dean of Oklahoma Baptist University's College of Fine Arts.

After serving as dean since 1936, Dr. Angell will retire in May after almost 37 years of service to the university. The OBU board of trustees has designated OBU's 1973 Founders Day, Feb. 21, as a time to honor Dr. Angell. Although he will remain with the university on a part-time teaching basis, Dr. Angell will be honored upon his retirement at this time by a variety of activities which will also coincide with the founding of the university.

The decision to study music was a turning point in the life of Angell who was destined to become the third dean of the College of Fine Arts at OBU. Born in Brooklyn as the son of an architect-engineer, Angell fully intended to follow the trade of his father. But the elder Angell was also a musician and this is where young Warren found his life-style.

Although an accomplished pianist by the time he graduated from high school in 1925, Angell still was determined to be an engineer. It was not until the late summer before entering college that he decided to study music.

"I made the final decision to study music in August," he recalls. "I just decided that the Lord had given me this talent for some purpose and I should use it. I gave myself one semester to find out if this was what I truly wanted, and by Christmas I was sure.

Before his appearance on the OBU campus, however, Angell gained the experience of playing in a traveling orchestra, teaching private piano, and teaching college music. While at Syracuse University he was a member of a traveling orchestra which toured Europe several times. After graduating from Syracuse in 1929, Dr. Angell taught about 35 private students in piano while working on his masters degree, which he received in 1933.

Following his marriage to Evelyn Wells in September, 1934, he accepted a position as head of the piano department at Murray State Teachers College in Murray, Ky.

The college teaching position prepared Dr. Angell to become dean of fine arts at OBU in 1935 when he was contacted about the position by OBU vice-president Dr. J. W. Jent. "As Dr. Jent talked of OBU and its possibilities, especially in the music department, I was won over," Dr. Angell recalls. "This seemed to offer what I wanted—a chance to settle somewhere and grow with the school."

The new dean made his professional debut in Oklahoma shortly after his arrival when he was presented in concert with the Oklahoma City Symphony in Shawnee's Municipal Auditorium. According to various accounts of the concert it "marked a new day for fine arts at OBU."

Angell's energetic talents were expressed more fully in his organization of a university singing group which would eventually spread the name of OBU around the world—The Bison Glee Club. Organized by Angell in 1938, the club made its first big appearance at the 1940 OBU commencement singing for the program which included the late FBI chief J. Edgar Hoover as speaker.

In 1942-44 Dean Angell took a leave of absence from the university to work on his doctorate at Columbia University Teachers College in New York. During this time he polished his professional career by singing top tenor in Fred Waring's Pennsylvanians and the Robert Shaw Choral.

Returning to OBU in 1944, he perfected his work with the Bison Glee Club which soon skyrocketed in popularity by performing for Southern Baptist Convention meetings, national auditions, nationwide tours, and various radio and television programs.

The College of Fine Arts also experienced tremendous growth under Angell's direction. From meager beginnings in 1936, the College of Fine Arts now has a total enrollment of 282 students with 29 faculty members. In 1971, the college made the move into the new \$600,000 Mabee Fine Arts Center on the lower level of Raley Chapel.

Dr. Angell calls the new facility the "culminating climax" of his career at OBU. He notes that many music authorities rank the OBU center as one of the finest in the Nation.

On the occasion of Angell's 30th anniversary as dean in 1966 the City of Shawnee presented him with a citation for his contribution to the university and to Shawnee by proclaiming Warren Angell Day in his honor. Among the festivities was the presentation of a program of Angell's compositions presented by his former students.

A leader of music conferences at Ridgecrest and Glorieta Baptist assemblies for many years, Dean Angell is still in demand for similar music and choral conferences in many States. He has written five books on vocal and choral techniques and has more than 60 published compositions in the choral and piano field. There are many more published hymn tunes as well as unpublished vocal and instrumental compositions.

After the presentation of one of his most recent compositions, "This is the Gospel," he received statewide acclaim. The cantata, a first in the Angell repertoire, was presented in March, 1971, and resulted in the adoption of a resolution by the Oklahoma State Senate

in his honor. The resolution, presented by two state senators on the premiere performance of the composition, expressed "great admiration for Dr. Warren M. Angell, the man, and for his many and varied accomplishments in the music world, and especially in the field of music."

For the past six years the OBU dean has been given the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers Award. Other honors include listing in "Who's Who in America," "Who's Who Among Deans and Presidents of American Colleges," and "Who's Who in Music." He is also included in the International Directory of Music and Musicians, Directory of American Scholars, and Directory of Outstanding Americans. He is also a fellow of the National Association of Teachers of Singing.

Dr. Angell holds membership in Phi Mu Alpha Sinfonia, national men's music fraternity, Music Educators National Conference, American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, and the National Association of Teachers of Singing. He is a charter member of American Choral Directors Association and is on the advisory board of "Who's Who in America."

Although Dr. Angell plans to retire from his position as dean, he has no plans to retire from his music. "I plan to do some teaching and composing and get rid of all this paper work. This will give me more time to devote to music workshops and festivals."

The Angell years on the OBU campus, however, are not to be forgotten. In addition to the College of Fine Arts which bears his name, there are hundreds of OBU graduates in the world of music which are a living tribute to the OBU dean—Dr. Warren M. Angell.

INCREASING ACCURACY OF ICBM'S

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the February 10, 1973, edition of the Augusta Chronicle newspaper in Augusta, Ga., contained an interesting column on new problems which will be faced by the world as improvements in the accuracy of intercontinental ballistic missiles became a reality.

Authored by Columnist Ray Cromley, this article points to issues which will be the subject of public debate in the years ahead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

INCREDIBLE ICBM ACCURACY IS NEAR

(By Ray Cromley)

Incredible increases in intercontinental missile accuracy will soon be possible.

This new accuracy will inevitably be incorporated into Soviet and U.S. weapons. The improvement in ICBM accuracy will be so great in both the U.S. and Russia that regardless of the ceilings now in effect on missile numbers, no fixed-site missile, such as the Minuteman, will be safe.

This imbalance would make a Soviet preventive nuclear strike tempting in time of grave international crisis.

For this accuracy would disrupt the delicate stability which depends on knowledge in the United States and the Soviet Union

that, regardless of who strikes first, the nation being hit would have sufficient power left to destroy the attacker. This balance depends on the defending country having enough missiles sufficiently protected so that the attacker could not possibly knock out an overly great percentage.

That is, this accuracy (combined with the quantity development of multiple independently targeted warheads) will make it possible to destroy such a high percentage of the defender's missiles no credible retaliatory missile force would remain—except for submarine launchers.

Today, Polaris-type submarines are virtually undetectable at a distance—and so provide considerable safety for the defender. But sub tracking and detection are making great strides, and, in any event, a Polaris-Posidon fleet alone is not considered a sufficient deterrent for an attacker able to knock out a defender's land-based static striking force.

The preventive strike is a part of accepted Soviet military doctrine. It is not U.S. doctrine. But the Russians basing judgment on their own myths, believe that it is. Therefore, even in the unlikely event that the Soviet Union should change its ways, consider this.

A totalitarian country in a severe crisis (believing that its opponent could and would jump the gun and believing that the opponent's first strike would leave it helpless and unable to retaliate effectively) would have a difficult time resisting the temptation to strike first.

The super-accuracy outlined above, measured in feet, is no far-out dream. New satellite-laser technology will make possible the location of objects (such as missile sites) 10,000 miles away with an accuracy measured in fractions of an inch. This measuring ability, in turn, will make possible far more accurate targeting than has been possible in the past.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE LITHUANIAN REPUBLIC

HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, as we observe the return home of our fellow citizens who have been imprisoned in Indochina, we can better appreciate those aspects of life in America to which they are returning and which we all too often take for granted.

The release of the POW's coincides with the 55th anniversary of the establishment of the Lithuanian Republic. Seeing this return from imprisonment to freedom, our friends of Lithuanian origin and descent living in the United States are reminded of the stark contrast between the exercise of their own freedoms here and the suppression of their countrymen's freedoms by the Soviet Union.

Throughout their long history—from the founding of the Lithuanian State in 1251 to its short-lived existence as a modern republic and down to the present—the people of this Baltic land have displayed courage and perseverance in their quest for liberty.

American life has been enriched through the contributions of its Lithuanian descendants. The United States owes a large measure of thanks for its

own freedom to a Lithuanian-born patriot—Thaddeus Kosciuszko—who contributed his considerable talents and efforts in our Revolutionary War. We now honor this outstanding leader with the establishment of the Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in Philadelphia where he lived for several months after the war prior to his leadership in Poland's fight for freedom.

The Lithuanian people continue their struggle to realize their heritage of independence. The names of Simas Kuodirka and Romas Kalanta are serving to inspire their countrymen in their struggle to gain the freedom they once knew. They are an example to all people everywhere who value human liberty and cherish the exercise of human rights.

Positive signs in the movement toward improved international understanding and cooperation are manifesting themselves. As we remove the walls of division and hostility which have separated nations in the past, we must actively pursue those constructive avenues that would help realize the freedoms of subjected peoples in Lithuania and elsewhere in the world.

THE 55TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked the 55th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence by Lithuania in 1918. This country is blessed with fertile farmlands, wide rivers, and white sand beaches along the Baltic Sea, yet its people are not free to enjoy their homeland in peace and prosperity. The country is caught in the suffocating grip of the Soviet Union, which exerts tyrannical control over all of Lithuania.

The events leading to the present mockery of independence can be described as one act of subjugation after another. Since 1909 Lithuania has been accorded recognition as a nation-state but usually under the watchful eye of a neighboring overseer, as Lithuania has been annexed intermittently by Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. After several revolts in the late 1800's, Lithuania managed to retain its language, traditions and religion despite Russian dominance.

Although World War I saw Lithuania besieged by invading troops, the defeat of Germany and the revolution in Russia provided an encouraging situation for Lithuanian independence. The German Government authorized a Lithuanian conference in 1917 which proclaimed Lithuania an independent state. This independence was short lived, as 1 year later the Russian Army entered Vilnius, the capital city, and instituted a Communist Government. The Polish Army drove the Russians out 1 year later in 1920, at which time Russia signed a peace treaty renouncing all rights of sovereignty over Lithuania.

For almost 20 years a period of economic and cultural prosperity was enjoyed in Lithuania. Land reform programs were highly successful, industrialization increased, educational facilities were expanded, and the arts flourished. World War II hindered this advancement, as Germany and then Russia forced their superior military strength upon Lithuania. In 1939 Lithuania was required, through a forced treaty, to admit Soviet garrisons and to grant air bases to the Soviet Union. The next year a rigged election resulted in a government friendly to the Soviet Union, which proceeded to request Lithuania's incorporation into the Soviet Union. Lithuania was subsequently overrun by German troops, then as the war ended, by Soviet military forces. Communist control has become firmly entrenched in Lithuania today.

The United States has refused to recognize Soviet incorporation of Lithuania, preferring to regard Lithuania as an independent state. We respect the courage of the 4 million Lithuanians now under Russian rule, and the determination of the 1 million persons of Lithuanian descent in America who seek true independence for their native land. Lithuanians have great pride in their accomplishments, and rightly so. Personalities of Lithuanian descent are prominent in our time, including football great Johnny Unitas and movie actors Laurence Harvey and Charles Bronson.

To encourage Lithuanian progress toward full independence, Mr. Speaker, we observe the 55th anniversary with hope for eventual self-determination. Perhaps we will evidence overtures toward this end as a result of the Conference on European Security and Cooperation, which is meeting in Helsinki, Finland. This gathering of representatives from the United States, Canada, and 32 European States may provide the impetus to Lithuanian independence.

I join the Lithuanian American Council and those of Lithuanian descent in my own State of Connecticut in their celebration of independence.

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues an award-winning speech by one of my young constituents, Juanita Madden, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Otis G. Madden of Eolia, Mo., in my congressional district.

Miss Madden is the winning contestant from the State of Missouri in the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States Voice of Democracy Contest, and will be competing in Washington, D.C., on March 6 for national scholarship awards.

Juanita is a credit to her family, com-

munity, and country, and her inspiring speech follows:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

(By Juanita Madden)

In these times of uncertainty over both national and foreign policies, I believe it's important for each of us, especially the young, to give some thought to what we believe and stand for. Personally, I find the present state of affairs very confusing, but I have set down some principles which outline what I believe thus far to be my responsibility to freedom. At least this is a start on which to build the ideas and beliefs that will govern my life.

First, we must realize that freedom isn't free. It must be bought and paid for with a price. And it doesn't sell cheaply. Our forefathers paid dearly for it in the Revolutionary War, and we have been paying premiums on it for years. Each war, each conflict, has really been a premium toward the maintenance of freedom. That may be hard to visualize on the spur of the moment; but think about it: We fought for freedom of the seas in the War of 1812. We fought for freedom in Europe in the First World War. We fought for freedom in both Europe and Asia in the Second World War.

Surely we have paid dearly for what was accomplished toward freedom; and surely we shall continue to pay dearly. Only as "one nation, under God, indivisible" shall we stop tyranny in the world. It would be wonderful to think that we could eliminate tyranny and bondage. That is our dream, but I fear it is only a dream. Therefore we cannot afford to allow ourselves to see that dream as reality. In that case, we might even come to believe "life so dear and peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery." Forbid it Almighty God!

We, as free Americans, have a responsibility to the rest of the world: to influence them so that, ultimately, all men everywhere will be free. I don't mean "influence" in terms of applying pressure to reach that goal, for in the applying of pressures we take away freedom of choice; but influencing them in the sense of presenting them with an example of how a democracy works.

However, we all know that a democracy has its problems too. But if we stand united, those problems can be worked out. In a letter to Horace Greeley, President Abraham Lincoln explained his purpose, his official goal in the conflict between the states: "I would save the Union." He realized that only a nation united under a central government could save itself from inevitable destruction. I agree with Mr. Lincoln. Therefore, I feel that it is my responsibility to freedom to back the government of the United States, not only when I agree with its policies, but also in times when I may personally disagree.

I have another very prominent responsibility to freedom. This responsibility concerns the freedom of future Americans. Possibly my greatest contribution, as an individual, toward freedom will be educating, instructing, and instilling in my children ideas of freedom, democracy, and patriotism. Each successive generation of Americans owes a great deal to the previous generation for not allowing the principles of freedom to become extinct from non-use and abuse. I think it's important that we remember that each generation has had its problems, but through the skillful use of the principles of freedom, it has somehow overcome these problems and left to the future generation a rich legacy: that generation has the privilege of making its own problems, and then choosing a manner in which to deal with them. That, truly, is freedom.

Maybe it's all a question of involvement. Once we realize that we do have a responsibility to freedom, we will become involved,

not only in preserving our great nation, but in making it better.

THE POSTWAR ECONOMIC RECONSTRUCTION OF UNITED STATES

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I have been looking in vain the past several weeks for signs of any plan emerging from the administration to foster the postwar economic reconstruction of the United States.

Ever since it was leaked to us in the Congress, by the press, that such postwar economic construction plans are already well advanced within the administration for North Vietnam, I have wondered whether similar attention is being given to the rebuilding of American cities which have been economically decimated by neglect and indifference. Much of that neglect is due to the Nation's concentration on the Vietnam war. In that sense, American cities are as surely a casualty of that war as have been North Vietnamese cities.

The budgetary actions of the administration during this same period, led to the unfortunate conclusion that there are no well-contrived contingency plans to feed our hungry, house our elderly, rebuild our slums, repatriate our aerospace workers, restore our economy, or assist the return to normal life of our own people.

At the same time the administration reports having clamped tight spending controls over payments to welfare recipients and needy citizens in our own country and has cut Federal welfare payments to the States below the \$1.7 billion expended in the last fiscal year, it is also reported fashioning a \$2.5 billion welfare program for North Vietnam.

The administration is speaking in the range of \$7.5 billion in welfare for North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Yet it is unable to find money with which to fund \$500 million of the health programs for the American people for which the administration asked funds last year.

Perhaps the most bitterly ironic contrast is found in the fact that the administration is ambitiously planning its \$2.5 billion reconstruction plan for North Vietnam, at the same time it has been unable to find \$103 million to finance expanded health care for our own returning Vietnam war veterans. Legislation which would have provided enlarged VA hospital staffs, given free care to dependents of totally disabled veterans and increased care for black GI's suffering from sickle cell anemia was vetoed last October 27 by the President.

At the same time the administration and its surrogates have been going about the country castigating Congress for failing to hold the line on domestic expenditures, it has been quietly mapping its vast \$7.5 billion program for the economic reconstruction of Indochina.

When the Congress, this fiscal year, approved a \$25 million fund to aid lagging private universities to admit and train Vietnam GI's, the administration, in its new budget proposals, urged this program be cancelled.

When the Congress approved \$50 million to help provide jobs for Vietnam veterans enrolled in school, the administration could find no funds to implement the program and in the budget submitted has asked for no funds.

Nor can it find \$200 million for manpower training programs for 3,000 returning Vietnam veterans.

Nor can it scrape up \$9.6 million a year to continue to fund the OEO legal service agencies in California, including California Rural Legal Assistance, which have handled some 60,000 individual cases in behalf of the poor people of my State in the past year.

But the administration finds no difficulty in coming up with \$7.5 billion for welfare for Indochina.

The exact figure and the total amount of money we are expected to appropriate is a figure which has not yet been shared with the Congress. At the appropriate time, I imagine Dr. Kissinger will be dispatched to the House and Senate by helicopter from the launching pad behind the Executive Mansion to inform us of the extent of the private commitments the administration has made and which we in the Congress will be instructed to ratify.

Presumably, the form in which we will be expected to provide that assistance will also be revealed to us.

The same administration that has indicated it couldn't be less interested in healing our divisions and wounds at home is nonetheless committing, without prior consultation with the Congress, the United States to spend billions of dollars to heal all the wounds of Indochina.

This surely must mark the first time we have been asked to pay reparations to a country we have not defeated.

It has been the traditional American custom, and it is a custom I support, to aid our defeated enemies to get back on their feet after a war in which the United States is victorious. It is a generosity of spirit I fully support and share insofar as the impulse and motivation are concerned.

However, it seems somewhat curious that we are also asked to pay reparations to those we have not defeated and that we must pay extra for the privilege of not winning a war.

At the extreme, if we are to comprehend the press reports of what Secretary of State Rogers said at his press conference last Thursday, we must give this aid to North Vietnam on its own terms in order to persuade it to accept such aid.

Secretary Rogers, according to the press reports, "prefers to be part of an international effort." But, the report continues:

Secretary Rogers acknowledged that North Vietnam may not want such a program under the United Nations or any other international mechanism with all the strings of control over the use of aid attached.

Therefore, he implied, the United States might have to do it alone.

The establishment at the same time of a two-party economic commission by Hanoi and Washington to deal with the postwar economic reconstruction of North Vietnam confirms that this will likely be the ultimate approach.

It would seem to me that when we are talking about as massive a sum as \$2½ billion we ought to impose as a central requirement that any country receiving such a sum should, at a minimum, have agreed to lose the war.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that since the administration has been feverishly mapping plans to spend \$7½ billion of our money without consulting the Congress that it look elsewhere for those funds to meet those commitments, if in fact such commitments exist.

I recommend that instead of dispatching Dr. Kissinger to Capitol Hill that it dispatch him on the first plane available to Moscow and Peking.

There, he will have the chance to test his amazing diplomatic skills of persuasion by obtaining an agreement from the Soviet Union and China to provide \$7.5 billion for the reconstruction of American cities and to meet the economic, health, and medical needs of our returning GI's, as well as toward meeting all the other needs of the American people after such a decade of neglect of our own urgent domestic problems and human needs.

Or, given the administration's distaste for unilateral action and fondness for bilateral exchange agreements which culminate from "tough" bargaining at "the poker table" using "big chips," perhaps Dr. Kissinger could secure an agreement which would permit China and the Soviet Union to do the reconstructing of North Vietnam while the Government of the United States employs that \$2.5 billion it would otherwise have expended toward meeting the needs of its own people.

Mr. Speaker, I will not support reparations for North Vietnam nor a massive welfare program for President Thieu's regime in South Vietnam nor economic redevelopment at U.S. expense of all of Southeast Asia until and unless the long-neglected domestic and human needs of our own people and our own cities are met by this administration.

CONGRESS IS NOT POWERLESS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I met with more than 100 of my constituents who came to Washington to protest Presidential impoundments, rescissions, cutbacks, and 1974 budget proposals which gut programs that deliver needed services to the poor.

They did not come to beg. They merely wanted to know what the President had against these programs and them. I could

offer few answers, but I did manage to dispell the thought that all of the action taken against them and the social service programs was an accident.

The fact is that there are rapidly becoming fewer and fewer such programs.

In my city of Pittsburgh alone, more than \$5 million in Federal day care, social service, and other programs assisting the poor are in jeopardy because of proposed new HEW regulations which were printed in Friday's Federal Register.

The regulations, in addition to cutting back on those eligible for assistance, would prohibit the use of private or donated funds, or in-kind services to qualify for Federal matching grants.

In practical terms, in my district this means that the Allegheny County United Fund cannot provide the 25-percent funding that generates \$2 million in family service programs for welfare recipients; or that the Pittsburgh Board of Education will not be able to carry out its 40 separate day care operations because, in lieu of its 25-percent contribution, the board contributes in-kind services including the professional and semiprofessional staff, the buildings, the maintenance, and other items necessary to operate the day care program.

How many of you have Federal programs funded by your local unit fund, or any charity for that matter? Under the new rules, they will be lost. Yet, there has been scant attention paid to this fact.

So, in addition to impounding money for the poor, making budget proposals that eviscerate programs which the Congress authorized to serve those who need help, the President now will legislate through administrative regulations and get at a few more programs which have, to date, escaped the axes wielded by OMB.

In January, HUD was ordered to put a moratorium on all federally assisted housing programs.

The outgoing Secretary of HUD told us that all projects which had not received a feasibility letter from HUD before January 5, 1973, would be frozen in the pipeline forever or until HUD could unscramble the mess it has made of our Nation's housing programs.

Between December 15, 1972, and January 5, 1973, HUD area offices sent out more than 8,000 letters to individuals and groups seeking 235 and 236 housing commitments telling them that their projects were feasible.

These "feasibility letters" usually precede a firm commitment from HUD.

How many of my colleagues realize that last week HUD sent a new missal to its minions and warned them to re-evaluate all of those projects with an eye toward taking back two-thirds of those letters and naturally taking back the preliminary commitments? There are 20 such projects in my district.

It seems that the HUD area offices in processing these applications obligated HUD to investing more money in housing than the OMB wanted. I repeat they obligated them to investing more money in housing than OMB wanted, not more money than the Congress said they could spend. For in fact, the obligations pushed

them nowhere near the amount this body said they could use to house your constituents and mine.

Two more instances where housing and services are being denied your people and mine, because the President would rather rebuild Hanoi than put houses in Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Kansas City, or a thousand other cities and towns in our country.

But we know there are programs coming up that he wants, and wants badly.

And the only way that we will get back the programs is to hold them ransom for the programs we need.

Recently, we had an opportunity to vote on refunding the REA loan program.

I am an urban Congressman, with urban and suburban constituents. I have no farms or farmers in my district and quite frankly I could sleep soundly tonight if there was no REA program. But I voted for it because I was voting on the principle involved and because I expect many of you with no urban constituents to vote with me and others on those programs which traditionally help city residents.

I repeat, we know there are programs Nixon wants and he needs us to get them.

It is here where we can exercise our leverage.

I, for one, will not vote one penny for aid to North Vietnam as long as my constituents in Pittsburgh cannot get housing, community mental health centers, and job training. And I expect to scrutinize the military budget and funds to operate the executive branch in the same manner.

What justice is there in telling an old man that the nutrition program which daily serves him his only hot meal cannot be funded but we do have millions to rebuild bridges and roads we blew to blazes just 2 months ago?

The people in Pittsburgh need jobs and job training much more than the Navy needs a new aircraft carrier.

Clean rivers and streams will benefit our citizens far more than trying to rekindle development of the supersonic transport.

I, for one, am not ready to concede that Congress is powerless in the face of the administration juggernaut.

I would like to include a copy of the letter I sent last week to President Nixon concerning the new HEW regulations:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 12, 1973.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to you concerning the promulgation of proposed new regulations by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which would virtually kill millions of dollars worth of activity on behalf of the poor and needy across the entire country.

The new regulations proposed to prohibit the use of private and donated funds as a match for federal funding of social service programs. In many areas, including my own city of Pittsburgh, large charitable organizations contribute to a myriad of programs which locally serve those who need help. It is preposterous for you to challenge the people to explore new resources on the local level and to develop initiative in their own communities and then to allow the issuance of

regulations which would destroy the very effort you demand.

You must realize that these new regulations if promulgated will cripple local efforts to help the elderly, persons receiving public assistance, and children.

Last year in Allegheny County, the Community Chest through United Family Services of Pittsburgh, Inc., generated more than two million dollars in services for these groups. Most of this was subcontracted to neighborhood organizations who worked on the problems of housing, health, and nutrition.

Under the proposed regulations, much of this activity would be lost—never to be assumed by overburdened State Agencies.

I cannot fathom the reasoning behind these suggestions. But I sincerely hope you will re-examine the matter before allowing the proposed new regulations to prevail.

I am writing to the Chairmen of various House Committees seeking their assistance in stopping what surely must be the most heartless budget saving idea yet to be developed by the Office of Management and Budget.

Sincerely,

OUR RETURNING PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

MR. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, there is, of course, no welcome adequate enough for our returning prisoners of war. None of us can begin to appreciate their sacrifices nor their courage. Many have spent years in the shadow of death. Yet they return with "God Bless America" on their lips and words of deepest gratitude for our Commander in Chief, the President who brought them home. The President who has been shamefully attacked by some who spent the recent years living in comfort in the nation they reviled while these servicemen were imprisoned.

One hopes the words and the example of our returning prisoners will teach them a lesson.

In my own judgment, these men have a lesson to teach us all, particularly our young people. For them it can be the greatest lesson in patriotism they can learn. It was an American playwright, I believe, who said the only men who are worth their time on earth are those willing to die for the freedom of their fellow men. Our prisoners of war took that risk. They have earned the eternal gratitude, not only of Americans, but of free men everywhere. For freedom was the issue in Vietnam, just as freedom has been the issue in every war this country has fought.

We who live in San Diego are especially happy to welcome these men home. Many of them were pilots who flew with squadrons, based in this area.

For these and other returnees, I sincerely hope and trust, that Americans, who owe them so much, will give them a welcome that goes beyond words, military bands, television interviews and all the rest.

It would seem only appropriate that the Government guarantees that these

men do not suffer from financial insecurity. Unions and employers as well as government should do all in their power to help these men resume old careers or begin new ones.

But beyond all this, it is America's obligation to show these men that we are grateful, that their sacrifice was meaningful, that they did indeed help their country achieve peace with honor.

One of the most moving speeches ever heard was the brief but eloquent statement uttered by Capt. James Bond Stockdale, U.S. Navy senior officer of the Vietnam prisoners of war when he returned to his home in San Diego. His joyful return was beautifully described in a column by feature writer Lew Scarr in the February 16 San Diego Union. I include Lew Scarr's column as a portion of my remarks:

JOY MINGLES WITH PRIDE AS STOCKDALE
COMES HOME
(By Lew Scarr)

It had been raining and cold, but as the jet rolled slowly closer, its engines now a muted whine, the sun broke through and it was suddenly warm.

Mrs. Sybil Stockdale stood for a moment alone, watching the silver airplane move toward her. Then she was joined by her son, James Stockdale II, 21, who placed one arm across his mother's shoulders.

Mrs. Stockdale's husband, Capt. James Bond Stockdale, 49, as senior officer aboard, would be the first to step from the airplane.

SENIOR POW

For 7½ years he had been senior naval prisoner of war held in North Vietnam. His wife had been a leader of a nationwide program to help free the POWs.

And now Jim Stockdale was home. Almost. The airplane had stopped on the apron now. Mrs. Stockdale, in a lemon yellow blouse and tan skirt, waved at the airplane. She couldn't see anything through the tiny windows, but she waved.

The door was opened and the stairway fell out. And there he was.

He walked down the steps deliberately, reaching out only with his right foot. Two Navy officers, one at each elbow, supported him as he made his way, dragging his left leg slightly, through the rain puddles toward a soggy strip of red carpet.

Young Jim held up a thumb. His mother gave that sign to her husband that has come to stand both for victory and peace.

WE'RE SO GLAD

Jim Stockdale smiled at them, but first he had something to say. He alone, of all the eight returning POWs, would make a public statement.

"We're so glad to be home," he said in a deep, firm voice. "Our thoughts have been with you ever since we left."

"For just an instant permit me to let my thoughts turn inward, inward to these wonderful Americans with whom I've been involved."

"I'm proud of their performance, proud of their patriotism, proud of their unity. I'm proud of their trust in each other, their trust in you people here at home, their trust in our commander-in-chief."

"We've fought together, we've laughed together, we've cried together and we've prayed together. Sometimes the words were words which may be familiar to some in this Navy crowd. (He then quoted this old Navy prayer.)

"If I am tempted, make me strong to resist. If I should miss the mark, give me the courage to try again."

"May I so live that I can stand unashamed and unafraid before my shipmates, my loved ones and Thee."

"I think God answered that prayer."

Jim Stockdale then turned and embraced his wife. Then he hugged his son. Then all three hugged each other, weeping openly, proudly.

The grown man of a son kissed his father and the father kissed his son in a frank display of utter affection that is seen too little anymore.

Two other sons (a fourth, Sidney, 18, was not there), Stanford, 13, and Taylor, 10, ran from a waiting car and threw their arms around their father, too, burying their faces in the folds of his tan uniform jacket.

Taylor's right arm had been broken in a roller skating tumble, and on the cast he had printed, "Welcome Home Dad."

But there would be time to talk about that later. There would be time to talk about everything.

After 7½ years, finally there was plenty of time.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 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?"

THE RIGHT TO LIFE

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, our Constitution in almost 200 years has been amended only 26 times. This is so because we have amended it only to right grievous wrongs, wrongs that diminish our rights as individuals in a free society

or that diminish our respect for life and for one another. In the belief that the abortion decision handed down January 22 by the Supreme Court of the United States denies the right to life and the protection of our laws to the unborn and consequently, meets these tests, I am today proposing an amendment to our Constitution.

There are those, of course, who welcomed the Court's willingness to give the convenience of the pregnant woman more weight than the morality of taking a human life. Some welcomed this decision because, to them, the unborn are not human beings. Following this line of reasoning the rights of women take precedence over the rights of the unborn, precedence over the rights of the fetus in a woman's womb.

If the fetus's rights are to be subordinated to a woman's rights, then we should be able to look to the Supreme Court decision for an answer to the age-old question, when does human life begin? But, if we do that, if we examine the decision, the question remains unanswered. In fact, the opinion delivered by Mr. Justice Blackmun in *Roe* against *Wade* tells us that we may not even look to medicine, to philosophy, or to theology for a consensus. Yet, in spite of this gap in our knowledge, the Court takes it upon itself to resolve the question in favor of the pregnant woman and goes on to deny the Congress and the States, and thus the people, any judgment.

The Court does not point to history and say without qualification that the preponderance of law on the subject of abortion led them to this decision. Instead, the Court relates that historical judgment is divided.

"Ancient attitudes," the Court opinion states, "are not capable of precise determination." The Persian Empire, as noted in the opinion, severely punished criminal abortions, although Greek and Roman law afforded little protection to the unborn.

Referring still to the Court opinion, we are told that, in the common law, "abortion performed before 'quickening'"—that is, before the pregnant woman first recognizes movement of the fetus in her womb—"was not an indictable offense."

As to the Hippocratic Oath which our physicians take, the Court opinion states the intent of the oath is clear in any translation: "I will not give to a woman a pessary to produce abortion," or "Similarly, I will not give a woman an abortive remedy." The oath, of course, as the Court points out, is not contested.

Both English law and American law, again according to the Court recitation, historically have vacillated in degree between a ban on abortion and restricted abortion, with English law currently being more liberal than a century ago and American law—until January 22—being generally more restrictive than it was 100 years ago.

Similarly, our courts, so we are told by the highest court of the land, have been divided. Then, without elaboration, the Supreme Court concludes:

Although the results are divided, most of these courts have agreed that the right of

privacy, however based, is broad enough to cover the abortion decision; that the right, nonetheless, is not absolute and is subject to some limitations; and that at some point the state interests as to protection of health, medical standards, and prenatal life, become dominant. We agree with this approach.

To its credit, the Court does not try to convince anyone that the word "person" as it is used in our Constitution does not extend to the unborn. Instead, based upon divided judgments in history, in law, and in the judiciary, it is persuaded "that the word 'person' as used in the 14th amendment does not include the unborn."

With these flimsy premises as its foundation, the Court's ruling ignores the moral issue completely and embraces a woman's right to privacy as the only issue for overriding most existing State abortion laws. In other words, without a clear constitutional warrant, the result of the Court's ruling as defined by Mr. Justice White in his dissent:

Is that the people and the legislatures of the 50 States are constitutionally disentitled to weigh the relative importance of the continued existence and development of the fetus on the one hand against a spectrum of possible impacts on the mother on the other hand.

In my view, human life begins at conception; and millions of Americans share this conviction. We do not believe society can accept the destruction of human life for the comfort or convenience of individuals within society. Our concern for the quality of life must include a respect for life—indeed, respect for life should be paramount.

Without unequivocal support in fact, in law, or in our Constitution, the Court has arbitrarily decided when life begins. Without unequivocal support in fact, in law, or in our Constitution, the Court has denied to Congress and the States—and thus to the people—authority to define due process of law. Without unequivocal support in fact, in law, or in our Constitution, the Court has brought us perilously near to justifying infanticide, perilously near to justifying the killing of the aged, the ailing, and the incapacitated.

Our only recourse is to restore these judgments to the people. This is the purpose of the Constitutional amendment I am proposing. With its adoption, we will improve the quality of life.

My proposal follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to insure that due process and equal protection are afforded to an individual from conception.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Neither the United States nor any State shall deprive any human being,

from conception, of life without due process of law; nor deny to any human being, from conception, within its jurisdiction, the equal protection of the laws.

"Sec. 2. Neither the United States nor any State shall deprive any human being of life on account of age, illness, or incapacity.

"Sec. 3. Congress and the several States shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

IOWA HISTORIAN RETIRES

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, some people today may not appreciate the important role that America's great rivers have played in our historical development. This year, the residents who live along our greatest river, the Mississippi, hope to enlarge public awareness of our heritage by celebrating the tricentennial of the discovery of the Mississippi River by Marquette and Joliet.

One man who may know more about the historical lore of the great Mississippi than any other is Iowa's William J. "Steamboat Bill" Petersen. Dr. Petersen recently retired as superintendent and editor of the State Historical Society of Iowa.

Like Marquette and Joliet before him, Bill Petersen has been a modern-day explorer of the Mississippi River. While riding up and down on the river, he gathered information for a doctorate degree on the history of steamboating on the Upper Mississippi River. He received his Ph. D. from the University of Iowa in 1930. He has served as superintendent of the State Historical Society of Iowa since 1947.

Over the years, Dr. Petersen has been a gifted writer on the historical lore and significance of our great rivers. He is a prolific historian of Iowa subjects. No one has made a greater contribution in his area of study. He loves the rivers and boats about which he has written so much. I hope the reenactment of the Joliet-Marquette voyage later this year by the Mississippi River Tricentennial Committee will enlarge others' love and appreciation of this great river.

Mr. Speaker, I know Bill Petersen and I am glad to be able to honor him upon his retirement. I insert in the RECORD an article from the Cedar Rapids Gazette on the retirement of Dr. William J. Petersen:

[From the Cedar Rapids Gazette]

IOWA'S STEAMBOAT BILL IS BACK ON THE RIVER
(By Art Hough)

IOWA CITY.—"Steamboat Bill" Petersen, Iowa's most prolific writer and expounder of historical lore, retired last Tuesday on his 72nd birthday.

Retired, that is, as superintendent and editor of the State Historical Society of Iowa.

But, the researching, writing and speech-making of this former Dubuque lad who gathered material for his university doctorate while hitchhiking up and down the Mississippi river more than 40 years ago, is continuing apace. Perhaps at a faster pace, now that he is freed of administrative duties,

We dubbed the project, or projects, he is on now his "doctorate plus." He started on the river and he is back on the river now.

Dr. William J. Petersen credits Dr. Louis Pelzer, professor of history at the University of Iowa, with re-routing his career from teaching and coaching to Iowa history and river lore.

GIVEN ULTIMATUM

In 1927 he was discussing his master's thesis with the professor and talking about his boyhood on the Mississippi when Pelzer gave him the following ultimatum:

"Petersen, do you mean to tell me that your father was associated with the Diamond Jo Line Steamers and that a considerable amount of manuscript material is available on the subject? Petersen, I personally will pull the rope that hangs you to yonder tree if you don't start working on the history of steamboating on the Upper Mississippi for your doctorate."

The rest is history.

Bill got his Ph.D. from the university in 1930. From 1930-47 he was research associate for the State Historical Society of Iowa, became superintendent in 1947. He has also been a lecturer and associate professor, participated in many summer sessions, written 10 books, one of which, "Steamboating on the Upper Mississippi", first published in 1937, was reprinted and enlarged in 1968; edited and given historical introduction to a score of books on rare Americana, history and biography, and almanacs.

Petersen wrote so many articles for the "Palimpsest," that some editors found it almost unbelievable in the space of time he had to put out the popular publication. For instance, between 1948 and 1970 he contributed 392 articles.

Bill never has been afraid of work and he is proud that "interlarded between subjects like Indians, pioneers, railroads, wolves, doctors, earthquakes, patent medicines, explorations, etc., I could always come back and do some phase of a river story."

Even before his doctorate, he had published two articles on "Minnesota History", the "Missouri Magazine of History"; 26 pages in the "Mississippi Valley Historical Review", two in the "Palimpsest", and one in the "Iowa Journal of History".

The contributions he has made to various periodicals and the honors he has won make a list so long that this writer, for want of space, can only refer the reader to "Who's Who in America", "Who's Who in the Midwest", "Who's Who in Education", "Who's Who in Iowa", the "Biographical Directory of American Scholars", and "The Authors and Writers Who's Who" for further details.

RIDING THE RIVERS

Petersen is already embarked on an ambitious project which has him riding the rivers of America on tow boats and barges with his wife, Bessie.

A publisher wants to sign him to a single volume on Iowa history (the publisher wants it in two years, Bill thinks he can do it in four, and they'll probably compromise on three) and he is also commissioned to do a book on "Steamboating on the Rivers of America".

"That's why I'm taking these trips. For joy rides to a degree, but, boy, you should see the stuff I write on it. It's fun. It's different."

Referring to increased river traffic, he says, "They dreamed of a grain traffic back in the 20s and today it's the third largest. Think what's happened this year with the river all of a sudden clamping its jaws down there. (The ice blockade.)"

"Meanwhile, Bessie and I get down to New Orleans and lo and behold a large number of boats are anchored in the middle of the Mississippi, Russian and others, waiting for the grain to come down."

"So there we have Iowa farmers losing millions because they can't get the soybeans

out of the ground, compounded by railroad cars filled and barges held up by ice.

"I'm having my fun right now with the boats."

Petersen admits he is several years behind on his book about the rivers, but this is understandable. He helped build the historical society to over 10,000 members, second highest in the country, mainly through his editing and writing for "The Palimpsest", and the "Iowa Journal of History".

Paul Angle, co-author of a series of essays on "Doorways to American Culture", said that "states older than Iowa may have larger historical literatures, but no state has had its past so thoroughly explored and so widely disseminated by its own historical society."

Talking about his forthcoming book, Petersen agreed "It's a tough one, as I get into it, a highly-illustrated book entitled 'Steamboating on the Rivers of America,' but it may be divided into two parts to include tow boating."

"There will be 500 pictures on all the rivers of America, from the Hudson to the Sacramento, not only the Mississippi Valley."

"Right now I'm trying to lay the ground work by taking these trips with Bessie," he said, marveling at sometimes seeing 30 barges or more with 1,200 feet of tow ahead of them.

RIVER PROBLEMS

"You don't begin to appreciate the situations of what these pilots go through, running bridges and locks, etc., and circumstances like that. The lower river doesn't have bridges or locks, but it has problems of its own."

"About the only way to travel any distance these days is on barges," Peterson pointed out, noting that exception for the Delta Queen, "the excursion boats are all localized—15 or 20 miles, maybe. There are about 15 of them between St. Louis and New Orleans."

Last fall, the Petersens went from Burlington to Cairo and back to St. Louis and then had to get off because he had a date to speak at the Iowa State Bankers convention.

Bill says "It's nice to have been able to write something for a doctorate . . . You take 99 out of 100 doctorates and they gather dust on library shelves, but this I've been able to work on it all the way."

"If I could have 10 years of good active life I could have the most productive period of my career—just concentrating, no worries about administration or getting other things out."

"People say the steamboat is my doctorate. Well, a part of it is, but my doctorate was 313 typewritten pages and the steamboat book was 850 typewritten pages."

Add to this the 1968 reprint which added 160 pages of pictures, plus four sets of maps.

BIGGER BOATS

Mr. and Mrs. Petersen spent Christmas week on the Mississippi, aboard the "Mava Kelso," going upriver from New Orleans. The tow boats make about two round trips a month.

"These boats are so much bigger now," Bill said. "When I hitch-hiked before 1930, while I was working on my doctorate, you'd sleep in a bunk above the captain or pilot. This time we had a room with twin beds, shower, etc., with television."

The guest accommodations are usually used by company officials.

Yes, you might say that Bill and Bessie are finally free to do the things they like best.

When Msgr. Luigi Ligutti, one-time executive secretary of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, a former Iowa priest, and now residing in the Vatican in Rome, heard of Bill's approaching retirement, he wrote:

"You'll always be on 'deck'. I am sure Old Man Charon will give you a reserved seat when you cross the river Styx."

RESOLUTION TO ABOLISH THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution with the cosponsorship of 50 colleagues which provides for the dissolution of the House Committee on Internal Security.

When I first became a Member of Congress in 1966, I was among those who supported the continuance of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

At that time, I felt that the committee had a legitimate legislative function, but that the controversies that involved the committee stemmed from a leadership problem that resulted in abuses of private dignity and the rights of those who appeared before it.

Mr. Speaker, the leadership of the committee has changed along with the name of the committee and greater attention is now directed to a semblance of dignity and concern for individual rights.

However, Mr. Speaker, the problem involving this committee is much deeper than my initial superficial analysis.

Since 1945 the committee has issued 174 contempt citations. Of these, 142 have failed in the courts. In that same period, a total of 14 contempt citations were issued by all the other committees of the House combined.

The committee all too frequently is engaged in constitutional battles in the courts, the last of which involved the 1970 case where a blacklist of campus speakers was prohibited from being published by the committee.

In the 91st Congress, the committee spent more money than the Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, Judiciary, and Ways and Means Committees. Surely, the legislative product of the House Internal Security Committee is not commensurate with that huge expenditure.

But of greatest concern to me, Mr. Speaker, and indicative of the basic problem inherent in such a "thought-monitoring" committee, is the huge number of secret files and dossiers it maintains on thousands of individuals and organizations. I am advised there are over 754,000 cards containing unverified information on individual Americans. I am also advised that there is a special highly secret file wherein are kept the dossiers of Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like this "Big Brother" apparatus. I would like to point out that this resolution does not evolve from any disagreement with the integrity of the chairman or the members of the committee.

I am motivated by the fear of "Big Government," of "secret files," and "thought control," concepts that are embraced by the committee.

I further believe that the legitimate legislative objective of curtailing activities of those disloyal to our Nation can and should be performed by the House Committee on the Judiciary. That

responsibility can be carried out without the trappings of totalitarianism that have historically had such appeal to HUAC and its successor, the Committee on Internal Security.

SMALL BUSINESSMEN ARE OVERWHELMED WITH GOVERNMENT FORMS

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the following is a copy of a letter which I sent today to Mr. Joseph Wright, Acting Director of the Census Bureau, concerning the heavy burden of paperwork imposed on small businessmen during the first 2 months of this year. It is very untimely to request census forms from these businessmen when they are already faced with the enormous task of completing literally dozens of Federal, State, and local tax forms.

I would like to enter this letter and the supporting documentation in the RECORD since I believe it will be of interest to other Members and to the Nation.

It is my hope that during the Ways and Means Committee meetings on tax reform, we will at least be able to eliminate some of the filings required of small businessmen by the Internal Revenue Service.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 21, 1973.

Mr. JOSEPH WRIGHT,
Acting Director, Bureau of the Census, U.S.
Department of Commerce, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. WRIGHT: On December 27, 1972, your office issued a release concerning the commencement of the 1972 Economic Census.

Many small businesses in my district received their census packets after January 20, 1973, with a note that the forms were to be filled out and mailed back by February 15, 1973.

Many small firms have one accountant, or the owner serves as both the president and the accountant. For these firms the months of January and February are the heavy months for IRS and other government forms.

One small sporting goods operation received the census form, which requested information that he will not have until his tax data is completed, which he expects will be in early April. Yet he has to have it mailed by February 15th.

If information is not available, Census asks the firm to estimate the data. Some small businessmen in my district have notified me that they filled out the form with imaginary figures just to meet the February 15th deadline. In anger over the volume of forms and the pressure of the deadlines, my office was informed that some of these firms may even purposely distort their figures.

As an example of the staggering variety and volume of forms which businessmen must fill out for the Internal Revenue Service alone, I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I have received from a concerned constituent listing the various tax forms due in the Spring. This list does not include the additional forms sent out by the Census Bureau.

As a result, small firms are overwhelmed for a short period of time while the workload for the rest of the year is substantially lower.

If this is a problem on a national scale, and I expect it is, the poorly chosen time and haste demanded in this economic census will undermine both its intent and purpose.

It is my hope, under the circumstances, that the due date of the economic census forms be extended to May 15, 1973, for those who have not as yet met the February 15th deadline, so that the accountants may spend the proper amount of time to thoughtfully fill out the forms with more adequate and accurate data.

In the future, it would be advisable to coordinate the issuing of forms with IRS and other bureaus so that unnecessary pressure is not placed on citizens. Coordination will also insure the intent of the survey.

While I recognize the need and value of census information, it appears that the complex and comprehensive demand which you are currently making on small business will produce erroneous data and constitute the final blow to a large segment of small business which needs only one more form to collapse. Certainly a considerable amount of the information which you requested can be coordinated with the preparation of income tax information and the date on which such material is filed.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. VANIK,
Member of Congress.

A. A. VOSEN,
Public Accountant,

Solon, Ohio, February 15, 1973.

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: In accordance with our recent telephone conversation, concerning the Census Reports required to be filed by February 15 with the United States Department of Commerce, I am listing the various Federal, State, County, and City tax returns that Public Accountants must complete for their clients.

FORM NUMBER, TITLE OF RETURN, AND DUE DATE

Federal

940: Federal Unemployment Tax Return, January 31.

941: Employer's Quarterly Federal Tax Return, January 31.

W-2: Wage and Tax Statement (one for each employee), January 31.

W-3: Transmittal of Wage and Tax Statements, January 31.

1099: U.S. Information Return on Commissions, Dividends, and Interests, January 31.

1096: Transmittal Return for Form 1099, February 28.

1120, 1120S: Corporation Income Tax Return, March 15.

1165: Partnership Income Tax Return, April 15.

1040: Individual Income Tax Return, April 15.

State

IT-941: State Return of Income Tax Withheld, January 31.

IT-3: Reconciliation of Ohio Income Tax; Withheld and Transmittal of Wage and Tax Statement, January 31.

UCO2: Employer's Contribution Report (State Unemployment Tax Report), January 31.

DP21: State Workmen's Compensation Report, January 31.

FT-1120: Corporation Franchise Tax Report, January 31.

IT-1040: Ohio Individual Income Tax Return, April 15.

938-939: Security Valuation and Investor's List, March 31.

ST-10: Semi-Annual Sales Tax Return, February 28.

County

Tangible and Intangible Personal Property Tax Returns for Individuals, Proprietorships, and Corporations, April 30.

City

Employer's Quarterly Withheld Municipal Tax Return, January 31.

Reconciliation of Municipal Income Tax Withheld and Transmittal of Wage and Tax Statement, January 31.

City Business Returns and City Individual Income Tax Returns, April 30.

If these various tax returns are not filed by the due date, the small businessman or taxpayer is assessed a penalty plus interest by the various governmental agencies. Having to complete the long and involved Census Reports by February 15 places an undue burden upon the small independent accountant.

Your reply to my telephone call was greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

A. A. VOSEN,
Public Accountant.

PERSECUTION OF IRAQI AND SYRIAN JEWS MUST CEASE

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a resolution today expressing the outrage of Congress over the persecution by the Syrian and Iraqi Governments of their Jewish population. This resolution also calls upon the President to issue a public U.S. policy statement condemning the Iraqi and Syrian Governments' treatment of the Jews. Furthermore, it requests the Attorney General to announce that he will use his parole authority for any Syrian and Iraqi Jew fleeing persecution to enter the United States.

This resolution is being cosponsored by Ms. ABZUG, Mr. GEORGE BROWN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURTON, Mr. BYRON, Mr. CONTE, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DON EDWARDS, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FISH, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. HARRINGTON, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. POBELL, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. STARK, Mr. BRASCO, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. PIKE, and Mr. PEPPER.

The plight of the Syrian and Iraqi Jewish community is desperate. During the last few weeks in Iraq nine or 10 prominent members of the Jewish community were executed, their families harassed, and their property confiscated. The Jewish community in Syria is being denied their basic rights and can attempt to leave Syria only at great peril to themselves and their families. As Members of Congress, we must do all we can to mobilize public opinion around the world and take action to prevent such atrocities from occurring again.

An article from the New York Times of February 18 tells a heartrending story of an individual who had to flee Iraq because of the harassment and it gives his own testimony of what happened to his friends in the Jewish community. I am appending the article for the information of our colleagues:

HALF BAGHDAD'S JEWS SAID TO APPLY TO LEAVE

Half the members of the tiny Jewish community in Baghdad have applied for passports to leave Iraq in recent weeks in the face of a crackdown by Iraqi authorities, according to a first-hand account.

The description of the wave of arrests and intimidation of the Jewish community was provided in an interview last week with a 54-year-old shopkeeper from Baghdad, the Iraqi capital.

Along with his wife and seven children, Mussa Einy—that is not his real name—fled Iraq in late January. Neither his name nor his present whereabouts can be disclosed for fear of reprisals against his relatives remaining in Iraq.

ABOUT 700 JEWS LEFT

Mr. Einy confirmed previous diplomatic reports that 10 prominent members of the community were seized by Iraqi security men in September and taken away. None has been heard from since, and Baghdad's Jews assume, Mr. Einy said, that all or most of them have been executed in prison.

Mr. Einy said that there were approximately 700 Jews still in Baghdad—nearly twice the number reported by Western intelligence sources.

Although they cannot prove it, Mr. Einy said, the Jews of Baghdad believe that the campaign of arrests and suspected executions is the result of collusion between the Iraqi security services and the ruling Baath party that is aimed at taking over the extensive properties the Jewish community still holds communally in Baghdad.

PROPERTY SEIZED

These holdings, which date back to the period before 1948 when there were more than 200,000 Jews living in Iraq, include enormous school and hospital complexes, apartment and office buildings, movie theaters, clinics, extensive athletic fields and parks in the center of Baghdad. Mr. Einy estimated that the communal holdings totaled some 200 buildings in all, with a value he put at between \$150 million and \$200 million.

The objective of the current campaign, he said, is to frighten the remnants of the once-large Jewish community into fleeing Iraq and leaving their property behind.

He added that the property of the men arrested last September—some of it very considerable—had all been seized by Baath party officials. In addition, strict laws have been passed forbidding Jews to sell any property or withdraw more than 100 dinars, or \$280, from a bank in any month.

To a large extent, Mr. Einy said, the policy of intimidation is succeeding.

"Life has become impossible for the Jews since September," he said. "They are constantly afraid now. No one goes anywhere alone any more for fear of being arrested."

The first man to be arrested, Mr. Einy said, was Yaacov Abdul Aziz, a prominent and wealthy lawyer.

SEIZED BEFORE YOM KIPPUR

Mr. Einy said: "It was about 6:30 in the evening, three days before Yom Kippur. He had just left the synagogue when some men from one of the security services caught him alone in a narrow alley. They blindfolded him and took him away."

"When his family went to the police they denied knowing anything about the arrest. Later the security men claimed he had left the country and came and took all his property."

The pattern of the subsequent arrests was the same, Mr. Einy said. "The security men would wait until they got them alone, usually coming home from the synagogue or their shops at night. They would grab them, blindfold them and take them away."

"Each time the security men would claim that the missing man had left the country. Then they would come and take the furniture and everything that would move and sell it at auction. Later we say party officials driving around in their cars."

Another event shocked and frightened the Jewish community even more than the arrests, Mr. Einy said. It was the brutal murder of Abraham el-Sayegh, one of the wealthiest Jews in Baghdad, a few days after the arrest of the lawyer.

BEATEN TO DEATH

Mr. Einy said: "His body was found in his home sprawled on the floor. He had been beaten to death with an iron bar. A few days later they came and took over all his property. He was a very rich man. He owned apartment houses, office buildings and many shops in the market."

Mr. Einy made his own decision to leave on Dec. 20—a day he says he will never forget. He said: "I was driving on a road on the far side of the Tigris, about an hour from home, when a tire went flat. I found the spare was flat also, and I had to walk half an hour to find someone to fix it."

"My family had expected me home by 1 o'clock. When I arrived at 2:30, the house was full of neighbors, my wife was hysterical and my children upset. They were all sure I had been caught and taken away. I knew we couldn't live like that any more. I made up my mind to leave."

A month later, Mr. Einy and his family boarded a Middle East Airlines plane for Beirut, Lebanon, on the way to a new life. "I had to leave everything behind," he said. "I closed up the house and drove my car to the school and parked it in the back with the keys in the ignition."

Although half the Jewish community in Baghdad was making active plans to leave by the time he left, Mr. Einy doubts that the other 300 to 350 persons will ever leave. "Baghdad is their home," he said, "just as it was mine. That's where they have their property and that's where they will stay."

COMMUNITY LAND GRANT ACT OF 1973

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, last Congress I introduced legislation entitled the "Community Land Grant Act of 1971" (H.R. 9422). Today I am reintroducing that legislation.

While hearings were not held last year on the proposed law, I am hopeful that this year a full inquiry and legislative action will take place in regard to the land grant matter. As you know, Mr. Speaker, over 100 million acres of land is involved, stretching from Texas to California; and the proposed legislation would affect nearly 10 million of our citizens of Mexican descent, today often termed "chicanos."

The bill purports to do a very simple and humane deed. Its singular, most important purpose is to right a 123-year-old wrong which has been perpetuated by the imperfect and/or nonimplementation of the Guadalupe-Hidalgo Treaty by which this Nation acquired from Mexico the entire Southwest. That 100-year-old wrong has resulted in the systematic theft of

Mexican-Americans' land and property. Unfortunately, the Federal Government shares in the dubious distinction of helping to take land from its own citizens. Though millions of acres are involved, much of the original land grants still remain under the Federal Government's auspices, held by the National Park Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

In terms of today's concerns and imperatives, the bill would also encourage the traditional Mexican-American practices of ecology and good land management for the total environment. Furthermore, the proposal's restoration and revival of dying or dead Mexican-American rural communities would provide a needed boost to rural life and values in a large area of the Nation.

This long neglected question of justice for our Nation's Mexican-American citizens needs the prompt and full attention of the Congress. I trust that it will receive that attention this year.

A DECADE ON THE ECOLOGY BATTLEFRONT

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, within the last decade, America has undergone a reawakening of thought and concern over the environmental effects of many of its actions. During this decade we have witnessed an increased dependence upon conservationists to be vanguards of the environmental crusade. This campaign has become a rallying point for many of our citizens and has instilled within them an element of concern about the probable effects of human actions upon the environment in which we live.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, we have arrived at a point where commonsense has come to play a larger role than ever before in decisions that concern possible detrimental action to the environment. Our realization that progress is indispensable to our future growth has attained a new interpretation. Progress is no longer synonymous with growth, but has been equated with the extent to which we can achieve an environmental setting that will provide for the continued existence of man.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I submit that we have only seen the beginning of the environmental age. Environmental activity has only begun to address itself to surface problems. The problems that await a solution will have an impact that will inevitably cause us to rearrange our lifestyle. To what extent and at what costs are only to be answered in speculation that is immeasurable at the present time. If we view our lifestyle with a contempt for nature then we only shorten the period of time that the earth will survive. If, however, we consistently work for implementation and growth of the attitude that has developed over the past decade, then we assure ourselves of a continued and healthy existence.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD an article written by Harold Gilliam and carried in the San Francisco Examiner and Chronicle on January 7 reflecting that period which has given birth to the ecological movement. The past decade is eloquently described with an added emphasis upon what the future portends for the ecological movement and for our Nation.

The article follows:

A DECADE ON THE ECOLOGY BATTLEFRONT

(By Harold Gilliam)

It is an immemorial custom at this annual time of endings and beginnings to look back at the past year and try to sum up its events and significance. Instead, this year in "This Land" we are going to look back at the past decade. It has been about ten years since this column began—a decade that has marked the beginning of a revolutionary turn in the 350-year affair between Americans and nature—from conquest to cooperation.

At the beginning of the decade, conservationists were an obscure minority waging losing fights on innumerable fronts to preserve valuable areas of natural America. By the end of the decade they were in the vanguard of an environmental movement that had enlisted millions, had swept through the communications media with a speed and thoroughness that has few parallels in American history, had become a political force across the nation, had turned many elements of business and industry to such ecologically constructive activities as recycling, pollution control and preservation of the natural landscape.

It has been the purpose of "This Land" to chronicle environmental action during these tumultuous years and to evaluate it, as my fellow critics in these pages evaluate the current doings in art, music and literature.

I am grateful for the opportunity to be at the scene of the greatest action. The San Francisco region is to the environment what Paris has historically been—and New York currently is—to music and art. It is the acknowledged leader, the place that sets the standards, fosters the traditions and gives birth to the innovations. This is the environmental capital of the United States—and to some degree of the world, as was evident at Stockholm last summer when Bay Area environmentalists played leading roles at the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment.

The first major environmental controversy that appeared on this page was the effort to create the Point Reyes National Seashore, the first national park area within a metropolitan region (along with Cape Cod). During the decade Point Reyes confronted more perils than Pauline, but the story climaxed happily this year with the creation of the magnificent Golden Gate National Recreation Area, adjoining and protecting Point Reyes along its vulnerable eastern flank. The story is not over, however, for both parks face the threat of overcrowding and overdevelopment.

Next was the battle of Bodega Head, immediately north of Point Reyes, where PG&E planned a nuclear power plant but gave up when earthquake faults were found at the site by the U.S. Geologic Survey. A similar struggle is now taking place over PG&E's proposed nuclear plant farther north at Point Arena in Mendocino county.

The safety of nuclear plants, particularly in earthquake areas, has been frequently debated on this page, and the Atomic Energy Commission is currently holding nuclear safety hearings in Washington. We have also written here about the promising discoveries of geothermal energy in the Imperial Valley as an alternative to nuclear power, but the energy establishment seems so committed to

nuclear fission that there is still no money for a large-scale geothermal program.

The great San Francisco freeway revolt was chronicled here in the early 1960's, when Golden Gate Park and the northern waterfront were saved from the bulldozers by mass action—non-violent, but otherwise in the best tradition of Lexington and Concord. From here a chain reaction of freeway insurrections spread across the country. As a result, the highway engineers no longer reign supreme over U.S. cities and countryside.

When an article appeared in this journal in 1964 entitled "Why Not Bring Back the Ferries?", one reaction was: "Sure, and bring back the horse and buggy, too." But now the new ferries of the Golden Gate Bridge District carry growing numbers of people to and from Marin, and we may hope that in the future ferries will be used to the East Bay and up and down the bay as well. Greater reliance on this relaxing means of travel, in preference to freeway driving, would doubtless diminish appreciably the Bay Area ulcer rate.

The bay itself was the focus of one of the great environmental battles of the decade. The "housewives campaign" to save it from destruction by filling has been widely written up as a model for citizen action elsewhere. The effort resulted in the creation of the highly successful Bay Conservation and Development Commission, which itself was a model for the new Coastal Conservation Commissions established by law when California voters approved of the coastal initiative in the last election.

A good many words on this page have been devoted to the parallel efforts to save open space and limit the growth of communities. The most notable developments have been in Livermore and Pleasanton, which have voted conditionally to withhold building permits; Petaluma, which set limits to its own growth; Napa county, which saved its vineyards by a 20-acre zoning law; and Marin, where the county's western hills and valley are being zoned in parcels as large as 60 acres. The Association of Bay Area Governments' open space plan points out what can be saved in other counties, and ABAG itself has shattered precedent by adopting a policy of limiting population growth in the entire region. It should be noted that these are not attempts to stop all growth but simply to put it under control.

It appears at long last that growth and progress are no longer synonymous—at least in the suburbs. In the city, the growth myth has not died, and the process of Manhattanization continues, abated only slightly by the new Urban Design Plan.

A subject that has recurrently appeared on this page, to little avail, is the great earthquake scandal: the appalling failure of California cities to forestall earthquake casualties by building-safety regulations. San Francisco has not even taken the minimum step of enforcing a parapet ordinance.

Beyond the Bay Area, other struggles have moved across this page during the decade: the battles to keep dams out of the Grand Canyon, to create a Redwood National Park (which is still far too small for adequate protection), to recycle solid waste and sewage, to limit urbanization at Tahoe and along the coast, to preserve natural streams and rivers (the Corps of Engineers, partly as a result of Bay Area initiatives is taking innovative approaches).

Nationally as well as locally, there have been environmental achievements that would have been undreamed of even five years ago—the two-year delay in the mammoth Alaska pipeline project for ecological reasons, the cancellation of the cross-Florida barge canal, the defeat of the SST, the huge industry investment in pollution control, the leveling off of the U.S. birth rate, the new laws enabling citizens to haul gov-

ernment officials into court for failing to account for the environmental impact of their activities.

I would like to offer my very grateful thanks to the hundreds of generous people who have supplied information for this page, my regrets to those whose favorite environmental cause has not appeared here, my apologies to those (dismayingly many!) whose communications remain unanswered, my gratitude to the editors who make it all possible.

I would predict that all of the environmental activity we have seen so far is only a beginning. The biggest questions have not yet been answered. Perhaps they have not even been asked. The future of man on the planet remains uncertain. But the new era of the environment opens before us, revealing whole new ranges of opportunity. No one can anticipate the profound changes it will bring in our modes of living and our relation to the earth.

FHA INSURED COOPERATIVE HOUSING: THROWING OUT THE BABY WITH THE BATH WATER

HON. RICHARD H. FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, among the many good programs to meet human needs which the administration so unwisely is attempting to cripple or destroy through insensitive and unwisely budget cuts are the Federal Housing Administration's programs to insure housing cooperatives.

Since the enactment of the Housing Act of 1950, which authorized the Federal Housing Administration to insure housing cooperatives, thousands of low, moderate and middle income families have obtained home ownership which, in many cases, would otherwise have been beyond their reach.

Most of the cooperatives financed through both assisted and nonassisted FHA programs are townhouse communities which provide their residents with not only good shelter, but also open green areas, recreational and meeting facilities, maintenance and social activities. Since they operate on a democratic basis, wherein residents elect their own board of directors and vote on important community issues, co-ops also train their members to be better, more active citizens of the larger community.

Figures compiled by the Urban Institute of Management and Research and released on December 31, 1971, confirm that cooperatives offer marked environmental and financial advantages as compared with other types of FHA-insured housing.

The Urban Institute study revealed that cooperatives, on the average, have a decidedly lower unit density than do comparable rental properties. It also noted that the co-ops consisted, for the most part, of townhouses, whereas rental properties consisted primarily of stacked apartment units.

The study found, too, that cooperatives enjoy a better default rate than even single family dwellings and con-

siderably lower maintenance, operating and administrative costs than most rental properties.

The 221(d)(3) below-market-interest-rate program and its successor, section 236, have served in recent years to bring these benefits to low-income families. Many of these families have come from unstable, low standard rental or public housing environments; others are elderly or young couples struggling to maintain a decent standard of living on very limited incomes. The success of their cooperatives—no section 236 cooperative has been foreclosed—has demonstrated that these people can meet their financial responsibilities and contribute to the life of a healthy community.

In the following letter, a member testifies to the benefits he and his family have enjoyed as members of an assisted cooperative:

INDEPENDENCE, Mo.,
November 1, 1972.

MR. CHARLES PARLEE,
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PARLEE: The wisdom of experience only comes in full measure to those who have undergone the particular activity. As an active and concerned member of Highleah Townhouses in the Kansas City area I therefore feel qualified to comment for the record.

If one researches the true meaning of a housing cooperative he finds that it constitutes a collection of family and single tenant residences, organized on the basis of economic cooperation, acting and willing to act with others. Inherent within its structure is the pride of ownership and the simultaneous security of sharing responsibility collectively.

My wife and I are parents of two small children. We both work but due to my full-time responsibility as a medical student our income is limited. Neither of our parents can afford to help us to any extent but we manage. The daily struggle is often more than we anticipated but we share a common dream in graduation.

Our home here at Highleah is one of our few precious possessions for which we are both thankful and proud. We enjoy the comfort and space of our three bedroom townhouse and monthly give thanks for its nominal cost, but to us Highleah is much more. We treasure its brotherhood. The occupants of our particular circle share everything from evening meals to babysitters and we find common ground in our struggle to survive without sufficient money.

Mr. Parlee, not only will I endorse cooperative living, I would seriously question the integrity of any individual or organization that might question the need for its existence. Stand fast on your enthusiasm for housing cooperatives and feel free to call upon those of us here in mid-America to help continue its necessary expansion.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. SHEPLER.

SALUTE TO LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate, at a time when our Nation is thankful for a peace settlement in a far

corner of the world, for us to turn our thoughts to another peace-loving country. I join my colleagues and the 1 million and more Americans of Lithuanian descent in the United States in commemorating the 722d anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian State and the 55th anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania.

Dominated by czarist Russia from 1795, this proud country declared its independence February 16, 1918. The United States recognized the Republic of Lithuania May 31, 1921; admission to the League of Nations was obtained September 22, 1921; and a permanent constitution adopted August 1, 1922. Basic human dignities were reasserted, and remarkable achievements in land reform, social progress, educational improvements, and encouragement of the arts were made under the elected President.

But in June 1940, these brave people were once again enslaved when the Soviet Union took over the Baltic States. The war that ravaged Europe took its toll in Lithuania, and independence has never been regained.

Since 1940, with the statement of the Freedom Charter of the Baltic States, each administration in the United States has opposed subjugation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. In 1966 the U.S. Congress unanimously passed House Concurrent Resolution 416, calling for freedom for these countries.

I strongly urge President Nixon to continue our tradition of support for the oppressed by requesting self-determination of the Baltic States as a top priority consideration at the upcoming European Security Conference.

The gallant Lithuanians have suffered greatly, with battles waged on their soil and minds, and humiliations inflicted on their bodies and souls.

Yet these indomitable people, through centuries of conquest and servitude, have never ceased striving for the freedom and justice that are our birthright. Lithuania is, tragically, a captive nation. Lithuanians are, astonishingly, not captive spirits. I respectfully salute the Republic of Lithuania.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE
COLGATE W. DARDEN, JR.

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, all of us in public life have occasion to hear many speeches—some good, some not so good, and occasionally a truly great one.

It was my privilege to hear just such a speech on February 10 at a significant ceremony celebrating the granting of the Royal Charter to the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Va.

The speaker was the Honorable Colgate W. Darden, Jr., former Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, former Governor of Virginia, former president of the University of Virginia, to

mention just a few of his notable achievements in life. Governor Darden is a man of impressive credentials and even the most casual remark from him is worth remembering.

His remarks on that occasion should be made accessible to every American interested in the future of our Government and our country. But more importantly, his words should be heeded by those of us in public office who are diligently and conscientiously trying to serve our country and our constituencies at the same time.

He very wisely opines:

The one indispensable element in our government, and the one that is presently sorely lacking is self-discipline. Without self-discipline we cannot achieve the restraint necessary to manage properly our affairs, and no amount of money, no amount of good intentions, and no amount of beguiling political oratory can save from grave difficulties what Lord Bryce described, not too many years ago, as a superb political system.

There are other thoughts expressed by him which I think will be found interesting and informative; so I insert his entire remarks in this issue of the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY HON. COLGATE W. DARDEN, JR.

Mr. Rector, Ladies and Gentlemen: You were kind to invite me to join you for this important celebration and I am very glad to be with you again. My association with William and Mary goes back more years than I like to remember. As a boy in public school, with teachers from this college, and then through schoolmates who found their way here, I came to know it well.

I was among those in Norfolk who in the late twenties enlisted the support of Dr. J. A. C. Chandler in the establishment of a branch of the College in that city. We could not have encountered a more willing nor a more effective helper. It was this branch which became in the fullness of time, Old Dominion University.

A few years ago it was my good fortune to serve with President Paschall on the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Revision. Owing to the kindness of Pat, a sub-committee of which we were members met here. Our assignment involved sections of our Constitution having to do with the Bill of Rights and with public education. Since Mr. Mason had drafted the Bill of Rights and Mr. Jefferson had laid the solid foundations for an effective school system, although our Constitution was singularly silent on the subject until 1870, our work was not onerous.

We were able, among other things, to produce a provision that aimed at uniformly good schools throughout the Commonwealth. It is, I believe a valuable addition to our basic law. Pat's encyclopedic knowledge of the Virginia school system, its strengths and its weaknesses, and the unfailing help of his staff, enabled us to arrive at the suggestions which we made. Our work here was done under unusually pleasant conditions, so you can readily understand my devotion to William and Mary.

An interesting study concerning unemployment among college graduates came my way near the close of last year. While the study dealt particularly with the problems confronting those attempting to improve their chances in business and industry, it suggested other aspects of higher education which are of interest.

The writer referred to the great American Dream. It was based, he said, on the widely held assumption that by means of education "successive generations will advance from blue collar to white collar to executive pin stripe." And this is true but only to a limited extent. One of the problems presently

confronting us is that the opportunities for advancement along this rather narrow road are limited even in a country as large and prosperous as is ours.

It might be noted that this observation as to the American Dream has its roots deep in American history. Alexis de Tocqueville, in his perceptive work "Democracy in America" (1835), described the Americans "as having a lively faith in the perfectibility of man; they are of opinion that the effects of the diffusion of knowledge must necessarily be advantageous and the consequence of ignorance fatal."

The study stressed the fact that unemployment was beginning to appear in the professions. Chemists, engineers, lawyers, and teachers were listed as among those having difficulty in finding positions. This imbalance had its origin, according to the author, in the legislation providing for the education of World War II veterans.

I think it more likely the real thrust came from quite another direction. The mighty effort which lifted the total spending on higher education from 4.2 billion dollars in 1956 to 28 billion dollars last year, most of it for science and technology, in my opinion flowed directly from the cold fear which the launching of Sputnik in 1957, engendered in the United States. This event frightened our government almost to the point of panic. From the President down there was grave concern because it gave notice to us that Russia, already deeply engaged in the cold war, was moving at an alarming pace toward overtaking the superiority in nuclear weapons behind which we were sleeping.

Certainly it cannot be said that we failed to bestir ourselves once we grasped the gravity of the situation. We plunged full speed into science and technology and I am sure there is not one among us who was not deeply moved by the great scientific capacity demonstrated in the Apollo Missions concluded last year. However, with this new emphasis we tended to neglect what for want of a better description we refer to as general education. We misread the times in this and we are only beginning now to realize it. As a result we are examining again our educational needs and we are reassessing those institutions which undergird a free society. We must spare no effort to this end.

This miscalculation occurred probably because the USSR so startled us by the successful launching of the satellite that, thrown off balance, we hastened to revamp our educational system to make it more closely resemble that of the nation which had so shocked us by producing this scientific marvel. Whatever the cause it was a mistake of the first order.

The Russian educational system, with its emphasis on science and technology, was designed to serve a rigid authoritarian order, and this it does quite well. However, it is not able to nourish and sustain the relatively free political institutions which constitute the framework of our society. By diminishing the vigorous support of general education which is, in truth, the life blood of our political institutions, we gravely impair the structure of our government.

It is not too much to say, I believe, that this aberration made some contribution to the violence and bigotry which swept many of our institutions of higher learning in the 1960s. I believe the fragmentation of learning which followed the waning confidence in the value of the Liberal Arts caused much of the restlessness and rootlessness which marked the sixties, and these in turn contributed directly to the violence which was so dismaying. This violence made it appear, at least for a time, that the long struggle to substitute reason for force, which is why colleges and universities were founded, had ended in failure.

We must take care therefore that in the future we do not neglect the support of good

general education for all who are found competent, because there can be no over supply of those who can profit from this, and who will in turn be more useful citizens.

One does not have to be an especially acute observer to understand the terrific stresses under which our political institutions are attempting to operate. Nor does one have to be a pessimist to conclude that unless substantial improvements can be made in our present system of government it will have difficulty in surviving.

The one indispensable element in our government, and the one that is presently sorely lacking is self-discipline. Without self-discipline we cannot achieve the restraint necessary to manage properly our affairs, and no amount of money, no amount of good intentions, and no amount of beguiling political oratory can save from grave difficulties what Lord Bryce described, not too many years ago, as a superb political system. Interestingly enough De Tocqueville, to whom I have just referred, pointed out that self-indulgence, such as we are now experiencing, could put an end to our government which he considered one of the most promising experiments ever undertaken.

This self-indulgence, which always produces internal difficulties and a decline in national will, underlies the somber conclusion reached by General Maxwell Taylor, in "Swords and Ploughshares", published last year. General Taylor who held at one time or another the highest positions in our army and who served as trusted military and civil advisor to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, in commenting on the difficulties that now afflict us, observed: "Unless we can learn to exercise some degree of self-discipline, to accept and enforce some reasonable standard of responsible civic conduct—we will be unable to meet the hard competition awaiting us in the decade of the 1970s."

Our difficulty was put in a more down to earth manner a few months back by a commentator writing from Washington, who stated that our national representatives had managed "to divorce the joys of spending from the miseries of taxing." And so it seems they have. Under our system of government it has been the necessity to tax in order to raise money for the operation of the government that has served as a reasonably effective counterbalance to excessive spending. But both of our major political parties now appear to be committed to printing money as a means of supplying the funds required to operate the government. As a result no candidate for national office seems to have any chance of election unless he is prepared to promise greater and greater benefits to those who he aspires to represent, and to do this, of course, without raising taxes. This he can do only by deficit spending; in short by printed money.

It is futile to blame the candidates for this alarming state of affairs. They are the victims, although infrequently not unwilling victims, of the system upon which we, the voters, appear to have put our stamp of approval. Unless all experience is in error this resort to uncontrolled deficit spending will end, as former experiments with paper money have ended, in misery and violence. We shall destroy our currency and we shall beggar the most substantial class of our citizens, those who over the years have put aside in savings some of their earnings. And having impoverished these people we shall have laid the foundation for a destruction of our political institutions.

It would be unfair to leave this bleak observation without some qualification. Many things have happened since I entered the U.S. House of Representatives some forty years ago, but the most profound change has been the great enlargement of the responsibilities of government for the welfare of the people.

All in all this concern for the ordinary

citizen has been good. Notwithstanding the costly mistakes which have been made, there is little doubt but that this enlargement of federal and state responsibility is an inescapable obligation of the modern industrial state. We shall make mistakes as we go along, but these can be corrected. However, we cannot offer any valid excuse for failing to make the effort to come to grips with problems that are part and parcel of a rapidly expanding industrial population. We do not live any longer in an agrarian economy, and industrialization has brought many problems along with its benefits.

It is the willingness to experiment, to attempt to repair our errors while not losing sight of the substantial objectives which we have set for ourselves that gives encouragement to those of us who believe that men have the capacity to govern themselves. It is our refusal to pay the costs of these needed social services which are within our means, and our recourse more and more to questionable financial schemes that give thoughtful people deep concern. It is self-indulgence at its worse.

When you divorce the "joys of spending from the miseries of taxing", to use the expression of the commentator, you remove the governor from an incredibly powerful and effective engine for economic and social advancement. As we forego the compulsion to tax in order provide funds for proliferating programs we abandon the only sure means we have to compel the elimination of those agencies of government found to be lacking in effectiveness.

The means whereby we can achieve the self-discipline which we require are not easy to develop, but certainly they do not lie beyond our reach. Some of you will remember hearing President Roosevelt many years ago refer to the United States as the "arsenal of democracy" and so it was when we were moving toward World War II, and the West was depending more and more on the vast industrial plants of this country. The United States remains the "arsenal of democracy" but in a far broader and a far deeper sense. Now our colleges and universities constitute the powerful defenses that guard our civilization. It is in these institutions that our people can and must be trained.

Self-government, more than any form of government contrived by man, requires an informed and intellectually disciplined citizenry. Lack of such a citizenry has resulted in the destruction of no end of governments in the past, and if we fail to achieve a reasonable level of competence among our people and to instill in them an understanding of the necessity of participating in government, there is no reason to believe we shall fare any better. As we enlarge the electorate by lowering the age at which our citizens can vote and by striking down literacy tests, we are enlarging substantially the number of those who must be instructed if they are to make a meaningful contribution to government. However, we need not despair because of the troubles that plague us if we can summon to meet them the wit and courage which in the past have been found, and which in my opinion exist still in ample supply, in our land. We are a young and virile people, inhabiting a rich area blessed with a good climate and protected on two sides by great sea barriers. Certainly we should be able to achieve that restraint and moderation which self-government demands and without which it will surely fail.

We must drill into the minds of those who are assuming the awesome burden of citizenship the necessity of achieving a balance between freedom and responsibility. What I have in mind was well put by a distinguished group of Harvard Scholars in a report entitled "General Education in a Free Society" which appeared at the close of World War II, when they stated:

"It is important to realize that the ideal of a free society involves a twofold balance, the value of freedom and that of society. Democracy is a community of free men. We are apt sometime to stress freedom—the power of individual choice and the right to think for oneself—without taking sufficient account of the obligations to co-operate with our fellow men; democracy must represent an adjustment between the value of freedom and social living." The Committee goes on to say, "Of course when union is stressed to the exclusion of freedom we, fall into totalitarianism; but when freedom is stressed exclusively we fall into chaos."

Throughout the whole study runs the theme of balanced thinking—of self-discipline. As President Conant, who appointed the Committee, stated in his introduction to the report: "The heart of the problem of a general education is the continuance of the liberal and humane tradition. Neither the mere acquisition of information nor the development of special skills and talents can give the broad basis of understanding which is essential if our civilization is to be preserved."

And long before this Woodrow Wilson, in his heroic struggle to revitalize the curriculum of Princeton University was pointing out the kind of education needed by young America. As his distinguished biographer, Dr. Arthur Link stated at Hampden Sydney College last year: "Liberal Education, Wilson said many times, seeks to impart discipline. Modern life is of all things changeable, and because changeable demands minds that are changeable. The discipline, therefore, that the modern man needs is the discipline of general preparation for the difficult task of our own day."

Shortly after the turn of the century Mr. Wilson discussing the responsibility of the colleges observed: "For the college is now bound, in times of confused counsel, to supply the country not merely with men, in the ordinary popular sense of the word—but also with men who can perceive, men who have something more than skill and aptitude and knowledge, men whose attention is not wholly centered upon making their own living, but is spent also upon the very exigent matter of lifting all the counsels of the country to a higher plane and place and opportunity of vision." Unfortunately the faculty or some powerful members of the faculty, allied with influential alumni blocked Mr. Wilson's plan for Princeton. However, they did succeed in making him President of the United States—the rank and file of Americans being somewhat more perceptive than those who labored in that academic vineyard.

Dr. Link went on to say in his admirable advocacy of liberal education, "Mr. Wilson believed universities which trained men to consider contemporary problems without carefully establishing the connection of their thought with that of the past were instruments of social destruction, for the worst possible enemy of society was the man who, with a strong faculty for reasoning and action, was cut loose in his standards of judgment from the past." There has never been a time in the history of our country when these words were more pertinent than they are today, and I find myself in complete accord with them.

I have long believed that all government, regardless of the name by which it is known, tends to tyranny, and unless carefully watched is quite apt to end there. As I grow older I am surer than ever that the people themselves are the only reliable guardians of their affairs, and that our great responsibility is to educate them for this important task, since each generation must demonstrate anew its capacity to govern.

We could do no better, I believe, in meeting this responsibility than to follow the

advice of the University of Virginia's most distinguished alumnus. Mr. Wilson, more than seventy-five years ago wrote that good education required "courses of instruction in that literature which contains the ideals of its race and all the nice proofs and subtle inspirations of the character, spirit and thought of the nation which it serves; and besides that, instruction in the history and leading conceptions of those institutions which have served the nation's energies in the preservation of order and the maintenance of just standards of civic virtue and public purpose. These should constitute the common training of all students, as the only means of schooling their spirits for their common life as citizens."

I spoke earlier of violence in our colleges and universities. This hostility to traditional values, disturbing though it be, should not be taken as a sure sign of decay. The unhappy events may be a by-product of growth. Machiavelli thought such to be the case with the disorders in the Roman Republic and so stated in his "Discourses." However, one need not agree with Machiavelli's appraisal of the Roman tumults to understand that hostility to tradition, unpleasant though it be, is in the long run far less dangerous to our social order than hostility to change, for change is at once inevitable and desirable. I shall close these random remarks with an observation as to this which you may find of interest.

"Laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times. We might as well require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy, as civilized society, to remain ever under the regimen of their ancestors." This wise statement which is especially applicable now was made toward the close of his life by an old William and Mary boy who is the patron saint of many of us, and one who believed until the end of his life that broad education was the only safeguard of the liberties of his fellow citizens. He graduated in the class of 1762. According to some of his contemporaries he was given, in the early days of his stay here, to fiddle playing and frolicking activities or reasonable variations of them, not unknown in these times, I understand. Be that as it may he did reasonably well. During a long and useful life he found time to take the lead in drafting the American Declaration of Independence, to author the legislation for Religious Freedom in Virginia, to serve as Governor of Virginia, during which time he was elected to the Board of Visitors of this College. He served as Minister to France was Washington's Secretary of State, Vice President with Adams and President of the United States for two terms. Finally in his old age he addressed himself to the establishment of the University of Virginia, over the opening of which he presided the year before his death.

Among the great figures from the past who look down upon us today as we celebrate the granting of the Charter of this venerable institution it would not be possible to find one who saw more clearly her limitless possibilities, nor one who treasured for her a deeper affection than did this distinguished alumnus. He never forgot the rewarding days spent in Williamsburg. And I am sure, Mr. Jefferson would view with complete understanding and approval the youthful spirit and dedication to speculative thinking which obtains here. For these are the beacon lights of the great humanist tradition to which William and Mary has adhered tenaciously over the years, and which set it apart as one of America's distinguished centers of learning.

CONGRESSMAN DINGELL PARTICIPATES IN DETROIT AREA LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE RESTORATION CEREMONY

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I was highly honored to participate February 18, 1973 with the Lithuanian-Americans of the Detroit, Mich., area in a ceremony to mark the 55th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania—which today is a Soviet-dominated land.

The country of Lithuania, which was independent from the end of World War I until 1941, was conquered by the Russians at the beginning of World War II. This Baltic nation, whose people proudly and bravely resisted Russian takeover, was absorbed into the realm of the U.S.S.R. after World War II.

The president of the Lithuanian National Council, Dr. Kazys Bobelis, spoke at the commemorative event in Detroit on Sunday telling of the resistance fighting by Lithuanians against the Russians. Dr. Bobelis was one of the freedom fighters.

I call for the President of the United States to request that the American delegation to the forthcoming European Security Conference state the strong desire of Lithuanian-Americans and the United States for the restoration of the right of freedom for Lithuania.

I include the following:

RESOLUTION

We, the Lithuanians of Metropolitan Detroit, gathered on February 18, 1973, to commemorate the 55th anniversary since the restoration of Lithuania's independence.

RECALLING THAT

1. The sovereignty and independence of the Lithuanian state, restored by the act of the Lithuanian Council on February 16th, 1918, won and protected by the blood sacrifice of the Lithuanian people during 1918-1920, and recognized by the international community was destroyed by the Soviet Union in 1940 by military occupation and incorporation into the U.S.S.R.

2. The Lithuanian people continued the unequal struggle for freedom from 1944-1952, when large Soviet military and police forces finally managed to extinguish armed resistance.

3. The Soviet Russian occupying power has perpetuated acts of genocide in Lithuania, resulting in the deportation to Siberia and other remote areas, and in the physical extermination of about one million Lithuanians, which constitutes one-third of the nation.

4. The freedom fight of the Lithuanian nation has now acquired different forms, which have received worldwide attention. Among the recent outstanding acts of resistance are these:

(a) 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 Vilnius, in May, 1971, to ten years of especially forced labor;

(b) The self-immolation of Romas Kalanta, a young student and worker, in a public park in Kaunas on May 14, 1972, of V. Stonys on May 18, 1972, and K. Andriuskevicius on June 4, 1972—actions designed to symbolize

the Lithuanian people's protest against the occupying power, and their demand for freedom.

(c) The petition addressed at the juncture of 1971-1972 to the First Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party, Leonid Brezhnev, and to the Secretary General of the United Nations, Kurt Waldheim, by 17,000 Lithuanian religious believers who risked their personal freedom in protesting against the denial of religious freedom in Soviet-occupied Lithuania.

WE RESOLVE

1. To demand that the Soviet Union withdraw its military forces and administrative apparatus from Lithuania and allow the Lithuanian people to govern themselves.

2. To request the President of the United States of America to instruct his delegation at the Conference on European Security and Cooperation in Helsinki that it demand the restoration of the sovereignty and of the independence of Lithuania.

3. To ask Senators and Congressmen of the United States for their support of the above requests.

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM: JOEL BERLINER, HAWAII'S WINNER IN VFW "VOICE OF DEMOCRACY" CONTEST, MAKES ELOQUENT PLEA

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies auxiliary sponsor a nationwide "Voice of Democracy" scholarship competition. High school students from every area of America participate in the speech contest—which was won last year, incidentally, by a young man from Hawaii. The final results of the 1973 competition will be decided here in Washington during the first week of March.

This year's winner in my State of Hawaii, who is now competing for the national scholarship prizes, is Joel Berliner, a junior at Radford High School in Honolulu, and the son of Mr. and Mrs. Orval S. Berliner. I take this opportunity to congratulate Joel, his parents, and the VFW. In his winning speech, Joel eloquently emphasizes the theme of this year's contest, "My Responsibility to Freedom." His speech follows:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

The old religious hymn, "Lay my burden down," usually brings to mind an elderly negro working in a cotton or tobacco field, asking the Lord to allow him to die so that he might be relieved of his burdens on this earth. Burdens of oppression, prejudice, and years of unyielding work.

In nations controlled by communism—Bulgaria, East Germany, Cuba—when a child is born he doesn't know the meaning of the words communism or dictatorship. Yet from the moment of his birth, that child will bear heavy burdens; the burdens of living under a communist regime, under total state control, and under the strong arm of oppression.

I, too, was born with a burden to bear. But I carry my burden with pride and dignity. For unlike the child in East Berlin or the negro slave, I am free. Perhaps another word, synonymous to burden could be

used—responsibility. I have a responsibility to freedom; and I cannot lay my burden down until the child born under communism is free from his. For while the burden of freedom is great, the burden of oppression is far greater.

My responsibility to freedom encompasses a large circle of actions and ideals. First and foremost, I must perpetuate the basic ideals of democracy. Freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom to choose one's own government—these are ideals which must be held dear. If these cease to exist, then we move one step further towards the burdens of the man in Czechoslovakia. I must strive to uphold the constitution, and defend the honor of the United States. But there's much more to freedom than this, and my responsibility is to meet the demands that freedom makes. For while the burden of freedom is great, the burden of oppression is even greater.

As an individual, I can do much to keep freedom strong. By helping in the campaign of political figures, I reinforce the democratic process. By expressing my views openly, I encourage others to do the same. The right to freedom of speech is one long recognized. As Voltaire once said, "I may not agree with what you say, but I defend to the death your right to say it." To fail to use this right is to misuse it, and to misuse it weakens the foundations of freedom.

I strengthen freedom when I express my views in letters to Congressional representatives, and work within the legal system to bring about changes and revisions which I feel necessary. I strengthen freedom by reading books and newspapers of my choice and by keeping myself informed on local, national and international affairs. I strengthen freedom by submitting articles to my school newspaper, participating in plays, debates and helping in community activities. I fulfill my responsibility to freedom by remaining free to myself and to my beliefs.

I cannot abuse freedom, for to abuse it would mean to lose it and once lost, freedom can rarely be returned; and while the burden of freedom is great, the burden of oppression is even greater.

An American once said, "freedom is the right of all, and the privilege of none." To allow one man to put a valve on another's freedom is to wipe out all that the word stands for.

The perpetuation of democracy and freedom is my duty, my burden, my responsibility. If I see that I am free, and am capable of furthering the cause of freedom, yet do not, then I am cheating myself, cheating my nation, and cheating freedom. For I was born free, and freedom is my burden which I bear with pride. The child born in a communist nation must carry the burden of living under the strong arm of oppression, and in the name of freedom I cannot and will not lay my burden down until the child born in communism is free from his.

I have a responsibility to freedom. I am free, and the responsibility I hold lies within myself. For while the responsibility of freedom is great, the burden of oppression is far greater.

THE 55TH LITHUANIAN ANNIVERSARY

HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my House colleagues in commemorating the 55th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania.

nia, a nation whose proud and noble heritage continues to be blighted by Soviet occupation of the country.

I would like to express deep admiration to those Lithuanians who have taken courageous risks and sacrifices to protest the Soviet Union's continuing denials of political and religious freedom to Lithuanian citizens. Recent news articles abound with accounts of such courage; including the young Lithuanian, Romas Kalanta, who self-immolated in a public square in a bold protest against Soviet occupation as well as the 17,000 Lithuanian Catholics who protested religious persecution in a petition to the United Nations.

Americans must continue to support Lithuanians in their struggle to regain the cherished human principles of political and religious freedom. One way that we can do so is to raise the question of restoring freedom and self-determination of Lithuania and other Baltic States at the forthcoming European Security Conference.

As we embark on our lofty goal of a generation of peace, Americans must not overlook the sacrifices for freedom continually being made by the dedicated Lithuanian people. Until there is a restoration of their basic human rights, there will be no true world peace.

CLINT BUEHLMAN, BUFFALO'S
BROADCASTER FOR ALL SEASONS
AND WORTHWHILE COMMUNITY
SERVICE

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, by coincidence, at a time when the attention of Congress is concerned with legislative proposals regarding licensing procedures for radio and television stations, it is with great pride that I commend the attention of my colleagues to the outstanding programming and public service record of Mr. Clint Buehlman of radio station WBEN in Buffalo, N.Y.

On Thursday, March 1, Mr. Buehlman will complete 30 years of broadcasting a consistent and positive blend of entertainment and useful communications to morning radio listeners throughout my 38th Congressional District and other portions of western New York State.

Year-in and year-out, many thousands of school children, their parents, workers and other listeners have relied upon Clint's time advisories and his accurate and helpful information on the weather, school closings, and road conditions.

Clint is our unofficial and dependable "waker-upper" and he can take justifiable pride for many an outstanding school and employment attendance record.

He has, since March 1, 1943, helped to make many civic endeavors, such as the Red Cross Bloodmobile and Blood Bank and a variety of other worthwhile community service activities tremendous successes.

For these contributions, all of us in western New York owe Clint our gratitude.

Just as important, he has cheerfully and consistently extolled Buffalo and western New York in the manner which I view our community—as a great place to live, to work, to play, and be a good neighbor and citizen.

ENERGY CRISIS

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that our Nation faces an energy crisis. There are many components of this crisis including: a lack of understanding toward many of the basic issues, administrative and coordinating problems, and the complexities of assuring sound technological and resource development.

Nevertheless, it is obvious that the Nation urgently needs new energy sources. We need energy sources which are not only efficient and economically feasible, we need sources of clean energy.

With this in mind one of the most exciting possibilities lies in the heat beneath the crust of the earth.

In one sense our earth is a giant furnace, and it is possible to tap that furnace to meet the needs of people. The natural heat of the earth is thought to be derived from the natural decay of radioactive core materials and frictional forces resulting from solar and lunar tides as well as the relative motion of crustal plates. Temperature measurements in drillholes, mines and the like, confirm that on the average temperatures increase with increasing depth, reaching values in excess of 1,000° C. or 1,832° F. in the molten interior of the earth.

When looked at as a power source, this heat is referred to as geothermal energy. It is an energy source which should be given a high priority by both government and private industry.

Geothermal power is known to be efficient, available, clean and abundant. It has tremendous potential to be part of the answer to the national energy crisis. It promises to be perhaps the most acceptable of all new energy sources from an environmental standpoint.

Geothermal development is unique in that all activities related to the power production cycle are localized to the immediate vicinity of the power plant. Support operations such as mining, fuel processing, transportation, and other handling facilities do not exist. For this reason, the environmental effects are site dependent in origin. This is not to say that geothermal energy will produce no adverse environmental considerations. However, there is evidence that it could be a very clean energy source.

Furthermore, it would be a mistake to look to electric power alone as the sole benefit from our geothermal resources.

Electricity, fresh water, minerals, natural gas are all there. There is great potential for contributing to the Nation's supply of fresh water.

For these reasons I have joined in sponsoring H.R. 4413, "a bill to promote the exploration and development of geothermal resources through cooperation between the Federal Government and private enterprise."

This bill is designed to pick up where the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 left off. The 1970 act provided for the development of Federal lands that have potential for geothermal energy. H.R. 4413 sees as the next objective the expansion of our knowledge about the occurrence of promising geothermal areas, and the improvement of exploratory and developmental methods. The basic contention in this bill is that if geothermal energy is to be tapped, joint public and private research must show the way.

The bill proposes a 5-year program which would basically consist of the present program expanded sufficiently to meet the urgent needs of today's energy and environmental crisis. The goals are: First, to assess the geothermal energy resources of the public domain; second, to establish a reliable body of knowledge of the principles that determine the occurrence and characteristics of geothermal reservoirs; third, to help develop the technology of power generation; and fourth, to help develop the technology of byproduct recovery, largely fresh water and mineral products.

The bill would establish an immediate revolving fund of \$20 million and an amount not to exceed \$5 million in each succeeding year. The total amount in the fund could never exceed the original \$20 million. Federal loans could be made to cover up to 75 percent of the cost involved in the exploration of ground steam or hot steams. The bill would allow the loans to be made for exploration on both private and public lands.

It appears that the potentials of geothermal resources are vast. At the same time it is clear that advanced research is necessary. H.R. 4413 is designed to promote this research and I therefore urge early consideration of this bill.

THE LID IS OFF

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court decision of January 22, 1973, which in effect, struck down abortion laws in 31 States regarding abortion and will require significant revision of laws in another 15 States has prompted an outcry from concerned citizens all over the country.

I was particularly impressed with two editorials on the subject which appeared in the Indianapolis News on January 26 and 29 of this year.

The proabortion ruling by the U.S. Supreme Court defies all the logic, fact,

and legal history and requires vigorous counteraction by the Congress.

I urge Congress to amend the Constitution to insure the right to life of the unborn. I have introduced an amendment to this effect, House Joint Resolution 261.

The editorials in the Indianapolis News emphasize the urgency of the situation. I include them at this point for the serious consideration of my colleagues:

THE LID IS OFF

A likely result of the U.S. Supreme Court's startling decision on abortion will be a stepped up propaganda campaign by the Federal government to encourage abortion.

Although the national government has been supporting the liberalization of state abortion laws for years, there has been a degree of circumspection—for example, the burying of an abortion information service in a Housing and Urban Development school program in Kentucky where abortion was forbidden by law. Also, a film advocating legalization of abortion has reportedly been held up from distribution to public schools because of pressure from the White House. The film is a visual version of the report of a Federal commission on population growth which the President rejected because of its free-abortion recommendation.

The Federal government has quietly promoted abortion by the funding of private organizations—such as Planned Parenthood—to proselytize for abortion and offer referral services.

Thus far we have been spared blatant radio or television pitches for abortion which, given the edict of the Federal Communications Commission that broadcasters air "public service" messages, may now be forthcoming under the sponsorship of the Federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Housing and Urban Department, the Office of the Education or some other U.S. agency.

Now that the Supreme Court has brushed aside the wishes of the electorate as demonstrated in recent referenda, and the authority of state legislatures to exercise police power within their borders, the lid is off on abortion and the full power of the Federal government public relations mill can be exerted to bring about its social as well as legal acceptance.

THE EXTERMINATORS

Monday's pro-abortion ruling by the Supreme Court is a shocking inversion of fact and logic which calls for vigorous counteraction.

Reading over the majority opinion, one is struck by its grim Orwellian reversal of the simplest ethical values. In this decision the major issues of life and death are blandly ignored or handled in parentheses, while secondary considerations of utility are pushed forward as crucial matters of discussion. If this opinion were all there was to go on, you would scarcely know that what is being talked about is the cold and deliberate extermination of life.

On the majority ruling, the issue at stake in abortion is the danger of the operation to the mother, period. When restrictive abortion laws were drafted, says the court, the operation was considered especially hazardous. Now medical science has made it less so. After three months, however, the mortality rate from abortion (for the mother) is as high or higher than the mortality rate from childbirth, so after this point the state can regulate abortions "to the extent that the regulation reasonably relates to the preservation and protection of the mother's health."

The health and life of child in embryo, on this showing, has nothing to do with anything—it is simply dismissed from consideration. The child may be killed on demand up to three months and under certain regulations thereafter to serve the health and/or

convenience of the mother—and the moral obtuseness of the court. The whole question of whether the child has any rights is settled out of hand without the slightest effort, on the record, to grapple with any of the complexities presented by the issue.

Referring to this question, the court simply says the drafters of the 14th amendment didn't believe the child in embryo was a "person" and that therefore the protection of this amendment doesn't extend to the fetus. But even if true and applicable this is obvious nonsense, because the result of that interpretation would simply be that the Federal government would not be empowered to override liberalized abortion laws. Restrictive laws would not be affected, since they simply confer or recognize this right on the initiative of the states.

There is impressive medical and legal evidence that genetically separable human life begins at conception and unless this life is to be extinguished by an orgy of permissive abortions concerned citizens must demand redress. Removal of such matters from the appellate jurisdiction of the Federal courts and/or a constitutional amendment protecting the unborn would seem to be the answer.

THE 55TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian people declared their independence after 120 years of foreign domination, first by Russia and then by Germany. This year on the 55th anniversary of that occasion I am proud and honored once again to join in the celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day.

With all my friends of Lithuanian ancestry it is my hope that Lithuania will someday regain its independent status, and that the Lithuanian people will once again enjoy self-determination, religious freedom, and the fundamental human rights of a free people.

The people of Lithuania, as a result of the occupation and annexation of that country by Russia, cannot observe this anniversary. It is being commemorated, however, by Lithuanian people who today live in many lands.

It is fitting that this occasion be remembered in the United States. Lithuanian-Americans have contributed much to our country. Drawing on the long and proud history of their people, men and women of Lithuanian stock have enriched our culture and strengthened the spirit of freedom which is found among us.

Lithuania has a proud history going back to the 12th century. During the Middle Ages the Lithuanians helped preserve Western civilization by protecting Europe from the Mongols and Tartars. The Lithuanians were in the forefront in developing a society in which human freedoms were enjoyed and encouraged. They frequently suffered, however, from the oppression of less enlightened, but powerful aggressor nations.

When Russian domination came in 1795, despite continued harassment and opposing pressures, the Lithuanian people were successful in retaining their

own language, religion, and traditions. Today the Lithuanian people are again going through an even more dangerous struggle to maintain their own identity. Under that earlier oppression the Lithuanians made numerous attempts to throw off the yoke of their captors, but it was not until World War I, with the invasion of the German armies, that the Russians were driven out. In 1917, the German Government was prevailed upon to authorize a congress of Lithuanian delegates. This led to the proclamation on February 16, 1918, of an independent Lithuanian state based on democratic principles.

During the 1920's and 1930's, as an independent nation, Lithuania showed extraordinary capability in developing a vital and prosperous modern society. The new nation's great promise was interrupted when Soviet troops occupied the country in 1940 and the Supreme Soviet declared the incorporation of Lithuania into the Communist empire. When war broke out between Germany and the Soviet Union, Nazi occupation troops replaced Russian soldiers in 1941 until the Soviet Army regained control in July of 1944. Since that time the Lithuanian people have not experienced a day of freedom.

The United States has never recognized the forced absorption of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. Americans must continue to insist on the inalienable rights of the Lithuanian people to national independence and individual freedom. It is my hope that the issue of freedom and self-determination for Lithuania and the other Baltic peoples will be raised at the European Security Conference. Free men must continue to speak out until the Lithuanian dream of self-determination becomes a reality.

DEMOCRATS HONOR FARLEY

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

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

[From the San Antonio Light, Jan. 14, 1973]

DEMOCRATS HONOR FARLEY

(By James L. Kilgallen)

NEW YORK.—It was an appropriate setting and a fitting occasion as James A. Farley arose to address a very special group here last week.

"Genial Jim"—former postmaster general, one-time national Democratic chairman and a party stalwart all his adult life—was the star attraction as the National Democratic Club made an affectionate farewell to the headquarters at 233 Madison Ave., which it has occupied just a year short of half a century.

The dinner to Farley, known to many of his fellow members as "Mr. Democrat," was a nostalgic affair. It marked the last hurrah at the closing of the sumptuous six-story granite structure. Close to 200 men and women attended.

CLUB MOVING

The club is moving temporarily into the quarters of the Advertising Club until a permanent suite is selected.

As Farley rose to speak, he was given a

standing ovation. Former New York Mayor Robert W. Wagner presented him with a scroll certifying him as a lifetime honorary member of the club.

"I'm deeply grateful to all of you—my friends," Farley said. "I have had many pleasant years in politics and have many happy memories. I have been fortunate in knowing seven presidents."

Paying a special tribute to Franklin D. Roosevelt, whom he twice master-minded into the presidency, Farley added:

FDR was the greatest political leader I ever knew. I think his first two terms as president were the two greatest terms in the history of the country because, by his leadership, he restored and saved the capitalistic system."

THIRD TERM

Farley said that although he broke with Roosevelt over the third term issue this difference of opinion did not impair their warm friendship.

Touching on current politics, Farley recalled that prior to the 1972 presidential election he predicted to a reporter for the *Hearst Newspapers* that Sen. George McGovern "would suffer the worst defeat since Gov. Al Smith's defeat by Herbert Hoover in 1928."

The 6-foot-2 Farley, now 84 years old and chairman of the board of Coca-Cola Export Corporation, appeared to be in good health although he seemed somewhat lighter than his normal 210 pounds. Last April he was hospitalized for a month with a heart attack. He is widower and lives at the Waldorf-Astoria. He has 10 grandchildren.

In the audience were his daughter, Mrs. Betty Farley Montgomery, and one of her daughters, 19-year-old Carole, and her husband, Glenn Montgomery, an executive of A.T. & T., who live in Scarsdale, N.Y. Another daughter, (Ann), Mrs. Edward Hickey of Grosse Pointe, Mich., was not present. His son, James A. Farley Jr., president of the Central State Bank, was present, however, and Farley related a story about him.

"When Jimmy was a boy," said Farley, he asked me: 'Dad, do you think you will ever be a great man?' I replied: 'No, I don't think I'm a great man.' Neither did I, young Jimmie replied."

WARM TRIBUTES

A dozen speakers at the affair paid warm tributes to Farley as a friend, a master politician, and as a loyal party man whose word was as good as his bond.

Among his friends at the dinner were Gene Tunney, former heavyweight champion, Harry Hershfield, the cartoonist, Arthur Levitt, state controller, Abe Beame, city controller, Louis Lefkowitz, state attorney general, Frank Hogan, district attorney of Manhattan, attorney Paul O'Dwyer, and Stanley Steingut, minority leader in the state legislature.

The walls of the club, which was founded in 1834, the time of Andrew Jackson, are adorned with paintings of celebrities, including Thomas Jefferson, Grover Cleveland, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, Al Smith and Jimmy Walker.

It was a great night for Jim Farley. The honor bestowed on him was reserved in the past for Democratic presidents such as FDR, Truman and Johnson.

NIXON ADMINISTRATION'S ATTACK ON THE PRESS

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, last week our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsyl-

vania (Mr. MOORHEAD), chairman of the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, addressed a seminar of the Pennsylvania Society of Newspaper Editors in Harrisburg, Pa. The seminar on "Public, Press, and Government" was directed at the serious problems facing the public media as a result of the concerted attack on newsmen by Nixon administration officials.

Mr. MOORHEAD's hard-hitting speech details the ominous sequence of events over the past several years that reveal this pattern of harassment, intimidation, and persecution of reporters and others in the news media. I commend the speech to other Members who share our concern over the increasing threat to fundamental first amendment rights of freedom of the press. The text of the speech follows:

PUBLIC, PRESS, AND GOVERNMENT

(Speech by Representative WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the press, honored guests, I appreciate your kind invitation to participate in this important seminar.

I'm sure I don't have to tell you that we are in a grave era as a Nation with regard to the relationship between the press and the White House, the Congress and the White House, and indeed the view of all three in the eyes of our Nation's citizens.

Twin gauntlets have been thrown by the White House at both the press and Congress. The Congress is being told, in no uncertain terms, that it can take its Constitutional prerogatives and stick them in their respective caucuses. And the press is being dared to run afoul of the party line as laid down by Richard the Second.

Only the naive could think the license challenge to the Washington Post-owned television stations by officials of CREEP—the Committee to Re-Elect the President—is anything less than White House revenge for the Post's day-to-day coverage of Administration activities.

Although we have always had rude public figures, I'm sure the Frank Sinatra-Maxine Chesire incident was set in motion by the oft-expressed Agnew attitude toward the working press.

As menacing as the Agnews, the Colsons, the Whiteheads, and others may appear—their obvious attempt at intimidation can only succeed if you and your colleagues allow it. I believe that no man, or group of men, is more mighty than this Nation's free press.

I know, like Congress, there is seldom unity throughout the industry or among the various media. Yet as a group, newsmen have responded admirably to the challenge. It is, I'm sure, because you well realize that if you don't hang together, you will hang separately.

I have little doubt, as Peter Lisagor said, newsmen were here before the Nixon Administration and they will be here long after the Nixon minions leave.

During the past two years, my vantage point in these struggles has been the studies, hearings and other investigative work conducted by the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee. In the last Congress we held more than 40 days of intensive hearings probing U.S. Government information policies and practices.

We reviewed the controversy surrounding publication of the so-called "Pentagon Papers" in June, 1971.

We investigated the way in which the Freedom of Information Act has been administered over the first five years since its enactment.

We delved into the complex maze of the Nation's security classification system and the bureaucratic information curtain that has been hung over the operations of many hundreds of advisory committees, commissions, and boards of Executive departments and agencies.

We took a long hard look at the ways in which the Executive has used its powers to withhold from Congress vital information that is needed by Congress to fulfill its Constitutional responsibilities.

From the first days of the establishment of our subcommittee in 1955, the Society of Newspaper Editors and other segments of the news and broadcast media have played an important role in our activities. Your support and encouragement were instrumental in the enactment of the Freedom of Information law in 1966. Consultation between news media representatives, our Members and staff has been close and frequent over the years. In many cases, we have acted as unofficial "ombudsmen" in assisting reporters and editors in their efforts to obtain access to information from Federal agencies. We appreciate the help which your organization has provided to our subcommittee, the excellent testimony presented by news media witnesses at our hearings, and the constant vigil which you exercise to help preserve First Amendment rights for all Americans.

But today, the challenge which we face is a more difficult and awesome one. We are witnessing a relentless attack on freedom of the press by the present Administration that threatens to engulf the basic free institutions of our social and political system and to submerge them in a tidal wave of secrecy. Consider some of the ominous sequence of events that have taken place during the past four years:

Secrecy-minded bureaucrats in both the White House and other Executive agencies have systematically hidden basic facts about important policies and programs—domestic and foreign—from the press, the American public, and from their elected representatives in the Congress.

The daily barrage of statements and releases from the Administration's propaganda and news manipulation teams has confused and virtually excluded the public from any meaningful understanding or voice in the decision-making process of this government.

In his November 13, 1969, speech in Des Moines, Iowa, Vice President Agnew launched an all-out criticism of the broadcast media's commentaries on President Nixon's speeches, warning that they enjoyed "a monopoly sanctioned and licensed by government." A week later in Montgomery, Alabama, he singled out the New York Times and Washington Post as symbols of what he called "the trend toward the monopolization of the great public information vehicles."

Soon after, Mr. Dean Burch, President Nixon's newly appointed Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, began requesting from television networks transcripts of commentaries on Mr. Nixon's speeches. Federal investigators also began to subpoena files of photos from news magazines that had covered student demonstrations.

These and similar examples of heavy-handed governmental actions, with their blatant attempts at news censorship and intimidation were followed by the Administration's effort to enforce prior restraint of publication in the "Pentagon Papers" cases in June of 1971.

Court rulings have upset the delicate balances that heretofore existed between the people's right to know and the government's need for information to prosecute. Some five newsmen have already been jailed for refusing to divulge their confidential sources while more than a half dozen others face possible jail terms.

The FBI was directed to conduct an investigation of a prominent Washington commentator who had criticized Administration

policies, and when it came to public attention, the flimsy excuse offered was that he was being considered for some unidentified Federal job.

Last year, interim FBI Director Gray publicly attacked what he said were "American journalists (who) are becoming too much a part of the culture of disparagement which threatens to destroy all respect for established institutions." A Deputy Assistant Attorney General told ASNE convention delegates in Washington that newsmen would face the threat of criminal prosecution if they dared publish what he called "government secrets." Brought before our subcommittee to testify on the incident, he then denied that he had meant to intimidate anyone.

Also last year, the Justice Department filed antitrust suits against the three major networks involving the production of programs for prime time viewing. White House speech writer Buchanan warned networks of possible anti-trust legislation if they did not "move conservatives and people with a viewpoint of Middle America onto the networks."

Meanwhile, our subcommittee's hearings underscored repeated refusals of the Executive to provide Congress with vital information it requires to carry out its duties as a co-equal branch of government. We discovered massive abuses of the security classification system that has created a mountain of more than 450 million classified documents dating back to World War II. The Subcommittee's hearings and subsequent report on the administration of the Freedom of Information Act pinpointed widespread patterns of illegal withholding of government-generated information that the law intended to be made available to the public. Our subcommittee will soon commence hearings on my bill to strengthen and improve the operation of this milestone law.

Last December, Clay T. Whitehead, head of the White House Office of Telecommunications Policy, told a newsmen's audience in Indianapolis, Indiana, that legislation was being drafted to make television stations responsible for all network material they carry, referring to what he called "the imbalance or consistent bias" of network news commentators. The club he brandished was the Government's control over applications for license renewal.

Scandals involving the highest levels of government, such as full details of the ITT anti-trust settlement, the infamous "Watergate Bugging" case and other examples of widespread Administration political espionage, receipt of illegal campaign contributions, and other obvious conflicts of interest, have been hidden from the press, the public, and the Congress or whitewashed by phony in-house Administration investigations.

Two weeks ago, a news reporter, while in the course of covering a story, was arrested in Washington by the FBI and hauled off in handcuffs to the lockup at the U.S. Courthouse for five hours. I can't at the moment think of anything more chilling on freedom of the press in this country.

This constant chipping away at the first amendment has got to halt! What reporter is going to look at any Government document which might embarrass the Government if he faces the threat of arrest, fines and possible imprisonment?

These and other examples of Administration intimidation, harassment, and the use of naked legal power of government to prosecute newspapers and reporters constitute the most serious threats to the free press since the dark days of the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798.

These ominous developments are likewise compounded by the aspect of the Constitutional crisis affecting the erosion of power in the Congress as a co-equal branch and

the growing trend toward the all-powerful Executive.

Congress has permitted three Presidents to wage war without any Constitutional declaration required by the Constitution.

Congress has delegated away much of its authority under the commerce clause to the Executive, dating way back to the late 1800's when the Interstate Commerce Commission was established to regulate railroads and rate structures. Congress has since created additional regulatory commissions such as the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, and many others. But the membership of these commissions, which have vast powers over matters of vital concern to the American consumers, are appointed by the President. While they are also responsible to the Congress, they are subject to Executive control over their budgets. Too often such commissions have been more interested in advancing the cause of the industries they are supposed to regulate than protecting the public at large from economic exploitation.

Our historic system of checks and balances as conceived by the Founding Fathers has become dangerously distorted as power, influence and public attention has flowed to the Executive branch of government—away from the Legislative branch, which represents the American people.

Only two persons in the whole vast bureaucracy of the Executive branch have been elected by the American people. But the thousands of appointed bureaucrats often forget they are the servants of the people—not their masters.

It is a truism that information is essential to knowledge and knowledge is essential to the exercise of power. When information is withheld or distorted by the Executive, when basic First Amendment rights are subverted, the Congress, the news media, and thus, the public, is denied information from the Executive to which it is legitimately entitled and upon which our free system depends for its life.

It then follows that the electorate is deprived of the facts needed to make intelligent, informed judgments at the ballot box and our entire system is then corrupted and the seeds of dictatorship are sown.

There is no "one-shot" solution to the multiple aspects of this complex crisis situation. Many of us in the Congress sponsored various types of "newsmen's shield" or "newsmen's privilege" legislation in the last Congress and again this year. Hearings have been held in the House and will soon commence in the Senate on these bills. It is vitally important for us to enact a strong and workable bill this year to blunt this Administration's encroachment on basic First Amendment rights. And, if necessary, we must muster the votes in the House and the Senate to override any Presidential veto of such legislation.

There are encouraging signs in Congress that serious efforts are being made to recapture power delegated or usurped by the Executive.

So-called "war powers" legislation has been introduced to avoid the commitment of American military power in "undeclared wars" such as the tragic Vietnamese conflict.

Efforts are being made to require testimony from Executive officials before Congressional Committees and to curb the abuses of so-called "Executive Privilege," which the President has used to withhold vital information from the Congress.

Legislation has been introduced to strengthen the powers of the congressional "watch-dog" over the Executive—the General Accounting Office.

My bill, to enact a tight security classification law to replace the present Executive

Order system, would also strengthen the hand of Congress and the public in obtaining information from the Executive branch.

Legal action has been taken by a number of Senators to test the power of the President to order the impoundment of funds authorized and appropriated by the Congress for specific programs.

Other confrontations between the two branches are also shaping up in other areas affecting selected foreign and domestic programs that involve budgetary priorities.

Among the key areas of concern in dealing with the present crisis is the need to strengthen the Freedom of Information Act itself. In 1966 Congress enacted this milestone law to guarantee the right of individual citizens to know about the business of their government. Subject to narrow exemptions to protect legitimate national defense and foreign policy secrets, internal governmental policy consultations, and certain basic rights of other citizens, the law said that anyone should be entitled to access to Government documents or other information that they could reasonably identify. Decisions by Government to withhold could be taken to Federal court and the burden of proof in such cases of denial was placed on the Government.

Our hearings on the administration of the law last year produced disturbing evidence that the Federal bureaucracy was, by and large, withholding vast amounts of information from our people by distorted interpretations of its provisions, delay and stalling tactics, exorbitant search and copying fees, and other devices.

Contrary to general opinion, vast amounts of information hidden by Government agencies have little to do with hydrogen bombs, weapons systems, state secrets, or other sensitive classified data that requires safeguarding to protect our national defense and foreign policy interests. Our subcommittee's studies showed that the large number of governmental denials of information requested under the Freedom of Information Act involve matters connected with the day-to-day activities of the Federal bureaucracy in their handling of various domestic programs financed out of our tax dollars.

We uncovered cases of maladministration of Federal programs by appointed bureaucrats who blatantly ignored the mandate of Congress in establishing and funding such programs. Much information has been withheld to avoid public scrutiny of blunders, scandal, or to prevent embarrassment to the Administration or one of its top officials.

In our report, the Government Operations Committee urged a number of significant administrative actions by Executive agencies to improve the day-to-day handling of Freedom of Information Act requests from the public. Many of them are now in the process of adoption and implementation.

We also urged that a number of the loopholes in the law that are being used to withhold information be plugged by amendments to the law itself. I have introduced such a bill based on these findings. Hearings will be held this spring, and I am hopeful that it will be favorably acted upon by the Congress before it adjourns, overriding—if necessary—any Presidential veto that might be exercised.

What can be done to reverse this dangerous trend of government behind closed doors that threatens our free press, free society, and our representative system?

How can Truth in Government—integrity in our governmental processes at all levels be restored?

How can we regain the confidence of all Americans in our government and our leaders?

No amount of pious rhetoric, slogans, or platitudes can gloss over the vital need to restore Truth in Government in America. It is the foundation upon which all human

progress eventually rests, whether involving governmental actions or those of our economic, social, and educational systems.

We must take all steps necessary to restore the faith and confidence of the American public in our governmental and private institutions.

We must choose our governmental leaders and leaders of our powerful socio-economic institutions of the private sector on the basis of their honesty, integrity, their dedication to candor and forthrightness, and their fundamental belief in the right of all Americans to participate fully in all aspects of human endeavor in this great land of opportunity and abundance.

We must fully protect the rights of a free press under the First Amendment to the Constitution, ending the administration's policies of intimidation, legal harassment and prosecution of newsmen, the use of propaganda and news manipulation, censorship, and secret dealings behind closed doors.

We must act promptly to halt the usurpation of power by the Executive branch of government, so that the people's representatives in Congress may again exercise their proper co-equal Constitutional role in the policymaking functions.

We must rid ourselves of the idiotic notion that our country, with our heritage of intellectual and personal freedom, can or should engage in the secrecy game with the closed societies of competing world powers.

This Administration's obsession with secrecy and closed government that bars maximum participation of our citizens in governmental affairs must be ended.

Government secrecy is the enemy of democracy. It subverts and will eventually destroy any representative system, just as it is essential to the maintenance of a totalitarian dictatorship.

Muscle flexing, intimidation, and flat-out seizing of authority were not invented by the Administration, although they may have carried it to a new dimension. I plan to deal with it—and expect the Congress to deal with it—and expect you to deal with it—the same way you would handle any bully . . . look him square in the eye and let him know that one more encroachment, one more violation, one more threat will only stiffen your resolve not to be violated, trespassed or threatened.

In the past, the Congress has, in some respects, made it too easy for the Administration to steal our prerogatives. No more.

The press, in some respects, has made it easy for the White House to paint you black and to lean on your Constitutional rights. No more.

How we resolve these conflicts, indeed if we resolve them, will test our mettle as a Nation of laws, not men.

No man, or group of men, is above the law of the Nation. And those who would subvert rights protected by the Constitution damage the Nation in addition to the objects of their attack.

I know that when this brawl is over, I'll be on my feet. And my bet is that you will be too.

LITHUANIA

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, during the month of February we have observed the birthdays of George Washington, the "Father of His Country," and Abraham Lincoln, the "Savior of the Union." We have also noted the 500th anniversary of

the versatile son of Poland, Mikolaj Kopernik, better known as Nicholas Copernicus.

While commemorating these great men, whose fame cannot be confined by national boundaries, we must not overlook other significant occasions. One of these is the 55th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania, now one of the numerous colonies of the gargantuan Soviet empire.

Although it had been a member of the family of nations for centuries, Lithuania lost its independence to the expanding empire of the Romanoffs. When World War I ended with ancient dynasties overthrown, it emerged as one of the three new Baltic Republics.

Unfortunately its rebirth of freedom was short lived. During World War II it was occupied in turn by National-Socialist Germany and Communist Russia. Since the end of that conflict the Kremlin has been firmly in control as far as Lithuania and its sister republics are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, although Lithuania has groaned under the heel of totalitarianism for more than a third of a century, its people have never given up hope. Neither must we in America, which has given asylum to so many of Lithuania's sons and daughters. Indeed, history teaches us to hope and not to despair.

DAVID ZINKOFF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have known David Zinkoff for many years. Everyone in the Philadelphia area knows his voice.

He has been the announcer at sporting events in Philadelphia for many years. His distinctive voice and manner are as much a part of the sports scene in the city as the games themselves. Dave Zinkoff is probably the only man in the country who can make a routine layup in a basketball game or the awarding of a salami as a door prize sound like events of national importance.

But, Dave Zinkoff is also known throughout Philadelphia as a man who will put his time and talent into making a charitable event twice as much fun for the participants and the audience.

Recently the President sent "The Zink" a letter of commendation for just one of his activities, the entertainment programs he has been putting on at military hospitals in the Philadelphia area for the past 25 years.

At this time I enter that letter into the RECORD:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., January 9, 1973.

Mr. DAVID ZINKOFF,
Care of Philadelphia 76ers Basketball Club,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MR. ZINKOFF: Recently I read a news account about the entertainment programs which you have been staging at military hospitals in the Philadelphia area for the past twenty-five years. I know how these shows

must brighten the lives of the recuperating veterans and that these men look forward eagerly to your periodic visits to their wards.

You are to be commended for the splendid work which you are doing, and I want you to know of my admiration for your outstanding dedication and concern for these most deserving Americans.

With every good wish,
Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

REVEREND KITTERER HONORED FOR SERVICE TO DEACONESS HOSPITAL

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, the people of the greater Cleveland area will pay tribute to Rev. Armin Kitterer, who will mark on that day 48 years of service to Deaconess Hospital. It is appropriate that at the ceremony to be held then, one of the towers of Deaconess will be renamed the Kitterer Tower, in recognition of this man who did so much to build Deaconess over the past half century. While this tower will be a lasting tribute to Reverend Kitterer, he is additionally honored by the lasting gratitude of the many people who have been served by the facilities of Deaconess.

In further tribute to Reverend Kitterer, I insert in the RECORD a column which appeared in the Cleveland Press at the time he stepped down from administrator after 42 years in that capacity, and assumed his present role of director of professional relations and administrator emeritus:

STILL WORKING FOR DEACONESS

(By Bob Seltzer)

When the Rev. Armin A. Kitterer, 78, retired a year ago after 42 years as administrator of Evangelical Deaconess Hospital, he actually moved into another job in the same executive suite.

"As associate administrator in charge of professional and public relations, I will stay as long as I can be of service to the institution to which I gave much of my life," said Kitterer, ordained in the Evangelical Church in 1911, and named Deaconess' first full-time administrator Mar. 1, 1925.

Kitterer simply exchanged offices with Casimir M. Nikel, who had been his assistant for 16 years and succeeded him as administrator Apr. 1, 1967. Both Kitterer and Nikel are working like yeomen on the Deaconess expansion fund campaign for \$1,500,000 from industry and the community.

"Total cost of the capital improvement will be \$4,150,000 for a five-story addition, increasing bed capacity to 270, providing a new emergency department, medical education facilities, a lecture hall and improved outpatient facilities," said Kitterer.

"This will be the third capital building fund on which I have worked for Deaconess. When I took over in 1925, the hospital was in a frame house—the old Johnson mansion. It was opened in 1923 and had 22 beds and six bassinets. We now have 232 beds and 36 bassinets, 250 physicians and 360 nurses.

"In the current expansion, we will do some deficit financing, seek a federal grant, and use funds on hand to add to the \$1,150,000 we hope to raise. Our first capital fund cam-

paign was in 1928. We raised \$175,000, and built a two-story brick building. The second drive, in 1952, netted \$696,380. From our own funds in 1958 we built a \$500,000 annex."

Kitterer, pink-cheeked, mustached, gregarious, said the only department of Deaconess Hospital at 4229 Pearl Rd. not crowded to capacity is the maternity.

Oldest of 11 children of an Evangelical pastor, Kitterer was born at Parkville, Mo. He attended an Elmhurst College and Eden Seminary in St. Louis. He learned to play golf as a caddy, and his earnings helped defray expenses at the seminary. During three years at Heidelberg College, he had his first pastorate at Fostoria and commuted by interurban cars and horse and buggy.

At Heidelberg, he was a three-letter man in football and captained the baseball team. After graduation, he managed a piano store in Tiffin for two years to earn funds for a year's graduate study at Princeton. There he earned his bachelor Princeton.

Kitterer was pastor of Zion Evangelical Church at Kansas City, Kans., when he received a call from Deaconess Hospital for a clergyman with business sense as an administrator.

He is a member of the American College of Hospital Administrators, a past president and director of the Cleveland Hospital Council, former trustee of the Ohio Hospital Assn., and was on the board of Blue Cross of Northeastern Ohio from its inception in 1934 to 1960.

Kitterer acquired permanent possession of the American Hospital Assn. golf trophy by winning three successive tournaments. Two of his brothers are retired ministers. Kitterer and his wife Margaret live at 6435 Denison Blvd., Parma Heights.

ST. PHILIP NERI LEISURE TIME CLUB

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the St. Philip Neri Leisure Time Club is a group of concerned citizens in my district who have been offering special services to 400 senior citizens in the North Bronx area. The majority of these citizens are ambulatory, with the remainder being confined to their homes. Services to the ambulatory citizens include a weekly meeting, and a variety of trips, luncheons, games, group discussions, and guest lectures.

The club's services to the confined members of the North Bronx senior citizen community is conducted entirely by a dedicated staff of volunteers. Their services include such vital tasks as escorting elderly patients to the doctor, running a chore service, and providing a car pool service for a monthly social event held by the club.

At the present time, the St. Philip Neri group has an application for increased funds pending with the New York City Human Resources Administration for title XVI moneys. Some of the goals they hope to achieve include a "Meals on Wheels" for shut-ins, and the establishment of a 5-day-a-week senior citizen center.

Mr. Speaker, the St. Philip Neri group, headed by their dedicated director, Sister Annunciata Bethell, are to be commended for their selfless contribution to the elderly of their community. Their hopes to expand these services should be looked on favorably by the Human Resources Administration. As one deeply involved in the fight for the rights of older Americans, it is my fervent hope that the St. Philip Neri Club succeeds in this venture. The time has come for other communities in the United States to follow their excellent example, and begin to offer their senior citizens the type of programs and services they so richly deserve.

TWIN CITIES METRO COUNCIL OPPOSES HOUSING MORATORIUM

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I continue to voice our concern about the President's attitude toward the budget. We think Congress ought to set priorities for spending and he thinks he should spend as he sees fit. He claims the American people support his actions. But any Member who reads his mail these days is aware of the concern back home. Mr. Nixon errs in believing that people are acclaiming his methods and his priorities.

I recently received a resolution adopted by the metropolitan council of the Twin Cities area. I submit this resolution and a copy of the letter sent by the metro council to former Housing and Urban Development Secretary George Romney for inclusion in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION No. 73-2—RELATING TO FEDERAL MORATORIUM ON SUBSIDIZED HOUSING, SEWER AND WATER, AND PARKS AND OPEN SPACE GRANTS

Whereas, the Metropolitan Council since its creation in 1967 has undertaken a positive housing program with the objective of creating increased housing choice for low and moderate income families throughout the Metropolitan Area; and

Whereas, this program has resulted in substantial increases in housing locational opportunities for such families; and

Whereas, the need for low and moderate income housing is critical in this Metropolitan Area requiring an annual production of 9,600 units through 1980; and

Whereas, the federally-subsidized housing programs which, in the past have been able to meet less than one-half of these needs, nevertheless offer the only available production tools to meet this need; and

Whereas, the Council in the housing section of its Metropolitan Development Guide has encouraged new and innovative approaches such as housing allotments and planned unit development concepts to provide a mix of housing as to design and economic levels served; and

Whereas, the executive branch of the federal government has imposed a moratorium on new commitments for public housing and interest-subsidy programs and grants for sewer and water and parks and open space facilities, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development; and

Whereas, such moratorium will have an adverse effect in carrying out the objectives

of the Council's Metropolitan Development Guide on housing, parks and open space and sanitary sewers; and

Whereas, such a moratorium will have an adverse effect on improving the living conditions of citizens of low and moderate income, and will severely affect related industry and employment in this Metropolitan Area, and any extended moratorium will set back the accomplishment of this Metropolitan Area in providing housing locational choice to low and moderate income families throughout the Metropolitan Area;

Now, therefore be it resolved that the Metropolitan Council urge the President, the Minnesota Congressional delegation, and the Secretary of HUD to support legislation that will increase the supply of low and moderate income housing to meet the critical need of the Metropolitan Area and urge that the current moratorium on the issuance of new commitments for subsidized housing and grants for sewer and water and parks and open space be terminated at the earliest possible time.

METROPOLITAN COUNCIL OF THE
TWIN CITIES AREA,

Saint Paul, Minn., January 19, 1973.

Mr. GEORGE ROMNEY,
Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY ROMNEY: The Metropolitan Council is deeply concerned as to the immediate and particularly the long-range impact of the moratorium that has been instituted by HUD on federal programs for housing, sewer and water, and parks and open space programs. While the Council supports a review of these programs to explore new and innovative approaches that would more effectively meet program objectives, and extended moratorium could have an extremely adverse effect on the capability of this metropolitan area to carry forward critical programs that have been initiated in accord with adopted Metropolitan Development Guide policies.

Attached is a copy of a resolution adopted by the Metropolitan Council. The Council will review and support new and innovative approaches designed to more effectively meet these program needs. In the interim period, however, we would urge that immediate steps be taken to ensure that current programs can be continued. This is particularly true in the field of housing where the Council has been successful in accomplishing the production of housing on a metropolitan area-wide basis providing housing locational opportunities for low and moderate income families throughout the Metropolitan Area. This is a most difficult objective to accomplish and the curtailment of the housing program for any substantial period of time could set back this metropolitan effort for several years.

We would hope that the financing support for these programs could actually be increased and that provisions could be made for packaging of funding of sewer and water, open space and housing programs to permit innovative large-scale developments in both suburban and central city areas. Such a program should also permit direct subsidies to the families. Such an approach would encourage planned unit development approaches to large-scale suburban development permitting a mixture of housing both as to design type and economic levels served. In this way, low and moderate income families would have free choice options to compete in the housing market and would provide a greater production of housing for such families in a quality living environment.

The Council would support legislation that would aid in carrying these housing concepts forward. At the same time, we believe that these principles can be carried forward within existing legislation and current hous-

ing efforts should not be curtailed as we improve our programs to meet these needs.

To illustrate the kinds of programs we have been carrying out in this metropolitan area, I am enclosing a copy of our Metropolitan Housing Development Guide and a copy of a proposed housing demonstration program for which we have been attempting to secure federal support.

Sincerely,

ALBERT J. HOFSTEDE, *Chairman.*

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to join my colleagues today in commemorating the 55th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Lithuania traces its existence as a unified state to the year 1253 when a delegate of Pope Innocent IV crowned Mindaugas king of all Lithuania. In 1795, Lithuania was annexed by Russia, but despite fierce attempts to eliminate the native culture, the Lithuanians remained faithful to their religion, language, and tradition.

During World War I, Lithuania was conquered by the Germans. However, the defeat of Germany and the Russian revolution made conditions favorable for Lithuanian independence.

On February 16, 1918, a congress composed of 200 Lithuanian delegates proclaimed an independent Lithuanian state based on democratic principles.

Independence was short-lived, however, on January 15, 1919, the Red Army invaded the Lithuanian capitol of Vilnius and installed a Communist government. In turn, the Russians were driven out by Polish and Lithuanian fighting units in 1920. On July 12 of the same year, Russia signed a peace treaty with Lithuania recognizing it as an independent nation and pledging itself to renounce forever all rights of sovereignty.

A permanent Lithuanian constitution was adopted on August 1, 1922, according to Lithuanian citizens freedom of speech, assembly, religion, and communication. The power of legislation was vested in a parliament known as the Seimas, and the executive authority in the president and a cabinet of ministers.

During the period of independence, which lasted until World War II, great progress was made by Lithuania on many fronts. A land reform program was instituted, industrialization began, social legislation was enacted, and Lithuanian literature flourished.

On June 15, 1940, however, the Soviets occupied Lithuania and on August 3, Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. by the Supreme Soviet in Moscow.

Since World War II, the Communists have pressed forward to subjugate Lithuania and to destroy the nation's proud cultural heritage. Soviet policy resulted in deportation and extermination of more than 1 million Lithuanians.

CXIX—317—Part 4

Despite Moscow's brutal treatment, the Lithuanians have persevered in their desire for freedom and independence. That the spirit of democracy still shines bright in Lithuania has been demonstrated in recent years by events such as the riots in Kaunas on May 18, 1972, following the funeral of a Lithuanian youth, Roman Kalanta, who had self-immolated in a public square in a dramatic protest against the Soviet enslavement of his country.

Mr. Speaker, let us all pray that the brave Lithuanian people will not be compelled to wait much longer for their true independence. We in the United States, so blessed with liberty and democracy, must never lose sight of the struggle for sovereignty which continues daily in Lithuania.

ENERGY CRISIS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, we are constantly being bombarded by dire warnings of the impending energy crisis. At the same time, we hear cries from the public for government and industry to "do something" about it. It is the same old problem: Everyone complains about the energy crisis, but not everyone is doing his part to improve it.

The Government and industry are working toward solutions to the energy problems we face, but there are steps which every American can take to conserve energy, and in the process, save some money.

A recent article in the Austin Statesman outlined some simple, practical measures we can all implement in our homes and offices to conserve this country's vital energy reserves.

It will take more than experts to cope with the world's growing energy shortage. But just as each individual vote counts in a democracy, so the individual efforts of millions of Americans can have a significant impact on the problem we face.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I include the article from the January 30 Austin Statesman in the RECORD:

ENERGY CRISIS

(By Peter Tonge)

When David Rose fitted radial tires to his 1958 Aston Martin, he calculated he would save a significant amount of gasoline. He did. It came to something better than \$30 worth of fuel a year as reduced road friction cut consumption by 10 per cent.

Dr. Rose is a professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). His specialty is energy conservation. Hence his interest in radials, in fluorescent lighting, and in storm windows, among other items, and in such things as shade trees and windbreaks.

They all save energy to a degree that makes economic sense. They can also contribute substantially, when practiced on a wide scale, to holding back what many see as an approaching energy crisis.

They represent practical measures individuals can take to help prevent this crisis from developing. The old-fashioned familiar-

ity of some of these things, such as storm windows, shouldn't hide their relevance as important energy-savers.

The United States and Europe particularly appear vulnerable to energy shortages in the decades ahead. In fact, outside of the Middle East and the Soviet Union, few nations have satisfactory energy reserves, Professor Rose contends.

Known oil reserves, according to Lawrence Rocks and Richard P. Runyan ("The Energy Crisis," Crown Publishers), will last some 20 years at 1970 consumption rates) 15 years at the present growth rate. Natural gas is put at 40 and 30 years respectively. Only coal, among the fossil fuels, is relatively abundant and could last 300 years.

The U.S. energy bill, including transportation of fuels, now stands at \$100 billion. That's one-tenth of the gross national product. Overall energy demands will double in the next 18 years while the population grows 80 per cent, says Professor Rose. Pure industrial energy consumption is rising at a considerably faster rate, according to Rocks and Runyan—7 to 1.1 in relation to population growth.

Half of everything transported in the U.S. today is fuel. More petroleum has been consumed here since the mid 1950's than in all history up to that point. Electric power consumption, now twice what it was 10 years ago, could rise to between four and six times its present level by the turn of the century, according to some projections.

Total rate of energy use in the U.S. now is about 10 kilowatts for each man, woman, and child according to Professor Rose. This is not just electricity, but also gas, gasoline, heating oil, and so forth. It includes not only what each one uses personally, but also his or her share of the coke in the steel mills, of jet transport fuel, and the like. The total is prodigious. It amounts to more than one third of all the power consumed in the world today. Put another way, 6 percent of the world's population expends 33 per cent of its power output.

That so much energy is spent, much of it in cavalier fashion, suggests that much can be conserved by plugging the leaks.

A study, "The Potential for Energy Conservation," put out by the President's Office of Emergency Preparedness suggests that by 1980 the U.S. could save the equivalent of 7.3 millions barrels of oil a day by steadily implementing such measures as:

Improved insulation in homes; adoption of more efficient air-conditioning systems; shifting intercity freight from highway to rail, "short-haul" passengers from air to ground travel, and urban passengers from automobiles to introduction of more efficient industrial processes.

The average man on the street can help in many ways too, and help his pocket book at the same time, say the experts.

The radial tires mentioned earlier are a case in point. Their greater expense tends to be balanced by longer life (40,000 miles). From Professor Rose's point of view their improved traction, coupled with reduced surface friction on the road, is the important thing.

Tests he has carried out show the reduced friction improves gasoline mileage by 10 per cent. That is an important factor in view of the anticipated 12 per cent increase in gas consumption brought about by higher exhaust emission standards.

Buildings, too, are prolific wasters of energy. Nearly every home in the U.S. spills heat needlessly into the winter air just as it fails to keep out unwanted heat in summer.

Better housing designs and optimum insulation of buildings would cut energy consumed for heating and air-conditioning by more than 25 per cent.

The cost of this additional insulation during construction of a medium-sized house,

Professor Rose estimates, would come to \$200. It is a small sum compared to the annual heating cost of around \$400 a year for the same home inadequately insulated.

Tests at MIT suggest that the cost of storm windows can be recouped through a saving in heating costs in six years. The double glazing creates a dead-air space, reducing heat loss.

Other significant savings result from having blinds or drapes, or both, at every window. Draw them the moment the sun goes down. The more dead-air spaces between room and outside window the better the heat retention.

Weather stripping around all doors is important too. Hold your hand an inch from the keyhole of an outside door to realize the importance of blocking every little leak. The constant flow of cold air coming through the keyhole is balanced by an equivalent outflow of warm air—air your oil or gas bill shows you have paid good money to heat.

Another tip: If you have a fireplace, keep the damper shut whenever there's no fire in the grate. Warm, invisible air billows out of an open chimney just as smoke does.

Humidity can also be important. A home that's too dry must be kept warmer than one with the proper humidity level to give the same degree of comfort, according to the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University at Blacksburg, Va. The Institute suggests a humidifier may be a worthwhile investment in those areas where the winter air gets very dry.

Never turn down a thermostat in home or office more than about five degrees for short periods such as overnight. Otherwise, it may take more energy to restore heat to the home than was saved by the reduction.

A protective row of conifers down the side of the house exposed to the prevailing winds can cut down quite significantly on heat loss. A building, says Professor Rose, is subject to the chill factor, just as people are. In contrast, deciduous trees on the sunny side of the house provide shelter from summer sun. They shed their leaves in winter, allowing the warm rays through when they're most needed.

Savings on electrical power consumption in a home can be considerable. As anti-pollution needs place increasing strictures on power generation and as fuel supplies decrease to push up the price to consumers, the practicality of such savings will become obvious.

Says a spokesman for the electrical appliance industry, "Turning off the light when you leave the room will become a meaningful thing to do. Penny-wise today it will become nickel-wise tomorrow."

Many little things can bring further energy-money savings. Here are some suggestions:

Refrigeration: If your freezer isn't self-defrosting, defrost it when the ice becomes a quarter-inch thick. A greater ice thickness cuts down on the cooling power of the coils. A self-defrosting refrigerator, by the way, consumes up to 50 per cent more electrical current than the standard model.

Keep your freezer full. The costly cold is retained by the food whereas 80 percent of the cold air spills out every time you open the refrigerator door.

Cooking: Never boil more water than is necessary to cook with. Use pots and pans that fully cover the elements. Use plug-in appliances such as skillets where possible. They are generally fitted with thermostats and can be set for exactly the amount of heat you need.

Prepare double quantities of such things as soups or stews which take a long time to cook. Then freeze the unused portion for future use. It is less power-consuming to hold the food in refrigeration and warm it up when needed than to cook up a new batch. Plan your meals. Several dishes can be baked

in an oven as economically as one food item. Remember, too, every time you open your oven door you lose at least 20 per cent of its heat. For some dishes a pressure cooker cuts down considerably on cooking time and therefore on the amount of energy used.

Bathing: A shower generally uses a lot less water than bathing in a tub. To be really economical try the Navy method. Soap yourself thoroughly. Then step into the shower for a quick rinse down.

Remember, hot water left in the pipes represents wasted heat. When installing a new heater have it located as close to your bathroom or kitchen sink as possible. Sometime in the future, waste hot water from bath or sink will be made to pass over the inlet pipes, in such systems, thus pre-warming the water before it reaches the heater.

Air Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration News states that gas is generally more economical than electricity for heating water.

Washing: Always wash full loads. It saves time, hot water, and electricity. Use cold water and cold-water detergents whenever they can do the job.

Drying: Don't overdry clothes. It is costly in heat and puts wrinkles in the garments.

Lighting: Fluorescent tubes use one sixth of the power of your electric iron in a 110-volt circuit. On the other hand, you use a lot more lights and burn them longer than you use irons. So it pays to turn off unneeded lights, and the television set nobody is watching.

Contrary to popular belief, turning a light on and off does not use more electricity than leaving it on.

Air conditioning: An efficient air conditioner will use as little as half the current of an inefficient one to give the same cooling effect. A simple test when buying a new one is to divide the number of watts into the BTU's per hour. Both have to be listed by law. The quotient will vary from 3 to 11. The higher the number, the greater the efficiency of the unit. From 7 on up is considered good.

Put the conditioner in a window on the shady side of the house. See, too, that it is not surrounded by shrubs, bushes or other dense growth outside the window. This will prevent efficient discharge of the heat.

These are simple measures. Yet, in saving energy, they could have a mighty impact.

BEST IN THE NATION?

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, one of Philadelphia's proudest boasts has always been that the city's fire department is the best in the Nation.

Once again that statement has proved to be correct. The National Fire Protection Association has awarded Philadelphia's fire department first place in its annual fire prevention contest for cities with populations of 500,000 or more.

At this time I enter into the RECORD the city's announcement of this award:

Philadelphia's nationally acclaimed and award-winning Fire Department has added another citation to its list of distinguished honors.

Fire Commissioner Joseph R. Rizzo announced today that Philadelphia has once again won first place in the annual National Fire Protection Association's fire prevention contest for cities with population of 500,000 or more.

Rizzo was notified of the award in a telegram from Charles Morgan, president of the NFPA, who praised the Philadelphia Fire Department for its outstanding record and innovative planning in teaching the message of fire safety.

This marks the 15th time in the last 20 years that Philadelphia has placed first in this national competition. The City has also won from the NFPA four Grand Awards symbolic of the finest fire service record of any city in the nation.

The Fire Department's fire prevention program has gained national prominence through its year-round efforts in educating every segment of the community in the value of fire safety and prevention in the home and school and in business and industry.

Rizzo said, "Fire prevention in Philadelphia is a full time commitment every day of the year. The success of our programs stems from the fine cooperation we get from our schools, businesses and industries in the Philadelphia area."

Over 1,700 cities competed in this contest, which yearly recognizes the best efforts in fire prevention and safety programs throughout the country.

The NFPA is the only world-wide organization with the express purpose of advancing through science and education the protection of lives and property from fire. The non-profit agency founded in 1896 with headquarters in Boston, Mass., seeks to stimulate universal fire safety consciousness and encourage wider use of modern techniques in fire prevention efforts.

OLIVER PAYNE BOLTON

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the death of Oliver Payne Bolton in the midyears of his life was a great personal loss to me, not only because he was a former colleague in the House but because he was, as well, a close and much-admired friend.

Born into a historic family and in a great State, Oliver Bolton served his Nation both in war and in peace with distinction and devotion. He was a soldier, newspaper publisher, Congressman, State official and an investment banker during his career. But most of all he was a gentleman and a friend of everyone he met whatever their own station in life or the cut of their political beliefs.

We knew him in Congress but a short time in comparison to the length of service of many of us. But it was long enough to be touched by the depth of his concern and love for his country and the people he represented while he was here. It was a love and respect from his birthright, nurtured by devoted parents and a high sense of history and patriotism.

Intense as he was about his country's future, he tempered it all with a constant sense of humor and the personal touch of friendship that leavened his life with grace and patience.

I admired him all of the days I knew him and am saddened to see the likes of him depart when we need men of his character and strength so badly at this moment in our history. His loss is more than that suffered by a loving family. It

is a national loss. I share it most sorrowfully because he was a friend as well as a colleague.

THE URGENT NEED FOR STRONGER PURE FOOD LEGISLATION

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of this 93d Congress, I introduced H.R. 323, a bill which would strengthen the powers of the Food and Drug Administration and enable that agency to guarantee a higher standard of food hygiene and sanitation to the American consumer. Hopefully, the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, under the leadership of the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) will hold hearings on this bill at the earliest possible opportunity.

Once again, the urgency of this problem and the pressing need for improved nationwide food processing sanitation has been brought to public attention by the recent discovery of deadly botulism in mushrooms packed for institutional consumption. Contamination in a can of its mushrooms has been discovered by the Ohio food processor which distributes the product. Unfortunately, 3,954 cans from the same lot have already been distributed in five States, including my home State of New York as well as Pennsylvania, Ohio, Wisconsin, and Illinois. Hopefully there will be no victims of the deadly botulism which has been located, but this situation underscores the need for speedy enactment of tougher food processing and inspection legislation.

A full account of this case was reported in the New York Times and in the New York Post on February 19, 1973. I am attaching those articles to my statement:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 19, 1973]

CANS OF MUSHROOMS RECALLED BY FDA FOR BOTULISM CHECK

WASHINGTON, Feb. 17.—The Food and Drug Administration reported Saturday night that an institutional-size can of mushrooms produced in Ohio had been found to contain the poison that produces botulism and that 29,500 cans of the product were being recalled.

The F.D.A. cautioned users of large cans of mushrooms, such as restaurants and pizza parlors, to be alert to the brand names and codes of the lots being recalled. The mushrooms were distributed in New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Wisconsin and Illinois, the F.D.A. said.

The agency said that the United Canning Company of East Palestine, Ohio, had discovered a swollen 6-pound 9-ounce No. 10 can on its warehouse shelves and that laboratory tests had shown that it contained deadly botulinum Type B toxin, which produces botulism.

None of 534 other cans of the lot still in the warehouse showed botulinum contamination, the F.D.A. said, but the remainder—3,954—were being recalled from distributors. Ten other lots packed at the same time on Jan. 26 were also being recalled.

The lot from which the contaminated can

came bears the code CJ3SA, stamped on the top and bottom of the cans. They were sold under various labels by a number of distributors.

The F.D.A. said the codes of the 10 other lots processed at the same time as CJ3SA and being recalled "as a precaution" were CE3SA.

Botulism poisoning attacks the nervous system and is usually fatal. The poison forms when canned food is undercooked after sealing, permitting botulin bacteria to multiply in the absence of air.

[From the New York Post, Feb. 19, 1973]

HUNT POISONED MUSHROOMS

WASHINGTON.—A search for canned mushrooms tainted by deadly botulism poison continued in New York State and three other heavily populated states today.

The Food and Drug Administration announced a recall of the mushrooms after the often-fatal poison was discovered in cans still in one Ohio factory on Saturday.

Yesterday, other tainted cans were found during the recall effort, but the FDA did not say where they had been located.

NOT YET SOLD

The agency said there was no evidence to indicate that any of the suspect canned goods had yet reached the public.

The agency said Saturday night a recall order had been issued for 30,000 cans of mushrooms which were processed in late January by the United Canning Co. of East Palestine, Ohio.

Earlier, 200 investigators were dispatched to four states to see if pizza parlors, wholesalers and other subdistributors had any of the cans in stock. But the spokesman said most of the cans have been accounted for and stopped from distribution.

The cans of mushrooms, distributed in New York State, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois normally would be sold through wholesale distributors or restaurants rather than for home use.

The FDA spokesman said Sunday: "We feel at this time encouraged by our findings that indicate most of the 11 suspect (identification) codes are under some sort of controls short of the customer level."

The most intensive checks have been in Pittsburgh, Buffalo and Cleveland, where a significant supply had moved beyond the wholesale level.

Botulism is an often-fatal food poisoning caused by bacteria and characterized by vomiting, abdominal pain, coughing, muscular weakness and eye disturbance. The recall was the first regarding possible botulism since 1971.

The Type B botulism toxin in the contaminated cans is relatively low in potency. It is identified easily by a strong smell.

The FDA said United Canning Co. found swollen and putrid-smelling cans in its plant Thursday and called in American Can Co. scientists for help. The scientists then called the FDA.

WARN RESTAURANTS

The FDA urged restaurants and other potential buyers to return the mushrooms to the distributor.

The first contaminated mushroom lot has the identification CJ3SA. The code on the 4500 cans identified yesterday is CG5A.

Cans recalled as a precaution have the following codes: CT3SA, CS3SA, CQ3SA, CN3SA, SM3SA, CL3SA, CI3SA, CF3SA and CE3SA.

The FDA said the contaminated mushrooms were distributed under the following labels:

Snow-top, stems and pieces, distributed by Follino Brothers, East Keesport, Pa.; Master, distributed by Delillo Supermarkets, Jeanette, Pa.; Veterans and Unico, distributed by Veterans Distributing Co., Chicago; Chicago Style Mushrooms, distributed by Battaglia Distributing Co., Chicago; and Frankie's

and Central States, distributed by United Canning.

Stouffers Food Co., Solon, Ohio, a large food manufacturer, also received some of the contaminated mushrooms "and has taken steps to prevent all distribution of its products which may contain mushrooms" from the contaminated lot, the FDA said.

THE DAY MY FAITH MEANT MOST TO ME

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to report to my colleagues that Noreen Todd, of Watertown in my congressional district, has received fourth prize in the 1973 Guideposts youth writing contest.

The Guideposts youth writing contest is sponsored by Guideposts magazine. To win Guideposts' annual contest, contestants must have written their own true stories about "The Day My Faith Meant Most to Me." This year, some 1,300 essays were submitted from contestants across the country.

Noreen, who is a senior at Norwich Senior High School, and four other finalists were honored at a luncheon in the Capitol on Tuesday, during which they learned the order in which they placed for the top \$7,500 in scholarship prizes.

I wish to share with my colleagues the text of Noreen's prize-winning essay. We all have anxious moments of doubt and uncertainty during which the strength and vitality of our faith helps sustain us, comfort us, and show us the way. The beautifully simple and moving essay by Noreen Todd, of Watertown, is a wonderful example of how faith and trust in God can help in a young girl's search for peace and understanding.

THE DAY MY FAITH MEANT MOST TO ME
(By Noreen Todd, Watertown, Conn., senior, Watertown High School, Watertown, Conn.)

"Where're you going?"

"Out!" I shouted back trying to block out the sound of my mother's voice. I had to get out and be by myself and I rushed out the door before she had a chance to call me back.

It was cold and the first snow of November had fallen. I pulled my sweater down over my hands because I'd left my mittens home. Nobody else was on the street so I let out a sigh of relief at finally being able to think by myself. I felt so confused.

When had it all started? The fights, the nagging and finally last night the hit across the face. Why did she hate me and I her? But did I really hate her?

I kicked through a small drift of snow and turned the corner. The next street was empty except for a little dog. I called to him, and he ran up and sniffed my hands. I petted his wet icy fur and tickled him under his chin. Someone up the street whistled, and my little friend scampered off. I stood looking after him, enveloped in the white smoke my breath made. Feeling the cold, I moved on.

We had moved that summer from a town I loved. My mother had gotten a job and it tired her out. Coming home exhausted at night, she'd notice only the wrong things. She didn't notice the dinner I'd made but the laundry I'd forgotten. I had problems

adjusting to a new school, but she wouldn't listen, so I'd just cry at night. She asked me why was I so moody. I didn't know.

I was startled when I felt something cold and wet on my hand. The little dog was back at my side. He wagged his tail furiously and danced around my feet. I picked up a stick and threw it for him. He ran and proudly returned to me. I threw it again and again until we both tired of the game.

"Let's go, boy," I called and began jogging down the street, the little dog running at my side.

It hadn't been so bad at first. I could understand that everybody feels grouchy at times. I didn't do everything she wanted me to, but I was in a new school and I wanted to belong. I felt I needed to spend more time away from home until I'd made friends. Wasn't my happiness more important than dishes?

We had reached the end of the street and it was so cold my fingers were turning blue. I didn't want to go back home, but it was too late to go visit a friend. The church bells rang ten times, and I thought of going to see my minister. But suddenly I felt embarrassed. It was my problem and I had to solve it. I turned around and slowly walked back home.

Ten chimes from the church bells made me think of the ten commandments. "Honor your mother and father," they said. What if your parents didn't honor you? Wasn't there anything in the Bible about that? I wished then that I had taken time to read the Bible. It probably held the answer to my problem.

Lately I had been doubting whether there was a God. My world was so blue, and what had God done to make it better? I was standing there cold and alone in the middle of the street, afraid to go home. I wanted it to be home again so badly. I wanted to feel warmth and happiness there.

The wind howled and blew snow in my face. I looked up and around at my surroundings. The black, bare trees were silhouetted against the white snow of the hill behind my house. I caught a glimpse of moving deer at the ridge of the hill. The little dog barked as a couple of birds fluttered out of the woods next to me. The whole street was a scene of quiet, winter peace. I'd never noticed how pretty my neighborhood was. I thought how nice it must be in the spring with the wild flowers, and birds. God hadn't forgotten me here as He was creating His beauty.

Suddenly I didn't feel so cold anymore. I no longer felt the sting where my mother had hit me. Maybe the loss of dignity had hurt more. It was my problem and I had to do something. I couldn't wait around holding a grudge. That wouldn't help anything. What was it they said in church about forgiving those who wronged you? Why hadn't I paid attention before? I'd hear it Sunday after Sunday but I'd never really listened. I'm listening now.

I rushed up the street and, hesitating slightly at the door, went into my house. My mother was downstairs and I went down to her. She looked up with a cold expression on her face, but it warmed up when she saw my smile. She asked me where I had been?

"I was out walking and thinking," I answered. "How was your day at work?"

"Tiring," she said wearily.

I realized then that I'd never even asked her how her job was or how anything was with her. Suddenly I felt the wall between us crumbling.

"You just rest," I smiled. "I'll take care of everything."

EASTERN AIRLINES SHOULD ACQUIRE CARIBAIR

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

MR. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I have today written a letter to President Nixon concerning the critical necessity for the Civil Aeronautics Board's approval of the acquisition of Caribair by Eastern Airlines. In view of the fact that this issue is so crucial to the future economic and social well-being of the Virgin Islands, I am inserting it into the RECORD at this point for the information of my colleagues, and am requesting their support for the islands' endeavors in this matter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1973.

THE PRESIDENT,

The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As the Virgin Islands' first elected Delegate to the Congress of the United States, I am writing to urge your immediate rejection of the Civil Aeronautics Board's disapproval of Eastern Airlines' plan to purchase Caribair. At the same time, I strongly request that this application be remanded to the CAB with a recommendation for approval on the merits which I believe to be of compelling necessity to the interests of the people of the Virgin Islands.

We are the farthest extension of United States territory into the Atlantic toward Africa and northeastern South America, and the only bearer of the United States flag, other than Puerto Rico, in the Caribbean. By virtue of our strategic location we hold important long-range Space and Defense implications.

For many years St. Thomas has been the most popular and most visited of any island in the Caribbean area by American citizens. Partially because of political risks elsewhere in the Caribbean area by American citizens, dollars have been invested in land, tourist, and commercial development in St. Thomas, St. Croix, and St. John, and these investments are continuing to increase.

In spite of our binding ties to the United States and the critical importance of commercial air routes to our economy, the Civil Aeronautics Board has not provided us with adequate air service. At the present time we have non-stop service from only New York and Miami, and even this consists of a limited number of flights. St. Croix has only one non-stop flight from the mainland, while the others come through St. Thomas. Pan American is not operating its Miami-Virgin Islands route at all, and Eastern is not allowed to continue its flight from the Virgin Islands up from Miami to any of the main east coast cities.

Because of this existing situation, practically all of our travel to the mainland requires the inconvenience and delay of stop-over connections. The majority of these are made in San Juan where there are between thirty and forty flights every day from the United States serving some ten different cities. Proof that this enormous disparity between the number of flights serving San Juan and those serving St. Thomas is inconsistent with the demands of the market is shown by the growth of the air taxi industry to approximately one hundred flights in each direction every day between San Juan and St. Thomas.

The air taxis are valuable to us, and as local industries we are very proud of their success. Thus, if I considered that competition from Eastern Airlines was a serious risk I would be urging that ways be found to protect them while still approving Caribair's acquisition by Eastern. However, we have seen no evidence that Eastern wishes to operate light aircraft in competition, and the remaining point would turn on whether Eastern would operate so many flights through San Juan from the mainland that they would make heavy inroads in the taxi companies' passenger loads. Caribair now operates about ten roundtrips in this market every day with DC-9 aircraft seating approximately 100 people. All that would happen is that these flights would be replaced by Eastern flights. Assuming that most of the Eastern flights would be through-service, it does not seem likely that Eastern would operate more flights in total than Caribair does and it is even possible that it might operate somewhat fewer. At the same time, this combination would give us the benefit of having both the local service and the through-service, and the total competition between air taxi and scheduled airlines would probably be in roughly the same balance that exists today.

In view of the fact that air taxis provide a specialized high-frequency service that large airlines do not duplicate, they will always have a strong and viable position in the transportation systems of the Caribbean. There are probably more air taxi companies and service in this area than any other place in the world. Only if too many of them enter the market will the smallest and least efficient be unable to compete. This will be independent of the completely different type of service provided by the large commercial airlines, and such service should ultimately bring the air taxis more business.

The first Section of the Declaration of Policy to guide the Civil Aeronautics Board in the Federal Aviation Act states:

"In the exercise and performance of its powers and duties under this Act, the Board shall consider the following . . . as being in the public interest . . . (a) The encouragement and development of an air transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the Postal Service, and of the national defense;" (Section 102(a)—Federal Aviation Act of 1958)

In appearing to ignore this Section, the Board is not encouraging or developing our transportation system; it is not designing a system consistent with our present needs; it cannot serve the needs of the commerce of this area merely with air taxis; and it is proposing to deprive us altogether of specific services Caribair provides to foreign destinations.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has failed to recognize the service needs that have existed in the Caribbean for many years. On the mainland the agency has continuously promoted the development of good one-carrier service, then through-plane service, then non-stop service. In contrast, it has actually blocked this normal step-by-step progress for the Virgin Islands and would now reject the only proposal which can provide us with the mainland service that we need. At the same time the Board has established a number of new routes to Jamaica, and as a result that island's growth in visitors has been the greatest of any island in the Caribbean in 1971 and 1972. The Civil Aeronautics Board, therefore, has given foreign areas a strong, preferential advantage over the Virgin Islands, and we now ask that this inequity to United States territory be corrected.

We also face the same problem in terms of foreign islands to the south of us, be-

cause many airlines operate more non-stop flights from New York to such islands as Guadeloupe, Barbados, and Curacao, every year, thereby by-passing both the Virgin Islands and San Juan. These airlines also fly directly to those islands from Europe, so that the Virgin Islands are being avoided both from the United States and Europe. I firmly believe that unless decisive action is taken to permit effective competition with these kinds of services there will be, within five years, a serious decline in the status of the United States areas, compared to the more southerly islands. The tourist industry, land development, capital investment, Caribbean commercial enterprises, and the development of financial and banking centers will be drawn south of the Virgin Islands. The only available alternative to such a detrimental trend is to permit Eastern to extend its Puerto Rico flights, which come from a variety of mainland cities, through San Juan over the Caribair system to the Virgin Islands.

In addition to preventing the almost certain immediate bankruptcy of Caribair, Eastern Airlines anticipates acquisition will make possible substantial savings by eliminating duplicate facilities and the economies which would result from Eastern's ability to purchase supplies in large volume at lower prices.

Mr. President, on behalf of the 600 employees of Caribair, the residents of the Virgin Islands, and the economic and social well-being of this United States territory, I respectfully implore your rejection of the action taken by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and ask that you do all in your power to facilitate the acquisition of Caribair by Eastern Airlines.

Respectfully,

RON DE LUGO,
Member of Congress.

AMERICAN HEART MONTH

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today, cardiovascular disease is the Nation's No. 1 killer. Tomorrow, cardiovascular disease will remain the killer it is today unless research provides us with knowledge of the causes of heart disease and ways to reduce death and disability due to cardiovascular disease.

During American Heart Month, the month of February, it is particularly appropriate that we recognize the scientists who are working toward ending heart disease which affects one-eighth of our population—more than 27 million citizens.

Many of the Nation's leaders in cardiovascular research are located in Los Angeles. We are proud of the work emanating from our home area which may save some of the more than 1 million lives expected to be lost to cardiovascular disease in 1973 alone.

Research now being conducted in the Los Angeles area includes studies on the effect of maternal exercise on the fetus and the effect of circulation on fat storage—which might lead to ending obesity.

The Los Angeles County Heart Association

is doing much to be supportive of these local heart researchers.

In 1972-73, the Los Angeles County Heart Association in conjunction with the American Heart Association awarded \$410,603 to area investigators and institutions in the area. Six fellowships and 10 grants-in-aid were awarded to Los Angeles area scientists working in cardiovascular research by the heart associations.

But, in addition to the associations' aid to research, the group informs the public of danger signs of heart disease, and instructs them in preventive and emergency action steps.

Our Los Angeles County Heart Association is ably lead by an outstanding group of officers, Advisory Council members, and Board of Directors members. Heading up the fine work of the local organization is Arthur V. Holmlund, the chairman of the board; and Dr. Irwin Hoffman, president.

The incoming leaders Lloyd Sugaski, chairman of the board-elect; and Dr. Morton Lee Pearce, president-elect; are certain to capably follow in the footsteps of their predecessors.

Other officers presently serving our local group are Dr. Eugene E. Berman, medical vice president; John G. Peetz, nonmedical vice president; Mrs. Fenton Taylor, Jr., treasurer; Dr. Glenn A. Langer, secretary, and Raymond L. Eden, executive director.

Under this group's able leadership, an important program to save lives, "The First Hour," has begun operation. The program provides a list of hospital emergency rooms committed to emergency medical care of heart patients in accordance with criteria established by the Los Angeles County Heart Association. The lists are distributed through neighborhood pharmacies.

The list is included in a brochure which describes the early warning signals of a heart attack and provides directions for quick actions that must be taken by the victim and those around him.

Innovative programing such as "The First Hour" reflect the dedication and commitment of the leaders of the Los Angeles County Heart Association.

During February, American Heart Month, it is only just that we express our gratitude to those persons active in cardiovascular disease research and to those who make that research possible.

CATHOLIC BISHOPS PASTORAL MESSAGE ON ABORTION

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Supreme Court's recent extraordinary decision authorizing abortion on demand has prompted a great many citizens to ponder deeply on our current system of values.

In this connection, I would like to call attention to a highly significant pastoral message on this subject issued by the Administrative Committee of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops.

The full text of the bishop's statement follows:

PASTORAL MESSAGE

Almighty God, the Creator of the world, has imprinted in the heart of man a law which calls him to do good and avoid evil. To obey this law is the dignity of man; according to it he will be judged (cf. *Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*, No. 16). In the encyclical letter, *Peace on Earth*, Pope John XXIII spoke of how nations can achieve justice and order by adhering to God's law:

Any human society, if it is to be well-ordered and productive, must lay down as a foundation this principle, namely, that every human being is a person, that is, his nature is endowed with intelligence and free will. By virtue of this, he has rights and duties of his own, flowing directly and simultaneously from his very nature. These rights are therefore universal, inviolable and inalienable (*Peace on Earth*, No. 9).

... Every man has the right to life, to bodily integrity, and to the means which are necessary and suitable for the proper development of life (*Peace on Earth*, No. 11).

The Supreme Court, in its recent decision striking down the laws of Texas and Georgia regulating abortion, has stated that the unborn child is not a person in the terms of the Fourteenth Amendment. Moreover, the Court held that the right of privacy encompasses a woman's decision to terminate a pregnancy, although the right of privacy is not an absolute right, and is not explicitly mentioned in the Constitution. In effect, the Court is saying that the right of privacy takes precedence over the right to life. This opinion of the Court fails to protect the most basic human right—the right to life. Therefore, we reject this decision of the Court because, as John XXIII says, "if any government does not acknowledge the rights of man or violates them, . . . its orders completely lack juridical force" (*Peace on Earth*, No. 61).

The Court has apparently failed to understand the scientific evidence clearly showing that the fetus is an individual human being whose pre-natal development is but the first phase of the long and continuous process of human development that begins at conception and terminates at death. Thus, the seven judge majority went on to declare that the life of the unborn child is not to be considered of any compelling value prior to viability, i.e., during the first six or seven months of pregnancy, and of only questionable value during the remaining months. Ultimately this means that the fetus, that is, the unborn child, belongs to an inferior class of human beings whose God-given rights will no longer be protected under the Constitution of the United States.

We find that this majority opinion of the Court is wrong and is entirely contrary to the fundamental principles of morality. Catholic teaching holds that, regardless of the circumstances of its origin, human life is valuable from conception to death because God is the Creator of each human being, and because mankind has been redeemed by Jesus Christ (cf. *Peace on Earth*, No. 9 and No. 10). No court, no legislative body, no leader of government, can legitimately assign less value to some human life. Thus, the laws that conform to the opinion of the Court are immoral laws, in opposition to God's plan of creation and to the Divine Law which prohibits the destruction of human life at any point of its existence. Whenever a conflict

arises between the law of God and any human law, we are held to follow God's law.

Furthermore, we believe, with millions of our fellow Americans, that our American law and way of life comprise an obvious and certain recognition of the law of God, and that our legal system is both based in it, and must conform to it. The Declaration of Independence holds that all men are endowed by "their Creator with certain unalienable rights," among which are "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." The Preamble to the Constitution establishes as one goal of the people of the United States "to secure the blessing of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity." Without the right to life, no true liberty is possible.

The basic human rights guaranteed by our American laws are, therefore, unalienable because their source is not man-made legislation but the Creator of all mankind, Almighty God. No right is more fundamental than the right to life itself and no innocent human life already begun can be deliberately terminated without offense to the Author of all life. Thus, there can be no moral acceptance of the recent United States Supreme Court decision which professes to legalize abortion.

In light of these reasons, we reject the opinion of the U.S. Supreme Court as erroneous, unjust, and immoral. Because of our responsibilities as authentic religious leaders and teachers, we make the following pastoral applications:

(1) Catholics must oppose abortion as an immoral act. No one is obliged to obey any civil law that may require abortion.

(2) Abortion is and has always been considered a serious violation of God's law. Those who obtain an abortion, those who persuade others to have an abortion, and those who perform the abortion procedure are guilty of breaking God's law. Moreover, in order to emphasize the special evil of abortion, under Church law, those who undergo or perform an abortion place themselves in a state of excommunication.

(3) As tragic and sweeping as the Supreme Court decision is, it is still possible to create a pro-life atmosphere in which all, and notably physicians and health care personnel, will influence their peers to see a value in all human life, including that of the unborn child during the entire course of pregnancy. We hope that doctors will retain an ethical concern for the welfare of both the mother and the unborn child, and will not succumb to social pressure in performing abortions.

(4) We urge the legal profession to articulate and safeguard the rights of fathers of unborn children, rights that have not been upset by this Supreme Court opinion.

(5) We praise the efforts of pro-life groups and many other concerned Americans and encourage them to:

(a) Offer positive alternatives to abortion for distressed pregnant women;

(b) Pursue protection for institutions and individuals to refuse on the basis of conscience to engage in abortion procedures;

(c) Combat the general permissiveness legislation can engender;

(d) Assure the most restrictive interpretation of the Court's opinion at the state legislative level;

(e) Set in motion the machinery needed to assure legal and constitutional conformity to the basic truth that the unborn child is a "person" in every sense of the term from the time of conception.

Bringing about a reversal of the Supreme Court's decision and achieving respect for unborn human life in our society will require unified and persistent efforts. But we must begin now—in our churches, schools and homes, as well as in the larger civic community—to instill reverence for life at all stages. We take as our mandate the words of the Book of Deuteronomy:

I set before you life or death . . . Choose

life, then, that you and your descendants may live . . .

MARGARET PANG RECORDS ORIENTAL SONGS FOR YOUNG CHILDREN

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii is a storehouse of rich and diverse cultures, a crossroads of East and West where people and cultures intermingle and attempt to bridge vast cultural gaps.

A great degree of success has been attained in bridging such gaps by providing young children with a broad educational and varied cultural experience. One person who is making a unique contribution in this respect is Mrs. Margaret Young Pang, a kindergarten teacher and mother of three in Honolulu.

Combining a rich Chinese cultural background, 22 years of experience as a teacher, and a master's degree in Asian studies, Mrs. Pang has just produced three albums of music for children with accompanying dance instructions. Two of the albums, "Marn-Ling Sees the Chinese Lion Dance," and "Marn-Ling and the Chinese Musical Instruments" feature Chinese children's stories and music. The other, "Hawaiian Rainbows" includes Hawaiian, Japanese, Samoan, and Maori music, along with some of Mrs. Pang's original compositions for children.

While she wrote most of the songs and music and does the singing on the albums, her family members also contributed to the production. Her husband, Raymond, played the Chinese instruments, including the flute, butterfly harp, lute, and zither on "Marn-Ling and the Chinese Musical Instruments," and their daughter, Lisa, did the illustrations for "Marn-Ling Sees the Chinese Lion Dance."

It is with pride that I share with my able colleagues the story of these wonderful record albums and the woman who created them, as written by Vickie Ong in the Honolulu Advertiser of February 1, 1973:

RECORD ALBUMS TEACH: ALL ABOUT CHINA—THE FUN WAY

(By Vickie Ong)

Once upon a time, a six-year-old girl, Lisa Marn-Ling Pang, and her mother, Margaret Young Pang, were in Chinatown when the child said, "Mommy, tell me a story."

Mrs. Pang told her daughter about a girl, who was also named Marn-Ling, who sees the ferocious Chinese lion and the pretty Narcissus queens at the Chinese New Year Festival.

Upon returning home, Mrs. Pang, a kindergarten teacher at Lincoln School, thought, "Hey, that's not a bad story" and jotted it down.

The tale, "Marn-Ling Sees the Chinese Lion Dance," later became a book and has just been recorded.

The album released in January with two others, "Marn-Ling and the Chinese Musical Instruments" and "Hawaiian Rainbows," features the voice of Mrs. Pang who narrates the story and sings Chinese songs for children.

After school in her classroom, Mrs. Pang said her children—both her young students and her three offsprings—have been the inspiration for the three albums.

"Without them, I wouldn't have been able to do it," said Mrs. Pang, a teacher for 22 years.

Last year, while ordering albums for classroom use, Mrs. Pang wrote International Telecomm Inc., "Would you be interested in Island material?"

The answer was yes, and she sent them Hawaiian, Japanese, Samoan and Maori songs and some original compositions which she was later to record for the album, "Hawaiian Rainbows."

She included background information on Aloha Week, poi, the ukulele and Boys' Day and suggested finger plays and dances for the songs so teachers can give a fun but informative cultural lesson on Hawaii with the record.

"I did this on an educational level. It's an attempt to bring together new songs for children. This is especially for the new teachers."

"Then, too, I (as a teacher) would want to know what to do with these songs and how to use this information with the children," she said.

Then the record company wrote Mrs. Pang, "By the way, do you have anything on China?"

Did she? Mrs. Pang only had a lifetime of Chinese cultural experiences, a Master's degree in Asian Studies, and scholarly interest in Chinese music and dance.

"My father loved Chinese opera and he used to take us when we were small," said Mrs. Pang. "And my grandmother, who was blind, said she'd pay us 25 cents to play Chinese music on the victrola."

"I said I'd do it and I just got exposed to the music. I'd follow along and mimic. You've got to be dumb not to learn the songs after hearing them everyday."

"Her interest in Chinese culture continued to grow as she performed with Chinese theater troupes passing up Chinese opera singing, she at first mimicked singers, then learned to read Chinese on her own."

"I've sung at benefits for the last 20 years. Since I sang Chinese songs, everyone thought I knew all about Chinese music."

In 1960, Mrs. Pang went to Taiwan to research and collect material on Chinese music for teachers. She was disappointed to find that the people were singing Chinese words to American tunes.

To supplement the information she got from books, Mrs. Pang kept a short wave radio tuned to China's wavelength to pick up its music and anthems.

From this experience, Mrs. Pang put together the material for "Marn-Ling Sees the Chinese Lion Dance" and "Marn-Ling and the Chinese Musical Instruments."

The first album includes Chinese songs, Chinese lyrics written out phonetically, and instructions for dances.

For the second record, her husband, Raymond, plays Chinese instruments—flute, butterfly harp, lute and zither—as Mrs. Pang describes each one.

Pang also shot the album's color photographs of instruments.

Even Lisa Marn-Ling Pang helped in the family project.

After the book, "Marn-Ling Sees the Chinese Lion Dance," Mrs. Pang asked Lisa, then 13 years old, to draw new pictures for the book in case it should be published.

"I thought maybe she might come up with something delightful. And the pictures were! I was very happy with them."

Lisa's black and white drawings capture the excitement of the Chinese New Year Festival and spotlight the Chinese lion, the parade, the food specialties and the Narcissus queens.

"When I did the drawings, I was looking through the eyes of a child. Chinese New

Year's to me was lots of lights, things that smell good. I thought, 'Wow! This is really neat!' said Lisa, who is 19 years old and a sophomore at the University of Hawaii.

"I kept the drawings all these years," said Mrs. Pang. "I thought the termites would get to them."

But the termites spared the 12 pictures, which now are a part of Mrs. Pang's album, "Marn-Ling Sees the Chinese Lion Dance."

In August, Mrs. Pang, her husband and 12 Chinese instruments went to Maryland to cut the three albums. The recording sessions were completed in three and a half days.

After receiving the albums last week, Mrs. Pang classroom-tested the records with her children in Room 35. Since Chinese New Year's was approaching, she played "Marn-Ling Sees the Chinese Lion Dance."

The children listened spellbound. When it was over, they said excitedly, "Play it again! Play it again!"

DOUGLAS PATTEN SPEAKS ON RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to hear young people speak out in the cause of Americanism. This is the purpose of the Veterans of Foreign Wars' annual Voice of Democracy Contest. It gives young Americans from nearly 500,000 secondary schools across the Nation an opportunity to compete for five national scholarships, and at the same time express the pride they feel in their country.

I am honored and pleased that the winning speech from Louisiana was delivered by a resident of my district, Douglas Warren Patten, of Bogalusa. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Hershel Vaughn Patten.

The text of Mr. Patten's winning speech follows:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

(By Douglas Patten)

"Free people, remember this maxim: we may acquire liberty but it is never recovered if it is once lost."

These are the words of Jean Jacques Rousseau, a French political philosopher whose ideas inspired the leaders of the French Revolution. Somehow it seems these words hold particular emphasis for us. For in only three years we will celebrate the 200th anniversary of the revolution which acquired our freedom. And it now appears that unless a drastic turn of national sentiment comes about, the liberties which we have come to take for granted will continue on the one-way road to demise.

Does this sound a bit pessimistic coming from a youthfully idealistic mind? It is instead a cry for the return of our nation to the basic principles of a democratic system.

Perhaps now the question becomes, "How do we, as individual citizens, secure the assurance that a democracy will be maintained?"

Speaking in general terms, there are occasions when all citizens have the opportunity to contribute to democracy. Voting intelligently and responsibly is, of course, the most common of these occasions.

It is indicative, however, that each citizen take it upon himself to display individual initiative in paying the price of freedom.

Each must seek out what he can contribute.

This is of prime importance to young people today. It is extremely advantageous for them to decide exactly what they can contribute while they are young. For while they are young, they possess the energy and resourcefulness to accomplish the most for their country.

Today as never before young people have the capacity to "re-revolutionize" this country and return it to the democratic form intended at its conception. By becoming involved in the governmental system that so many have come to distrust, a young person can combat the two major deterrents in the American system.

The first of these is corruption, which destroys. Far too long have the legislatures on all levels been controlled by the "power bosses"—often men not even members of these legislatures. It is now time for the lobbyists who have misrepresented the people's interest to step down or be struck down. For example, the labor union heads and their lobbyists have become so powerful and corrupt that, according to recent polls, significant portions—often majorities—of many major unions disagree with the policies and standard of their own unions.

Apathy, the second major deterrent, is equally dangerous, for its end is stagnation. It is rather frustrating to hear the vast majority of Americans be referred to as "silent," though they certainly deserve the title. The most accurate measure of their "silence" is the voter turnout. Public officials are often elected and important issues are often decided by less than thirty per cent.

The problems are immense. Those who contend that there is nothing wrong with America serve only to pacify the apathetic.

So what can we do to stop the decline of our free system?

First let us not neglect the privileges given all Americans, such as voting. But go one step further. Become involved. Let those who represent you know your sentiments. Fight the things you see wrong in your government.

In the words of John F. Kennedy:

"Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need—not as a call to battle, though embattled we are—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle year in and year out, 'rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation,'—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself."

LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1973

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to realize that Lyndon B. Johnson has left us, barely 9 years after that tragic afternoon when he suddenly assumed the heavy burdens of the greatest office on earth.

Having spent almost his entire adult life in the service of the legislative establishment, first as an employee, then as a Member of this great body, later as a Member of the other body, and finally as Vice President he entered the White House well qualified to lead the Nation through some of its most difficult years. A broad acquaintanceship with those who serve in the Congress, a great familiarity with the legislative process, and a detailed knowledge of what he was convinced were the needs of the people all combined to make him one of the

greatest practitioners of the legislator's art. There has never been a greater lobbyist for the causes in which he believed than Lyndon Baines Johnson.

It is regrettable that, having laid down the burdens of high office while still in the prime of life, he was destined to enjoy but a short retirement. During his 64 years he lived life to the full, striving mightily, first on behalf of his community, later as his horizons broadened, on behalf of Texas, the Nation, and the world.

Mr. Speaker, Lyndon Johnson was devoted to his family, to the political philosophy to which he subscribed, and to the country which he served well during war and peace. May he rest in peace and may God comfort his loved ones.

AN ANTIDOTE TO LAW REVIEWS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the Passaic County Bar Association, with headquarters in Paterson, N.J., publishes each month a remarkable journal called The Reporter.

Its editor, Daniel Crystal, who is a very old and dear friend of mine, calls it "an antidote to law reviews." Its pages are filled with scholarly articles discussing current developments in the law and in society, humorous articles, news, and views. It is always educational and entertaining to read, and I commend the Passaic County Bar Association and Dan Crystal for their excellent and thoughtful work.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this point a number of worthwhile articles from the latest issue of The Reporter and commend them to all of my colleagues:

... LEST YE BE JUDGED

After all, a judge is merely a lawyer hired by the State to conduct trials or to hear appeals; what justification is there for him to be arrogant? The conduct of a trial or the argument of an appeal is no easy matter at the best for counsel, witnesses, and jurors. The judge's business is to make their arduous task as effective as possible. Any exhibition of ill-temper or lack of interest in the proceedings will frustrate the satisfactory exercise of the judicial function and is not to be tolerated.—ARTHUR T. VANDERBILT.

Those who speak most of progress measure it by quantity and not by quality; how many people read and write, or how many people there are, or what is the annual value of their trade; whereas true progress would rather lie in reading and writing fewer and better things, and even fewer and better men, and enjoying life more.—GEORGE SANTAYANA.

We must not forget that the role of the courts is not merely to define the right. It is also to administer the remedy. Unless the remedy is actually applied to persons and things, the right is a mere pious idea.—CHIEF JUSTICE EARL WARREN

What, after all, is the law? At its best, at least as laymen see it, isn't it an attempt to methodize the madness of mankind? Isn't it a high-minded endeavor to create group sanity out of individual surrender to folly, and to regulate personal impulse so that it

becomes a social order? Doesn't it seek to superimpose a pattern of reason on a world of passion and to offer a guarantee of continuity by relating the precedents of the past with the dilemma of the present?—JOHN MASON BROWN

BILL OF RIGHTS DAY, 1972

Our distinguished local publication, The Paterson News, scooped The Reporter on December 15 by printing an eloquent editorial, entitled Bill of Rights Day. The News advised its readers that that day was one that all Americans should celebrate in the grand manner for it was the one on which in 1791, the Bill of Rights, "that bulwark of individual liberties," became effective. As the News pointed out, these first 10 amendments to the U.S. Constitution, guaranteeing freedom of religion, speech, the press, assembly, petition and the right to a fair trial, were not included in the original Constitution on the grounds that the document contained no grant of power to Congress to legislate on any of the subjects with which a bill of rights would deal. Supporters of these protections finally succeeded in getting them adopted three years after the Constitution was approved.

We pass on to those of our readers who missed the News editorial its warning that the Bill of Rights is in great danger today:

"A decade or two ago, civil libertarians feared that the Bill of Rights was being dangerously weakened by legislative excesses. Today, they are more worried about what the executive branch is doing. While President Nixon has affirmed his 'strong adherence to basic values that the nation believes in and the people believe in,' his critics charge that the administration has used 'law and order' and 'national security' to justify governmental inroads on the Bill of Rights. These critics cite administration actions in arresting demonstrators, attempting to bar newspaper publication of the Pentagon Papers and requiring reporters to testify in court about their confidential sources of information. They also accuse the administration of violating the individual's right to privacy through widespread use of wiretapping and the advocacy of 'no-knock' laws and preventive detention.

"While the Bill of Rights remains a theoretical sacred cow, there is some indication that many Americans support the administration's actions despite the complaints of some constitutional scholars. It might be well for these Americans to ponder the words of Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas: 'Each surrender of liberty to the demands of the moment makes easier another, larger surrender. The battle over the Bill of Rights is a never-ending one.'

Sobering words these with which we could not agree more. The News spoke for all of us in this splendid editorial on Bill of Rights Day.

ILLITERATE WASHINGTON

(By Lance Mann)

The thought came to our mind the other day that there's something of a daffy relationship between the gloriously inept Brooklyn Dodgers of yesteryear and the recent bombing of North Vietnam.

There was one never-to-be-forgotten moment when three confused Dodgers landed on the same base at the same time, and the immortal Casey Stengel asked the heavens imploringly, "Don't nobody around here know how to play this game?"

Our paraphrased question is "Doesn't anybody in Washington know how to read?" Specifically, regardless of what game plan the President may have, hasn't anybody—President Nixon, Mr. Kissinger, or whoever—read the Pentagon Papers?

At p. 494, Document No. 110, comprising

excerpts from a memorandum to Secretary of Defense McNamara, by the Assistant Secretary of Defense McNaughton, it states unequivocally that, "Bombing has failed to reduce the limit on the capacity of the DRV (Democratic Republic of Vietnam) to aid the VC (Viet Cong) to a point below VC needs," and, "Future bombing of North Vietnam cannot be expected physically to limit the military support given the VC by the DRV to a point below VC needs." And the same memo continues:

"C. Future of a bombing strategy:

"Although bombings of North Vietnam improve GVN morale and provide a counter in eventual negotiations (should they take place) there is no evidence that they meaningfully reduce either the capacity or the will for the DRV to support the VC. The DRV knows that we cannot force them to stop by bombing and that we cannot, without an unacceptable risk of major war with China or Russia or both, force them to stop by conquering them or 'blotting them out.' Knowing that if they are not influenced, we cannot stop them, the DRV will remain difficult to influence. With continuing DRV support, victory in the South may remain forever beyond our reach."

There's more in the Pentagon Papers along the same lines. On August 29, 1966, there was submitted Pentagon Paper No. 117. This was a report by the Institute of Defense Analysis on the effects of U.S. bombings on North Vietnam's ability to support military operations in South Vietnam. It speaks for itself:

"The aspects of the basic situation that have enabled Hanoi to continue its support of military operations in the South and to neutralize the impact of U.S. bombing by passing the economic costs to other Communist countries are not likely to be altered by reducing the present geographic constraints, mining Haiphong and the principal harbors in North Vietnam, increasing the number of armed reconnaissance sorties and otherwise expanding the U.S. air offensive along the lines now contemplated in military recommendations and planning studies. . . . Furthermore there would appear to be no basis for assuming that the damage that could be inflicted by an intensified air offense would impose such demands on the North Vietnamese labor force that Hanoi would be unable to continue and expand its recruitment and training of military forces for the insurgency in the South."

To paraphrase the great statesman, Casey Stengel, "Don't nobody in Washington know how to play this game."

VIEWS ON RETURN OF PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Bernard Sklar, a sociologist and assistant professor in the School of Education of the University of Southern California, recently expressed some views regarding the return of our prisoners of war that are in rather sharp contrast to the administration's viewpoint. Some of our colleagues may find Dr. Sklar's statements to be of interest, and I am therefore inserting into the RECORD the following articles by Dr. Sklar, one from the Los Angeles Times and the other from Commonweal:

[From The Los Angeles Times "Opinion" Section, Feb. 4, 1973]

POW's: QUICK WILL RETURN TOO SLOWLY FROM THE DEAD

(By Bernard Sklar)

The war is over, at least one part of it, and in the next couple of weeks we will witness what promises to be another American conundrum—the return, reintegration and rehabilitation of the slightly over 550 men who were prisoners of war in Indochina.

This spectacle will not be without an important message: that we can be a nation of enormous goodwill and concurrent ill service. For if anything is evident as one examines the headlines and the complex plan for the prisoners' return—originally called Operation Egress Recap, but recently retitled Operation Homecoming by the Pentagon—it is this:

1—That these men will not come home as quickly or as directly as we would hope.

2—That everything will be done to delay them from seeing or hearing anything about America as long as possible and then only under the most controlled circumstances.

3—That the treatment planned for the POWs is insensitive to them as human beings, whether one regards that psychologically, socially or politically.

4—All of these efforts have been and will continue to be orchestrated for their maximum public impact.

But first let us review what is involved in Operation Homecoming.

Research and planning for this has been going on for eight years. It is being coordinated at the highest levels and one cannot doubt that some of the best minds in government have applied themselves to it. Teams (6,000 men in all) have been deployed to pick up the men as they are released, to fly them to Clark Air Base in the Philippines (in "specially configured medical evacuation C-141 aircraft").

At Clark, teams of doctors, nurses and other service personnel wait to give them medical attention, new uniforms, and personal packets with information and photos from their families.

Arrangements have been made for the first phone calls home, for motion pictures, tape recordings and other media to bring them up to date, for back pay, and ultimately for counseling and help to resume other careers or improve their station in the military.

What more could one ask for? A lot of things.

For one thing, they should come home to their loved ones sooner.

Although somewhat obscured by official statements made when the matter was investigated, the facts are, as POW families were told in the information pamphlet they all got from the Department of Defense, "this period (overseas and before reunions) could be as long as 10 days to two weeks." There are several reasons put forward for this delay—which could prove even longer unless public opinion is mustered—but most of them revolve around a simple and mistaken premise.

In the words of the Defense Department, "Egress Recap is founded on the basic premise that all returnees will require medical attention, some more than others."

By raising the specter of their ill health, which by implication must have resulted from their inadequate, if not willfully harmful, treatment by "the enemy," we are expected to believe that the POWs will require painstaking physical examinations and extensive medical care.

Obviously, some of the men will be ill, some will still be suffering from wounds, and some of them may have incurred some kind of injury while in captivity. Such men will need quick and complete medical treatment.

But it does not seem that all, or even most, of the men are in that category. All the evidence we have indicates that the men appear to have been generally well treated.

The government points out that debriefing must take place and that it will be crucial to families still awaiting word about the fate of their loved ones. As Dr. Roger E. Shields, who heads the Defense Department POW and MIA Task Group, put it before the House Armed Services Committee last October:

"I am certain you can appreciate the urgency families of our missing men attach to this information (about those missing). We find from experience that returned men are eager and anxious to give us this information immediately upon release—before their memory is confused by the influence of the many activities that will occur after release."

But we learn from Mrs. Iris R. Powers, chairman of the National League of Families of American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia, that "70% of all missing and captured men have entered or soon will enter their fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth years in POW/MIA status."

Of course, that was said last October, before additional U.S. Air Force personnel were lost over Hanoi, but nevertheless one wonders how much such men will be able to recall after all that time and how much, in reality, they will be able to add to what is already known.

Of course, we want to learn everything we possibly can about the possible fate of the men classified as missing in action—but at the same time, it seems to me, we need to be realistic about how much more we can learn. More importantly, we must be fair to those who have actually been spared to come home, and we must keep them behind hospital walls for as short a time as possible.

Another rationale for the delayed return of the POWs is the "mental stress" thesis developed by Navy psychiatrists that "a sudden plunge back into the nerve-rasping stimuli of routine American life could do the men lasting damage."

As a sociologist I would say this is the most patently false thesis of the lot. There is no evidence for this either in theory or in history.

Surely there is a shock involved in returning to one's culture after captivity, but is it made much easier by stretching the time between the release of the prisoners and their reunions with their families and this society?

Eventually, of course, the POWs will be flown home—that is, to military hospitals near their homes—but not for immediate reunions with or receptions by families, the public or the press. Rather, reunions will take place "as soon as possible after the returnees arrive at the hospital."

Furthermore, "the precise manner and timing of the reunion and those in attendance will be determined by medical advice and the desires of the returnee and his family."

Although this again sounds like sensitivity for the POWs' and their families' right to privacy, something none of us would wish to deny them, it is also an unmistakable move in the direction of controlling access by the press—and as a result, the public—to their hearts and minds.

Of course, it remains to be seen whether the Pentagon can keep the press at bay for that long, but it is clear that it aims to try. For the last thing the Pentagon wants is the inevitable necessity of the public—via its surrogate, the press—confronting these men and discussing, in however imperfect form, the war they wasted their years upon.

Some—perhaps those who were imprisoned longest—may still carry a vestige of belief in the rightness or nobility of that cause. But there are few Americans today who do so,

and these men will soon discover that. Yet they fought for us and may be angry for the way we treated them and this war.

They deserve the chance to say so and hear why we have done so—not to a psychiatrist, I maintain, but to us.

We are going to great lengths to give the illusion of concern by pouring money, equipment and personnel into what appears to be a humane process of bringing these men home while in reality keeping them away from those they love and the associations they need for as long as is possible.

It should be apparent why this is being done. First, because it accentuates the barbarity of those we fought ("see how much these men have suffered; see how long it takes us to restore them to their normal condition"); second, because it defuses the effect of their encounter with the nation and the press by giving the government the maximum amount of time to coach the men and control the circumstances under which they will be exposed to the world; and finally, because it makes more difficult an honest and open dialog concerning the ultimate meaning of this war.

If these men were free to come home and to talk—I am certain that they would want to do so—we might have some bitter questions to consider. What was this war really for? Why, if it had so little support, did we not end it sooner? These are questions that embarrass our leaders and force them to manipulate the POWs in order to serve their own purposes.

A harsh judgment perhaps, but the next few weeks will demonstrate how valid it is. Yet hope remains that we will raise our voices and see to it that these plans are amended to take into consideration the real needs of these men, their families, and the nation.

Mr. Speaker, just for contrast, here are some remarks by the President, as reported in the same issue of the *Los Angeles Times*:

THE PRESIDENT ON THE POW'S

President Nixon had the following comment on the prisoners of war at his White House press conference last week:

I have noted some speculation in the press, and it isn't speculation, I should say, that is justified because I understand there was a Defense Department report to this effect, that I was going out to Travis Air Force Base to meet the first POWs when they came in.

I do not intend to do so. I have the greatest admiration for the prisoners of war, for their stamina and their courage and the rest, and also for their wives and their parents and their children who have been so strong during this long period of vigil.

This is a time that we should not grandstand it; we should not exploit it. We should remember that it is not like astronauts coming back from the moon after what is, of course, shall we say, a very spectacular and dangerous journey, but these are men who have been away sometimes for years. They have a right to have privacy, they have a right to be home with their families just as quickly as they possibly can, and I am going to respect that right, of course, to the extent that any of them or their families desiring to visit the White House can be sure that they will be very high on the list.

And here, Mr. Speaker, is the other article by Dr. Sklar:

[From *Commonweal* magazine, Jan. 5, 1973]

RETURN OF THE POW

(By Bernard Sklar)

In what looks like a matter of weeks or months, depending on how the Paris negotiations fare, we will be seeing the return of slightly over 500 American prisoners of war from somewhere in Indochina. For reasons

that should be apparent to everyone, not the least of which is their symbolic importance as victims of the enormous conflict we ourselves have had as a nation over this war, the return, reintegration and rehabilitation of these men take on enormous significance. To accomplish this the Pentagon has set up what purports to be an "all contingencies" plan, euphemistically dubbed Operation Egress Recap. Nothing could be more clearly calculated to frustrate the return of these men to their country and their families in a sensitive, humane way nor to provide the basis for a national reconciliation amongst us on why we have fought so long and so hard for such a futile if not erroneous cause.

For if they are victims, as they surely are, it is equally true that we have been victims and in no way will it be possible, under the clearly circumscribed and tightly controlled plans of the Pentagon, for a truly meaningful encounter between these men and this nation to occur. But that is not the only problem insofar as Operation Egress Recap is concerned. Another failing, and one that we should concern ourselves with to as great an extent as our efforts at reconciliation, is the way in which these men themselves will be handled by the machinery of the Services on their way back to the arms of their families and loved ones.

To understand what is involved in all this, one must first confront the conflict that exists between standard bureaucratic practice and normal social or cultural practice. Every society known to us has what Murdock has called "hospitality," that is the greeting of those who are strange to us as well as those who are near and dear but who for one reason or another have been absent from our midst for some time. Depending on the culture, of course, the practice may vary from one in which the visitor or returnee is elaborately feted in a tribal, public fashion to those which are more solemn, simple and essentially private affairs. Americans, being a polyglot culture, have used both forms as anyone knows who was around to witness the return of veterans to the United States after World War II. Ethnic groups such as the Italians, Mexicans, Poles and, to some extent, blacks have typically tended to produce elaborate fiesta-like occasions complete with music and dancing while the Protestant groups as well as Jews and others have tended to have small family gatherings suffice as their way of celebrating such occasions.

I would venture to say that, because of the decline in ethnic isolation in America and the overwhelmingly negative feeling that this war has engendered, few if any open, largely tribal occasions would be held for these individual POWs after their return; that is even if it were possible for some families to do so. For even a superficial glance at the outline provided by Dr. Roger E. Shields of the Defense Department, chairman of the Prisoner of War and Missing in Action Task Group, will disabuse anyone who might have had such a notion about these forthcoming reunions. It is from beginning to end a formalized, rationalized and depersonalized attempt to do something which is, or should, by its very nature be spontaneous, informal and essentially human. It is also calculated, whether consciously or unconsciously, to abort any attempt by anyone outside the military establishment from having a direct encounter with these men about the war they fought and why they fought it.

I suspect that most Americans learning the details of Operation Egress Recap will be impressed by the concern which normally bureaucratic agencies, not known in our society for their warmth or concern for the human dimension, have taken in regard to these men. Indeed, as will be apparent in a moment when we discuss these arrange-

ments, every normal human need has been anticipated, be that back pay, notification of deaths or serious illness in the POW's family, or vocational counseling for a new or non-military career. At the same time one must say, after examining these procedures, particularly in terms of what they fail to do, or fail to provide for, that Operation Egress Recap probably is the most meticulously staged homecoming for a set of warriors ever recorded but perhaps the least human or understanding one.

But let us see what is involved in this long-researched (it took years of preparation, according to Dr. Shields), high level (flag and general officers together with "experts in pertinent fields" were involved), comprehensive (one journalist has described it as providing for "every imaginable problem of a POW returnee") plan. In doing so I think it will be apparent that there is unmistakably involved in all this an underlying concern, one might say even a fear, for the real needs—medical, physical, political and psychological—of the individuals concerned but a blindness to the way these socially-engineered plans fail to meet those needs, particularly the last two, in anything like a predictably successful manner.

THE PROCESS

To begin with, the men will be picked up by reception teams (including a physician) at whatever release points there are and immediately flown to the nearest military hospital for medical treatment, if severely ill, or other overseas military hospitals designated as "Joint Central Processing Centers." It seems that no quarrel can be raised about such procedure, except to point out the obvious; that they will not be flown directly home to the United States and to those who really care for them (their families) or those who want very much to hear what they have to say (the public and the press). But it must also be pointed out that this procedure also implies that (1) these men have not had the medical attention specified in the Geneva Convention or (2) that there may be something grievously wrong medically with them as a result of their imprisonment. The concern for the "medical condition," in fact, is something that pervades this report. Given what we know about these men from the many unofficial as well as official (via exchanged prisoners) reports we have of their relatively good condition, one can only surmise that "medical condition" is a code word for many other things, including psychological rehabilitation and preparation for the ultimate encounters these men will have with the press.

Upon arrival at such hospitals they will find waiting for them, in addition to kits of personal items (toiletries, etc.) and uniforms complete with "appropriate rank, insignia and up-to-date decorations," an individual brochure. What these brochures contain is information concerning such matters as pay, savings and promotions earned while in captivity and details concerning the death or illness of family members, the latter being told to the individual in a manner and by a person designated by the family. It should be pointed out that over 2,000 family members have been involved and informed of these procedures by Pentagon officials. The kits will also contain personal messages and photographs supplied by the family. Lest one get the impression that there is something wrong with any or all of these matters let me point out that while each of the items mentioned—the photos, the messages, the uniforms—may in themselves be "good," the fact that they are delivered by non-family members, on military premises, in a foreign country only accentuates the ritual aspects of concern while leaving unfulfilled the normal, urgent need these men will have for contact with those who can provide

these things with great meaning, sensitivity and human understanding.

At this time, we are told, the returnee will be able to make a telephone call to his family. After the physical examination, the personal orientation and the phone call comes the first debriefing. We are assured by Dr. Shields, who recently testified before the House Armed Services Committee, that this will only take place after the man has gotten his medical clearance. We are also informed that this "is for the sole purpose of securing information on men missing and men not returned." There follows in the testimony before this committee one of those statements by an honest man that can only be the result of mistaken judgment concerning the credulity of others or sheer confusion in face of conflicting pressures.

I am certain you can appreciate the urgency that the families of our missing men attach to this information. We find from experience that returned men are eager and anxious to give us this information immediately upon release—before their memory is confused by the influence of the many activities that will occur after release. As an example of how valuable the men are as sources for this type of information, and the importance that the men themselves attach to it, one former returnee from Southeast Asia had memorized the names of 350 men and much information about their condition.

This information, we are told, will be "collected and assessed by computer so that it can be compared with all known information on a particular man and provided to the families as quickly as possible." Although, on the surface this appears to be a humane gesture, the emphasis it is given should not blind us to the fact that it delays the return of these men for what, in all probability, will be little new, or for that matter, very hopeful information to the families concerned.

Presumably, at least several days will have passed before all of this has been accomplished; surely an agonizing period for those who have waited so long for their return and suffered so much by their imprisonment. Then the men will be flown in specially designed airplanes (C-141's that have been adapted for this purpose) to a military hospital closer to their home. Each returnee, we are told, will have both a bed and a seat on the plane and be accompanied by a service escort. Aboard the plane there will be a complete medical team; once again stressing the medical and physical aspects of their return and not the psychological and political we have been emphasizing.

One would imagine that once in the United States it would be possible for the reunions to take place immediately but this is not the case. Rather reunions will take place "as soon as possible after the returnees arrive at the hospital." The precise manner and timing of the reunion and those in attendance to be determined by "medical advice and the desires of the returnee and his family." Everything will be done, as it should be, to see to it that the families involved are transported and housed near these facilities, or overseas in the case of those too ill to travel, at government expense. They, like the returnee, will find themselves provided with an escort and will be kept informed of what is happening to the returnee at every step of the way.

At this point Dr. Shields assures us that the actual reunions can take place, but rather than acknowledging that they are unmistakably political as well as personal events, he implies that they can only be successful if carried out without the intrusion of the press or the public. "We prefer," he tells us, "and the families agree that these reunions should take place privately." He goes on to note that "large crowds and fan-

fare may hinder the reunion that the men have envisioned." How he can say just what these men envision is of course an open question, but the point is that the public, or its nominal representatives, the press, will not be around when these first encounters take place.

At the first blush one might want to acknowledge that this is indeed the decent thing to do; particularly in view of the kind of reputation American reporters have for pushing the limits of civility in their encounters with individuals who have just suffered some great crisis or personal trial. But we must recall that it is already several days since these men have been released from captivity, that they have already had some occasion to gather their thoughts and perhaps even been coached in regard to them, and taken stock of the situation they are in. It is also possible that they might want to say something or want to hear something from the representatives of that nation that sent them off to fight this dreadful and meaningless war. Dr. Shields acknowledges that, but in a manner that betrays his bias concerning the demands of a free society and the rights of the press: "Every man," he tells us, "who returns from captivity urgently needs to tell his story—not publicly but privately to someone who will listen, not critically or with sympathy, but with empathy and understanding." (emphasis mine)

Continuing their hospitalization, the men will have a number of opportunities to catch up with the society they left behind. Resumes have been prepared of major national and international events. Through films, recordings and written materials they will be able to learn the details of much that has happened right down to the scores of their favorite ball team. They will also be able to get back pay, arrange other administrative matters and deal directly with their vocational futures. A specialized career-counseling program has been designed to guide these men back into various civilian pursuits, including further education, or a continuation of their previous military careers. At this time, we are told by Dr. Shields, the military will complete their debriefing of the man. "We are eager," he tells us, "to learn of this experience so that we can gain an insight into the captivity environment and better prepare others who might be so unfortunate as to be captured by the enemy in the future." Given the state of knowledge in regard to such matters, one can only remark that this is a rather ingenuous statement, once again by a somewhat over extended official. Nevertheless, there is an element of truth to what Dr. Shields says, for at another point he stresses the fact that the returning POW is "eager to tell his story." It is, he says, "important to the man." Indeed, but whom he should tell it to and under what circumstances is another question entirely.

Throughout this period, which can go on for a matter of weeks it seems, depending on how the various military hospitals define the returnee's medical condition, the man has been prevented from encountering anyone but military personnel or the members of his immediate family. It is only then, with hospitalization over that the returnee may, if he wishes, tell his story at a press conference. Press conferences, as everyone knows, are rather elaborate, ritualized events. One can hardly expect great candor or genuine insights to flow from them, although I am sure the press will try hard to learn how the men feel, what they have experienced since their release as well as before, and what they hope to do now they are back home. All of this is predictable and will be eagerly awaited, I'm sure. We can count on the fact that one journalist or another will arrange an interview under quieter conditions and that we will give various profiles

of individual men and their reactions to the experience of being back in America again. Nevertheless, the impression remains that an elaborate effort is being made not simply to delay the inevitable engagement which these men will have with the society, about which they must have some ambivalence, but to prevent and in some respects neutralize it as well. After all, being the prisoner in a war that no one, including many who sent you out to fight, wants, can leave one with a number of questions, some anger and perhaps even a desire for redress. How this can be accomplished is of course a difficult question but it seems to me Operation Egress Recap is an elaborate attempt to sterilize the entire process. It keeps the men out of range, even from those they love, for a period, under physical and psychological conditions, and for purposes that are to say the least questionable if not wrong.

Dressing up these events with the various medical, physical and so-called social programs I have described only obscures the fact that the men are not prisoners-of-war—now-free but prisoners of war who will continue to be, so long as it can be managed, prisoners-of-state. For American citizens to conscience this is to conscience another dishonorable, deceitful and immoral act on top of a heap of such acts committed over the past nearly 12 years. Nothing that this government does will, of course, prevent a kind of cleansing of the American spirit that must eventually occur. Inevitably this will involve those who fought and in this case suffered the worst kind of punishment for their part in it. For the government to try to abort that process is typical of the kind of shortsightedness of those who have guided us throughout this debacle and who would now hope to prevent us from putting to rest the last great myth that exists in the public mind—that to have fought in this war was somehow honorable or just. One can only pray that something like an outcry from the American people will halt or at least alter these plans so that something like a less sanitized, less deceptive and more honest reintegration can take place between these men, their families and the nation they served.

**NIXON ADMINISTRATION PROPOSES
WEAK SURFACE MINING BILL
DESPITE PLEAS OF ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION AGENCY
TO SUBMIT STRONGER BILL**

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, last week President Nixon sent his natural resources and the environment message to Congress. In that message, he recommended several legislative proposals. One of these is the Mined Area Protection Act—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 15, 1973, pages 4326-4329. In commenting on that legislation, he said:

Surface and underground mining can too often cause serious air and water pollution as well as unnecessary destruction of wildlife habitats and aesthetic and recreational areas. New legislation with stringent performance standards is required to regulate abuses of surface and underground mining in a manner compatible with the environment.

On the day of the message, February 15, the Interior Department sent to

Congress its version of the President's proposal. Upon reading it, I can only conclude that the drafter of the President's message failed to communicate the President's desire for a strong bill "with stringent performance standards" to the people at the Interior and Commerce Departments and the Office of Management and Budget who drafted the bill. Interior's proposal is weak, riddled with loopholes, and does not contain the "stringent" performance standards that the President said are "required". For example:

First. It expressly excludes from its scope "prospecting" for "evidence of mineralization," although it appears to cover some related activities such as the construction of access roads and semi-permanent camp facilities and mechanical trenching. This exclusion was recommended by the Commerce Department in a letter from its General Counsel, Mr. Letson, to the then Director of the OMB, Mr. Caspar W. Weinberger, who is now Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Second. It gives the States up to 2 years to submit for approval or disapproval proposed State environmental regulations. In the interim, the mine operators can continue to destroy our landscape without meaningful controls. The mining interests, not the environmentally concerned, seek this long delay.

Third. It provides that State regulations developed to meet Interior's proposed performance standards "should consider" in addition to "relative" degrees of environmental protection, the "relative costs involved." The latter phrase is quite vague. It could be interpreted as meaning social costs or costs to our environment; or it could be interpreted as applying only to the costs incurred by the mine operator in reclaiming the mined land. If the latter interpretation is applied to this ambiguous phrase—which, incidentally, was not included in Interior's earlier draft of February 7—which was circulated among Federal agencies, this phrase could become a significant loophole.

Fourth. It provides that the State regulations shall not apply to Federal and Indian lands. Regulation of these lands is left to the discretion of the appropriate Federal agencies. Their zeal to protect the land is illustrated by the fact that the Forest Service has not yet published for public comment mining regulations it prepared nearly 2 years ago to implement an 1897 statute.

Fifth. It requires that Interior approve or reject the proposed State regulations within 180 days after they are filed. It is silent on what happens if Interior fails to act within this time. This silence may result in court rulings that the regulations either automatically died and the State's efforts were wasted, or automatically became effective when the 180-day period ended. Both alternatives are undesirable from the public's standpoint.

Sixth. It does not require or authorize any opportunity for the public to participate in Interior's review and approval or disapproval of the proposed State regulations. This is incredible. Obviously,

these mining interest agencies do not trust the public.

Seventh. It provides for judicial review, in the U.S. courts of appeal of Interior's approval or disapproval of any State's regulations within 90 days after the Secretary acts. But it provides no standard for the court to apply in reviewing Interior's action. Without such standard, it is unlikely that the court would scrutinize the adequacy and effectiveness of the State's regulations. Instead, the court review will probably be based on the narrow standard of whether the action was "arbitrary, capricious, or an abuse of discretion."

Eighth. It provides that the State regulations must require active mining operations to "obtain" permits "within 1 year" after the regulations are approved. However, it states that each permit "may allow" the operator up to 2 years from the approval date "to come into compliance with performance standards," and if the operator is producing less than 10,000 tons of minerals annually, the permit may exempt him from the performance standards for up to 5 years after approval of the regulations.

This means that, for example, if Congress enacts the administration bill on October 1, 1973, and a State takes the full 2 years—until September 30, 1975—to submit its proposed regulation, and if the Interior Department takes 6 months to approve them, coal operators in that State who produce 10,000 tons or more annually will be allowed to surface mine free of all performance standards until March 1978, and those who produce less than 10,000 tons annually may be exempt until March 1981. During this immunity period the "abuses" or surface and underground mining will, under the administration proposal, continue unabated. During this period, we will see, I feel certain, an acceleration of surface mining resulting in severe devastation to our environment. We cannot accept such an outlandish timetable. If we cannot obtain total regulatory control of surface mining within 18 months, then we had better look to other alternatives than regulation.

Ninth. It provides that State regulatory agencies must have authority to carry out the purposes of the legislation, including "authority" to obtain cessation of mining where a violation occurs. However, the language of this provision is weaker than that contained in Interior's February 7 draft, which specified that the States should be capable of halting such operations where violations occur through the use of an "administrative order" or by "civil and criminal actions." By deleting any reference to such specific enforcement procedures, Interior has the flexibility to interpret the word "authority" quite broadly and thereby approve enforcement procedures that will not insure prompt "cessation" of mining operations when violations occur.

Tenth. It requires that each State's regulations must be "compatible to the maximum extent practicable" with those of neighboring States. This would make it difficult, if not impossible, for one State to ban certain types of mining

where the neighboring States do not do so.

Eleventh. It directs that Interior promulgate within 6 months after enactment "performance standards" for the reclamation of surface and open pit mining areas. It allows Interior up to 1 year to adopt such standards for underground operations.

These are not the "stringent" performance standards called for by the President last week. They are too vague and allow unfettered discretion to Interior to determine what standards should be adopted.

But most importantly, this provision is preceded by a general statement that in "choosing" among specifications which "satisfy" such standards, Interior must "consider" in addition to the "relative" degrees of environmental protection, the "relative costs involved." If this vague phrase means the "relative costs" of reclamation to the operator, these weak standards will be weakened even further by this giant loophole.

Twelfth. Although it requires a Federal regulatory program if a State fails to submit its regulations or if they are disapproved, no date is established for Interior to publish and finally adopt such a program in each State. It merely says that Interior should act "promptly." Years could pass under that admonition before an effective land protection program is in fact established in each State.

Thirteenth. It quite properly requires that interior recover the full cost of its regulatory program from fees charged operators for permits. But it does not specify that the fees will be deposited into miscellaneous receipts at the treasury. Without such a provision, Interior might successfully argue that the fees go to Interior for its use. Those fees would then govern the level of enforcement. If the fees are inadequate, enforcement also would be inadequate.

Fourteenth. It does not provide for the restoration of abandoned mined areas. Thus, much of the surface mining problem is ignored by Interior.

Fifteenth. It does not give a citizen the right to sue violators of the Federal or State regulations, as well as Interior, when it fails to perform a nondiscretionary act. Such suits are authorized in the air and water pollution laws. This is just another example of Interior's disregard for the interests of the public.

Any legislation passed by Congress on this subject must, as a minimum, have such a citizen suit provision.

Sixteenth. At the request of Commerce, a provision requiring that the States control or prevent the "waste of mineral resources" was deleted from Interior's proposal. If our energy crisis is as severe as the administration states, such a provision would seem essential.

Seventeenth. It does not provide for Federal inspectors to enforce the law, or for suits for damages against mine operators who fail to comply with the law, or for protection of workers who testify or otherwise inform the Government of law violations by their employers.

Last month the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, Mr.

Ruckelshaus, in a January 31 letter to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, urged extensive revisions in the proposed legislation. He said:

In response to the Office of Management and Budget's request to review the Administration's position on the proposed "Mined Area Protection Act" the Environmental Protection Agency recommended extensive revisions to the bill.

The primary reason for these revisions was the development of several excellent provisions during extensive hearings in the 92nd Congress, which we believe should be incorporated into any national legislation to control the adverse environmental effects of mining.

The Administration's bill did not receive serious consideration by the Congress, primarily because of its failure to specify the performance requirements in greater detail and to provide for a program to restore abandoned mined areas.

I am concerned with the direction in which the Administration appears to be going as a result of recent OMB-interagency staff meetings on these issues. It is clear that Congress will again set aside the Administration's bill if we fail to take a stronger stance than that which was taken in the earlier proposal. A strong Administration position will demonstrate our commitment to solving this problem which is so highly visible. This can be accomplished with minimal Federal costs.

I urge that the Administration move aggressively to provide the strongest program to deal with this serious environmental problem and that full consideration be given to the points which I have outlined above and which are detailed in the EPA proposal.

Mr. Ruckelshaus then recommended that the administration proposal:

First. Provide adequate State or Federal requirements "in the shortest possible time. Mining is presently affecting between 4,000 to 5,000 acres per week, and most operations do not incorporate adequate safeguards for the environment. To delay controls for 2 years or more as was the case in the administration's previous bill is needlessly long."

Second. Establish an interim Federal program effective within 9 months after enactment. Such a program would continue until States receive final approval of their regulations.

Third. Provide that Interior "designate by regulation mining and reclamation techniques, which the advances of technology have made available." Once designated, State-permitting agencies would have to consider them "in imposing appropriate performance requirements."

Fourth. Provide that mine operators restore an area of land affected by mining operations to a condition at least equivalent to its original uses prior to mining. The EPA proposal does not specify that Interior consider economics in requiring that lands devastated by surface mining be restored. Clearly, this provision is far closer to the House-passed bill of the 92d Congress than that which has been proposed by the Interior Department.

Fifth. Provide for restoration of past mined areas at least Federal cost and minimum risk of windfall profits to private landowners.

Sixth. Provide Federal authority to review State-issued permits "where the

mining activities to be permitted would have substantial adverse environmental impact of more than local or regional significance." The Government "should have authority in those cases to require appropriate conditions for such a permit if it determines that the State-issued permit is inadequate."

OMB, Interior, and Commerce paid scant attention to Mr. Ruckelshaus' suggestions. For example, he offered 14 specific minimum provisions that all mine operations would have to comply with as follows:

(1) conduct mining operations so as to maximize the utilization and conservation of the mineral or solid fuel resource being recovered;

(2) where feasible, remove the top soil from the land in a separate layer and store it in a stable stock pile so that it will be available for replacement during reclamation;

(3) backfill the operation so that the approximate original contour of the mined area is restored without depression or to hold water except where the retention of water is required or desirable for reclamation purposes, or as otherwise approved by the Secretary;

(4) bury under appropriate cover any pyritic shale, sulfides, or other material determined by the Secretary to have adverse effects on the environment;

(5) refrain from mining operations within one hundred feet of any permanent stream, lake, or other water impoundment, unless otherwise authorized by the Secretary;

(6) refrain from the construction of roads or other accessways up a stream bed or drainage channel or in such proximity to such channel so as to seriously alter the normal flow of water;

(7) grade, backfill, revegetate or implement other appropriate reclamation requirements so as to keep current with the mining operation and complete such reclamation within six months following completion of mining operations or completion of mining operations in any section of the mined area, unless otherwise authorized by the Secretary;

(8) revegetate immediately after grading in accordance with methods designated by the Secretary and as a minimum afford equal ground stability and cover to the original;

(9) identify and correct or eliminate continuous polluting discharges, seepages, mine and refuse fires and other conditions that resulted from past mining operation and that present an imminent hazard to the health and safety of the public;

(10) correct any off-site damages that may result from his mining operations and shall institute immediate efforts to correct such conditions;

(11) with respect to disposal of mine waste, tailings, slimes, and other waste in areas other than the mine workings or excavations, incorporate the latest available engineering practices for the design and construction of waste retention facilities and construct such facilities to ensure (A) that the location will not endanger health and safety of the public should failure occur, (B) that construction will be so designed to achieve necessary stability with an adequate margin of safety to ensure against failure, (C) that leachate will not pollute surface or ground water, (D) that final contour of the waste accumulation will be compatible to the extent feasible with natural surroundings, and (E) that the site can and will be stabilized and revegetated when abandoned;

(12) with respect to disposal of combustible waste such as coal refuse and culm, ensure against spontaneous combustion and sustaining burning; and

(13) refrain from mining within fifty feet

of active or abandoned underground mine openings unless otherwise authorized by the Secretary; and

(14) auger to the dip of the resource. All auger holes will be filled to a depth of a minimum of three times the diameter with an impervious and noncombustible material.

He also recommended additional performance criteria for surface mining or slopes greater than 20 degrees. This criteria places the burden on the operator to "reasonably demonstrate" that his operations and reclamation activities "will not result in: First, the permanent placement of overburden or other waste materials on the natural slope above, below, or adjacent to the excavation; second, slides and excessive erosion; third, impoundments, either temporary or permanent, of water except for the intermittent retention of water for flood or sediment control purposes; fourth, the exposure of the high wall; and fifth, a vegetative cover less than what is necessary to stabilize and cover the mine area to an equivalent or better condition than what existed prior to mining."

These are some of the "stringent" performance standards the President referred to in his message last week. But the OMB, Interior, and Commerce Department drafters rejected them in favor of weak and ambiguous provisions.

After learning of EPA's suggestions and that the other agencies had rejected them, I called this to the attention of the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality. I said:

It is apparent that OMB is listening to the mining interest agencies of Interior and Commerce, but not to the environmentally concerned agencies, such as EPA.

That is what happened in the last Congress, and as Mr. Ruckelshaus noted, the Administration's proposal was not given much weight in Congress.

Surface mining is rapidly increasing in the east and the west. As the scale of mining increases, so will the cumulative damage. The Administration should realize this. But there is little evidence that it has as yet or, if it has, that it really wants to turn the tide and halt this devastation.

I urge that the Administration pay less attention to the mining interests, and more attention to the public's interest in enhancing the quality of our environment. I urge that the Administration discard Interior's weak and ineffective version of a proposed surface mining bill, and support Congressional legislation that will effectively prevent further environmental damage caused by surface coal mining and, most importantly, will encourage, not discourage, public participation in the program. EPA's recommendations which also cover Federal and Indian lands, will go a long way toward that goal.

My urgings, like those of Mr. Ruckelshaus, were obviously rejected by the administration. The die was cast. The mine interests, not the public, seemed to be winning their way no matter what we said.

It is true that the administration bill requires that Interior "obtain" EPA's "concurrence" in those "aspects of each State's regulations which affect air or water quality." But this is very vague language. No criteria exists to guide EPA or the States. The public cannot participate in EPA's concurrent role. Moreover, once EPA acts on the State regulations, its role in the program ceases. EPA has no role—not even one of "concurrence"—

where Interior regulates the mining operations. Permits can be issued by the States or Interior without EPA's concurrence. In short, the bill provides only a token gesture to EPA to participate. Such tokenism is hardly worth the effort.

The Congress should set aside and pay little attention to the administration's bill. We should study carefully EPA's proposals and give consideration to a very basic question; namely, is the Interior Department the proper agency to administer this program? I now think it is not.

In 1969 the Interior Department promulgated regulations designed to control surface mining on Federal and Indian lands. Those regulations only apply to leases and permits issued after the date of the regulation, despite efforts by many to cover earlier permits and regulations. As a result, a great number of permits and leases in existence today are not covered by even these mild regulations.

In August of last year and in June of this year the General Accounting Office reported to the House Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee, headed by Congressman HENRY S. REUSS of Wisconsin, that the Interior Department has failed to properly and effectively administer and enforce these regulations in order to protect our environment. That same Department proposed the legislation which I have just discussed, which is weak and which is riddled with loopholes.

The evidence is clear. The Interior Department is not anxious, even with stringent requirements, to regulate the mining industry in such a way as to insure that the public's interest in environmental protection and enhancement will receive the attention it deserves. We must enact legislation which will insure that the agency responsible for administering it will act vigorously in enforcing the law. It is doubtful that the Interior Department would do this. I urge the Congress and all concerned citizens to consider this fact as we begin the process of considering this important matter in this session of the 93d Congress.

NICOLAUS COPERNICUS

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, Nicolaus Copernicus, Poland's greatest scientist, was one of the world's great pioneers. We honor his birth 500 years ago for the gift of understanding he gave all of us concerning man's place in the universe, and for his thoughts and theories that revolutionized the scientific work of the men who followed him.

Born in Cracow on February 19, 1473, Copernicus achieved enduring fame in many fields. He was a physician and mapmaker, and above all a remarkable astronomer. The Copernican theory recognized that the earth rotates on its own axis, which accounts for day and night,

and that it revolves around the sun, which accounts for the seasons of the year. This great man was the first to understand that we live in a heliocentric world.

From Copernicus' studies came his book, "On the Revolution of Heavenly Bodies," which established the groundwork for all of the celestial studies that followed, and most important, changed the emphasis of how man viewed his world. It has been pointed out that psychologically this great scientist's contribution to man's self-image was far more important than his essential correction of ideas in the field of astronomy. Earlier, men had thought that their home planet was the center of the universe. Copernicus' work showed up the folly of human arrogance in bold relief.

Mr. Speaker, in commemorating the 500th anniversary of the birth of Nicolaus Copernicus, a proud son of Poland, we remember the story of a life of genius and dedication which will continue to inspire the hearts and minds of succeeding generations throughout the world.

WYOMING'S VOICE OF DEMOCRACY WINNER

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, the Voice of Democracy Scholarship program, annually sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary, has again chosen the winning essays from each State, and is in preparation for the national judging in March.

The theme this year was "My Responsibility to Freedom," and it served to focus attention on the principle that freedom is a responsibility that all citizens must strive to preserve.

Wyoming's winner, Miss Susan Marie Mitchelson, is from Farson, a small town of about 50 people. Susan has been active in athletics, music, and speech in her high school, and has proven to be an outstanding student and leader.

I congratulate Susan Mitchelson, and I would like to insert her winning essay at this time:

THE ANSWER

(By Susan M. Mitchelson)

Babylon flourished as one of the most spectacular civilizations between 3000-2000 B.C. It was the center of the world in Biblical times, but fell in 331 B.C. This is due to the fact that people practiced idolatry and religion became a factor of little importance.

Greece practiced a new religious system which after a period of time failed, causing a disintegration of its civilization. Greece fell in 246 B.C.

The next center of the world, Rome, fell due to similar reasons in 476 A.D.

Civilizations have fallen accordingly. This process begins when the spiritual life of the people falls. The morals of these people fall next, whereas the government falls last, bringing about the collapse of the civilization.

On her deathbed, Gertrude Stein is said

to have asked, "What is the answer?" She paused, then asked, "But what is the question?"

Let me ask American citizens this question: "Is something going on that we cannot see?"

It is a difficult to observe the slow process of a decaying country, yet it is happening!

Everyone is involved in the obvious movements to make our country a better place in which to live. Slogans such as, "Keep America Beautiful!" "Help Stop Pollution!" "Help Stop Drug Abuse!" and other similar ones are heard repeatedly. But has it ever occurred to anyone that very little is ever said about keeping religion alive?

Church attendance has decreased. Altizer is saying, "God is dead!" No one seems to make an effort to preserve religion.

The previous slogans that I have mentioned are important factors, but doesn't anyone see that our civilization may be doomed as many others were in the past?

"The fight against communism," J. Edgar Hoover said at Valley Forge, Pennsylvania on February 22, 1962, "... is economic, social, psychological, diplomatic and strategic—but above all it is spiritual."

Our forefathers left their European countries and came to the New World to be released from a dictatorship and to have freedom of religion. They fought the Revolutionary War in order to have our country declared a free and independent one. Freedom of Religion was fought for.

I feel then, that it is my responsibility, my obligation to keep religion alive, to maintain freedom of religion in order to forego dictatorship.

How? By exercising my freedom of religion and respecting the fact that I have this freedom, a spiritual life, set morals, and an outstanding, strong government.

Let us refrain from losing our freedom due to a needless cause. Keep religion alive! Exercise freedom of religion to sustain an everlasting, free country! If religion should die, OUR country, OUR civilization may be doomed as others have been in the past.

"What is the Question?" "Will our civilization deteriorate and collapse?"

"What is the Answer?" "Keep religion alive! Uphold our spiritual, moral, and governmental standings so that OUR country may be an everlasting and free one!"

"AND THEN THERE WAS ONE"—
GEN. FOSTER C. LAHUE

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the February issue of Marine Corps Gazette features a very interesting article, "... And Then There Was One," on Lt. Gen. Foster C. LaHue, Chief of Staff of the Marine Corps, who is, ironically, the last of his officer class to remain on active duty. This article is a fascinating study of the course of military officers' careers as well as a fine salute to General LaHue.

I hereby present this article:

... AND THEN THERE WAS ONE

(By Lt. Col. Harry W. Edwards, USMC (Ret.))

In a civilian context it would probably be difficult to imagine a business where 325 young executives start out together and in a period of 30 years only one is left still in the business.

In service life this is not unusual. However when that one, who is still in the business, happens to be the Chief of Staff of the Marine Corps, and his 324 contemporaries are those classmates who were commissioned with him, it makes an interesting study.

Lt. Gen. Foster C. LaHue pinned on his third star and took office as the Chief of Staff of the Marine Corps on 1 August 1972. He thereby became the first member of his class to attain three-star rank and the last to remain on active duty. The class represented by Gen. LaHue was the Fifth Reserve Officers Class, whose members were commissioned as officers in the Marine Corps on 29 May 1941.

Events leading up to WWII caused all services to inaugurate accelerated officer training programs. To supplement its input of officers from the Naval Academy and the platoon leaders classes, the Marine Corps adopted a program involving a three-month candidates' class for college graduates. They began their military training as privates first class. Those who succeeded were commissioned second lieutenants and assigned to a Reserve Officers' class for an additional three-month training program.

Gen. LaHue was one of 368 young college graduates who assembled in Quantico, Virginia, on a wintry day in March 1941 as a member of the Second Candidates' Class. All members of the class were formed into military units, commanded by officers and NCO's of the regular establishment, and given a rigorous training program to determine who had the necessary potential for leadership as Marine officers.

Their number was reduced by 43 in the course of training as candidates. The remainder received commissions as second lieutenants on 29 May 1941 and became members of the Fifth Reserve Officers' Class, or 5th ROC, as it was more popularly designated.

Being an officer rather than a PFC naturally brought more pay and certain amenities but the training was none the less rigorous. An additional 21 were dropped from the ROC, so that, on 10 September 1941, a total of 304 graduates remained to be assigned to active duty. Most were in the status of reserve officers, however, 25 were awarded regular commissions and an additional 25 were designated as alternates. Practically all of the class was sent to the Fleet Marine Force to become platoon leaders for newly-forming units. A small number were sent to various specialist schools, including aviation, for additional training, and subsequently to the FMF.

By 7 December 1941, when those first shots were fired in anger, nearly all Marine combat units had a quota of officers from the 5th ROC. Their performance of duty was to be a good measure of the quality of the accelerated instruction provided by the Marine Corps Schools system.

The timing would seem to indicate that this particular group of officers could anticipate heavy casualties. However, it turned out differently. It was to be a fortunate class in many respects. Few of its members would serve long as second lieutenants, and therefore platoon leaders. Accelerated promotions in the early days of WWII brought the 5th ROC to company grade within a year. Instead of leading platoons into battle most of them had been promoted to captain and thereby became company commanders. This fact had a significant bearing on the total casualties suffered during the war as compared with other classes whose members served as platoon leaders for relatively long periods of combat.

In spite of the fact that nearly all members of the 5th ROC served in the Pacific action for two years or more, only 16 were killed in combat. Of these 16, the Saipan action claimed four; Guadalcanal three; Tarawa two; the Marshalls, Guam and Okinawa each one. Two others were killed in airplane accidents and one aboard ship.

By the end of WWII, a total of 62 members of the class had integrated into the regular establishment. However a majority of those who went inactive at war's end stayed in the reserve component. One of them, Arthur Hanson, went on to become a major general in the reserve; another, Harold Oppenheimer, became a brigadier general. An additional 60 members of the class attained the rank of colonel in the reserve.

Many of those who entered the reserve were assigned to organized units. When the reserve was mobilized for service in the Korean conflict, nine of these officers returned to active duty with their units, and rejoined their former colleagues who had integrated as regulars during the war. Once again, many FMF units were led by officers of the 5th ROC. However, this time most of them carried the rank of lieutenant colonel, leading battalion-size units, rather than the captains with companies of WWII. It is noteworthy that at one period during the fall of 1951, six of the nine infantry battalions of the 1st Marine Division, which was then engaged in combat in the east-central sector of Korea, were commanded by classmates of the 5th ROC.

Once again, this higher rank status apparently had its beneficial effect on the casualty rate sustained by members of the class during the Korean campaign. Only one classmate was killed in action and this happened at Koto-ri in North Korea during a bitter action of November 1950. However, the selection board would have its effect. What battlefield attrition had failed to do was compensated for in the next promotion.

The rank of lieutenant colonel was the end of the line for 28 members of the class, but the remaining 43 regular officers were promoted. Those not promoted took their 20-year retirement and returned to civilian life in 1961 and 1962. Most of the others stayed on, at least for 26 years, which gave them an opportunity to see who would be selected for general officer.

As might be expected attrition took a heavy toll on the promotion to brigadier general, and only six members of the 5th ROC pinned on their star. These were: Ed Wheeler, Webb Sawyer, James Herbold Jr., George Webster, Foster LaHue and Ed Doyle. Of this group only Wheeler and LaHue were subsequently advanced to the rank of major general.

The recent retirement of Maj Gen Wheeler, left Lt Gen LaHue alone to occupy the place in the Marine Corps that once was served by 304 second lieutenants as members of the 5th ROC. Such are the inexorable effects of time and the selection process.

Thanks to the diligent efforts of one historically-minded member of that class, Col Winston Jewson, now retired, all members of the 5th ROC have been traced and located. They are widely scattered and engaged in all manner of businesses and professions. At least one, who is remembered as one of the most colorful members of the group, is now in the ministry. Another, who attained legendary prowess as a swinger and party man is now a staunch member of Alcoholics Anonymous. There are teachers and lawyers and a few in the medical profession. With rare exception most have made a smooth transition back to civilian life and many are highly successful.

Col Jewson's investigation revealed that an additional 19 class members had died since the war. This brought the total to 36, which represents about 12 per cent of those 325 who accepted their original commissions in 1941. Insurance actuaries may well be encouraged at this rate of survival over two wars and 30 years of rather hectic existence.

The remaining members of the 5th ROC, many of whom had been holding reunions down through the years, were inspired in 1970

to erect a plaque at The Basic School in Quantico. It commemorates the 17 officers who were killed in action, along with the other 19 classmates who have subsequently died of other causes. The plaque is appropriately inscribed "In memory of the members of the Fifth ROC whose lives were dedicated to the service of their Country and their Corps."

JUDGE US BY OUR DEEDS, NOT OUR WORDS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights has issued its third report since the Nixon administration took office on Federal civil rights enforcement. Since its inception in 1957, the Commission has played a very important role in protecting the civil rights of minorities in our society. Almost 90 percent of its recommendations have been signed into law.

From voting rights to fair housing, from employment to education, the Commission has consistently pursued the goal of equal rights for all throughout its long history. It has had disagreements with every administration, for just as it has acknowledged accomplishments, it has also recognized failures. It is the Commission's unblemished reputation of impartiality that makes the issuance of this latest report on Federal civil rights enforcement policies the most important assessment yet made of the Nixon administration commitment to progress in the field of civil rights.

I would like to insert into the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Washington Post praising the Commission's report and challenging the administration toward constructive change:

CIVIL RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT: "HIGHLY INADEQUATE"

In its new report on federal civil rights enforcement, the United States Commission on Civil Rights has painted a doubly dismal picture. In this, its third such report since the beginning of the first Nixon administration, the commission concludes that "the federal effort is highly inadequate." But it might just as well have said that the effort is *still* highly inadequate. And, therein lies the deep disappointment and the great sadness.

It has been five years since the publication of the Kerner report which painted a grim picture of where our society was headed unless urgent remedial steps were taken. Yet, we are still worrying about the essential commitment of the federal government in this crucial area. When the Kerner Commission told us how much trouble we were in, our greatest asset, as a society, was the array of civil rights laws and regulations already on the books and the broad ways in which those laws in conjunction with the activities of the federal government touch the country.

But in 1973 the Civil Rights Commission is telling us that despite a few bright spots, HEW is failing in its obligation to provide equal educational opportunity, the Federal Power Commission refuses to enforce equal hearing standards in the power industry, the Labor Department has downgraded the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, and on and on throughout the government.

The Commission noted that its earlier reports had been discouraging and said of the current report, "Our findings are dismayingly similar to those in our earlier reports." The report also contains a poignant appeal to the President to put energy and muscle into the program. Almost two and a half years ago, on the issuance of the first of these reports on the Nixon administration's efforts we tried to point out that the Commission's work was not a spear in the chest of this particular administration, but rather, a continuation of the valuable contributions the Commission had been making over the years and, at least in part, a reflection of the legacy which the administration had inherited. We said, "In this particular report the commission has handed Mr. Nixon an invaluable case study of what has gone wrong in civil rights enforcement and how it can be set right. We hope he will receive it that way."

Well, from this report, we can see he didn't. There is no question that we are now seeing Nixon administration policies at work. And that is the most disappointing thing of all, for the commission is not, as it points out, dealing with abstractions, but rather with the grainy texture of American life. It is talking about the education of American children, the access to the employment market of American workers and the access to the housing market of American families. And thus, for all his glittering successes in the international field, Mr. Nixon is failing the country if, because of a failure of will on the part of his administration we are asked to tolerate human misery which, in some measure, we have the tools to alleviate.

In the last analysis, we believe that Mr. Nixon and his administration will be judged by the standard laid down by President Johnson in his last major public appearance: "... the essence of government lies with unceasing concern for the welfare, dignity, decency and innate integrity of life for every individual, regardless of color, creed, ancestry, sex or age." It is a high standard, but it is fair and President Nixon has clearly failed to meet it.

CONSUMERISM, GOVERNMENT, AND HIGH PRICES

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, much of the discussion which in recent days has been called consumerism has led many Americans to the conclusion that, more and more, businessmen are attempting to sell them shoddy merchandise at increasingly higher prices.

Such spokesmen frequently call for Government intervention in the economy to correct such evils, which they believe is caused by competition in the market place.

The real facts of life with regard to the American economy are far different. In many areas where prices have increased dramatically the cause of such increase has been government itself, and not the free market. One example of this state of affairs, of course, is food prices, which directly relate to huge government subsidies paid to farmers and similar government subsidies to trade in farm goods with the Soviet Union.

How many "consumer advocates" tell the American people about those areas where prices are lower than they were

in the past? Unfortunately, there are very few.

The Wall Street Journal recently noted that:

Air travel is cheaper, faster and more convenient than ever. Refrigerators and freezers are vastly improved. Durable new fabrics have increased the life span of many clothes, thereby in effect making them cheaper to own. Motor oils last far longer today. House paints are more convenient, and they cover better and last longer. Those bulky, expensive portable radios of a decade or two ago have been replaced by small inexpensive transistors.

Many products are more expensive than they have been in the past, and some are not built as well as they once were. The best remedy for such a situation, however, is competition, not Government regulation. When Government enters an area, as in the farm field, what we observe is not a better situation for the consumer, but an advantageous situation only for the producer. Government involves itself in transportation not in behalf of the consumer, but in behalf of the industries involved. The same is true in almost every area of the economy.

The Journal concludes that:

Competition, while not guaranteeing perfect products at bargain basement prices, does guarantee the search for newer and better products. The economic marketplace, in which consumers conduct millions of plebiscites every single day, remains the most competitive chamber of all.

The consumer is supreme not when industry is regulated, but when it is free. Only then is he able to vote in the marketplace with his dollars for the kinds of products he wishes to purchase.

I wish to share the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of February 13, 1973 with my colleagues, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

PRICES, VALUES AND SUPERMAN

No one entrusted with the family budget needs to be reminded that the nickel cigar, dime beer, 15 cent hot dog and 25 cent hamburger are largely things of the past. Mr. & Ms. Householder don't need the consumer price index to remind them that prices—are like the old Superman rallying cry now repeated in popular music and slick commercial—Up, Up and Away.

Granted all that, some items are actually cheaper now than they've ever been. As a recent article in this newspaper noted, the price of mini-calculators has dropped by one-half in only two years and is expected to drop by a total of two-thirds before the year is out.

True, mini-calculators fall somewhere into the luxury or nonessential class. But so did the ordinary ball point pen not too long ago, when it sold for as high as five dollars. And it wasn't too long ago that TV sets were luxuries, so expensive that few families could afford them. The sets they could afford—black-and-white only—came with postage-sized screens in which every production, from Dante's "Inferno" to South Seas sagas, were played out against snowy backgrounds.

Air travel is cheaper, faster and more convenient than ever. Refrigerators and freezers are vastly improved. Durable new fabrics have increased the life span of many clothes, thereby in effect making them cheaper to own. Motor oils last far longer today. House paints are more convenient, and they cover better and last longer. Those bulky, expensive portable radios of a decade or two ago have been replaced by small inexpensive transistors.

Don't get us wrong—not all the modern inconveniences are cheaper. And there are still so many overpriced and undervalued goods waiting to lure the unwary customer. But the emphasis on consumerism in recent years, an emphasis that on the whole is laudable, has tended to create the impression that all merchandise is shoddy and expensive, that commercial exchange is one big con game.

On the contrary, competition, while not guaranteeing perfect products at bargain basement prices, does guarantee the search for newer and better products. The economic marketplace, in which consumers conduct millions of plebiscites every single day, remains the most competitive chamber of all.

A reasonable amount of skepticism is probably a good thing in a commercial climate not too far removed from the philosophy of caveat emptor. But the key word is reasonable, not a stubborn refusal to admit that even amid higher prices there remains an abundance of values. Yet some consumer spokesmen do deny it, thereby lapsing into the sort of cynicism described by Oscar Wilde, that of knowing the price of everything but the value of nothing.

MEDICAID ABUSES IN NEW YORK CITY

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent series of articles in the New York Daily News detailing the very disgraceful abuses of the present Medicaid system in New York City. The articles speak for themselves in pointing out the enormous profits that may be made from wholly inadequate medical services. The following is the first of several articles which I will be inserting here for the interest of my colleagues:

THE CITY'S MEDICAID SYSTEM: STILL SICK, SICK, SICK

Exactly one year ago, a Manhattan grand jury made headlines with its finding that "50% of the money spent on the Medicaid program—or almost \$1 billion—went down the drain."

What has happened in the past year to change things? To find out, The News assigned an undercover reporter-photographer team to dig into Medicaid in New York City.

Working closely with officials of the city's Health Department and of the Human Resources Administration, two agencies that have been fighting hard to stem abuse of the Medicaid system, this newspaper's investigation included not only a lengthy field inquiry, but an exhaustive examination of city records and candid interviews with public officials.

Here are a few of the highlights of The News' Medicaid probe, which will be detailed and documented in this continuing series of articles:

Ping-ponging of patients from doctor to doctor in several privately owned group medical centers where the poor are rammed through an often needless, but costly, labyrinth of X-ray exams, lab tests and dental care.

Cases in which doctors insisted that the patient fill prescriptions at a specific pharmacy even though Medicaid regulations demand that all patients be given a completely free choice of pharmacies.

A voluntary hospital that was paid \$457,000 for care that city health officials later discovered centered on the use of drugs that were never approved by the federal government for human experimentation, much less for actual clinical treatment.

A deal in which optometrists and an optical company collaborated in charging Medicaid about \$800,000 for eye examinations and eyeglasses even though most of the glasses were declared to be unsatisfactory by the Department of Health.

Psychiatrists who billed the city for more hours than there are in a day—one for as much as 35 hours of consultations in a single day.

A dentist who billed the city \$800,000 in two years for treatment given 10,000 patients in his seven-chair East Harlem office. He is now under indictment, but is still billing Medicaid for his practice.

A doctor who maintains he treated 300 patients—half of them Medicaid—in a single day; and others who double-billed for services or billed for patients they never saw, for treatment never dispensed.

Several pharmacies that gave short counts on prescriptions and unprofessionally preprinted them for doctors.

Doctors who send all of their laboratory test work—tests often found to be unnecessary—to a particular lab that, in return, pays them up to \$3,000 a month for "rent."

Doctors who fail to take patient's past histories or fail to thoroughly examine patients, but jot down only Medicaid card numbers (for billing purposes).

CAUGHT A COLD? TAKE THREE DOCTORS EVERY HOUR

(By William Sherman)

(First of a series)

Disguised as a welfare client complaining of a cold, a reporter with a Medicaid card wandered into a group medical office in Ozone Park, Queens, one day last week and asked to see a doctor.

The patient was first sent to a foot doctor, then twice to an internist with instructions to come back a third time, and then to a psychiatrist who arranged for weekly visits. On his second visit the patient was given an electrocardiogram, three blood tests, two urine tests and a chest X-ray.

He was handed six prescriptions in one day and doctors directed him to a pharmacy on the second floor of the center to have them filled. He walked out that day with a mixture of foot powders, a mild foot cream, a vial of sleeping pills, a bottle of powerful tranquilizers, penicillin tablets, and a bottle of cough medicine—all in response to his initial complaint of a cold—a feigned cold, at that.

AGENCIES COOPERATED

The visit to the medical offices in Queens was part of an intensive investigation by The News into Medicaid and its abuses. The inquiry was conducted with close co-operation of the city's Human Resources Administration and of the Department of Health, which monitored the probe every step of the way.

These agencies agreed to issue the temporary medical card to the reporter, who was in sound health when he visited several group practices in Manhattan, the Bronx and Queens. The Health Department then audited his treatment at the various centers and analyzed the drugs he received during the investigation.

Accompanied by a news photographer who posed as the patient's cousin, the reporter strolled into the Park Community Medical Building at 131-12 Rockaway Blvd., where he joined 25 other patients nervously waiting to receive medical care. At that moment the reporter was, in effect if not in fact, just another ailing welfare client with a cold. He tried to act and talk like those around him.

WHITE TAPE

At the reception area, a woman in white Xeroxed his Medicaid card several times and asked, "Your first name, please, your date of birth, and do you have a phone?"

She entered the information on a Medicaid invoice, which would follow the patient, along with additional bills, throughout the center. Then she asked, "Why are you here?"

"I have a cold, I think, and I'd like to see a doctor."

"Well, the medical doctor is busy right now; first you should see the podiatrist to have your feet checked. He's not busy."

"Why? I just have a cold."

"You should have your feet checked."

"Okay," said the patient, and with his "cousin" in tow he was ushered into the office of podiatrist S. David Geller, a mild-mannered man who directed the cold victim to lie down on a couch and "relax."

TOE TO HEAD

Socks and shoes were removed and the podiatrist squeezed both feet, looked up and asked, "Ever have any trouble with these feet?"

"Nope, I have this cold. How come I'm seeing a foot doctor?"

"Well, here we examine everybody from the ground up and we're starting with your feet. We'll get to the rest of you later."

A light rash on the patient's left foot was noted, and Geller asked, "How long have you had this?"

"A couple of days," said the patient.

"I'll write you out some prescriptions; you get them filled upstairs. Rub the cream on and it will be all better."

"Why should I get them filled upstairs? I have a drugstore in my neighborhood."

"The pharmacist here knows what the doctors write for and they stock accordingly," said the foot specialist.

MUST HAVE A CHOICE

Medicaid regulations specifically require that doctors give patients complete freedom of choice in choosing a pharmacy to fill prescriptions.

Geller wrote out the prescriptions for a combination of foot powders and the cream and told the patient his rash was a "fungus growth." (A Health Department podiatrist said later that for such a reading, a culture should have been taken. This was not done.)

The Park Community podiatrist completed his examination in five minutes, reminded the patient "not to worry" and beckoned for the receptionist. She promptly whisked the patient into another office—this time a 4-by-8-foot examination room manned by Dr. Henry Wilkins, an internist.

"What's your trouble?" asked Wilkins, reaching for a stethoscope.

"A cold."

"How long have you had it?"

"A couple of days. Since I caught it I haven't been sleeping so good."

USUAL PROCEDURE

Wilkins then examined the patient's throat with the usual "say ah" procedure, thumped the patient's forehead with a finger asking if it hurt, listened to the patient's chest with the stethoscope, took a blood pressure reading, asked if there was a fever or muscular aches and then began to open a package containing a disposable syringe.

All this took four minutes, and the patient said he didn't know if he had a fever. The doctor never took his temperature, but he noted a "slightly red throat" and then abruptly announced, "You have the London flu. Roll up your sleeve. I'm going to give you a shot of penicillin." (Influenza is caused by a virus that is not affected by penicillin.)

"Hey, I don't want any shots!" the patient yelped.

"It won't hurt, it'll make you better," said Wilkins.

"I don't want it, I don't need it, needles make me nervous," said the patient.

AN RX INSTEAD

Wilkins looked up with a frown, made a note of the patient's refusal, and left the disposable syringe lying on the piece of cotton on his desk.

"All right," he said. "I'm writing you a prescription for penicillin, a cough medicine, and some pills to take twice a day that will relax you." Then, on a blue sheet of paper he wrote that the patient should have an electrocardiogram, blood tests, X-rays and a urine test.

When the patient balked at all but the urine specimen, the doctor explained that "the tests will determine if there is anything more seriously wrong."

Wilkins walked out into the hall and beckoned to the receptionist. The patient was led into a similar adjacent examining room by the woman, who said, "Another doctor wants to see you."

Seconds later, a stocky man in a beige sport jacket walked in and sat down. He looked at the patient's chart, introduced himself as Dr. Samuel Kramer and said softly, "How do you feel?"

ENTER SEX

"I have a cold and I'm not sleeping so good."

"You look depressed. Are you always this depressed?"

"No."

"Do you have a girl friend?"

"Do you?" the reporter retorted, wondering why a cold complaint was transposed into an investigation of a patient's sex life.

After questions on the patient's family background and job history Kramer leaned forward, looked very seriously into the patient's eyes and said, "You seem afraid."

"I'm not."

"Well, you shouldn't worry about injections . . . I'm going to write you a prescription for some pills that will let you sleep better; you'll feel more relaxed."

"Come in Monday," he added. "I'd like to see you one day a week to work out your problems."

NO RECORD FOUND

The interview with Dr. Kramer was finished in about 15 minutes. During this period the doctor took no notes and made no references on the patient's chart, not even a mention of the tranquilizer prescribed.

Later, the Health Department's senior medical auditor, Dr. Howard Katz, inspected the center's records and reported that there was no objective indication for a psychiatric examination. In fact, no record of the examination was found at the center, he said.

On the way out of the psychiatrist's office, Wilkins, the internist, reminded the patient, "Come back Wednesday, no matter how well you're feeling; I have to check you out again."

The patient nodded assent and followed the podiatrist's instructions to get the prescriptions filled upstairs. With his "cousin" still in tow, he walked to a room on the second floor blocked by a Dutch door with a counter on top. A sign read "Rakal Pharmacy—medicaid accepted."

SHORT COUNT

The patient handed his prescriptions to a young man behind the counter who identified himself as Howard Feder. Moments later Feder delivered the six various tubes and vials to the patient, and the reporter and his "cousin" then left for the day.

One hour later, at the Health Department, pharmacist Eli Gorelik counted and identified the drugs. A photograph had been taken of the prescriptions before they were filled, and Gorelik stated that four ounces of Benlyn expectorant, a cough medicine, had been prescribed. The patient was given the cough medicine in a three-ounce bottle.

INEFFECTIVE POWDERS

Later, Dr. Katz noted that penicillin is not an effective cure for the patient's complaint,

a cold, nor is it effective in treating influenza, the internist's diagnosis. He added that three of the drugs were contra-indicated—they are dangerous when taken in combination—and that the sleeping pills, tranquilizers and cough medicine were enough to keep the patient in a daze for a week if taken as prescribed.

A Health Department podiatrist said that the foot powders, which the druggist inexplicably put in a bottle with a Tetracycline label, were so mild and nonspecific that they would have no effect on a fungus.

The costs of the patient's first day of care for his "cold" at the center, based on the city's medicaid fee schedule, were \$5.20 for the podiatrist's exam, \$15 for the internist, \$20 for the psychiatrist and \$2 for the urine specimen, a total of \$42.20.

Health Department pharmacist Gorelik, referring to the 1973 Drug Topics Redbook used for medicaid billing, determined that the six prescriptions would cost \$21.60.

The total potential bill was \$63.80. Katz said that if the center had only handled the patient's complaint, a cold, the bill would have been about \$10, for time spent in an examination and for the prescription for cough medicine.

Nobody knows how much the doctors at the center will actually charge for the services performed for the News reporter. Since he was a "medicaid patient" the bills will be forwarded to the Department of Health, where experts will decide which charges are allowable. Any cost determined to be legitimate will be paid to the Health Department by the News.

Meanwhile, the cold treatment at the center was far from over.

THE BIG WORD: JOBS

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the attached article from the Philadelphia Bulletin shows why Ed Toohey works so hard in COPE, AFL-CIO. I would like at this time to have this article inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

GETTING PHILADELPHIA MOVING AGAIN—

THE BIG WORD: JOBS

(By Edward F. Toohey)

Ask the working man what's wrong with Philadelphia, and he'll tell you in a word: Jobs.

The jobs are disappearing, he'll say, and the statistics bear him out. Since 1969, according to the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics, Philadelphia has lost 53,100 jobs.

It's not that the working man is unaware of the other massive problems that face the city—deteriorating housing, an inadequate school system, a shrinking tax base, polluted air, etc.—but just that he feels if there were enough work for everybody, including the minorities, the rest would take care of itself.

Where are the jobs going, why, and what can be done about it?

First, we must realize that a good portion of the problem is national in scope. New York City has lost 184,300 jobs since 1969, and the figures are similar in our other large cities.

There is little wrong with Philadelphia that is not also wrong with other large, industrial cities, particularly in the crowded north-eastern United States.

NATIONAL POLICIES

Much of the job loss can only be cut by changing national economic policies. Foreign competition, particularly in the apparel and

electronics industries, is putting thousands of Philadelphians out of work.

That is why one of the top priorities of the AFL-CIO in this session of Congress will be passage of the Burke-Hartke Bill to help wipe out the unfair advantages of multi-national corporations that are, in effect, exporting American jobs.

We can't expect all of Philadelphia's problems to be solved at the federal level. Several years ago, labor cooperated with the South-eastern Pennsylvania Economic Development Corporation in a study aimed at improving the competitive position of metal industries in the Delaware Valley.

Based in part on interviews with several hundred employers, the study found most of them rated the area "high" on difficult-to-change environmental factors, such as transportation, the living environment, and the marketplace.

The area was rated "low" on the more easily changed human factors, such as supply of skilled labor, labor-management relations, and tax policies.

Interestingly, however, the study found that the area's poor labor-management relations reputation was unjustified. Most of the employers who said they thought the labor climate was bad admitted that their own experience in labor relations was good.

The latest statistics bear this out. In terms of time lost due to work stoppages and union wage scales, Philadelphia is competitive with the other large, industrial cities.

The conclusion of the study: "Reputation lags performance" in labor-management relations in Philadelphia.

Unfortunately, it is not the facts but what businessmen may believe are the facts that often affect their investment decisions.

Speaking for the Philadelphia AFL-CIO Council, I pledge that our unions will attempt to reach accommodations whenever necessary to save jobs. But the impetus for such accommodation must come from the city and from business.

We also are willing to participate in programs to increase the supply of skilled workers here, if there are assurances there will be jobs for them. The need for training and retraining programs will increase with improved technology and the continuing trend, nationally and in Philadelphia, from an industrial to a service-based economy.

A prerequisite to such programs, however, is a more effective school system. It is difficult to train young men and women who cannot read.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

Also needed is increasing emphasis in our public schools on vocational training and a conscious upgrading, by the media and the business community, of the status of the blue-collar worker. He is "the forgotten Philadelphian" who pays the bulk of the taxes to keep the city and schools operating.

I urge the creation of a city-business-labor committee to meet on a continuing basis to coordinate and publicize the efforts of Philadelphia to brighten its employment picture and regain its once well-deserved reputation as "a workingman's town."

CONCURRENT MEMORIAL

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was happy to note recently that a concurrent memorial had been introduced in the Arizona House of Representatives establishing that human life with local personality begins at the time of conception and

that the unborn have equal right to due process and all other constitutional rights.

The memorial, introduced by Jim Skelly, of Phoenix, calls on the Congress to take appropriate action to amend the Constitution of the United States to insure that these rights are given to the unborn.

On January 30 I introduced into the House of Representatives, House Joint Resolution 261, which proposes to amend the Constitution guaranteeing the right to life to the unborn, the ill, the aged, or the incapacitated.

Following is a copy of Representative Skelly's memorial and his remarks on the floor of the Arizona House, January 29:

A concurrent memorial urging an amendment to the Constitution of the United States establishing that human life with legal personality begins at the time of conception and that all constitutional rights, including due process of law, apply to the unborn in the same manner and to the same extent as to all other citizens of the United States

To the Congress of the United States of America:

Your memorialist respectfully represents:

Whereas, medically and scientifically a human embryo or fetus exists as a living and growing human individual from the time of conception; and

Whereas, the moment of birth represents merely an identifiable point along the course of human development and not the beginning of human life; and

Whereas, respect for human life has been a hallmark of civilized society for millennia; and

Whereas, respect for and protection of unborn human life has been traditional with the medical profession since long before the beginning of the Christian era regardless of prevailing political, religious or social ideologies or dogmata; and

Whereas, a legal threat to the right to life of any individual member of a society imperils the right to life of every other member of that society; and

Whereas, in states in which abortion laws have recently been relaxed or repealed, professional medical ethics and respect for unborn human life has proved to be wholly inadequate for the reasonable protection of the lives of the unborn; and

Whereas, the United States Supreme Court has withdrawn all legal protection from an entire class of human beings, namely, the unborn. Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, the Senate concurring, prays:

1. That the Congress of the United States take appropriate action to amend the Constitution of the United States establishing that human life with legal personality begins at the time of conception, and that all constitutional rights, including due process of law, apply to the unborn in the same manner and to the same extent as to all other citizens of the United States.

2. That the Secretary of State of Arizona is directed to transmit a copy of this Concurrent Memorial to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each member of the Arizona Congressional delegation.

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE JIM SKELLY ON THE HOUSE FLOOR, JANUARY 29, 1973, ANNOUNCING THAT HE WOULD INTRODUCE A HOUSE CONCURRENT MEMORIAL

The memorial would petition Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution establishing that human life with legal personality begins at the time of conception, and

that all constitutional rights, including due process of law, apply to the unborn in the same manner and to the same extent as to all other citizens of the United States.

One week ago today, on January 22nd, the Constitution of the United States, the very cornerstone of our republic, was violently altered. In effect, the court ruled that the destruction of human life without due process is now the law of the land.

On that day, literally millions of unborn innocent babies were sentenced to a violent death, and I say violent deliberately. Dr. Albert W. Lilley, who is known as the father of fetology and who perfected interuterine transfusions for RH babies, has said that a baby in the womb suffers the same pain as a baby in the crib.

What crime are these unborn innocents guilty of? Absolutely none, of course.

The ramifications of this decision are frightening. In 1971 there were 262,807 induced abortions officially reported to the New York State Health Department. And this is the result of abortion on demand in one State only.

It has often been said that those who do not learn from history are doomed to repeat it. Forty years ago, in the dying days of the Weimar Republic in Germany, permissive abortion statutes were enacted and abortion on demand became an accepted public policy.

A few years later, in 1938, the Nuremberg decree was published. It said very simply, "Life unworthy to be lived shall be eliminated." And that is just what happened.

The mentally retarded, both young and old were the first to feel the results. Those suffering from physical diseases such as multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy and the like were next. By actual body count, 500,000 Germans were exterminated because they were "useless eaters". Of course, we all know that by 1939 the pro-death mentality which existed in Nazi Germany arrived at the ultimate Jewish solution, and names like Dachau and Auschwitz became part of our vocabulary.

The point I am trying to make is simply this. A legal threat to the right to life of any individual member of a society imperils the right to life of every member of that society. And the proof of what I am saying is the fact that in a couple of State legislatures there have been bills introduced during the past two years which would have permitted euthanasia had they been passed into law. It is simply a matter of time.

In his book, "A Handbook on Abortion", Dr. J. C. Willke says this: "For two millennia in our western culture, written into our Constitution and Bill of Rights, specifically protected by our laws, and deeply imprinted into the hearts of all men, has existed the absolute value of honoring and protecting the right of each person to live. This has been an inalienable, and unequivocal right. The only exceptions have been that of balancing a life for a life in certain situations or by due process of law."

Dr. Willke continues, "yet our newly enacted permissive abortion laws . . . represent a complete about face, a total rejection of one of the core values of western man, and an acceptance of a new ethic in which life has only a relative value. No longer will every human have an absolute right to live simply because he exists. Man will now be allowed to exist only if he measures up to certain standards of independence, physical perfection, or utilitarian usefulness to others. This is a momentous change that strikes at the root of western civilization."

It makes no difference to vaguely assume that human life is more human post-born than pre-born. What is critical is to judge it to be, or not to be, human life. By a measure of 'more' or 'less' human, one can easily and logically justify infanticide and euthanasia. By the measure of economic and/or social usefulness, the ghastly atrocities of Hitlerian mass murders came to be. One cannot help but be reminded of the anguished

comment of a condemned Nazi judge who said to an American judge after the Nuremberg trials: 'I never knew it would come to this.' The American judge answered simply: 'It came to this the first time you condemned an innocent life.'"

I respectfully urge that every member of the Arizona House of Representatives join with me in sponsoring a memorial, which is now on my desk, urging the United States Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution establishing that human life with legal personality begins at the time of conception, and that all constitutional rights, including due process of law, apply to the unborn in the same manner and to the same extent as to all other citizens of the United States.

I will introduce this house concurrent memorial this afternoon.

At stake is not only the destruction of unborn innocent babies but the destruction of Judeo-Christian civilization as we know it.

RECOGNITION GROWS FOR NONSMOKERS' RIGHTS

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, more and more, the public is recognizing that the nonsmokers of America have rights too. For too long, nonsmokers have been forced to inhale the noxious fumes of others' tobacco—fumes that cause severe distress to the nonsmoker and endanger his health.

To protect the neglected rights and health of the nonsmoker, I introduced H.R. 1309, the Nonsmokers Relief Act which would require seating areas for nonsmokers aboard airlines, trains, and buses. While this bill in no way infringes on the rights of those who choose to smoke, it does protect the rights of those who do not want to be forced to breathe polluted air when traveling. Since the bill was first introduced in the 92d Congress, many of America's leading airlines have voluntarily agreed to provide separate seating.

As further evidence of the growing recognition that the vast majority of Americans who choose not to smoke have that right, I note that the Marriott hotels in the Washington, D.C., area are now providing separate floors where smoking is not allowed.

The Marriott chain is to be commended for its consideration and foresightedness. An account of the Marriott program, as outlined in the February 13, 1973, edition of the Washington Star, follows:

NEW MOTEL POLICY: NO-SMOKING FLOORS
(By John Holusha)

"It is a custom loathsome to the eye, hateful to the nose, harmful to the brain, dangerous to the lungs and in the black stinking fume thereof, nearest resembling the horrible stygian smoke of the pit which is bottomless"—King James I of England in his 1604 "counterblast" on the use to tobacco.

Well, there'll be none of that going on in Room 1102 of the Crystal City Marriott Hotel. Nor in any other of the 35 rooms of the 11th floor; the 19 on the 5th floor of the Key Bridge facility or the 15 in one section of the Twin Bridge Motel.

Since Monday these rooms have been reserved for nonsmokers only. All the ashtrays and matches have been removed; all the curtains, rugs and bedding thoroughly cleaned; and nonsmoking maids and housemen have been assigned.

The motive, apparently, has nothing to do with the principles of the Mormon Marriott family. Profit is the lure.

Executives of the Marriott hotel division hope to increase occupancy rates by attracting nonsmokers who have been gagged by the lingering tobacco smell in motel and hotel rooms. The experiment is now confined to the three Washington area facilities, but will be expanded to all 24 hotels and inns if successful, they said.

In doing so, Marriott is following something of a trend. Airlines and passengers trains have long limited smokers to certain areas. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare is trying to keep smokers from large gathering areas in the HEW office building and some school districts have attempted to ban both students and teachers from smoking on school grounds.

As well as increasing occupancy, Marriott officials figure they'll be able to cut costs significantly. According to Crystal City hotel general manager Rick Manzari, there will be less frequent cleaning of smoke-catching drapes, less outlay on ashtrays and matches and a sizable savings on the replacement of furniture and carpeting damaged by burning cigarettes.

"Maybe we'll even get reduced insurance," he says.

The no-smoking floors are Manzari's project. The original idea, he says, came from a customer on one of the questionnaire cards left in each room.

The official kickoff of the program is set for today with former Surgeon General Jesse Steinfeld and other members of the anti-smoking establishment scheduled to attend.

The Marriott experiment should prove attractive to those concerned by a report released by Steinfeld just over a year ago. Titled "The Health Consequences of Smoking," the report found that concentrations of exhaled smoke are dangerous to nonsmokers in the area.

Manzari finds it easy to sympathize with the effect of stale tobacco smoke on the abstainer. "I quit about a year ago."

"Since I've quit, I realize how even the slightest bit of smoke coming from a nearby room can be highly offensive."

FEDERAL ACTION NEEDED TO LESSEN EARTHQUAKE HAZARD

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, this morning, at approximately 6:45 o'clock—Pacific standard time—an earthquake again rocked the southern California area leaving damage in its wake.

While current reports from the scene are sketchy, we can only hope that its effects were minimal.

Yet, this points up the great need for a Federal program aimed at first, accurately predicting earthquake occurrence; second, minimizing the death and destruction such as occurred February 9, 1971, in California; and third, providing efficient, effective relief to those involved in the tragedy.

And, on all three fronts, the Federal

Government is not performing adequately.

EARTHQUAKE PREDICTION

First, the Federal Government has not provided adequate funds to develop a system to predict earthquakes so that life-saving precautions can be taken.

According to Dean Richard Jahns of Stanford University:

During the next 25 years we can expect, in various parts of the United States, at least one great earthquake, several major earthquakes, and numerous lesser damaging shocks.

Despite warnings of Dean Jahns and other scientists, there does not exist the capability in the United States to predict the occurrence of such earthquakes. The possibility to make such predictions exists because of tremendous breakthroughs in seismology in the past few years. For instance, Japanese scientists were able to give warnings at Matsu-shiro in 1966 and Russia is claiming equipment to predict the location and magnitude of an earthquake 5 days in advance.

The administration has chosen the crucial area of earthquake research in which to impound funds. In fiscal year 1973, Congress appropriated \$8.65 million—more than \$7 million greater than the funding level for the preceding year. The administration impounded the entire increase, which was urgently needed if the U.S. Geological Survey was to make any headway in its efforts to predict earthquakes. Only recently, part of the impounded funds were released. However, funding is still below Congressional appropriations, and there is no guarantee that fiscal year 1974 funds will not be similarly impounded.

PREVENTIVE MEASURES

Second, the cost of preventive measures, while substantial, must be measured against the casualties and losses that otherwise will occur in future major earthquakes.

Without the proper planning and preventive measures, such an earthquake, as Dr. Jahns predicts, will completely devastate an area.

Again, Dr. Jahns states:

A single earthquake of Richter magnitude eight or more, were it to occur in a metropolitan area under unfavorable conditions of weather, time of day, and human response, could cause damage of billions to tens of billions of dollars, and the loss of hundreds to tens of thousands of lives.

Rather than hide our heads in the sand and pretend that earthquakes will not occur, we must face the prospect of future earthquakes, and take affirmative action to minimize the kind of death and destruction that occurred February 9, 1971, in California.

The Federal Government should insure the use of proper earthquake-resistant design and construction standards for both public and privately owned facilities.

Vigorous Federal leadership is essential to provide information and research programs designed to map earthquake geologic hazards, and to test in laboratories the current theories on this topic.

In addition, the Federal Government should help communities evaluate their

seismic hazard levels, encourage the States to strengthen their roles in hazard reduction, and take responsibility for a realistic overall plan for earthquake-disaster response.

EARTHQUAKE INSURANCE

Third, the Federal Government should provide a system of earthquake insurance, similar to that currently provided for floods. Where rates are extremely high or insurance is difficult to purchase, the Federal Government should ease the financial strain on the homeowner and the businessman by assisting the private insurance industry in pooling risks, minimizing costs, and distributing burdens equitably among those who will be protected and the general public.

Mr. Speaker, the likelihood of another major earthquake is not an unfounded doom-saying prophecy; it is going to happen. Refusing to acknowledge that fact and not attempting to do whatever we can to minimize the results is an exercise for those living in a fantasy. We are prisoners of the inevitable, and we must take affirmative action.

THE SAN JOAQUIN WILDERNESS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a very important bill along with a sizable number of my colleagues from the California congressional delegation.

This bill provides for the creation of the last linking chain of wilderness areas along the crest of the High Sierras.

This new wilderness area, to be called the San Joaquin Wilderness, closes the existing gap between the John Muir Wilderness and the Minarets Wilderness.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will protect the John Muir Trail, a most unique hiking trail from Yosemite National Park to the Sequoia National Park, from being broken by roads or further development.

I am pleased to say that the Governor of the State of California has offered his support of legislation to create a wilderness in this area and that the wilderness area enjoys widespread support from throughout the State.

I am aware, Mr. Speaker, of the objections of some in our State. The basis of these objections is that it would effectively stop a proposed all-weather highway from crossing the Sierra in the vicinity of Minarets Summit.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make quite clear my own views, and those of the cosponsors, that this legislation should not be interpreted as intended to block anything that will help residents of the San Joaquin Valley.

Rather, we think that every possible assistance should be given to helping residents of the area in overcoming any transportation problems.

I do think, though, that the Trans-Sierra Highway proposed for the Minarets Summit area is not the answer.

The State of California and the Department of Transportation have both indicated that highway development in the area is not feasible.

The heavy winter snows in this area preclude an all-weather highway in that snow removal costs would far outweigh the economic advantage any highway at this point would bring.

With more sophisticated air, rail, and trucking technology, crops from the valley now reach eastern markets with a minimum of delay.

Highway travel has been improved from the valley to the east with the construction of Interstate 5 and work on Interstate 80 in the northern part of the State and east-west routes in the southern part of the State.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that this legislation will be acted upon this session. It merits the support of the Congress and will do much to preserve the natural resources of the Nation.

RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE ON AID TO NORTH VIETNAM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, today I reported to the people of my district on the proposed post-war aid program to North Vietnam. I insert the following text of that report:

Daily, our Prisoners of War are returning safely to American soil. We are all deeply touched by their patriotic gestures, and a new sense of national pride is growing. But we cannot lose sight of the fact that the war in Vietnam was not fought to gain release of the POW's. We must not delude ourselves into believing that we have won the war.

We are now being led to believe it's time to "kiss and make up" with North Vietnam, to shower our enemy who just a few short weeks ago was killing our American fighting men, with billions of tax payers dollars—an investment in peace. Some editorial writers would tell us, we must rebuild the factories, power plants and communication lines our bombers so effectively destroyed just a few months ago. They cite as historical precedent, our rebuilding of Germany and Japan following their defeat in World War Two and call this our "humane duty."

But comparing the crushed Axis Powers to North Vietnam today is false and misleading.

When World War II ended, the Allied Nations had succeeded in their goal—to destroy the warring capabilities of Germany and Japan and to rid these countries of the tyrants who began the destruction. The victory was total and unconditional.

Victory is a word unspoken today, except in North Vietnam. There, the cease-fire is considered a victory for Communism. After all, the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong have achieved many of their avowed goals, if not on the battlefields, through negotiations and their so called "Peoples Struggle" continues.

Now the American public is expected to bail the Communists out, to reconstruct their war machine to give them time to reorganize an "investment in peace."

Let's put the President's pledge of giving up to two and one half billion dollars in post-war-aid to North Vietnam into perspective. This amount is more money than the U.S.

gave to Japan in six years after World War II. And Japan, with more than three times as many people as North Vietnam, was devastated by two atomic bombings.

Hanoi's aid from its Red Chinese neighbors at the four peak years of the war is almost insignificant compared to the sum that the Administration now plans give them. Our proposed contribution is a half a billion dollars more than Russia provided its ally during the same period.

Serious questions are now being raised by the American people. Why is the U.S. offering to bail out a country so recently a bitter enemy, when nothing has changed in warlike attitude of that country's leaders? How did we get ourselves into this situation in the first place?

As far back as eight years ago financial foreign aid to the North entanglement began. In April of 1965, President Johnson proposed to include North Vietnam in a 1-billion-dollar postwar-aid program for Southeast Asia. In January of last year, a "major reconstruction program" for Indo-China, including North Vietnam, was disclosed by the White House as part of the secret negotiations with the Communists. And now the figure has swollen to seven and one-half billion dollars, five billion for South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia and two and one-half billion for North Vietnam.

But whatever the final figure amounts to, and you can expect it to rise, I shall, as your voice in Congress, oppose any and all moves to give aid-money to North Vietnam. I believe this position reflects the feelings of not only the people of the sixth district, but of the American people as a whole. Daily, I receive letters urging me to stand fast against the massive give-away of tax money to aid Communist North Vietnam. These letters don't represent some planned effort by any lobby group. They are the sincere feelings of average citizens who have made the sacrifices to pay for this long and tragic war, not only with their tax money, but some with the lives of their sons and loved ones.

They recognize that pouring tax dollars into North Vietnam is little more than "bribe money" to a renegade country, with the expectation that it will "behave" a little while. There is no guarantee that these dollars will encourage the North Vietnamese to toe the mark in honoring the terms of the truce. There is no peace—at most a shaky cease-fire. The same leaders remain in control in Hanoi, unrepentant and undefeated, the Communist armies remain armed just biding time until a Communist takeover of all Vietnam looks thoroughly safe. And we cannot expect a few pieces of paper they signed to cause the Vietnamese Communists to abandon their long-range goal of bringing all of Indo-China under Communist domination.

Can the North Vietnamese expect their Red allies to come to their financial assistance now that the fighting with the U.S. has ended? If past performances by Reds are any indication, Hanoi had better not spend our U.S. money yet. Hanoi still owes the Russians millions for the Mig fighters, SAM missiles, machineguns and munitions they bought on credit during the war. As long as the money was going to kill American fighting men, the Russians were ready with a loan, but neither Russia nor China has offered any hint of the amount of money (in any), they will spend to aid North Vietnam or the other Indo-Chinese nations—including their moral duty to help South Vietnam.

Red China, who found the money to help continue the killing, is itself so underdeveloped that it cannot properly feed its masses let alone be expected to aid the North. Unless Russian foreign policy changes, Moscow cannot be expected to join any international fund to help rehabilitate the North. Certainly the North needs aid to crawl out of the destruction. Experts estimate that the wreckage in North Vietnam

totals between 300 and 400 million dollars, but let those countries who supplied the weapons of war to North Vietnam, and prolonged the conflict now supply them with materials to rebuild.

In all the propaganda hoopla about aiding our enemies, there are several things we have lost sight of.

Our country's national priorities need to be brought into sharp perspective. What about the war damage done at home to the American people. Who can we look to to reunify our people and mend our damage?

The polarization of the American people is pulling the nation apart from within. For the first time in more than a decade since the war began, it is time for the American people to come first in priority in all considerations.

President Nixon's "New Federalism" program of returning tax money and power to the state and local governments is good in principle. This is something I have stood for since you first sent me to Congress. But what people would vote to tax themselves in order to send the money to the murderers of their sons? Certainly not the people of the sixth District.

We should turn our attention homeward, to heal the wounds that this war has cut into the national character. Our national concern should be focused on the problems that now lie ahead.

We cannot bury and forget the 46,000 men who gave up their lives on the battlefields of Indo-China. Nor can we forget the families of those fightingmen who has inquired as to how they feel about rewarding the murderers of their sons and loved ones by sending them billions of our tax dollars?

Nor can we forget the 153,000 men who returned wounded—thousands disabled for life. Or the 60 to 100,000 men who came home addicted to drugs. Nor can we forget the men who just served honorably and returned home quietly without fanfare. These are the people who deserve top priority in our compassion and assistance.

We cannot allow our joy at the return of our POW's to overshadow the problems facing the other men and women who served our country in Vietnam.

In the same week as the first Prisoners of War returned, the Veterans' Administration announced plans to cut the disability benefits for Vietnam veterans. And it was only after an enraged public outcry that the President rescinded the order.

Sixteen major U.S. companies have announced that they would do anything they could to find jobs for the POW's, if they decided to leave the service. This is a course commendable. But what about the thousands of other Vietnam veterans who can't find a job, whose unemployment rate is much higher compared to men in the same age bracket? These men deserve a higher priority than our former North Vietnamese enemy or some draft dodger or deserter?

I opposed from the very beginning the committing of American fighting men in an Asian land war. But once our men were committed, I always felt that the reasons for their sacrifice justified victory. Our officials deserted them on the field of battle, with a diplomatic no-win policy, but we Americans cannot desert them or what they were sacrificed for now.

And pouring billions of dollars of aid into North Vietnam, like granting amnesty to those men who chose not to serve their country, would indeed be a betrayal of our soldiers' sacrifice.

How does the returning Vietnam veteran feel when he is told that tax money from his paycheck will now be given to the very people he fought against a short time ago—and at the expense of short-changing himself and other returned veterans?

President Nixon has said publicly that this country will not grant amnesty to draft dodgers and deserters. The same bleeding

hearts who created and propagandized for the no-win military strategy in Vietnam, are now telling us that we must "forgive and forget" and welcome home with open arms the men who fled rather than serve or deserted under fire.

These people had the choice to make, and their decision should be theirs to live with. They had the opportunity to serve the country of their birth, which is a legal as well as moral responsibility, yet they elected to run from that obligation.

The only amnesty I feel they deserve is to be allowed to remain in the foreign sanctuary or if they choose to return, to pay the penalty for the crime they committed.

And as we talk of amnesty for cowards and deserters, and of foreign aid for North Vietnam, and as our POW's are released from Communist camps, let us all remember that our U.S. POW, Lt. Calley still remains a Prisoner of War right in our own country. A scapegoat to the end.

THE CONTINUING TRAGEDY OF JEWS IN IRAQ

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, as the world views with continued concern the struggle for the balance of power in the Middle East and the constant harassment of Israel by her Arab neighbors, we frequently tend to forget about the plight of those Jews who continue to live in Arab lands and the suffering they have been forced to endure, particularly in the aftermath of the Six-Day War. It is only after some tragic event has occurred that world attention is briefly focused on the problem and, regrettably, is often forgotten by the free world's leaders a short time later.

However, we cannot—we must not—ignore the violations of basic human rights which are being perpetrated on the Jews in countries such as Iraq. The small but vital Iraqi Jewish community has been subjected to the cruelest forms of discrimination, restriction and arbitrary arrest. These men, women and children are denied those basic human rights and civil liberties protected by international conventions and subscribed to by most civilized nations. They have become the victims of political, economic, social and cultural oppression and are denied the opportunity to openly observe their religion. The Jewish community of Baghdad has dwindled from approximately 4,000 persons to less than 400 in just 6 years.

Last fall I began to receive reports that certain members of the Iraqi Jewish community had been arbitrarily arrested, imprisoned, and threatened with execution. Although information from Iraq is sketchy, I was later informed that some of these persons had been released, only to be rearrested a short time later.

Finally, earlier this month we received the news that nine or 10 prominent Iraqi Jews had been executed. With its typical cavalier and uncooperative attitude, the Government of Iraq has refused to furnish any information on this subject and has callously rebuffed various international humanitarian organizations who

have sought information on the status of the Jewish community and imprisoned Jews.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to permit this cruel and unspeakable act to go unnoticed and we must rally world public opinion against the inhumane and ill-conceived policies which Iraq, Syria, and certain other Arab States are pursuing vis-a-vis their Jewish citizens. We must make it clear to these nations that we will not tolerate the continued persecution of the Jews and that countries such as Iraq stand condemned before the family of nations for the illegal execution of Jewish citizens on unfounded and trumped-up charges and without even the semblance of a trial. Not since the dark days of the great holocaust of the 1930's and early 1940's in Germany has the world witnessed such a vicious campaign of harassment and persecution against a minority. The actions of the Iraqi Government makes a mockery of its membership in the United Nations and its supposed adherence to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

A man is born free, whether in the United States or Iraq, and his individual freedom cannot be capriciously restricted or otherwise violated simply because he may belong to a minority. We must make clear our position and take steps to alleviate the suffering of these unfortunate victims of bigotry and hatred.

In order that our colleagues may be better informed of this situation, I insert herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, a letter I received earlier this month from the World Union of Jewish Students and a well-written article which appeared in the February 11 issue of New York Times. I urge that our colleagues give this matter their fullest and most careful attention and join in the public outcry against these loathesome policies:

WORLD UNION OF JEWISH STUDENTS,
London, February 7, 1973.

HON. HERMAN BADILLO,
American Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Some time ago we wrote to you in regard to reports of discrimination and cruelty to the Jewish population domiciled in Syria. You were of great help on this prior occasion and appreciated it very much. The situation in Iraq is getting worse and worse so we are again taking the liberty of approaching you on this particular matter.

In order to make things more clear I am articulating the situation as it is now, as accurately as possible, and hopefully these details will be of help.

The situation in Baghdad, Iraq, is as follows:

The Jewish community numbers only 350. These people are not allowed to have any contact of any sort with the outside world. Community institutions have been closed down.

They are forbidden to sell or mortgage immovable property, to give it away or dispose of it in any way.

All Jews employed in public service have been dismissed. No company or institution may make payments to Jews without governmental authority. Banks are authorized to make only minimal monthly payments to Jews from their own credit account.

Some four months ago the following eight Jews were arbitrarily arrested and held without trial in Baghdad jails after Mr. Abraham Sayeg was murdered in his home in the ghetto.

1. Abdul Aziz Jacob.

2. Shaul Rajwan.
3. Jacob Rajwan.
4. Dr. Ezra Khazzam.
5. Shaul Shamash.
6. Victor Ezra David.
7. Azuri Shamash.
8. Selim Sedaka (as at January 1973 for the above 8 and as at February 1973 for the following two names plus the above).
9. Naji Sytiat.
10. Ezra Shamtov.

Hoping that you will be able to help stress the right factors in order to better, if possible, the situation of the people concerned.

Yours faithfully,

YONA YAHAV,
Secretary-General.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 11, 1973]

"GONE," SAID THE RED PAINT

(By Terence Smith)

JERUSALEM.—For the once large and flourishing Jewish community in Iraq, the years since the Arab-Israeli war of 1967 have brought uncertainty and dread. Their treatment by the Baghdad authorities has fluctuated from month to month, from relative tolerance to outright persecution. The darkest period was in January, 1969, when the militant Iraqi regime that had seized power six months earlier convicted 14 persons, including nine Jews of spying for Israel and hanged them in public squares.

The executions set off an international outcry and the situation of the Jewish community improved. Jews imprisoned without trial were freed. Emigration was permitted, first unofficially and then officially, and thousands seized the opportunity to leave. From the 1967 total of about 4,000 Jews, the community in Baghdad has dwindled in about 400, most of them prosperous professionals and merchants reluctant to leave their considerable property behind.

In the last few months, the plight of this remaining group has abruptly worsened. According to reports reaching Israel last week, nine or 10 prominent members of the community have been executed in recent weeks in the Qasr el Nihaya prison in Baghdad.

The victims were said to have been arrested last September and December as part of an unexplained crackdown. According to the reports, which a senior Israeli official here described as 99 per cent certain, their property has been confiscated, their families have been driven away and their homes have been boarded up, with the word "gone", smeared in red paint on the front doors. The reported victims include a number of prominent businessmen, a lawyer, and a well-known Baghdad doctor who had treated a number of Iraqi leaders in the past.

The Iraqis have refused to explicitly confirm or deny the reported executions, which were publicly denounced last week by humanitarian groups in Denmark and France. The only official response has been a statement issued by the Iraqi Embassy in Paris last week denying that any Iraqi Jew was in prison for religious or political reasons. It attributed the execution reports to "Zionist propaganda."

If the Israeli reports are correct, what explains the change in the Iraqi attitude? What is the motivation behind the sudden crackdown on a tiny community that has already been stripped of its political rights?

Although the intelligence from Iraq is sketchy, the Israelis believe the current repression is probably the result of a bitter political struggle among Iraq's four competing security services, each of which backs a different political faction of the fractured national leadership. They are the Internal Security Service, the Baathist party intelligence, the Iraqi Army intelligence and an over-all military intelligence organization.

When the domestic political atmosphere is unsettled, as it currently seems to be in Iraq, the most militant of these groups tends

to assert itself. Repression of the Jewish community and strained relations with the powerful Kurdish minority are often the result. "There is probably a mixture of rational and irrational reasons behind it," a senior specialist in the Israeli Foreign Ministry said, "most of which will not become clear for several months."

In the meantime, the Israelis are launching a major campaign to focus international attention on the plight of the remaining 400. Appeals have been made to the United Nations, foreign governments and private humanitarian groups to do everything possible to persuade the Iraqis to give an accounting of the arrested men and protect the others in the community.

"The fate of the Jews in Iraq's prisons is still unknown," Premier Golda Meir said last week. "The best we can do is pray for them."

COMMEMORATION OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1973

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate Lithuanian Inde-

pendence Day. I speak of a nation whose history reaches back to the 11th century. Lithuania has been thwarted time and again from functioning as an independent state. Finally breaking the czarist shackles on February 16, 1918 at the close of World War I, the Lithuanian people proclaimed their independence and established a free government. This independence was directly challenged by the Bolsheviks, who invaded the newly established state. There were many bitter battles but finally the Lithuanian people emerged triumphant. On July 19, 1920, the Soviet Government signed a treaty of peace. It declared in this treaty—mark these words well—that it "voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and their territory."

For 20 years Lithuania knew peace and independence. During this period there was a great renaissance of national literature and culture. But then came the Hitler-Stalin Pact and the partition of Poland between Germany and the Soviet Union. Shortly thereafter the Soviet Union moved against Lithuania by demanding permission to place 20,000 troops in the country and establishing military bases there. Eight months later Moscow

delivered an ultimatum calling for the installation of a government friendly to the Soviet Union and the Red Army entered the country in force. Subjugation followed quickly. Three weeks later the Kremlin ordered the dissolution of all non-Communist parties and the arrest of their leaders.

On July 14 to 15 the people were compelled to vote in national elections with only the Communist Party represented. Two days later the legislature chosen in these rigged elections convened its first session and in less than 1 hour without debate 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. Following the brutal fighting on Lithuanian soil during World War II, Soviet reoccupation of Lithuania was firmly established in 1944. Since that time Lithuania has not known independence.

I deplore this tragic history. And I am proud, Mr. Speaker, that our Government to this day has refused to recognize the illegal annexation of the Baltic States by the Kremlin. We must never forget the fight urged by the Lithuanian people to reestablish their complete independence.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, February 22, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Valdeko Kangro, pastor of the Estonian Evangelical Lutheran Congregation, Manchester, Conn., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, may Thy Spirit lift us into Thy presence as we seek to glorify Thy name.

We beseech Thy guidance to our Nation, our President, and to the Members of this House, that divine order might manifest itself in our lives and country.

We commemorate the 55th anniversary of the Republic of Estonia, and pray that her freedom, likewise the freedom in Christ, in thought and movement might be restored for all peoples in distress, knowing that Thy Word still stands:

If My people, which are called by My name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek My face, and turn from their wicked ways; then I will hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land.—II Chronicles 7: 14, Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the

following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 39. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide a more effective program to prevent aircraft piracy, and for other purposes;

S. 43. An act to provide for the mandatory inspection of rabbits slaughtered for human food, and for other purposes;

S. 50. An act to strengthen and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes; and

S. 394. An act 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.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 86-380, appointed Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. HOLLINGS, and Mr. PERCY as members, on the part of the Senate, of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

NATIONAL LITTLE LEAGUE DAY

(Mr. ROUSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a House joint resolution which I believe to be of interest to many of my colleagues.

This resolution calls upon the President to proclaim the third Monday in June of each year as "National Little League Day" and it calls upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities. I believe both goals very worthwhile.

The importance of such a proclamation was brought to my attention by the manager of a Dana Corp. Little League, Ivan D. Standiford of Fort Wayne, Ind. There are many other Little League teams throughout the Fourth Congressional District of Indiana, which I am honored to serve as Representative.

I believe that many of us here are aware of the varied activities of Little Leagues throughout the country, since most of us have children who have participated in the baseball teams that function as Little League teams. Some of us may even remember belonging ourselves.

Either way we are aware of the unique value this kind of activity has for our own children and those of our neighbors. By means of the Little League, children are taught the values of sportsmanship, of cooperation, of wholesome competition, of personal achievement, of athletic and physical excellence. A direction and an interest is given the lives of the children who are fortunate enough to participate in the Little League activities.

I am sure that many a Congressman here today could recount stories of just what being in the Little League has meant to a member of his or her family.

So I believe that it is time we recognize a successful and valuable nationwide movement, a movement which has now spread to some 30 nations throughout the world. And how can we do this? By setting aside 1 day yearly to commemorate and celebrate the national and personal values of the Little League teams. That is the purpose of the legislation I am introducing and I hope it will secure passage rapidly so that we can begin that celebration this year.