

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR NO. 37, SENATE RESOLUTION 41, TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, immediately following the transaction of routine morning business, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 37, Senate Resolution 41, a resolution authorizing additional expenditures by the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs for inquiries and investigations.

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

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Then it would be my understanding, in accordance with the previous order, which has just been amended, that upon the disposition of Calendar No. 37, Senate Resolution 41, the Senate would proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 55, S. 7.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW AND THURSDAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the program for tomorrow is as follows:

The Senate will convene at 12 o'clock meridian. After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

standing order, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business of not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes each, at the conclusion of which the Senate will proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 37, Senate Resolution 41, a money resolution relating to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

Upon the disposition of Senate Resolution 41, the Senate will take up S. 7, a bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. There may be yea-and-nay votes tomorrow.

On Thursday, the Senate will convene at 11 o'clock a.m. After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, the following Senators will be recognized for not to exceed 10 minutes each: The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSSON), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), and the Senator from Utah (Mr. CHURCH).

After the orders for the recognition of Senators have been consummated on Thursday, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business of not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes each.

At the conclusion of routine morning

business on Thursday, in the event the Senate has finally disposed of S. 7, the bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, the leadership would intend to proceed to the consideration of Senate resolution 69, a resolution to amend rule XXV relative to open and closed sessions of committees. There may be yea-and-nay votes thereon.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; and at 3:20 p.m., the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 28, 1973, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 27, 1973:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Byron V. Pepitone, of Virginia, to be Director of Selective Service, vice Curtis W. Tarr, resigned.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 27, 1973:

NEW ENGLAND REGIONAL COMMISSION

Russell Field Merriman, of Vermont, to be Federal Cochairman of the New England Regional Commission.

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

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"**MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM**", AN ESSAY BY MISS MARJORIE LYNN O'CONNOR OF MARION HIGH SCHOOL, MISHAWAKA, IND.

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars' annual Voice of Democracy Contest has again been concluded, and I am delighted to report that the winning entry from my State was submitted by Miss Marjorie Lynn O'Connor of Marion High School in Mishawaka, Ind.

Miss O'Connor addresses herself very eloquently to the dangers of complacency in a democratic society, and her essay on "My Responsibility to Freedom" is well worth the attention of the Members.

I would, therefore, like to include Miss O'Connor's winning entry in the RECORD at this point in order that it might be available to all:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

If you are one of the people who read the comics section of the newspaper, you may

have seen a recent episode of Mort Walker's *Beetle Bailey*. In this particular episode, Beetle was leaning against a tree, talking to himself. He said:

"I don't know why everybody's always hopping on me for being lazy. Half the trouble in this world is caused by too much energy . . . People running around starting fights and trying to get stuff! I oughta write a book! I could go around making speeches . . . I could get people behind me and run for office! Baleyism, that's what I'd call it! Baleyism would sweep the country! Even the world! Except that it all sounds like a lot of work."

In the last frame, Bailey was still resting under the tree, all his grand plans never to be put into effect.

The reasoning behind those plans seems to be that since zeal can have undesirable results, it is praiseworthy to be apathetic. However, Beetle can do nothing to improve society without committing himself to "a lot of work." This general apathy is ironic, because Beetle, as a soldier, is theoretically committed to the specific cause of freedom, and willing to expend not only his energy, but also his life to defend it. The defense of freedom will never be achieved through the concept of Baleyism, for it is only by positive action that the liberty we have can be preserved.

The term "positive action" means taking definite steps to preserve one's own freedom by protecting the rights of others. There are many ways to become a leader in the protection of human liberty. However, one can

not hope to speak up in the community until he speaks up in his own family. He should not expect to defeat pollution on a large scale until he conquers his own selfish, polluting habits and he will never be able to free an oppressed minority group if he fails to safeguard individual rights. We must meet his responsibility to freedom not through Baleyism's empty promises, nor by merely refraining from undermining liberty, but by taking positive action, both in major concerns and the little matters one meets daily.

I can not honestly say that I have always met this obligation, because at times I have failed to use my opportunities to act or speak out in behalf of someone else. I have avoided taking part in family arguments over the use of the television, although I knew it was the third straight week of Monday night football, and time for my little sister to watch her favorite program instead.

Generally indifferent about pollution, I have often overlooked discarded pop cans or candy wrappers, depriving everyone of his right to a clean America. Rather than come forward, I have seen an innocent student punished for the misdeeds of a friend. I have stood by while a child was bullied by the neighbor children, and given tacit approval to the merciless teasing that I have seen in home and at school.

According to the philosophy of Baleyism, I should be praised because in each of these situations I did nothing wrong. I say I am guilty, of infringing on my own freedom as well as my neighbor's, because I didn't

February 27, 1973

do something right. My failures to protect others' rights in little matters made these people less free, and when their freedom is curtailed, so is my own. As Carl Shurz, American statesman and journalist, said, "If you want to be free... guarantee an equally full measure of freedom to all your neighbors."

In evaluating how well I personally lived up to this challenge, I had to ask myself how often I had responded to the daily opportunities to protect the rights of others. Each of us must ask this question of himself. The answers we give will determine whether, we shall make the effort to protect our neighbor's freedom and our own, through major contributions, but first in the little things we can do every day, or whether we shall lie back, complacently, with Beetle Bailey, while the liberty we say we value so highly crumbles at our feet.

ASSISTANCE TO INDOCHINA

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, arguments advanced to date by the administration in support of the proposed new program of assistance to North Vietnam and the rest of Indochina are not persuasive.

On February 22, the Roanoke World-News published an editorial pointing out that the reasons given for this new aid program have been sharply criticized and do not seem convincing.

It is my view that neither the situation in Indochina nor the financial condition of the United States are such that a major new program of assistance should be undertaken by this country at the present time.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "Better Ways To Help Indochina," be included in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

BETTER WAYS TO HELP INDOCHINA

Virginia's Sen. Harry Byrd Jr., has more than adequately summed up the arguments of the opponents of massive aid to North Vietnam and the rest of Indochina: The proposal seems to run counter to the "Nixon Doctrine" of less dependency on the United States as both world policeman and universal rich uncle; it comes at a time when the administration is involved in an all-out battle to lower federal deficits; it would go to countries in political and economic turmoil; and it is a dubious attempt to "accomplish economically what we could not accomplish militarily."

The senator speaks for a large group of congressmen, which makes what Sec. of State William Rogers said about such aid (it has "a problem with Congress") seem one of the great understatements of the year.

So far all of the arguments put forth by the administration have been effectively shot down. Critics have said, for instance, that aid to Indochina cannot be effectively compared with Marshall plan aid after the Second World War; Indochina is most certainly not western Europe. If we can pour billions of dollars down the drain for a war we didn't understand against a people we don't understand, think what we might waste in the cause of peace.

The administration has not gotten much

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

further with its argument that such aid will provide the carrot to keep Hanoi abiding by the terms of the ceasefire agreement. Congressmen find it hard to believe that a few billions can turn Hanoi from its basic aim—the unification of the Vietnams—when ten years of American might could not.

That last point shakes even the most vocal critics of our Vietnam policies. Some of them want to see us give aid to Hanoi, not as an inducement but an open admission that we made a mistake and wish to offer reparations. The Washington Star-News' Frank Getlein, long-time critic of the war, sees in the inducement-aid move the potential for the day, "not too distant, when we shall alternate blowing up hospitals and rebuilding them, blowing them up once more and putting them back together, in a pattern that reasonably could last forever." Mr. Getlein writes in only half-jest.

The opposition to blind, massive aid to Hanoi doesn't necessarily mean that one is hard-hearted. There are other, far better ways that the U.S. could fulfill those obligations, moral and financial, that it may have built up either during the war or in the course of the peace negotiations.

We could put our prestige and leverage behind a multi-nation effort to help rebuild the torn countries of Indochina. Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim of the U.N. has suggested such an effort through that organization. Such a project would fit far better into Nixon's post-Vietnam foreign policy. It would also stand a chance of getting past a testy Congress.

SALT AT NATO: HOW TO WIN AT RUSSIAN ROULETTE, CHEAT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the latest disarmament fiasco occurred with the invitation of the Communist Warsaw Pact Nations to meet with NATO to discuss mutual disarmament with each side to give up equal numbers of arms.

The Soviets liked the scheme so well that they donated an extra 1,000 new tanks to the Warsaw Pact Nations just to make sure that their side had weapons after the free nations of NATO were disarmed. This way the Russians were assured of coming out ahead.

The Soviets do not even play Russian roulette according to the rules.

I asked that related news clippings follow:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 12, 1973]

SOVIETS ADD 1,000 NEW TANKS TO EAST EUROPEAN ARSENALS

(By Michael Getler)

The Soviet Union, over the past 4 years, has added about 1,000 new tanks to its already sizable arsenal of armored vehicles in Eastern Europe, according to a new assessment of Soviet strength made by the United States and its NATO allies.

The additional tanks—mostly new T-62s—have not brought with them any greatly increased alarm among U.S. defense planners with the newer vehicles looked upon as primarily a Soviet attempt to modernize their huge but relatively old tank force in Europe.

Because the origins of this gradual buildup go back to the 1968-69 period, U.S. officials also do not believe the increases were part of any pre-planned Soviet attempt to strengthen its bargaining position in future negotiations

on possible Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions (MBFR) between NATO and the Warsaw Pact nations.

Nevertheless, the larger number of tanks now reflected in more refined allied intelligence estimates is expected to have an unavoidable impact on those talks.

Preliminary talks on such prospects are already under way in Vienna as a prelude to more formal discussions which may begin next fall.

The Soviets have not withdrawn any of their older tanks as the newer ones have been added, say defense officials, thus the traditionally large disparity between Warsaw Pact and NATO tank strength is now larger.

On the other hand, the existing U.S. British and West German tanks in front-line units with NATO—though smaller in number—are judged to be superior in fighting capability of their Soviet counterparts, including the relatively new T-62 model.

Also, the NATO allies are granted an edge in superior anti-tank weaponry. And, the NATO tank stockpile in Europe is actually much larger—when reserve tanks are counted—that is usually reflected in published statistics.

The additional Soviet vehicles that have been moved into Eastern Europe in recent years are the equivalent of about two new armored divisions. However, the tanks have been dispersed among existing motorized rifle divisions and armored divisions to increase their strength rather than to create new units.

This might eventually allow the Soviets to withdraw some of their older T-54 and T-55 tank units as part of an MBFR agreement without disrupting entire units.

Or, by increasing the tanks in their rifle (infantry) divisions, the Soviets may seek to negotiate mutual withdrawal of traditional armored divisions which would still leave large numbers of tanks with Soviet infantry units.

Most of the new tanks have gone to Soviet divisions based in East Germany.

According to U.S. defense officials, the Warsaw Pact nations now have about 15,000 tanks arrayed against NATO forces in the critical Central European sector. This figure includes medium and heavy tanks based in the so-called northern tier of countries including East Germany, Poland and Czechoslovakia. When tanks based in Hungary are added, the figure jumps to 17,000. Of the 17,000 about 9,000 are Soviet tanks.

The Hungarian tanks, about half of which are Soviet-built, are sometimes included in the balance of power more associated with NATO's southern flank, where Romania and Bulgaria add another 3,000 tanks to the overall equation.

NATO's tank forces on the southern flank—mostly in Greece, Turkey and Italy—amount to about 2,000 tanks.

In the critical central sector, NATO has close to 6,000 tanks deployed with operational units. But there are also, according to high-ranking defense officials, about 4,000 other tanks—mostly modern U.S., British and West German main battle tanks—in reserve and maintenance units which could be used as replacements and reinforcements in battle, if crews could be made available.

The United States, for example, has some 3,000 tanks in Europe, but about half of these, according to Pentagon officials, are in a reserve and maintenance stockpile.

The current NATO main battle tanks—the U.S. M-60, the British Chieftain, and the German Leopard—are all larger than the Soviet tanks, including the T-62. All are also judged to be more efficient and have more accurate firepower, even though the Russian T-62 has a 115mm gun, larger than the M-60 and Leopard but smaller than the Chieftain's 120mm armament.

A new version of the Leopard is being built with a 120mm gun.

All three allied tanks have longer range guns than the older T-54s and T-55s, which still make up the bulk of Soviet armor.

Nevertheless, despite these qualitative advantages, the Soviet tank force in Europe has always been the single greatest concern of military planners trying to deal with the prospects for European defense in any conventional attack, and the addition of more tanks simply increases the problem, in their view.

[From the Washington Star and Daily News, Feb. 21, 1973]

RUSSIANS STOCKING WEAPONS, WEST GERMAN SOURCES SAY

BONN, GERMANY.—West German sources contend that the Soviet Union has supplied its armies in East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary with the latest model tanks, armored personnel carriers and artillery, but is keeping the "replaced" equipment on hand.

Instead of withdrawing the older equipment, the Russians have stashed it away in secret depots located in the four satellite countries, the sources said yesterday.

One theory of Western military experts is that Moscow plans to announce major arms reductions in Central Europe on the eve of the East-West mutual force reduction talks, then withdraw only the older weaponry.

"They could then beat the propaganda drums without losing any of their material or personnel sustenance," one Bonn official said.

Even if the Russians knew that Western experts would discover the reported caches, they might feel that announcement of a reduction involving obsolete weapons would put tremendous public pressure on the West to respond with genuine cuts, the experts theorized.

Another theory is that the estimated 3,000 obsolete T54 and T55 tanks, 1,000 armored personnel carriers and 1,000 cannons were mothballed as a secret emergency reserve that could be activated by flying in troops.

Another possibility is that the obsolete weapons were kept around simply because of bad organization.

The four Soviet allies reported to be harboring the secret stockpiles are the same four countries invited by the West to participate with the Kremlin and North Atlantic Treaty Organization powers in the preparatory arms reduction talks that started recently in Vienna.

Western experts estimate that the Soviet Union has up to 56,000 troops and 80,000 airmen in the four countries. They are equipped with about 12,100 tanks, including advanced T52's and 1,400 fighters and fighter-bombers.

By comparison the United States has about 200,000 soldiers in West Germany and another 100,000 in the rest of Western Europe.

Meanwhile, in Moscow, a Soviet general said yesterday that the Soviet Union is compelled to build up its armed forces because the West plans to step up the arms race, United Press International reported.

Gen. Serge Sokolov, first deputy defense minister, attacked Western "imperialism," press and "reactionary" politicians in his remarks marking Soviet Army-Navy Day which is Friday. He made no mention of China, whose armed forces are a major source of concern to Moscow.

"The aggressive strategy of imperialism is spearheaded, above all, against the Socialist countries," he said. "This compels us to take steps for further raising the combat strength of the armed forces."

ASSAILED WESTERN SPOKESMEN

Sokolov said "reactionary politicians in the West" like to raise the specter of a Soviet military threat but that "we do not want to intimidate anyone."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

[From the Washington Star and Daily News, Feb. 25, 1973]

THREE ARMS OFFICIALS RESIGNING

(By Oswald Johnston)

At least three front-line officials in the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency are resigning in what some observers describe as a deliberate administration purge of the agency most closely associated with last year's strategic arms limitation treaty with the Soviet Union.

According to informed sources close to the agency, the three officials—all Democrats and all associated with disarmament policies since the early 1960s—were recently informed that their resignations, routinely submitted to President Nixon after his reelection, had been accepted.

The three officials, according to these reports, are:

Lawrence D. Weiler, counselor to the ACDA director and associated with the agency since its beginning.

James F. Leonard, assistant director and chief of the agency's international relations bureau.

Spurgeon M. Keeny Jr., assistant director and chief of ACDA's science and technology bureau.

Leonard, a foreign service officer, will presumably be reassigned within the State Department, with which ACDA is affiliated. The other two men are supergrade Civil Service employees.

The White House has not commented on the ACDA shakeup, and disarmament officials yesterday were tight-lipped. There would be no comment, one official remarked, "until the dust settles."

Just how much dust is being kicked up is still not clear.

According to one account, the White House intends to make sure every top grade slot in the arms control agency is filled by a "loyal" supporter of administration policies in the strategic disarmament field.

Proponents of this view noted that the agency is having its \$10 million budget slashed by a third, and is losing 12 employees and most of its research funds in the coming fiscal year.

President Nixon has already made it plain that the chief negotiator in the next phase of the SALT negotiations with the Russians will not be associated with the arms control agency.

The SALT negotiator, Gerard Smith, stepped down as ACDA director when he resigned from government service early this year. His designated successor on the negotiating team is career diplomat U. Alexis Johnson, who has long experience haggling with the Soviets but little expertise in the disarmament field.

Taken together, these moves indicate a clear intention by the administration to gather all the authority for future disarmament negotiations into its own hands and remove the disarmament agency from a first-line role.

The arms control agency was created early in the Kennedy administration, and for that reason alone is thought to be held suspect by White House loyalists. Smith, however, was a Nixon appointee and his position as both chief SALT negotiator and ACDA director in Nixon's first term is believed to have shielded some of the men whose resignations are now being accepted.

No successor to Smith has been named, and it is understood that his deputy director, Philip J. Farley, has been asked to stay on as acting director at least until a successor is confirmed in the office.

Whether Farley would then join the others in resigning is unclear. But most of the officials bearing the title assistant director or its equivalent are thought to be on the White House list for replacement.

One other probable target of the shakeup

February 27, 1973

is William W. Hancock, general counsel of the agency and another Democrat. Assistant director Robert H. B. Wade of the economic affairs bureau is a Republican and is believed likely to survive. Neither of these men has been mentioned specifically in the official reports of the ACDA purge at present circulating in Washington.

Ever since its creation in 1961, ACDA has been identified with the orthodox nuclear disarmament theorists who hold that nuclear stability is best achieved by limiting the nation's strategic strength to the minimum number of warheads and missiles that will assure destruction of the enemy's cities in a retaliatory second strike.

This doctrine, known as "assured destruction," has been in large part abandoned by Nixon himself and by his top adviser, Henry A. Kissinger. Both claim they favor a strategic capability more flexible than would be possible under the strict doctrine of a massive second strike attack on population centers.

The assured destruction doctrine is anathema to Pentagon theorists. Critics of SALT I's allegedly excessive concessions to the Soviets such as Sen. Henry M. Jackson, D-Wash., blame most of its weaknesses on the heavy ACDA participation in the negotiations.

It is unclear how much of this ideological dispute lies behind the administration's recent moves against ACDA. By reducing the agency's budget and influence and by purging disarmament-oriented Democratic holdovers, the White House seems to be acting out the misgivings of Jackson and the Pentagon.

At the same time, sources close to the SALT I negotiations stress that every substantial decision in the talks was taken directly by Nixon and Kissinger and that Smith's delegation, which included representatives of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as well as ACDA reported daily by cable and special telephone lines when the negotiating sessions were in progress.

PROPOSED ASSISTANCE TO NORTH VIETNAM

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

MR. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, the February 22 edition of the Lynchburg News included an excellent editorial on the subject of proposed assistance to North Vietnam.

The editorial points out that it is unlikely that Hanoi will abandon aggression against its neighbors and that assistance directed to that nation would support a Communist regime which claims victory in the war in Vietnam.

The editorial also notes that the financial condition of the U.S. Government is not sound, and that this is, therefore, not an appropriate time to undertake a major new program of foreign aid—particularly aid to North Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "No Justification," be included in the Extensions of Remarks. F. James Murdock is editor of the News.

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

NO JUSTIFICATION

Unless Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr. gets a lot of support—in the Congress and from the country—the Nixon Administration and Congressional liberals are going to take several

more billion out of the pockets of American workers and hand it over to North Vietnam.

Hand it over while North Vietnam continues to pursue its invasion of South Vietnam, with several divisions of its troops in control of South Vietnamese territory, with its Viet Cong in control of even more territory, and its political organizations sabotaging the Thieu Government and seeking to complete the Communist takeover by political means.

There is, as Senator Byrd said on Monday, "no justification" for giving North Vietnam any economic aid whatsoever. The argument advanced by those who favor giving American dollars to the Communist enemy—that we did the same for Germany and Italy—is false on its face. We gave that aid to defeated enemies, whose governments we had destroyed. Does anyone in his right mind think the United States would have advanced billions of dollars to rebuild a Germany in control of Adolf Hitler and his Nazi Government? But that is exactly what the Nixon Administration is proposing we do in North Vietnam—extend billions of dollars to bulk up the Communist regime which claims it was victorious in this war. It is a claim we find hard to dispute.

Whether or not the United States abandons its practice of extending aid to countries and governments fighting Communist subversion and invasion depends upon whether we any longer intend to help other peoples resist enslavement. Senator Byrd questions the wisdom of extending massive aid to South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and Thailand. We do not question it as a matter of principle, but we do as a matter of principle. We simply haven't got the money!

The Federal budget is running billions of dollars in debt each year. Seventeen cents out of each dollar of personal and corporate income tax paid in this country goes for interest on the national debt—and the debt continues to go up and up and up. There is never any discussion of paying it off. The taxpayer is groaning under a tax burden which is rapidly approaching the confiscatory stage. Federal, state and local taxes, direct and indirect, are taking more than half of each dollar earned. What "justification" has the Nixon Administration or the Congress handing out additional billions of our wages to rebuild a victorious enemy who is still pursuing his conquest of our formerly?

Some proposals affront all logic and common sense, all systems of values. The suggestion we help rebuild North Vietnam is one of those. It is sheer stupidity, which is recognized as such around the globe. We cannot long survive this kind of leadership in the White House and the Congress—leadership which includes the members of both major political parties.

MERITORIOUS SERVICE BY A SOCIAL SERVICE DIRECTOR

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our national commitment to various social service programs seems to be wavering, it is heartening to be reminded of dedicated human concern for the needs of many less fortunate fellow citizens. One person who has demonstrated such care and public service is Mrs. Ernest (Janice) Sivesind. Mrs. Sivesind recently retired after 30 years as Winneshiek County social services director in Iowa.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mrs. Sivesind has been helping people since 1944. She is an example of how a concerned and effective administrator can bring reality and achievement to a social service program. With a real interest in helping others, she has been able to alleviate many personal hardships and provide for the genuine needs of the citizens of Winneshiek County.

Mr. Speaker, Janice Sivesind retires with an outstanding record of service which I hope will be an example to many other administrators of social service programs now and in the future. I insert in the RECORD an article from the Cedar Rapids Gazette on Mrs. Sivesind's 30 years' experience in the social services field:

[From the Cedar Rapids Gazette, Jan. 14, 1973]

NE IOWAN HAS 30 YEARS OF DRAMATIC MEMORIES

(By L. Dale Ahern)

DECORAH.—When Mrs. Ernest (Janice) Sivesind retires Monday as one of northeast Iowa's most highly-respected social services directors, she will take home memories of nearly 30 years in the same office.

Janice, as she is familiarly known to hundreds of people in her home county of Winneshiek and throughout this section of Iowa, has had countless dramatic experiences with the people she has served since Jan. 1, 1944.

Her work as Winneshiek county social services director has endeared Janice to many, inspiring all who know her with admiration and esteem.

"Her deep concern for people's needs and her dedication to satisfying these," said Albert Quas, chairman of the local social services board, "have set her apart."

Among souvenirs she values most is a certificate presented recently by the Iowa governor, bearing these words:

"Presented with gratitude and appreciation to Janice N. Sivesind in recognition of long and meritorious service to the state of Iowa and for personal dedication to the welfare of the citizens of this state.—Robert D. Ray."

PEOPLE IN TROUBLE

Janice Sivesind's memories are shot through with poignant cases of human sorrow and suffering. She remembers many people in trouble.

She often thinks of the honest, hard-working citizens who fell into financial hardships from which they couldn't extricate themselves without help; the needy blind forced by circumstances beyond their control to look to social services for a ray of hope; the young, unwed mothers; the tragically forgotten old people; and many more.

And there are many people whose memories of Janice and her work are quickened by news that she will soon be stepping out of her familiar role. Among these is a young housewife-office worker, Mary Hall, and members of her family, Mr. and Mrs. Carl Nelson (both names fictitious).

Mary grew up on a farm in Winneshiek county, one of a family of six children. Her parents found the revenue from their operation scarcely adequate to supply the family's basic needs, and Carl couldn't get around without crutches because of a serious affliction of arthritis.

To add to their misery, a boy friend gave Mary a loaded drink one night and left her pregnant. Young Mary became despondent, and her parents, in desperation, began to talk about getting rid of the baby.

"Mary didn't want to marry the fellow," her mother said, "and he wasn't marriage-minded. He had three other girls in trouble."

A close friend suggested seeing Janice Sivesind. What followed is a classic example of professionalism with a heart.

NURTURED MORALE

Janice counseled Mary and her parents, took a vital personal interest, arranged for Mary to receive some ADC funds, and little by little nurtured the family's morale back to normal.

During this period Mary met Jonathan Hall (fictitious name), a young man who fell in love with her and accepted her condition. When Marietta was born, Jonathan was at the hospital to be near Mary.

At first Mary was not permitted to see her baby since plans were afoot to have the child adopted, but—as soon as Mrs. Nelson saw the youngster—she realized she couldn't part with her new grandchild. Mrs. Nelson then had a nurse carry the baby to Mary.

"When I told Mary we were going to keep the baby," the older woman said, "Mary laughed and cried simultaneously."

Today Mary Hall lives in another state with Jonathan, an insurance company representative and Marietta. Mary is happily busy keeping house while, at the same time, serving as a secretary in a government office.

"It would have been next to impossible," Mrs. Nelson said. "to have kept the family together without the guidance and help we received from Janice Sivesind. She restored our confidence and gave us hope."

"And we are so glad Janice saved Marietta for us. She is everybody's pride and joy."

Mary's case is an example of ADC achieving an admirable objective. The social service woman's files contain numerous similar cases and those that are just as striking in areas of old age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the disabled, foster care, and other fields of human rehabilitation.

LARGER STAFF

When Mrs. Sivesind began her work as Winneshiek county social services director in January, 1944, she ran her office with one other helper, a stenographer. Today the staff numbers five.

In the beginning the social services director did almost everything that had to be done. She personally conducted investigations into every application.

She visited with people in their homes; prepared social histories for her board and the court; made personal contact with dozens of individuals, institutions, and organizations in her efforts to establish whether requests were based on genuine needs; administered the best possible program of help in each case; and worked with the people in efforts to solve their problems.

Down through the years her personal touch distinguished Janice Sivesind's work. "Although we have about 70 of her people in our homes all the time," the Rev. Virgil Hougen, administrator of Aase Hagen Homes, Inc., said, "Janice has always taken a personal interest in each one, for relationship with the residents and members of our staff has been very fine."

"She not only worked with the people in their homes before they came here but has continued to follow up on their individual problems, visiting with them frequently after their arrival here."

DEDICATED TO HELPING

"With her, administering the programs of social services has not been merely an office job. She has been dedicated to helping people."

Among many who pay tribute to the high-calibre service of Mrs. Sivesind is Mildred Jacobsen, who has worked for the Winneshiek county social services director the last 25 years. "This is where I got my education," Mrs. Jacobson said.

"One of the things I learned from Janice is the importance of meeting deadlines, especially when people are in trouble and need help."

"She was very conscientious about doing everything on time. It was one of my jobs to assist her in keeping a daily schedule.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

No matter what she set out to do, Janice didn't let it die until it was done."

Miss Katherine Jewell, secretary of the Winneshiek county social services board the last 30 years, said, "I always found it a joy to work with Janice. I look back to the three decades I spent with her as the best years of my life."

"Janice puts so much meaning in the services performed by our social services office. It was as if each individual who came to her for help became her personal responsibility."

As she looked back over the many years she was involved in helping people through the various programs provided by social services, Mrs. Sivesind said, "My greatest satisfaction comes from recalling the happiness experienced by people who were able, through the help of our office, to rise above emergency problems that almost had them down."

Quass spoke warmly of the outstanding job Mrs. Sivesind did, handling details and in taking advantage of available funds to provide maximum services for the people of Winneshiek county. "Other counties," he said "have come to Janice for guidance in administering their programs."

It is no wonder James Gillman, commissioner of the state department of social services, wrote to Janice Dec. 21, 1972, as follows: "Your contributions to the welfare of Iowa citizens since 1942 makes us all very proud."

And it is no wonder Irene M. Smith, former chairman of the state department of social welfare, once called Mrs. Sivesind, "a most able representative of the best in public welfare."

FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR SCHOOLS OF PODIATRY

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) asked a question of the distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Mr. McCLELLAN, in order to clarify the intent of Congress regarding the expenditure of certain funds for health manpower programs. The effect of that colloquy was to make it clear that Congress intends that the so-called "mandated funds" be actually spent by the administration.

This will have a tremendous impact on schools of veterinary medicine, optometry, podiatry, and pharmacy. In order to clarify the impact of the proposed budget on schools of podiatry, I ask that an editorial from the upcoming issue of the *Journal of Podiatric Education* be inserted in the RECORD.

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

PRESIDENT'S PAGE

IMPACT OF PROPOSED BUDGET CUTBACKS ON SCHOOLS OF PODIATRY

The recent stunning news that the new proposed federal budget calls for a complete elimination of assistance to the colleges of podiatry requires that all of us set before the Congress the meaning of the cuts for the future of podiatric colleges and the future of podiatric medicine, itself. The effect would be the annual loss of over \$2 million to the schools.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PROMISES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The budget proposals raise once again the question of the federal government's credi-

bility and its intention to keep stated promises. In 1965, more strongly in 1968, and with greater intensity in 1971, the Congress and the Administration urged the schools of health to expand enrollment in response to American health manpower needs.

It was stated national policy that federal funds would subsidize this growth because it was acknowledged that the schools, themselves, could not assume the entire burden. Indeed, the Congress provided for and the Administration agreed to continually increased authorizations through 1974.

The colleges of podiatry responded by increasing enrollments at a rate even greater than the other health schools. The projected enrollment in colleges of podiatric medicine for the 1973-74 school year represents an increase of 41% over the comparable figures for 1968-69—proportionately higher than any other health profession.

NEED FOR PODIATRISTS WAS NEVER MORE EVIDENT

Over the past two decades, the number of active podiatrists has grown only slightly, increasing from 6,400 to 7,100, despite a growing need for podiatric services. During the 1960-70 period, there was virtually no growth in the number of active podiatrists, as the number of new graduates entering the profession was offset by deaths and retirements of active podiatrists.

The ratio of active podiatrists to population decreased from 4.2 per 100,000 in 1950 to 3.9 per 100,000 in 1960. It decreased further to 3.5 per 100,000 in 1970.

A Department of HEW study to be released shortly, however, projects the podiatry manpower need by 1980 of 15,000 active podiatrists. Studies also show that even with federal assistance at levels projected in 1970 legislation, there will be only 9,900 active podiatrists by 1980, a shortage of 5,100. Where will these additional health professionals come from without continued government support?

Two other important factors to be considered are:

(1) The average age of active podiatrists is greater than that of other health professionals. Thus, a greater proportion will be approaching retirement age soon, emphasizing the need for increased enrollments in podiatric schools to offset the losses.

(2) America's population over 65 years of age is growing rapidly, as is the ratio of that age bracket to the total population. In 1900, only 4.1% of the population was over 65; by 1960, 9.3%; and in 1970, 9.9%. Surveys show that the need for podiatric services in the over 65 age group is nearly double that of the under 65 age group.

NEED FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IS CRITICAL

Where can the colleges turn for the required assistance to prevent the closing of their doors? Those who have drawn up the proposed budget suggest that the deficiencies be made up from the following sources:

(1) *State Funds.* No, this is not possible. There are only five colleges of podiatry, located in California, Illinois, New York, Ohio and Pennsylvania. Over the last four years, freshman classes at these schools were comprised of students from almost every state (except Alaska, Hawaii, South Carolina and Wyoming). Obviously the schools are a national resource, and no state wants to support students from outside its jurisdiction.

(2) *Funds From Parent Institutions.* In the case of podiatry, there are no parent institutions from which to draw support. All five schools are free-standing, with no university affiliation.

(3) *Local Funds.* Since the great majority of students come from outside the local areas there is even less reason for local jurisdictions to lend financial support than there would be for states to do so.

(4) *Increased Tuition.* Those of us who work with students know that rapid rises

February 27, 1973

in tuition, in combination with the inflationary aspects of every student's life, have already placed a heavy financial burden on students and their families. Further increases would be counter-productive—higher tuition would mean fewer students, not more.

CONCLUSION

It is clear that the elimination of federal support from colleges of podiatric medicine would be a cruel blow to this vital health profession. It would mean the collapse of podiatric education and the negation of the great advances made in the field of podiatry over the last several years. We must take whatever steps are necessary to insure the survival of podiatric education and, indeed, podiatric medicine itself.

THE ASSOCIATION OF INDIANS IN AMERICA, INC.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite the attention of the House to the important work now being done by the Association of Indians in America, Inc. This nonprofit organization, the only organization of Indian immigrants now permanently residing in the United States, is one of the newest in that long line of associations which has done so much for the greatness of America. Like its forebears which guided the arrival of other immigrant groups to the United States, this organization is doing much to foster the ideals and spirit of America, while preserving ethnic identity.

The Association of Indians in America, Inc., has undertaken an important responsibility which demands our support and cooperation. As we all know, the Government of Uganda has ordered the deportation of its Asian population. Of the over 45,000 involved, we have done too little in America by accepting only 1,000 refugees to these shores. Additional efforts in this direction are needed and the association is doing its part in seeking an increase in the number of stateless Ugandan refugees allowed to come into the United States.

But of equal importance is the work of the association in making America a home for the 1,000 whom we have admitted. Under the leadership of their president, Dr. Roshan Chadda, its members are providing their fellow Asians with an "orientation program" on America. They are teaching their fellow immigrants how to enjoy the best of their culture and at the same time take part in their new communities.

I myself was privileged to receive a humanitarian award from the organization last October for my own "humanitarian efforts on behalf of the besieged Asians in Uganda."

On December 10, I was privileged to present a "statue of liberty" as a symbolic gift of welcome to the refugees who were able to attend a meeting of the association in New York.

The expulsion of the Asian Ugandans went almost too smoothly. Faced with the specter of so much potential suffering, as our colleagues know, I petitioned

the Departments of State and Justice to grant special parole status to 5,000 stateless Ugandan refugees. But much more must be done to alleviate the suffering of those who have not had the good fortune to arrive in America, and efforts must be made to bring more of them here.

SOCIAL SECURITY COULD TRIP NIXON

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article by Mr. Bruce Biossat which appeared in the Westerly Sun, a newspaper in my district. I think Mr. Biossat's editorial aptly describes the significant loss to effective administration that will result from the dismissal of Robert M. Ball, as Commissioner of Social Security.

Mr. Ball has proven himself to be a capable, innovative and highly respected administrator. To quote Mr. Biossat:

In casting him out, President Nixon has made a gross error in judgment.

The article follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY COULD TRIP NIXON

(By Bruce Biossat)

WASHINGTON.—President Nixon's dismissal of Robert M. Ball as commissioner of Social Security raises some serious questions about how to achieve and maintain skillful management in the government bureaucracy.

Since the agency has always been deemed to be off limits politically, it would be a bad slip if the President were to name a successor whose experience suggested he was less a qualified social insurance expert and more an out-and-out political appointee.

But, actually, that is the shallow, obvious aspect of the matter, easy to judge. There is a deeper issue.

Ball has headed the Social Security Administration for nearly 11 years, and for roughly an equal time before that he was deputy commissioner of SSA's predecessor agency. His entire working career falls within the social insurance realm.

Does this kind of service make a man go stale and leave him empty of new ideas?

There is a school of thought that would say yes, automatically. The proponents of this view contend that turnover at the top level should occur fairly frequently. The argument can be guessed. Change assures regular infusion of fresh ideas, new energies, flexibility. Men of long tenure, it is suggested, cannot fill this need.

The argument has undeniable plausibility. The woods are full of executives and administrators whose energies flag and whose imagination runs thin. Rigidity and complacency often set in all too quickly. Against this very real prospect, change—even systematic change—looks like a sound rule.

Yet there is a strong counter-argument put forth steadily in the field of public affairs. Its core is that there are always men with a great capacity for self-renewal, continuing growth, and adaptability to altered circumstances and problems. Such men not only can meet new challenges, but have a way of searching them out.

Here again, the contention has undoubted force. The corporate and government landscape is well dotted with figures whose long service in top posts is a consequence not of

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

power but of demonstrated abilities maintained through markedly changing times.

Proponents of this point argue, incontestably, that to dispense with or shift such leadership from its proved realm is to waste rare human resource, to deprive a society of commanding individuals who serve its institutions as a keystone holds an arch together.

Does Robert Ball deserve such an accolade as this? There are a good many men in the U.S. Congress and many practiced observers of public service performance who believe he does.

He has presided over Social Security during its transformation from an agency of modest scale to one of enormous size and increasing complexity, and seen it hailed as the best of bureaucracy. In 1965, he laid over it the huge framework of the Medicare program, a task reasonably pictured as one of the greatest peacetime administrative assignments in history. He is a tireless innovator who knows his field as he knows the lines in his hands.

In 1972, Congress handed SSA new challenges for 1973 and 1974. Everything in the record suggests Ball was the man above all to meet them. His expertise is unmatched, and at 58 his powers and talents seem undimmed. He is a public servant of genuine distinction. In casting him out, President Nixon has made a gross error in judgment.

THE HATCH ACT AND THE FIRST AMENDMENT

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, a recent Federal Bar Journal contained the following article on Federal employees, the Hatch Act, and the first amendment:

POLITICAL ACTIVITY

In a 2 to 1 decision a special 3-judge Federal district court declared 5 U.S.C. 7324(a)(2) unconstitutional. 5 U.S.C. 7324(a)(2) is the part of the Hatch Act that "prohibits Federal employees from taking an active part in political management and campaigns." The Act incorporated by reference the Civil Service Commission's pre-1940 determinations as to what activities constituted political management and political campaigning. The court was of the opinion that the above-quoted provisions of the Act are vague and overly broad when measured against the requirements of the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States; the prohibitions are worded in generalities and lack precision; and the Act is susceptible to sweeping and uneven application. While generally laudatory of the Civil Service Commission's enforcement of the Act, the court stated that "any conscientious public servant concerned for the security of his job and conscious of that latent power in his supervisor to discipline him . . . must feel continuously in doubt as to what we can do or say politically. The result is unacceptable when measured by the need to eliminate vagueness and overbreadth in the sensitive area of free expression." The court enjoined enforcement of the Act but, on its own volition, granted a stay of its order pending a final determination by the Supreme Court. For technical reasons the Court declined to apply its ruling to State and local employees who work in Federally funded programs and who are subject to similarly worded prohibitions.

National Association of Letter Carriers, AFL-CIO, et al. v. United States, No. 577-71 D.C. (3-Judge), July 31, 1972.

MRS. SULLIVAN INTRODUCES AND URGES CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON THE PANAMA CANAL AND CANAL ZONE RESOLUTION

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it is well known that I have always strongly opposed the ceding of any U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal to the Republic of Panama, or to anyone else. In the many years I have been associated with the Panama Canal as chairman of the Panama Canal Subcommittee and otherwise, I have long recognized the commercial and strategic importance of the canal and the related necessity of U.S. control of the zone.

In the beginning of this session of the 93d Congress, I introduced a resolution opposing the ceding of our indispensable sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal. In the intervening period of time, it became clear to me that the resolution I introduced needed changes and could be improved upon. With this end in mind, I made what I consider to be the necessary changes and the present resolution, which I am introducing here today, reflects my feelings on this critical matter.

Over the years, the people of the United States have invested over \$5 billion in the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Panama Canal. The strategic position of this artery of commerce, together with world politics and the behavior of the provisional nonconstitutional government of the Republic of Panama over the last several years, leaves me absolutely convinced that if we were ever to cede our sovereignty and jurisdiction over the 10-mile area of our territory on each side of the canal, it would leave the canal unprotected and vulnerable. This, of course, would be a totally undesirable and unacceptable development, since a viable, operative canal under the control and protection of the United States is necessary to the security of Panama, the Canal Zone, the Western Hemisphere, and the United States itself.

In all the circumstances, it is abundantly clear that if the United States were to surrender any of its sovereignty and jurisdiction in this volatile and strategic area, we would weaken, and finally destroy, our position. There is no way we could reasonably expect to exert our control over the operation of the Panama Canal or protect this commercial artery if we foolishly relinquish by negotiations or otherwise, our lawful rights, prerogatives, and jurisdiction. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing my new resolution, and I consider it my duty and obligation to do all within my power to assure a continued and unmitigated U.S. presence in the Canal Zone in order to protect the canal and its operations.

Following is the wording of the resolution introduced today:

H. RES. —

Whereas it is the policy of the House of Representatives and the desire of the people

of the United States that the United States maintain its indispensable sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal; and

Whereas under the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901 between the United States and Great Britain, the United States adopted the principles of the Convention of Constantinople of 1888 as the rules for the operation, regulation, and management of said canal; and

Whereas, by the terms of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 between the Republic of Panama and the United States, the Republic of Panama granted full sovereign rights, power, and authority in perpetuity to the United States over the Canal Zone for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal and to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority; and

Whereas under the Thomson-Urrutia Treaty of April 6, 1914, proclaimed March 30, 1922, between Republic of Colombia and the United States, the Republic of Colombia recognized that the title to the Panama Canal and Panama Railroad is vested "entirely and absolutely" in the United States which granted important rights in the use of the Panama Canal and Railroad to Colombia; and

Whereas from 1904 through June 30, 1971, the United States has made an aggregate net investment in said canal, including defense, of over \$5,695,745,000; and

Whereas said investment or any part thereof could never be recovered in the event of Panamanian seizure, United States abandonment of the canal enterprise, or under any other circumstances; and

Whereas under article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the United States Constitution, the power to dispose of territory or other property of the United States is specifically vested in the Congress; and

Whereas 70 per centum of Panama Canal traffic either originates or terminates in the United States ports; and

Whereas said canal is of vital strategic importance and imperative to the hemispheric defense and to the security of the United States as well as Panama itself; and

Whereas the December 1, 1970, report by the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission revives the entire canal situation, including surrender of the Canal Zone to Panama and operation of the Panama Canal by an interoceanic organization not subject to laws of the United States; and

Whereas the recommendations of said Commission would place the United States in a position of heavy responsibility without requisite authority and invite a takeover by Soviet power of the isthmus as occurred in Cuba, other Latin American countries, and at the Suez Canal; and

Whereas recent administrations of our Government have engaged in diplomatic negotiations with Panamanian Governments a prime purpose of which has been surrender of United States sovereignty over the Canal Zone to Panama. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Government of the United States should maintain and protect its sovereign rights and jurisdiction over said Canal Zone and Panama Canal and that the United States Government should in no way cede, dilute, forfeit, negotiate, or transfer any of these sovereign rights, power, authority, jurisdiction, territory, or property to any other sovereign nation or to any international organization which sovereign rights, power, authority, jurisdiction, territory, and other property are indispensably necessary for the protection and security of the United States and the entire Western Hemisphere, including the Canal and Panama.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INTRODUCTION OF SUBMERGED LAND BILL

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a measure which grants the American citizens of Guam and the Virgin Islands, and the residents of American Samoa, legal jurisdiction over their offshore land areas.

At present, all coast States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico have full title to their offshore land areas, which includes all lands permanently or periodically covered by tidal waters from the line of high tide outward to the 3-mile mark. Their governments and the citizens can do what they wish with the submerged areas lying off their shores, providing, of course, they comply with local and Federal environmental laws.

For the residents of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, however, the matter of building even a simple pier is a frustrating and needlessly complex matter. Legal jurisdiction over offshore areas in these islands lies not with local residents, but with faraway officials in the U.S. Department of the Interior. Should the governments of the aforementioned territories or any of their residents want to construct a structure extending outward from their shoreline, they must go through an incredible maze of bureaucratic technicalities and paperwork in order to gain official permission.

First, building permits and environmental clearances must be obtained from the local governments. Next, the Department of the Interior is petitioned for their official approval. Interior, however, cannot proceed until they have gained the sanction of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. As you can see, this cumbersome procedure is a deterrent factor to the utility of such areas if necessary for the economic development of the respective territories.

In the case of Guam, the resulting delay in getting permission to build is often years. I have in my office, for example, the permit application for one of my constituents, approved by our local government, that has been waiting for the Federal Government to act since last summer. And, the example I just cited is, unfortunately, all too commonplace.

Although most Federal officials involved in processing claims from our territories are eager to help, changing this system would be begging my main point. There is no moral or legal reason why the territories of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa should not have the same jurisdictional rights over their offshore areas as do the States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. To deny them his basic land right is patently unfair, and only results in burdening the already overworked Federal Government with additional paperwork they neither need nor want.

The measure which I introduced today would resolve this inequity by amending Public Law 88-183, an earlier act con-

February 27, 1973

veying certain limited submerged land areas to the territories, to give the territorial governments authority over all their submerged lands not needed for national defense. The American citizens of the territories are as capable as those in the States and Puerto Rico of managing their submerged lands. The time has come for Congress to remove this lingering trace of colonialism. I ask my colleagues for their support in our efforts to put an end to a system which has discriminated against their fellow Americans in Guam and the Virgin Islands, and the people of Samoa.

EYEGLASSES, HEARING AIDS, AND PRESCRIPTION DRUGS UNDER MEDICARE

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, many of our senior citizens are still unable to provide adequate health care for themselves or to meet the high cost of prescription drugs on the meager incomes which they now receive.

I have therefore reintroduced H.R. 276 which will go a long way toward helping our senior citizens bear the financial cost of illness which so often accompanies advancing age.

My bill provides that all prescription drugs not covered by medicare be made available at cost to persons on either part A or part B of medicare. In addition, it provides that hearing aids and eyeglasses be made available on the same wholesale basis by hospital dispensaries. Finally, the bill provides that drugs for medicare patients be prescribed on a generic rather than brand-name basis.

Making these drugs, hearing aids, and eyeglasses available to senior citizens at wholesale cost and at generic medicine cost rather than brand-name medicine cost will help substantially to reduce the total cost of drugs for the elderly.

My bill would also permit medicare participants to purchase these necessities from the Public Health Service, Veterans' Administration, and Hill-Burton assisted hospitals and clinics at wholesale prices.

The number of senior American citizens over age 65 is expected to exceed 25 million by 1985. In my own city of Chicago over the past decade the percentage of elderly persons in the 60 and over category has grown from 15 percent in 1960 to 15.3 percent in 1970. Today almost 10 percent of our population is elderly, and there are 20 million Americans in the senior citizen category. Of these, 17 million have no private protection whatsoever as far as prescription drugs are concerned.

Our senior citizens now spend 20 cents of their health care dollar on prescription medications. This amounts to about \$1 billion a year or 25 percent of our Nation's total outlay for prescription drugs. When we consider that many of our older people are living on minimal fixed incomes and that fully 25 percent of

them are living at or below the poverty line, then we cannot help but realize the terrible strain which high cost drugs, hearing aids, and eyeglasses must place on their limited financial resources.

For these urgent reasons, I commend this legislation to my colleagues and urge their assistance in the passage of this bill.

THE GOLD STAR WIVES

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced for appropriate reference legislation to incorporate the Gold Star Wives of America.

This national organization was established in 1945 by the widows of members of the Armed Forces who died while in active service of their country.

A growing, active organization, it today has more than 2,000 members in 49 States, with active chapters in more than half the States.

During the past Congress, I sponsored similar legislation which would have incorporated, within the District of Columbia, the Gold Star Wives. This measure was promptly approved by the House, but, following hearings in the Senate Judiciary Committee, was not further considered.

The Gold Star Wives, Mr. Speaker, have been seeking incorporation—a Federal charter—for many years. Because the House Judiciary Committee has refused to act on such legislation in the past, I decided to seek the District of Columbia incorporation last year, so the Judiciary Committee could be bypassed.

However, because the leadership of the organization strongly believes they should have a full Federal charter, I am sponsoring this legislation, which undoubtedly will be referred to the House Judiciary Committee.

Within the next few days, Mr. Speaker, I will be seeking co-sponsors of the Gold Star Wives bill. I hope many of my colleagues will join with me so that this worthy organization can have the full benefits of a Federal charter.

I know of no other group more deserving of national incorporation. Its membership is composed of women who have experienced the great anguish of losing their husbands through active duty in the Armed Forces of our Nation.

Their objectives are both praiseworthy and significant. What more valuable contribution to society can be made than to bolster the fortitude and uplift the spirits, as well as to aid materially, the widows and children of those who paid the supreme sacrifice in the interest of their fellow citizens?

Mr. Speaker, our colleague in the Senate, Mr. BAYH of Indiana, introduced identical legislation in the other body on Thursday, February 22. In his remarks, which can be found on pages 5131-5133 of the RECORD, he more fully explains the need for such a Federal charter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT ACCEPTS LAND DONATION FOR DISMAL SWAMP REFUGE

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, last week a very auspicious ceremony took place at the Department of Interior which I would like to bring to the attention of my esteemed colleagues in the House of Representatives. The occasion was the donation of over 49,000 acres of the Great Dismal Swamp by the Union Camp Corp., to the U.S. Government.

This is the single largest land donation ever made to the Government for historic and wildlife preservation, and I certainly commend the Union Camp Corp. for this excellent example of public responsibility.

Without further comment I would like to have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this news release prepared by the Department of Interior announcing the donation:

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT ACCEPTS LAND DONATION FOR DISMAL SWAMP REFUGE

Under Secretary of the Interior John C. Whitaker today accepted control over more than 49,000 acres of the Great Dismal Swamp in Virginia for a new national wildlife refuge—the largest single land donation ever made to the Government for wildlife conservation.

Dr. Whitaker, acting on behalf of Secretary Rogers C. B. Morton, received legal papers covering the transaction from top officials of the Union Camp Corporation, owner of the historic property for more than 60 years, and The Nature Conservancy, national land preservation organization which served as an unpaid middleman. The gift has an appraised value of \$12.6 million.

The Union Camp property comprises more than 70 square miles of heavily forested land, much of it once owned by George Washington, Patrick Henry and other prominent Virginians. It represents about 20 percent of the Swamp's total remaining acreage, and about half of the Swamp in Virginia; the remaining 60 percent of the Swamp is in neighboring North Carolina. The Swamp, overall, is less than one-third of its original size, owing to agricultural and residential development.

"To be able to receive a gift of this magnitude on behalf of the American people is a rare occurrence," Under Secretary Whitaker said at the ceremony at the Interior Department. "I can only hope this example set by the Union Camp Corporation will inspire other companies to follow suit, because the future of wildlife and wild lands in the United States is so closely tied to what owners of private land decide to do with their holdings."

Union Camp's board chairman, Alexander Calder, Jr., conveyed a 40 percent interest in the company's property to Everett M. Woodman, president of The Nature Conservancy, who immediately turned it over to the Interior Under Secretary. The company will make subsequent donations of its remaining interest in the land in 1974 and 1975 until the transaction is completed. Under U.S. tax laws, the company receives a deduction of the donated land's appraised value from taxable earnings over a period of several years. No significant timber harvesting has occurred on the property during the past quarter of a century.

In his remarks at the ceremony, the Un-

der Secretary cited the Nixon Administration's commitment to a better environment for all Americans, and cited progress achieved during the past four years.

Secretary Morton, in a message to participants at the ceremony, said "President Nixon has consistently challenged the American people to take personal responsibility for the preservation of our natural heritage and the quality of our environment. As he has repeatedly said, the job to be done requires the best efforts of government at all levels, and participation by every citizen. . . . The ceremony today demonstrates exactly the kind of private, voluntary action the President has called for. I salute Union Camp and The Nature Conservancy, and I pledge our utmost efforts to conserve this outstanding natural resource."

Situated within a few minutes' drive southwest of a major population center—the thriving Norfolk-Hampton Roads port and industrial complex—the Dismal Swamp contains forms of plant and animal life seldom seen elsewhere. For some it is the northern end of their range; a unique native species is the Dismal Swamp short-tailed shrew. Seventy-five species of birds nest in the Swamp, and one of the last native breeding populations of black bears in the East is there. Insects, fishes, frogs, mammals and a varied assortment of plants combine in a unique community.

At the heart of the Swamp, on the property being conveyed by Union Camp, is Lake Drummond, covering nearly 3,000 acres and roughly circular in shape. Its average maximum depth is only six feet, but these unusually pure waters are essential to the Swamp ecosystems.

Dr. Whitaker said the Interior Department, managing this new property through its Fish and Wildlife Service, will have as its prime objective the preservation and enhancement of natural values. "All management programs will be conducted to support this purpose and must be consistent with it," he said.

Although it is impossible to restore the Swamp to its pristine state, Dr. Whitaker said, the essentially natural character of the Swamp will be the basis for a detailed management plan to be developed within the next 18 months. Perhaps the highest priority will be assigned to how best to manage the area's waters, especially Lake Drummond.

Like all new refuges, the Dismal Swamp National Wildlife Refuge henceforth is closed to public uses until specifically opened to those uses, the Under Secretary emphasized. He said consideration would be given to limited hunting and fishing which would be consistent with the purpose of the refuge system. But existing cabin sites and hunt club facilities in the refuge will be terminated, since Federal law prohibits exclusive private use of any lands within national wildlife refuges.

Scientific investigations, environmental education, and means for interpretation of the natural scene will be encouraged. Off-road vehicles will be prohibited, but some boating for recreation probably will be permitted when the management plan is complete.

PRESIDENT LYNDON JOHNSON

HON. PHIL M. LANDRUM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 1973

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, the genius of leadership is manifest in a variety of talents. Some leaders are aggressive; others are benevolent and kind. Some are ideological; others are prag-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

matic. Some lead by superior intelligence and others through pure inspiration, and sometimes one leads with sheer, boundless physical energy.

Our history is replete with names of great leaders who possessed one or more of such talents. Of the 35 other Presidents who have served our Nation, each of them certainly had a large share of these personal traits. But no one, in my judgment, possessed all of these qualities to the degree of President Lyndon Johnson.

He was able to identify the problems of the ordinary American because he was an ordinary American, but he had the extraordinary capacity to lead whether he was on the banks of the Pedernales with the one-room school teacher of his boyhood or at the highest level of our society with industrial giants, ministers of foreign governments and all of the potpourri that is the human element of governments.

Certainly he made mistakes. Like the shortstop who goes after every ball hit in his direction, one comes along occasionally that no one, however capable, can field. But in identifying our problems and offering solutions as he saw them, he not only demonstrated his great powers of discernment and superb qualities of leadership, but he pointed up the human weaknesses characteristic of a nation of free people and through this made tremendous contributions toward the identification and improvement of our problems and the strengthening of the fibers that go to make us what we are.

Some say it is too early to judge his accomplishments, but I say that it is better for his contemporaries to judge by what he did and what he caused us to do than it is to leave it to history. Lyndon Johnson was a restless, concerned citizen, a splendid Congressman, a superb Senator and leader of that body, an extremely helpful and cooperative Vice President and, in terms of leading our Nation to recognize its problems and move toward their solutions, Lyndon Johnson was a great President.

This is our judgment now, and history can certainly do no less.

FREEDOM HAS A PRICE

HON. ALAN STEELMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is an unfortunate, accepted fact that, in this time when freedom in the United States is at its maximum, careful consideration and respect for these freedoms are at a minimum. In order to encourage the appreciation of America by her youth, the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge sponsors an annual essay contest.

This year's first-prize winner is Keener Meredith of Dallas, Tex. His essay, entitled "Freedom Has a Price," is an excellent example of a thoughtful appreciation of American freedom. I

would like to have his essay inserted in the RECORD:

FREEDOM HAS A PRICE
(By Keener Meredith)

Freedom has a price. It is not something that is inherited, but is something that is bought. To me, the price of freedom is self-control and discipline. Without discipline a boxer could seldom win, a football team would often lose, and an army could never fight. If something as basic as a diet requires discipline for it to succeed, it should follow that something as complicated as procuring and securing one's freedom should require far greater forms of self-control.

When a society loses its self-control, it becomes necessary for some power to control the society, and it is then that the power of the people to govern themselves is lost.

Through self-control Americans first gained their freedom. Though sickness, hunger, and fatigue in the perpetual cold of Valley Forge and the dirt on Bunker Hill were the immediate prices paid for freedom, individual self-control made us victorious. Without the discipline to endure the hardships, we most certainly would have lost the battles.

The self-control of a society dictates the degree of independence of its people. Americans today must be willing to discipline themselves if they are to perpetuate their freedoms, for self-control is the price of freedom.

DR. JAY M. ARENA ADVANCES CAUSE OF CHILD SAFETY IN UNITED STATES

HON. IKE F. ANDREWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, the Council on Family Health released a new booklet entitled, "The Care and Safety of Children," which is of special concern to me. The author of the book is Dr. Jay M. Arena, former president of the American Academy of Pediatrics, and professor at Duke University Medical Center. As a practicing pediatrician for over 35 years and himself the father of seven children, Dr. Arena has made it his life's work to enlarge public knowledge about the accidents and illnesses which strike our children and bring unwanted pain and tragedy to all involved.

In this new booklet, Dr. Arena provides parents with answers to such problems as what they can do to help avert the tragedy of crib death—sudden infant death syndrome—how to protect toddlers from toxic chemicals and misuse of medicines in the home, and how to teach children to understand the meaning of danger.

When one realizes that accidents are the leading cause of death in children under 15, claiming more victims each year than all six leading fatal diseases combined, it is clear that Americans need to know more about safeguarding the lives of our children. This year 4,000 children under 4 years of age will die from home accidents, and one child in three will be injured seriously enough to require medical attention.

Because Dr. Arena has become one of

February 27, 1973

the Nation's leading authorities on this problem, his findings have gone far beyond his own medical practice and the medical campus at Duke, where he is professor of pediatrics and community health services. In 1965, he wrote a major book, "Dangers to Children and Youth," and has also written many other articles.

Dr. Arena is keenly aware of the major role of parental concern and in the new pamphlet cites the ways parents must be vigilant. For instance, he notes that hunger or fatigue generally make children more susceptible to accidents. A sudden change in family environment, or even tension between parents, can also contribute to accidents. Dr. Arena also points out how parents can recognize the telltale signs of a trouble-prone adolescent.

Dr. Arena has served in many posts of high distinction. He is a past president of the American Association of Poison Control Centers and is currently a member of the Council on Family Health's Medical Advisory Board. But I am sure that he would consider it his highest honor to be known simply as a man who wants to help children and their parents.

The Council on Family Health, sponsored as a public service by the manufacturers of medicines, is currently distributing this booklet to health and safety organizations throughout the country. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to bring this effort to the attention of my colleagues and to salute Dr. Arena in his goal of making life safer for our children.

COMPENSATING AUTHORS FOR THE USE OF THEIR BOOKS BY LIBRARIES

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to establish a commission to study the feasibility and the possible methods of compensating authors for the use of their books by libraries. Such "lending royalties," if found appropriate by the commission, would be provided by the Federal Government.

At present, there would seem to be an inequity which authors face; although a copy of his book may be read by hundreds of people who borrow it from their library, he receives only one royalty when the copy is purchased by the library.

Several European countries have recognized this inequity and have instituted a system of paying authors lending royalties. Great Britain is now studying the establishment of such a system.

The commission shall include the Librarian of Congress and 10 other members, who will report back to Congress and the President within 18 months from the date of enactment of this bill.

In making the study, the commission is authorized to evaluate the systems presently in effect in Sweden and Den-

mark and to consider all questions on feasibility and methods which could be set up to compensate authors for the readership of their books. If found feasible, the commission would be expected to study avenues of financing the lending royalties—whether, for instance, funds should be channeled through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Library of Congress, the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, or another unit.

I commend this bill to the attention of my colleagues.

WE NEED BRAINPOWER

HON. DAN DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, it is already obvious that most of the work during the current session of Congress will involve budgetary matters. The recommendations made by the administration in an attempt to balance the budget are farreaching. The committees of Congress have a responsibility to evaluate and analyze these recommendations to bring forth a legislative budget which will preserve our economy and at the same time, provide the means for carrying out the necessary Government programs.

Many fine articles and columns have been written on this problem but none that I have seen grasps the problem or sets the tone more cogently than that of an editorial which appeared in the February 8 edition of the Lynchburg News of Lynchburg, Va. This editorial entitled "We Need Brainpower" strikes at the heart of the problem which, in my opinion, will become in future years even greater than it is today, unless something is done to change the present system.

We simply cannot continue to spend and spend without there being a day of reckoning. The capacity of our people to sustain greater taxation is obviously limited and it is high time that the best minds in this Nation be brought together to deal with this gigantic problem.

What the Hoover Commission accomplished two decades ago in simplifying certain functions of the Government now needs to be applied to the process of budget making.

I include the editorial herein with my remarks and commend it to the reading of the Members of the House:

WE NEED BRAINPOWER

Last year President Nixon asked the Congress to impose a \$250 billion ceiling on Federal expenditures. The Congress angrily refused.

This year the President has submitted a budget calling for \$268.7 billion in Federal expenditures. This represents \$12.7 billion more than anticipated revenues. It is nearly \$19 billion more than the ceiling the Congress rejected last year. Nevertheless, this Congress has been denouncing the President for ignoring the "needs" of America.

Since 1932 the Congresses of the United States have attempted to solve the problems

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

of the country by spending vast sums of money. When they ran out of money, they raised taxes. When they did not dare to raise taxes any higher, they began borrowing. After 40 years of this spend, borrow, spend philosophy, the Congress has committed the people to a debt of over \$400 billion, with a yearly interest rate of more than \$20 billion. During those 40 years the Congress has spent several hundred more billions on welfare state schemes.

The result: not a single major problem has been alleviated, let alone solved. Not a one. The problems have, in fact, grown larger and more demanding. And the deficit spending of the Congress has created problems of its own, including inflation. The demand for welfare is on the increase. Crime infests the entire country. There is a breakdown in law and order and social mores. There is warfare in the streets. The public education system has deteriorated. The court system is virtually paralyzed. There is widespread distrust of government. During those 40 years the nation has fought three wars, winning one, tying one and now losing one. Its defense ability has been drastically weakened. Its trade balance is the worst in history.

Such is the record of the U.S. Congress during the past 40 years. It obviously has come up with no workable answers in its spend, borrow, spend philosophy.

The only thing that will help solve our problems is brains.

The greatest service Richard Nixon could render his country on the domestic front in this his second and last term would be to go to the people with this message:

"We cannot solve our social and economic problems with money."

"We must solve them with brainpower."

"We must impose realistic ceilings on governmental expenditures—Federal, state and local."

"We must cut our expenses to come under these ceilings, meaning we must balance our budgets. As the economy expands, we must use the excess to pay off our debts."

"We must marshal the best brains in the country and apply them to solving our problems within the framework of the capitalistic, free-enterprise economic system."

We doubt that Mr. Nixon is ready to go that far. We know the Congress won't even listen. It is already demanding a budget for next year with an even larger deficit. It is calling for more programs which are designed to take money from those who work and give to those who are not as affluent. Take from the haves and give to the have-nots, regardless of why they have not. . . .

The inevitable result of this philosophy of looting the people will be, as we can see, Federal seizure of private industry and property. Inevitable.

This is the philosophy of Socialism, described by Winston Churchill once as "the philosophy of failure, the credo of ignorance, and the creed of envy."

Such has been its harvest wherever tried. Such will be its harvest here. The Congress, controlled by Socialists masquerading as "liberals" in both parties, is committed to imposing the system upon this country, and destroying the capitalist, free-enterprise system which has made the country rich and strong and free. They hate those words, the Socialists, and are determined to banish them from America. They would, as De Tocqueville noted long ago, "rather be equal in slavery than unequal in freedom."

The Congress has demonstrated that it is irresponsible and unresponsive. The only solution it proposes for problems is to spend money. We need brainpower. We're not getting it and there is no indication from Washington that we are likely to get it. The alternative is more of the same—debt, distrust and deterioration.

ONCE THEY HAVE SEEN THEIR TAX BILL, HOW YOU GONNA KEEP 'EM DOWN ON THE FARM?

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, most of us in the Congress are aware of the rate at which families are giving up their farms. Not everyone is aware, however, of the amount of acreage which is converted from agricultural use to other uses each year. Recreational or second-home developments, highways, and spreading suburbia all take their toll of productive farmland.

According to an article in the New York Times of January 28, the State of New York is now taking action to provide farmers with some consideration of the realities of land values. Although a piece of land may be very valuable for other uses its farmer-owner may not even consider selling, no matter what the profit possibilities are. Thus, through high tax assessments or rates based on these other potential uses, some of our Nation's farmers are being forced off their land.

We in the Midwest do not face quite the same pressures on our land but this developing policy approach should be given consideration for its beneficial side effects.

Speaking of side effects, Mr. Speaker, I might point out to my ecologically conscientious colleagues that this program deserves consideration for its benefits in that area, too, as the article points out, as follows:

ZONING TO PRESERVE FARMS GAINS MOMENTUM IN STATE

(By Harold Faber)

ALBANY, January 27.—A program to preserve farmland in New York State by forming agricultural districts, with special zoning regulations and possible tax benefits for farmers, is gathering momentum upstate.

So far, 35 districts covering 300,000 acres have been organized by local farmers from Dutchess County west to Erie County and north to Washington County. Of these, 14 districts are fully approved and operational, while the 21 others are awaiting final approval.

In addition, dozens of other districts are in the process of being organized all over the state to take advantage of the Agricultural Districting Law, passed by the State Legislature in 1971, in an attempt to preserve farming as a major industry and a way of life in the state.

State officials expect that 700,000 additional acres of farmland will come under the protection of the new law when all the districts now contemplated are operational.

As an indication of the mortality rate in New York farms, the number has dropped to 56,000 this year, down 3 percent from 10 years ago. The acreage under cultivation this year totals 11.4 million acres, down from 14 million acres in 1961.

HEARINGS ON TAX RATES

In an attempt to ease the tax burden on farmers, the state is also preparing new assessment rates for farms. The new rates will vary in different parts of the state and for different farm uses. For example, the rate for pasture land may be different from that for orchards.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The new assessment rates will be presented by the State Board of Equalization and Assessment at a series of public hearings throughout the state in February. When the rates are adopted, it will be up to local assessors to apply them, hopefully before the new assessment rules are made up in May or June.

"In the next 10 years, agricultural districts will help keep a lot of fellows in farming," according to William Prendergast, the Cooperative Extension Service agent in Middletown. "It's our only hope; otherwise, we are licked."

As an example of the problems farmers face, he cited the case of an Orange County dairy farmer whose tax went up from \$4,000 to \$18,000 this year.

"He paid it this year," Mr. Prendergast said, "but what he'll do next year we don't know."

RESPONSE GROWING

Farm officials here were enthusiastic about the response of farmers to the Agricultural Districting law.

"It's snowballing," William E. Bensley, executive director of the Agricultural Resources Commission, said here recently.

Mr. Bensley, a former dairy farmer who is now at the center of the drive for the districts, added: "we anticipated a lot more friction than we have."

Frank E. Walkley, Commissioner of Agriculture, who introduced the bill in the State Assembly when he was a member of that body, said that districts were important to the maintenance of agriculture in the state, but added that other forms of assistance would be needed, too.

Henry L. Diamond, Commissioner of Environmental Conservation, said that creation of agricultural districts was important to all the people of the state, farmers and non-farmers.

"Maintaining these lands as healthy and productive farmland that benefits the environment for us all," he said.

The attempt to preserve farms upstate is taking a different form than in Suffolk County, where the County Executive recently announced a plan to buy farmland, threatened by land developers and speculators, and lease it out to farmers who use it.

One of the reasons for the different approach is that farms upstate are not as yet threatened as those in Suffolk County, where the value of farmland for housing or commercial use may range from \$5,000 to \$15,000 farms for \$1,000 an acre, although the price an acre. It is still possible to buy upstate is rising each year.

In Suffolk County, Daniel H. Fricke, the Cooperative Extension Service agent in Riverhead, questioned the district plan for his own county. He said the loss of flexibility for farmers in an agricultural district made it impractical for adoption in Suffolk, with its high land prices.

Aside from weather, natural calamities and rising costs, farmers in New York are faced by the triple-barreled threat of rapidly rising prices of land, reassessments based on non-farm uses and a consequent increase in real-estate taxes.

The heart of the tax problem in farm areas is the assessment, which by law is supposed to be what a willing buyer will pay a willing seller. In other words, according to local assessors, if an operational farm could be sold for a real-estate development, it should be taxed at the higher development rate.

The new law tries to solve that problem by making it possible for farmers within districts and, under complicated rules, for other farmers to apply for the agricultural assessment, if he commits himself to maintain the property as a farm.

If a farmer with lower tax rates sells his land for nonfarm purposes, he is subject to roll-back taxes for the preceding five years.

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, recently my principal appointment to the Air Force Academy for 1973, a young gentleman named Joseph Niemeyer, was selected as the winner of the Veterans of Foreign Wars' Voice of Democracy Contest for Rhode Island. He will now be competing in the national competition, which annually awards a \$10,000 scholarship to the winner.

This year's contest theme was "My Responsibility to Freedom." I think the veterans are to be commended for proposing such an important theme, one which recognizes an essential element of our democratic government.

In his essay, Joseph has presented an eloquent explanation of the relationship between the maintenance of personal freedoms and the protection of the common good. Mr. Speaker, I include Joseph's essay in the RECORD at this point:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

(By Joseph Niemeyer)

I am fortunate to have freedom. All Americans want to be free, so we have established a government that recognizes human rights—a free government which encompasses the essential freedoms and allows them to be implemented to the wishes of the individual.

Yet this feature is based on an important aspect of United States government which says that the success of our system is dependent on the success or failure of individuals, like myself, in completing our duties. The guarantee given me to live without interference is thus dependent on the cornerstone of personal duty. The continuance of the American ideal of freedom is only possible if there is a full recognition of the close connection between liberty and the responsibility of performing our basic duties in the way most beneficial to the common good.

My first responsibility to freedom is the protection of my basic rights. Nearly every day we are confronted with threats to our freedom. We can see this in the way we are at times branded with faceless numbers and monitored by electronic devices. They are not always so evident. But our duty is to see that subversive or destructive forces against liberty are controlled. A good point in this respect, is our duty to prevent the abuse of common rights, such as freedom of speech and freedom of the press. On a personal level, I should attempt not to infringe on others rights through enforcing opinions or creating disturbances through my own rights of speech and expression. We should also be conscious of preventing the abuse of the basic rights of others. My responsibility is to protect the rights of the common man to live life as he wishes and be unrestricted in pursuing his goals. Freedom is the guarantee of rights, the right to move about unrestricted, the right to have a different opinion. The protection of human rights is thus essential and equivalent to the protection of freedom.

I am secondly responsible to protect the ideals of our government. For, in fact, freedom stands on the ideals presented in the Constitution; our blueprint of government. This I can do by seeing that judicial precepts and Constitutional principles of property and life are upheld. Maintaining the fairness of our court system is a good example in this instance. The United States

February 27, 1973

government is the most equitable in terms of respect for human freedom yet devised, but it will fall apart if its basic principles aren't upheld. It is not only my duty to protect rights but just as important to protect the highly principled machinery that backs it up.

My third major responsibility to freedom is in engendering a quality in the character of America worthy of possessing freedom and able to protect it. Many a nation has fallen because of internal corruption. The fall of the Greek and Roman empires are testimonies of this fact. Only a people of high moral standing and disciplined character are capable of maintaining a free democracy. The responsibility of young people, like myself, is to learn to discipline ourselves for future decisions and actions. This entails learning respect for private property and developing a sensibility in actions that might involve others. Parents must take the responsibility of creating a home atmosphere instructive in Christian morals and respect for human life. High attributes of character are essential to the American attribute of freedom.

I have many responsibilities to freedom. Responsibility to my rights, to democracy, and to my fellow man are essential to maintaining freedom. Responsibility is the key to freedom, and freedom the essence of life.

EARLY ACTION ON POW BILL
NEEDED

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am joining with several of my colleagues today in introducing a bill to aid our returning POW's. These brave men have been welcomed home with glad hearts by their families, friends, and communities. All of us who sat and watched on television were moved to see them step on American soil and hear their thanks and praise of America. There are many offers of assistance to them and the respective branches of the services seem to be doing all they can in aiding the adjustment of these men. Private firms and companies are also making discreet efforts to make their welcome home enjoyable and rewarding.

We will be seeing many legislative approaches to aid these men and I am sure all of them deserve serious consideration. I believe, however, that one of the earliest steps we must take is that proposed in the bill we are offering today. We have learned that after World War II our returned POW's were subject to an unusually high death rate in the years immediately following their release. The relationship between imprisonment and life expectancy having been established, Mr. Speaker, it would be inappropriate for the Congress not to act. If these men wish to retire from the military and pursue careers in private life they should be able to do so without having to sacrifice additional years or possible benefits for their families. Our bill would allow an additional day's credit toward retirement for each day spent in the hands of their captors.

I should point out that this legislation, while directed at our Vietnam POW's

would also accrue to the benefit of those held in both World Wars and Korea. Also it is in no way intended to propel these men toward early retirement if they do not wish to leave the armed services. Some men will desire to stay in as long as their health and other personal factors allow, and I was made well aware of that this weekend when I saw an article which said that one officer had been caught by his wife talking to his detailer here in the Navy's Bureau of Personnel about assignment aboard an aircraft carrier. The men who want to go on serving will be allowed to do so notwithstanding the effects of this bill.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation has been approved by the National League of Families of American POW/MIA's and I believe it is an appropriate step we can take soon to aid these brave and unselfish men and their families.

**VOICE OF DEMOCRACY
CONTEST**

HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as most of the Members of this body are aware, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conducts a voice of democracy contest.

It is my understanding that this year almost a half million secondary school students participated in the contest and competed for five national scholarships awarded as the top prizes. The theme of this year's contest was "My Responsibility To Freedom."

I am very proud to be able to insert for the readers of daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD proceedings the winning speech from the Commonwealth of Kentucky—not only for its attention-getting style and contents, but because the First Congressional District is justly proud of its author, John Paul Goode, route 1, Cadiz, Ky., 42211.

I feel that everyone privileged to read John's remarks will receive the same lift that I did in knowing that tomorrow is in good hands when we recognize the responsible, patriotic attitude evidenced by such students as those participating in the voice of democracy annual contest:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

When the sun climbed over the trees that summer day nearly 200 years ago, the American colonists had no idea they were about to employ me in their business of the day. With the reading of the Declaration of Independence, I was put on the payroll of the "freedom industry", which was called the United States of America.

My job in this unique factory of freedom is simple. It is the same job as that of every American. Even though it's small, it is vital to the welfare of America. The task is keeping "My Responsibility to Freedom".

As the sun of freedom shines on me it helps remind me of the many ways to maintain my inherited freedoms. First, obedience and reverence for God. Our main reason to colonize the New World was to have the freedom to adore God and to live with the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

inalienable rights cited in the Declaration of Independence. To maintain freedom there must be respect for the laws of God, who granted freedom to these United States.

The vast resources of America are illuminated by the light of democracy, so I must have respect for the laws of nature. I am only as free as the land I live on. To abuse the forests and rivers of my country is a sin against my ancestry. Our freedom to use America's resources is a God-given privilege which is in danger of being denied simply because we are careless with nature's gifts.

Inscribed of the Statue of Liberty are these words by Emma Lazarus. "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, . . ." This means America is a land with freedom for all people. The sun shines equally for all the different races, creeds and sexes. It shows our many hatreds and prejudices which harm our country and shows that we must have respect for the rights and beliefs of others.

Obedience, reverence and respect for God, nature and my fellow man. These are the responsibilities in maintaining freedom.

For 200 years the rays of liberty have helped light our darkest parts of the world. Now the light shines on me. Out of the shadow I cast comes the question. . . . "What can I do now and in the future to preserve freedom?"

I have yet to experience all the many treasures of liberty. When I am endowed with the privilege to vote, I will respect it and expedite its potential.

I may someday be called upon to defend my country, to sacrifice my life for the ideals of democracy.

It will also be my duty to render tribute to my government in the form of taxes to further the goals of freedom.

Right now, I can be active in community and city affairs which is a duty to my country too.

This world is made of leaders and followers. I am too young to be a leader of great importance so I must be the best follower that my abilities enable me to be.

All these will help assure prosperity for liberty now and in the future.

The sun of freedom lights the road to better citizenship that we all must follow. For when I reach the age that others look to me for their example, I must have the knowledge to act wisely with respect for all freedoms.

An understanding of my government and the democratic way of life is essential, along with knowledge about other nations. I must read, research, experience, analyze, compare and question my surroundings. Only by dissecting my privileges of freedom can I increase my appreciation for it. With an increased appreciation comes a burning desire to keep freedom alive for all to share and enjoy, a desire like the revolutionary soldiers had in their fight against tyranny. It will prepare me for more productive citizenship.

It is now the twilight of my childhood. Now the sun announces the dawning of a new citizen. As I am launched into the space age of democracy I am comforted with the assurance that I will do my best to preserve the sunlight of freedom. I will uphold my responsibility to freedom both now and in the future. I will give tomorrow the opportunity to be better than today.

**MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—
HOW LONG?**

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, for more than 3 years, I have reminded my col-

leagues 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?"

CONGRESS SHOULD RESIST

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress are now engaged in a highly visible and dramatic struggle against the encroachment of the executive branch in an effort to regain our rightful control over the Federal budget. The President has carefully orchestrated his attacks on the legislative branch; his charges that we have abdicated our fiscal responsibility have received the widest press coverage.

But it is not in the nature of this body to fight for fighting's sake against the President, and in fact, the many instances in which he has received our cooperation are now all but forgotten.

We are willing to cooperate with a President whose action has the support of the American people, but we cannot allow this President or any branch of Government to run roughshod over the Constitution, grabbing power from the Congress—and ultimately from the people.

When the President said in his last news conference that he is more representative of the people, because he is the only person in Washington elected by all of the American people, he was mocking the very concept of democracy. We in this House stand closest to the people. We know their needs and desires, and we have been most effective in serving them.

I believe the challenge we face now will prove to be the most crucial issue of the 93d Congress.

There has been much written on this

subject, but I wish to insert here an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of February 8, 1973, which I found contains a new perspective on this serious issue:

CONGRESS SHOULD RESIST

President Nixon cannot really complain, as he wages his battle with Congress over the spending power of government, that he has been shortchanged by the Legislature in those national decisions which have most mattered.

Despite their own turbulence of conscience over Vietnam, the men of Capitol Hill supported the President every time the issue went to the mat. His hands were never really tied by a war-spending freeze, by an imposed get-out date, or by serious interference in the peace negotiations.

Similarly, on the economic front, Congress gave President Nixon full authority to deal with the domestic inflation crisis and followed him through the tightmoney, higher unemployment recessionary stage and through the first three phases of wage and price controls. Congress also has given the President his head in international monetary and trade matters.

Thus the President cannot say that in the largest issues of American deportment as a world military and economic power, he has been thwarted by Congress.

Challenged yes. But in the face of his actual initiatives, the criticisms and questionings of Congress have been mere nettles.

On the domestic side, the situation has been somewhat different. Welfare reform, water-pollution control, a budget ceiling—these have put the President and Congress into a fray where there is as yet no winner. But in these matters, there is no particular reason the President should expect or have an easy time of it.

We have pointed out before that the visitor to Washington notice how the incoming arterial streets are keyed on Capitol Hill, not on the White House. Congress, for all the recent aggregation of power to the executive branch, remains the branch of government most central to the concept of American representative democracy.

This representative branch is especially important now when the United States, after Vietnam, seeks to repair the brokenness of its institutions, to recover from a serious unease, a feeling that more change is coming before the dust of recent disruptive change has settled.

America needs a viable, responsive Congress at this moment in its history. It is thus encouraging to see Congress finding a sense of itself in recent days. The 64 to 17 vote on Monday in the Senate, requiring Senate confirmation of key White House budget-planning officers, found 14 Republicans crossing over to join the Democratic majority. In such important areas as determining the structure of the American budget, Congress should not merely flop over on its back and let the White House have its way but should fight determinedly for whatever authority it can hold to.

There is a danger in the current contest over the impounding of funds and other spending issues. This is that it could serve the White House's purpose to keep the imbroglio going. The White House's budgetary plan is based on central government stasis. One can agree that a pruning of many programs is in order, and see the White House's side. And yet the social situation in America is in many ways grave. In the last election we saw again a staying away from the polls by many citizens—particularly the poorest and the urban minorities who constitute the most flammable threads of the social fabric. The last election was as much characterized by cynicism on the part of the voter as it was by any mandate for the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Republican President in international affairs, or the Democrats of Congress domestically.

Americans need to revive their hope that government can affect their lives for the better. Why bother to vote for congressional candidates if a legislature is impotent—if Congress is a mere ratifier of presidential initiative?

A fortunate irony could be, of course, that the White House's impounding of funds and other power maneuvers could galvanize Congress and hasten its revival. But if Congress is found wanting and fails to put up a good fight, then the American democracy will be in a bad plight indeed.

Hopefully, the contest between President and Congress is a sign of governmental vitality, not a signal to the rest of the world of an erosion of American purpose and identity.

CONGRESS—A DECLINING INSTITUTION IN AMERICAN POLITICS

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to discuss with my colleagues the role of Congress in the 1970's. Many people believe that Congress is a declining institution—powerless before the vast technology and authority which modern Presidents possess.

They say that to a great extent the congressional protest against the Vietnam war was an exercise in futility—that it did not stop the President from sending troops to Laos, from invading Cambodia or bombing North Vietnam.

They predict that Congress will not stand up to its present challenge, in which the President has assumed the power to cut off funds for social and environmental programs approved by Congress and passed into law.

They contend that Presidents from Jefferson to Nixon have gradually usurped the warmaking power and budget authority of Congress.

Truman, for instance, did not seek congressional approval when he cut back on Air Force spending, or when he sent troops to Korea. Nor did Johnson, when he withheld part of the housing and urban development funds or when he adroitly reinterpreted the Gulf of Tonkin resolution as his mandate to escalate the Vietnam war.

What then is wrong, they ask, with President Nixon bypassing Congress in the Cambodian invasion, bombing Vietnam without consulting Congress, and setting up a "lasting structure of peace" on a budget that swells the military coffers to over \$80 billion while slashing funds for housing, health, education, public service employment, and economic development for low-income communities? One difference is that over 80 percent of the Nixon budget cuts hit the poor and disadvantaged, and neither Truman nor Johnson discontinued programs authorized by the U.S. Congress.

The invasion of Cambodia, was based on a theory of defensive war so elastic that a President could, on his own initia-

February 27, 1973

tive, invade any country housing troops that might conceivably be used to attack American troops. I fear that this same logic could also justify a first-strike nuclear attack against a country solely on the basis of military hypotheticals and imperatives.

What alarms many of us today is the unilateral imposition of one man's sense of priorities. His budget proposes more for defense than at any time since World War II at the expense of programs designed to help the poor, the sick, and disadvantaged.

These actions reflect not so much an institutional crisis of power, but a silencing of the people, as Presidential tyranny leads to benign neglect and indifference.

When Nixon decided to close down the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Community Action Agencies, he destroyed a remarkably successful effort to open the political and institutional process to the poor and minority who have always been denied access to power and representation.

Can we possibly believe that a White House bureaucracy will be more responsive to the needs of the people than community boards which guarantee their participation? Can we possibly believe that we are better served by decisions reached by Presidential fiat than those which require congressional and community approval?

It appears that Presidential impoundment asserts an absolute right to determine national priorities and withhold funds for congressionally approved programs.

Recently a freeze was imposed on new housing construction and redevelopment on grounds that some of the programs were wasteful. Certainly our housing policy should be reviewed and revised. But an arbitrary freeze will not solve our housing crisis—it will only perpetuate substandard living conditions for millions of poor and elderly Americans.

Freezes, moratoriums, and cutbacks for appropriated programs do not represent a positive, sound approach but a regressive one. As long as the President can impound at will, he is able to impose his own priorities on Congress and the people.

For example, the President has decided to close down the Office of Economic Opportunity and appoint Howard Phillips to preside over its burial. Mr. Phillips says he relishes his role as destroyer, calling OEO a "Marxist notion" which treated the poor "as a class apart." These remarks clearly distort the real purpose of the economic opportunity program which was to bring the poor and minority into society's mainstream.

The administration's phaseout of OEO will not alleviate poverty nor will it increase citizen participation. But it will strangle the only visible and responsive advocate that low-income people have had in the Government. By ignoring the evidence of discrimination and poverty, the administration is, in reality, perpetuating a class and elitist system in America.

Benign neglect is also reflected in the proposed manpower cutbacks which would eliminate the public service pro-

gram for some 280,000 unemployed. It would repeal the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which has provided concentrated programs to help the disadvantaged, handicapped, and bilingual child.

It is silent on welfare reform, meaningful employment opportunities, and adequate child care programs.

Lastly, it is silent on civil rights and equal employment. In a recent report on Federal civil rights enforcement, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights concludes that "the Federal effort is highly inadequate." The report indicts HEW for failing to provide equal educational opportunity, the Federal Power Commission for refusing to enforce equal employment standards on the power industry, the Labor Department for downgrading the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, the Justice Department for being "lethargic" in enforcing civil rights laws, and the Civil Service Commission for refusing to validate its employment tests regarded by minority groups as a barrier to equal employment and unreliable in measuring specific job skills and individual talent.

In November 1970, President Nixon announced his 16-point program to assist the Spanish speaking in obtaining Federal jobs. Last year a House Judiciary Subcommittee held hearings on the effectiveness of this program. It was their unanimous conclusion—with not one Republican member dissenting—that there had been "no significant increase in the level of Spanish-speaking employment relative to the total work force since the inception of the 16-point program."

During those hearings I testified that Nixon's 16 points had become another high-sounding abstract document without enforcement powers or concrete goals and, as such, had failed to end the existing occupational caste system within the Federal Government. Today the Spanish-speaking represent 6 percent of the total U.S. population but hold only 3 percent of Federal positions with virtual exclusion at the top. What this means is that the Government would have to provide some 80,000 more jobs before the Spanish-speaking could achieve parity with all other groups. It will take at least 60 years to achieve this goal.

As we can see the administration's budget is intended only to create the illusion not the reality of growth and renewal.

In his message to Congress Nixon states that the Community Relations Service, created in 1964 to ease racial and police-community tensions, would expand its crisis prevention role—but fails to mention that this agency is about to suffer a 60 percent cutback which would clearly wipe out this role.

The budget message justifies these reductions and reversals in social programs as the only way to prevent inflation and tax increases. But not once do we hear a commitment to offer a tax reform package which would end tax breaks to large corporations and the privileged few. This itself would increase Federal revenues by \$7 to \$10 billion a year.

I believe that if Nixon cannot get his

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

way, he will continue to use the impoundment power to impose his own set of social and military priorities. This centralization of power runs counter to our traditions and violates the constitutional balance of power.

Congress can no longer be satisfied with verbal protests and "sense of Congress" resolutions which have no meaning or impact.

Congress must regain its policy role, but must do so without resorting to the pretensions of power. Like Presidential truths, congressional ones are just as bad. One answer is the reformist movement now occurring in Congress and being pushed by such groups as Common Cause, the Democratic Study Group, the consumer and environmental coalitions, and community activists. This movement demands that Congress take the lead in the reconstruction of America and work to heal the deep scars of Vietnam, of racism, and inequality. The other is to return to the sharing of power and responsibility, in both domestic and foreign policy—to a balance which preserves the democratic process and opens up the flow of information from Washington to the public.

In the foreign policy area Schlesinger phrases the issue this way:

If foreign policy becomes the property of the Executive, what happens to democratic control?

If we look to the Constitution, we find language that is capable of the broadest interpretation. The early view, the one associated with such leaders as Madison and Hamilton, saw Congress as having another country.

In a letter to Jefferson, Madison wrote:

The Constitution supposes, what the history of all governments demonstrate, that the Executive is the branch of power most interested in war, and most prone to it. It has accordingly with studied care vested the question of war in the legislature.

The political lesson of Vietnam is that no war should be fought without the approval of Congress and the people. In our democracy this approval only comes through an open process where Congress weighs the consequences of war.

To refuse to recognize this process is to argue for one-man rule. It was Abraham Lincoln who as a Congressman gave this warning:

Allow the President to invade a neighboring nation, whenever he shall deem it necessary to repel an invasion . . . and you allow him to make war at pleasure. Study to see if you can fix any limit to his power in this respect.

What are these limits?

The first is to adopt a war powers bill that would affirm congressional control of undeclared wars, with either House having the power to terminate these hostilities by resolution.

The second is to bring the executive agreements under the purview of Congress. Modern Presidents have used these agreements as treaty-making devices, bypassing Senate approval.

The third is to end the myth of executive privilege by requiring Presidential advisors to give an account of their public role.

These three actions would greatly improve the flow of information to Congress, which is essential to making sound policy decisions.

If the Executive and Congress are subjected to the scrutiny of an informed public, they may not fall prey to their own delusions and fantasies of power.

In the domestic field the reorganization of Congress should include the following actions:

First, the establishment of a joint committee made up of appropriations and tax Members from both Houses. This unit would be responsible for setting a mandatory ceiling on expenditures and budget authority for each year.

Second, a limitation on the impoundment power which requires the President to report any impoundments promptly to Congress and to stop the impoundments after 60 days unless Congress approves by resolution.

Third, the adoption of a tax reform bill which would more equitably distribute the tax burden now shouldered by middle- and low-income citizens.

And fourth, the enforcement of equal employment laws by requiring each Federal agency to show significant improvement in minority hiring and promotion before being funded.

I believe that these changes in both foreign and domestic areas will restore the balance of power, and return us to the principle of sharing power without, however, falling into legal rigidities and technicalities.

We should be careful not to place our hopes totally on these procedural and structural changes. Congress and the President must also approach their responsibilities without the pretensions of absolute truth and power. They must be willing to share that power with the people.

Citizen participation and dissent are vital to the renewal of our political and educational institutions. I believe that community action boards, citizen-based coalitions, and other public interest efforts offer productive models.

If our democratic system is to endure, it must encourage dissent and debate. Otherwise, it will isolate itself from its people and turn tyrannical. Writes Morgenthau:

Such a society can carry on for a while, like a body without a soul, but sooner or later it must either recover its soul—that is, the purpose that has given it life—or disintegrate from within.

Sharing power requires dissent and mutual agreement—and this is the ultimate significance and purpose of democracy.

THE ELDERLY NEED ASSISTANCE WITH THE COST OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, over 5 years ago, the Congress directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

to study the possible coverage of outpatient prescription drugs under medicare and to report on the need for and the design of a workable program. Three years ago, in February of 1969, the Congress received the HEW report. It provided evidence that the need for such a program does, in fact, exist. As a group, the elderly comprise only about 10 percent of the population but they account for well over 20 percent of all outpatient prescriptions and for 25 percent of all outpatient drug expenditures. Private insurance protection for the cost of prescription drugs is not a realistic alternative for the bulk of the elderly. A recent report of the Social Security Administration revealed that only about 15 percent of the elderly have managed to obtain out-of-hospital drug insurance from private sources. The rest of the Nation's elderly, whose annual drug expenditures may run into hundreds of dollars, must try to meet these costs from their own, often very limited, financial resources.

During the 92d Congress, I joined Congressman OBEY in sponsoring legislation which would have established outpatient drug benefits as part of the medicare hospital insurance program. In the Senate, similar legislation was introduced by Senator MONTOYA as an amendment to H.R. 1, the Social Security Act Amendments of 1972. That particular amendment was considered by the Finance Committee, which recommended the passage of a modified amendment to restrict coverage to specified drugs necessary for the treatment of most crippling or life-threatening chronic diseases of the elderly. Unfortunately, that language was deleted in the House-Senate conference on the Social Security Act amendments.

Mr. Speaker, because of congressional inaction on the coverage of outpatient prescription drugs under medicare, drug costs for the elderly have become a progressively greater burden. In 1967, about the time the HEW study on the need for such coverage began, the average expenditure by the aged for outpatient prescription drugs was \$54.15; during fiscal year 1969, the private expenditure for prescription drugs purchased by the elderly rose to \$70.25. There is no reason to believe that the amount of these expenditures will decline in future years.

Therefore, I am again joining my colleagues in the House of Representatives in cosponsoring H.R. 2714, which, I am convinced, represents an effective and workable solution to the problems of paying for drugs under medicare. This bill which would establish outpatient drug benefits as part of the medicare hospital insurance program is identical to the bill H.R. 2235 which was introduced in the House during the 92d Congress. Under the proposal, community pharmacies would enter into agreements with intermediaries or other agencies to provide a full range of pharmaceuticals for medicare beneficiaries. In this way, patients would be relieved of claims recording and filing responsibilities. In addition, numerous exchanges of small amounts of program benefits would be eliminated in favor of consolidated transactions between the vendors and the intermediaries and other agencies.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Beneficiaries would incur a \$1 copayment for all prescriptions filled under the program so that both the patient and provider would know the extent of the patient's liability at the time the services are provided. The bill also provides for the periodic adjustment of the copayment to reflect changes in the general level of prescription prices.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the features of H.R. 2714 to my colleagues, and urge that it receive early and favorable action in this Congress.

AMERICA MUST WIN THE FISCAL BATTLE

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, America must win the fiscal battle now going on in our Nation's Capitol. It should not be a question of whether Congress or the President wins, for both Congress and the President must put our country always ahead of any partisan or parochial interests.

Actually, if the budget can be pared to meet the income limitations of the revenue received all the proper objectives can be met: Fighting inflation, reducing waste, stabilizing the dollar, rearranging the priorities by Congress, and upholding the Constitution. If either the President or Congress should fight a partisan type battle, neither would win in the end; and the country would truly suffer.

I call particular attention to the following excellent editorial of February 7 of the Jacksonville Journal:

THE IMPOUNDMENT WAR

President Nixon has escalated the "impoundment war" with Congress by adding another \$8.7 billion in money appropriated by Congress to the amount that he doesn't intend to spend.

The debate over impoundment pits a president who is convinced that he has the majority of the people on his side against members of Congress who believe—and there is a good chance they may be entirely right—that Nixon has confronted the House and Senate with a serious constitutional question.

The question is whether an appropriations bill is a mandate for the President to spend the money provided therein, or whether it is merely a piece of permissive legislation which may be ignored by the President in the interest of thrift in government or to fight inflation.

It is well-known provision of the U.S. Constitution that the president cannot spend money which Congress has refused to appropriate. But, in Article II of the Constitution, is another provision requiring the president to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

The annual appropriations bills, once they are adopted by Congress and enacted by either the president's signature or the overriding of his veto, are laws of the land just as much as a bill forbidding the transportation of a stolen auto across a state line.

Therefore, goes the theory, the president has a duty to spend funds appropriated by Congress, and no more right to impound money than he has to tell the FBI to wink

February 27, 1973

at certain criminal laws. Otherwise, say the critics, Congress would be weakened significantly in its power to influence national policy.

Many presidents have impounded funds before Nixon, and nobody seriously challenges Nixon's contention that impoundment will help to slow inflation and perhaps forestall a federal tax increase. Nevertheless, the President's actions may have placed us on the brink of a serious constitutional crisis involving the delicate balance between two branches of the federal government.

The irony of it all is this: If Nixon should lose the battle, the chief political victims might well be his congressional critics. They might not be able to survive election campaigns if unrestrained spending touched off a tax increase or another round of inflation.

And I call attention to the following excellent editorial of February 16 of the Florida Times-Union:

THE REAL ISSUE IS FREE SPENDING

While political partisans and die-hard administration critics in Congress continue to wage verbal battle with the White House over the President's impoundment of congressional appropriations in an effort to get the runaway federal budget under control, other and more level-headed lawmakers are proceeding quietly and effectively to cope with the real problem.

The real issue is between the dedicated free-spending liberals in Congress who remain convinced, after more than a generation of demonstrated failures, that money can solve any problem, and those who follow the philosophy of the President that the time is long past due to take a hard new look at every automatically continued drain on the Treasury to determine if it is paying its way.

There is evidence, too, that Congress is beginning to get the message in the vote of a joint House-Senate study committee, created last fall, to recommend creation of a permanent budget committee in Congress, run by a professional, non-partisan staff and equipped with all the facilities needed to keep appropriations and tax-writing committees fully informed on government finances.

The committee, in effect, would be the congressional counterpart of the Bureau of the Budget, an arm of the White House organization which reports directly to the President.

As proposed by the joint study group headed by Rep. Al Ullman, (D-Ore.) the congressional budget committee, in addition to providing Congress with its own original fiscal data unfiltered through the White House, would be charged with recommending to the Congress early in each session ceilings on the year's total appropriations.

When such a ceiling won the approval of both houses, the total of all appropriation bills would have to be kept under the ceiling.

One of the principal flaws in the present appropriations process which has contributed to the runaway budget is the fact that appropriation bills are passed piecemeal after being drafted by subcommittees having no information about what other subcommittees are doing. As a result, the annual spending total is never known until the last appropriation bill is passed, when it is too late to do anything about it.

If Congress sincerely wishes to put a harness on runaway spending, it will move immediately to put the study group's recommendations into effect. If it ignores them in favor of continuing its vendetta with the President, it will confirm widely held suspicions that its real motives are political, and that it has chosen to take its stand on the discredited theory that spending will solve

all problems without worrying where the money is coming from.

Then two other recent editorials of the Florida Times-Union also ably discuss the matter in further detail, as follows:

LIVING WITHIN OUR NATIONAL MEANS

President Nixon's budget message to Congress on the 1974 national budget stresses pruning out the withered parts of government while retaining those programs which are bearing fruit.

The President said, in effect, this is how we can avoid inflation and tax increases—and if Congress won't go along it must assume full responsibility for both.

His exact words were directly to the point:

"I will do everything in my power to avert the need for a tax increase, but I cannot do it alone.

"The cooperation of the Congress in controlling total spending is absolutely necessary."

This "message to Congress" was, thus, actually a message to the American people. The theory is clear: The word to Mr. U.S. Taxpayer, touching the hyper-sensitive tax nerve, will rebound back to the taxpayers' representatives on Capitol Hill (with far more influence than it would have had from the White House alone).

The President, and his advisers, have done a good job of answering, in advance, many of the predictable protests which the Congress will surely raise.

To begin, many of the most conspicuous cuts are in programs which have proven themselves to be failures. It would be a difficult task, indeed, for anyone to justify the value-received-to-dollars-spent ratio of those programs singled out for cancellation or reduction.

Further, in its overall thrust, the President has an answer to those in Congress who will say, "But this is ending humanitarian programs."

In point of fact, inflexibly revealed in the black and white of columns of dollars and cents, the truth is that spending in 1974 on "human resources" will actually rise by two percent, whereas the military budget (despite the staggering costs of the pay scale necessary to achieve an all-volunteer armed forces) will decrease by the same percentage.

It must be remembered that only the federal government has a defense budget. But the categories of spending which fall under the heading "human resources" account for the vast majority of the budget appropriations of every state, county and city in the United States. Add to that the \$20 billion or so collected annually from private philanthropy and a more true picture emerges than the 47 percent for human resources and 30 percent for defense.

Congress can, and should argue the merits of the various proposed specific cuts as against other possible cuts. All wisdom does not lie in the White House in this regard.

But it should accept the overall premise of fiscal responsibility and the certainty that huge deficit piled upon huge deficit will eventually lead—nobody knows how far down the road—to fiscal disaster.

The alternative to some checkrein on spending is a tax increase and if congressmen want to hear how their constituents back home feel about this let them introduce a tax increase measure.

ECONOMY IS EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS

The way that Congress spends money—funding program by program separately without anyone knowing or seeming to care what the total expenditures will be—is one major reason that Capitol Hill so consistently overspends.

A second key reason is the prevailing practice of supporting economy—for the other members' constituents. That is, representa-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tives from urban areas (elected by urban votes) are willing to cut everything except programs directly benefiting urban areas. Likewise, the "farm belt" delegations clamor for reducing expenses except when it comes to programs benefiting farmers (and, at least supposedly, affecting farmers' votes).

The type of cloakroom bargaining and the type of spending which this philosophy leads to is obvious. Our record of repeated, in fact routine, budget deficits attest the fact.

Accordingly it is quite noteworthy when a dissenting voice, much in the manner of the outcry by the little boy proclaiming the emperor's nudity in the familiar Hans Christian Andersen fairy tale about the emperor's new clothes, is raised.

Such a dissent was bluntly expressed in the editorial of the Farm Journal for February. To quote in part:

"It is the duty of a farm magazine, isn't it, to stand foursquare behind government help to farmers?

"To campaign hard to get commodity, conservation and farm lending programs through Congress. And then to fight their repeal or loss through actions such as the administration has just taken against REAP (Rural Environmental Assistance Program) . . .

"(The President) has ordered a series of cuts which we understand will extend pretty well across the board. Housing, urban development, stream pollution control already have been cut, and others will follow.

"Each of these programs is somebody's favorite. We have no basis for thinking that these other groups will take a reduction unless we're willing to do the same.

"The President (by his cuts) didn't just hand this question back to Congress. He handed it to us. . . ."

The Farm Journal's candor is encouraging. To begin, REAP for the most part paid farmers to do things which they should have done for their own long term benefit, anyway; and from which they primarily would gain, with scant justification for taxpayers to foot the part of the bill.

Further, the benefits appear limited. Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz recently cited a typical example: In one county with 1,466 farms only 199 farmers got REAP assistance last year; to the rest the program meant nothing.

Further telling testimony to the non-urgency of REAP lies in the observation that every President since Harry Truman's time has tried to eliminate the program, but Congress always has balked.

It might appear, this time, that the "kill" will stick.

The House, last week, did pass legislation to reinstate REAP after the White House had closed it down. However, the vote margin in the House wasn't enough to sustain the measure over the presidential veto which seems assured should the Senate take similar action.

Perhaps the issue will become even clearer if everyone will realize that everyone must share in the axe-blows if inflation is to be halted, higher taxes avoided, and so notify their representatives in Washington.

This is a realization which must be reached and acted upon if fiscal sanity is to be restored to federal budgeting.

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a short speech by Miss Pati

Townsend, 4332 Barton Road, Lansing, Mich., which earned for this young lady the position of being the State of Michigan's winning entry in the 26th annual Voice of Democracy contest. Pati's remarks, addressed to the subject of "My Responsibility to Freedom," offers a challenge to apathy in civic and governmental affairs that is both moving and refreshing. I think that we, as a nation, can certainly take encouragement that there are young people, like Pati, throughout America, who are also realizing the vital need for involvement and individual commitment. So that others may share the note of caution she so eloquently expresses, Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of her speech in the RECORD:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

Picture in your mind an elementary school classroom in the year 2500. Some of the little children sitting at the desks might be great, great grandchildren of yours. At a certain time in the day the children take out their history books and a teacher calls on each of them to read aloud. As one little boy starts reading you hear him speaking of a civilization based on the idea of democracy, a strange philosophy to the young boy. The book describes the attitude of general unconcern on the part of the people and of dissent against all order and established government. Finally the text mentions that it is describing the time in history right before the falling of democratic America as we know it.

If this hypothetical situation bothers you, then I am suggesting that you and I have the responsibility to see that it doesn't happen.

But this classroom example might not bother you. You and others may say that I am being naive and slightly impulsive, and you may be right. But before you close your mind remember your defense might be because you have already been caught up in the problem I am describing. My concern is with the growing apathy on the part of that group of loyal and responsible American citizens known as the silent majority.

I'm not talking just about attitudes towards voting in important presidential elections. I'm referring also to wanting to attend a local school board meeting or supporting your choice for mayor or maybe writing to your representatives in Washington to make sure their choice is the people's choice. And more than that, remembering that America was based on the idea of respect of one individual for another's point of view. That attitude was why the laws of freedom were established in the first place. And yet so many times we become too concerned with the welfare of our own small existence. You see, apathy is a strange thing, the less concerned you are about having it, the better chances are that you've already got it.

I can remember what my father told me once when I said my ambition was to go into social work. He said, "Honey, people who have the goal of helping humanity often become disillusioned by the red tape society has developed. They try to change the world and end up finding their hands tied." Then he gave me some advice. "If you really want to help people, be prepared for discouragement and don't let problems make you insensitive to the goal you started with."

And he's right, because becoming indifferent is an attitude that grows inside people and people are the ones that make up democracy.

I often think the life of a democratic nation is like running a two-man track race. The two start out even but chances are one crosses the finish line first.

In life, one of those runners is freedom, the other is apathy, one of them will eventu-

ally cross the finish line and become the winner.

But a race isn't just won or lost on a field. The practice and the training a runner puts in is a much surer prediction of the outcome. If you knew a runner hadn't stood up, let alone walked for a month but was planning on entering a race the next day, you wouldn't expect him to come close to winning.

And the same with our race for democracy. If we don't constantly have the attitude of respect towards individuals and the freedoms with which we were lucky enough to be born, we will be giving over the prize of those valued freedoms.

But as you may realize, because our ancestors cared enough about us to preserve a free country for us, we probably don't have to worry about losing them in our lifetime. I consider it my responsibility to preserve them for those future generations. If I don't they may not be as lucky as I. Democracy as a philosophy may only be known to them from a history text or perhaps from the example of another country. The preservation of freedoms for others to come is a responsibility that lies in your hands and mine. They have no choice. And it won't come about with a selfish attitude on our part.

It begins by stepping out of an apathetic state of mind and showing some concern and some respect for someone else.

Please, don't walk out of this room without considering my request to you because if you do that you'll only be giving apathy one extra leap in that race, a race where the prize involved is the determination of the fate of America, the fate of those children in the future generations.

A BILL TO ALLOW TUITION TAX CREDIT FOR NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

HON. WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, if we are to keep open the doors of nonpublic schools, Congress needs to pass tuition tax credit legislation. Over 11 percent of our country's children attend nonpublic schools. Many of these schools have supplied the diversification and innovation in education that has made America a great nation. Unfortunately, because of escalating operating costs, more and more nonpublic schools are closing their doors. Last year alone, over 500 nonpublic schools had to close. Moreover, to keep the remaining nonpublic schools open parents have had to pay higher and higher tuition costs. In an effort to be helpful, today I am introducing a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents. This legislation would give parents a tax credit of 50 percent for tuition paid to send their children to a nonprofit nonpublic elementary school, up to a limit of \$200 per child. Hopefully, this proposal, if enacted, would help the nonpublic schools to keep their doors open. I would point out, also, that the proposal makes economic sense because, if nonpublic schools were forced to close, these children would have to go to public

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

schools thereby creating a tremendous impact on education cost which would be reflected in higher tax bills for all local taxpayers.

LEE HAMILTON'S WASHINGTON REPORT ON REFORMS OF 93D CONGRESS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my February 26, 1973, Washington Report on the reforms of the 93d Congress:

REFORMS IN THE 93D CONGRESS

During the first several weeks of this session, the 93d Congress has taken giant strides to correct obsolete procedures and strengthen its ability to fulfill its constitutional role as a co-equal branch of government.

These improvements are the most heartening developments that have occurred in Congress since I have come to Washington, and I will continue to support them to make the Congress responsive, efficient and deliberative. The Congress is one of the most successful political institutions in the world today, but unless changes are made in the way it operates, the Congress will become ineffective.

Among the important changes that should strengthen the Congress and make it better able to meet its responsibilities are these:

1. *Congressional Control of Federal Budgetary Matters.*—A bipartisan committee of Congressmen and Senators has approved a plan to improve Congressional control of the budget. Under the plan the Congress would make a comprehensive revenue and spending review, and would be in a position to balance the costs of the programs it passes with available revenues. The impact of governmental expenditures on the state of the economy, international trade and the national debt, would receive consideration under the proposed budgetary inspection mechanism. Once enacted, such a system would help the Congress exercise its "power of the purse" with responsibility and prudence.

2. *House Committees—Jurisdiction and Operation.*—The House has chartered a bipartisan committee to study the functions and organization of all House committees. The present committees and their areas of responsibility were last reviewed in 1946 when many of today's policy questions and demands could hardly be anticipated, as, for example, the space program and the concern for the environment. It is imperative that committee organization and jurisdiction be reviewed regularly to insure an efficient work load, evenly divided among the committees.

3. *Selection of Committee Chairmen.*—The House has reformed the procedure for selecting committee chairmen and ranking committee members of the minority party. At the beginning of each Congress, committee chairmen will be chosen by separate caucus votes which will be conducted by secret ballot if 20 percent of those present so request. This reform democratizes committee leadership which has long been controlled by seniority. Seniority will no longer guarantee powerful positions on committees and chairmen will become more responsive to the members of the party caucus which elects them every two years.

4. *Subcommittee Leadership and Assignment.*—The Democratic Caucus has also

February 27, 1973

adopted procedures for assigning seats on subcommittees to new Members of the House to assure them major assignments on subcommittees. An individual Congressman may now chair only one subcommittee at a time under the new system, a change which will have the effect of opening positions of power to younger and newer Members.

5. *Secrecy in Committee.*—Another rule, expected to be adopted, will open committee meetings to the public unless a majority of the committee votes in public to close the meeting. Exception to the open meeting would occur if the committee were discussing matters which would endanger the national security.

6. *Strengthened Leadership.*—The Democratic Caucus has also approved a strengthened Steering and Policy Committee, which will reflect the views of the Democratic Members, has given the Speaker more flexibility in scheduling legislation, has strengthened his control over key committees, and has adopted procedures to allow amendments to tax bills. These moves also reflect the revival of the party caucus as an active, policy-making body in which Members can thrash out their differences and push for reforms and legislation.

7. *New Electronic Voting System.*—With the installation of a modern electronic voting system each Member's vote is instantaneously recorded, displayed and tallied. This procedure cuts in half the time consumed by the old roll call vote.

The winds of change are blowing in the Congress in the direction of openness, democracy and efficiency, and the nation should be refreshed and invigorated.

THE IMBALANCE OF POWER

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the imbalance of power between the legislative and executive branches is generating public concern about the implications it holds for the future of our system of government. I have received many letters indicating this concern recently. One particularly thoughtful and articulate statement by my constituent David N. LaFontaine of Minneapolis I feel is worth sharing with the membership of the House. I would add regretfully that I must agree with Mr. LaFontaine's observations that Congress is voluntarily abdicating too many of its responsibilities.

The letter follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
February 8, 1973.

Hon. DONALD M. FRASER,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

CONGRESSMAN FRASER: There is perhaps no more critical issue facing the Congress at this juncture in our history than that of the division of authority between the Legislative and Executive branches of our government.

Charges that the President has usurped prerogatives of dubious constitutionality do not stand on firm ground. Congress itself has voluntarily abdicated much of its responsibility. Congress itself is duty bound to reclaim that responsibility.

Ultimately, in a democratic society such as ours, the people bear the basic responsibility for their fate. As citizens and voters we have

been instrumental, through our own neglect, in the passage of more and more power to the hands of the President. We have seen the fruits of that neglect in an increased arrogance on the part of the President and his administration in two areas in particular.

The administration has been increasingly remiss in its duty to provide Congress with information legitimately required by that body in order that it might perform its proper function with adequate knowledge. It is imperative that Congress insist that the administration provide such information. "Executive Privilege" as a means of denying testimony before congressional bodies must be severely limited. At present we are treated regularly to the spectacle of such dubious immunity being invoked with an impunity that should embarrass any responsible public official.

Possibly more ominous is the growing tendency on the part of the administration to enforce only those laws meeting with its own approval. The President has announced his intention to impound funds duly appropriated by the Congress. While still Attorney General, John Mitchell announced publicly that the Justice Department should conduct wiretapping activities at will regardless of Supreme Court decisions. This area of executive arrogance is becoming increasingly crowded.

I cannot stress strongly enough my conviction that much of the responsibility for such a state of affairs rests largely at the door of Congress itself.

We live in troubled times and a strong chief executive is certainly necessary. We are, however, presently in danger of acquiring a Presidency that may be much too powerful for the long range benefit of the country.

Due to the apathy of citizens as mentioned above the pressure upon Congress to avoid its proper responsibilities is indeed heavy. It is certainly tempting to make much smoke in terms of empty rhetoric. To make fire in terms of difficult decisions on the floor of the House is hazardous. Any definite stand becomes vulnerable as elections draw near.

It is hoped that Congress will, in the current session, rise above pressures toward vacillation. The framers of the Constitution have left us with a system of checks and balances that have served the nation well thus far. The challenge to preserve those checks and balances is at hand. It is my fervent hope that you will meet that challenge and provide positive leadership toward a reaffirmation of the Congress as an equal branch of our government.

Respectfully,

DAVID N. LAFONTAINE.

ARE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY BEING DOWNGRADED?

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I recently received an article regarding science and technology that I think would be of interest to my colleagues.

With the ever-increasing national uses for science and technology, it is imperative that the executive branch obtain the best counseling available in this area. Mr. Patrick P. McCurdy, editor of the Chemical and Engineering News, expresses these concerns very perceptively in his article, titled "What's Going On, Mr. President?"

With the recent reorganization of the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

executive branch, it is worthwhile to re-examine the position science and technology will have in the structure of the Executive Office. Undoubtedly, as our Nation advances in these all-important fields, we will need enlightened guidance for proper evaluation of scientific problems. Mr. McCurdy offers his own astute feelings about this matter in the article which follows:

WHAT'S GOING ON, MR. PRESIDENT?

At press time, the state and status of science and technology in this country were not at all clear. The past several weeks have seen extensive reorganizing in the White House, including planned abolition of the Office of Science and Technology, the office of the science adviser to the President (established under President Eisenhower), and the President's Science Advisory Committee. Many of the former responsibilities of these departing science representatives are to be transferred to the National Science Foundation and its director, H. Guyford Stever. As C&EN's Washington News Bureau head, Fred Zerkel, puts it, Guy Stever seems slated to become a "czar of sorts" over much of the federal science effort.

The question is: Of what sort and over what effort? This is no criticism of Dr. Stever or NSF. Rather it reflects the still larger question: Whither U.S. science and technology? Firm conclusions would be premature at this point, with so little hard information in hand, but it is difficult not to conclude that this latest Administration action represents a general, even severe, downgrading of science and technology in the mind of the President. We hope we're wrong. Yet what other interpretation can be put on a move that apparently cancels out the nation's highest science advisory office, one which, at least in theory, had direct contact with the President, and removes (relegates?) its function to an agency, and not a large one by federal standards, at that?

Opinion is mixed, but only in relative, negative degree. Reaction in the federal science establishment runs a gamut from deep pessimism to cautious optimism. Perhaps the most stinging response thus far comes from Rep. John W. Davis (D-Ga.), chairman of the House Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development (which oversees NSF). Davis calls the reorganization "disastrous . . . a bad mistake". Seasoned with partisan rhetoric, perhaps, but Davis' words deserve attention. After all, one could view the President's plan as actually strengthening the science hand of both Rep. Davis and Sen. Kennedy, as well. But maybe the President doesn't care; that's the real worry.

For with the key role played by science and technology in this country and the hope it holds for the future, it seems beyond question that the President needs to hear the voice of science directly, often, and from a science source that is "above the battle." In OST the voice, effective or not, at least was there. Now it will be muted and modulated as it goes through George Shultz, Secretary of the Treasury.

The idea of a central science czar has never had much appeal among scientists, a view we share. Science and technology cut across too many areas for such a concept to be workable. But for this very reason, it would seem imperative that the President have a respected scientist/statesman in his immediate circle.

A year ago, both in his State of the Union remarks and in his unprecedented R&D message, the President seemed to be giving renewed emphasis to science and technology. "Science and Technology represent an enormous power in our life—and a unique opportunity. It is now for us to decide whether we will waste these magnificent energies—or whether we will use them to create a better

world. . . ." He also talked of setting "clear and intelligent targets for research and development." He referred to a new "federal partnership." We also heard talk of an overall technology policy. More money for science seemed ahead.

We thought he was on the right track a year ago and said so. Now we wonder whether there's been a derailment. Perhaps we will be pleasantly surprised by still another of those startling thrusts that are becoming a hallmark of this Administration. Meanwhile, we ask: What's going on, Mr. President?

IRS INFORMATION ON MONTHLY LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, many of us have various forms of newsletters or legislative reports that we issue from time to time to those who reside in our congressional districts.

For some time now, a source of financing these informative reports has been a question.

I presented the format I use in my monthly legislative reports and the method I use in paying for them to the Internal Revenue Service for an official opinion. I thought the informative and complete response I received from the IRS would be helpful to my colleagues:

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., January 16, 1973.

HON. SAM M. GIBBONS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GIBBONS: On behalf of Commissioner Walters, I am replying to your letter of July 3, 1972, in which you inquire as to the treatment, for Federal income tax purposes, of the "Sam Gibbons Legislative Report Fund," under the circumstances described below.

From 12 to 15 times a year you send legislative reports to the constituents on your mailing list. From time to time you also send questionnaires to your constituents requesting their opinions on various issues. In the past you have personally paid the printing costs involved in the preparation of these reports and questionnaires, although they are mailed under the Congressional franking privilege. However, you recently established the "Sam Gibbons Legislative Report Fund" and asked your constituents to contribute to it in order to defray some of these printing costs.

Contributions to the Fund are solicited through notations on the legislative reports and requests made by telephone by a member of your staff. The reports and questionnaires are mailed to constituents without regard to whether they contribute to the Fund.

The Fund is in the form of an ordinary bank account and is segregated from other funds maintained by your office. Although you have the authority to sign checks on the account, this function is normally performed by designated members of your staff. Amounts expended from the Fund are never to be used for campaign purposes, but are to be used only to defray the printing and related costs of the reports and questionnaires. Any excess in the Fund at the end of any particular year would be carried over to the following year to be used for the same purpose.

Section 61(a) of the Internal Revenue Code

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

of 1954 defines gross income as all income from whatever source derived, except as otherwise provided by law.

While section 102 of the Code provides that gross income does not include the value of property acquired by gift, the amounts contributed by your constituents in response to your solicitation do not stem from a "detached and disinterested generosity," but from the anticipated benefit of continued newsletter publication, and therefore do not qualify as "gifts" in a statutory sense. *Commissioner v. Mose Duberstein, et al.*, 363 U.S. 278 (1960), Ct. D. 1850, C.B. 1960-2, 428.

Nor are the contributions excludable from your income as funds held in trust, since they are expressly available for your use in performing a function of your office. *Angelus Funeral Home v. Commissioner*, 47 T.C. 391 (1967), acquiescence limited to particular facts and circumstances, C.B. 1969-2, xxiii, affirmed, 407 F. 2d 210 (1969), certiorari denied, 396 U.S. 824 (1969).

Accordingly, we conclude that the amounts contributed by your constituents to the "Sam Gibbons Legislative Report Fund" solely to defray the printing (and related) costs of the legislative reports and questionnaires would be includable in your gross income for the year in which such amounts are received.

With respect to the deductibility of amounts expended from the Fund, section 162(a) of the Code provides for the deduction of all the ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year in carrying on any trade or business.

The performance of the official duties of a Congressman in his trade or business as an elected official includes keeping his constituents informed with respect to the affairs of the Federal government and to his official actions.

I.T. 4095, C.B. 1952-2, 90 (a copy of which is enclosed), holds that expenses incurred by a Congressman in printing and addressing a letter to his constituents, the letter consisting principally of a report of his activities and findings in connection with an official inspection trip to foreign countries but also containing a brief personal message, qualify as ordinary and necessary business expenses.

Section 62 of the Code, defining adjusted gross income, specifies the particular items of expense that may be deducted from gross income in arriving at adjusted gross income. Since the expenses in your case do not fall within any of the categories mentioned in section 62 of the Code, such expenses are deductible only as itemized deductions in computing taxable income.

Accordingly, we conclude that amounts expended from the "Sam Gibbons Legislative Report Fund" for the purpose of defraying the printing costs of the legislative reports and questionnaires would be deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses under section 162 of the Code, provided you itemize your deductions.

We regret the delay in replying to your letter and hope that it has not inconvenienced you.

Sincerely,

PETER P. WEIDENBRUCH, Jr.,
Assistant Commissioner, Technical.

ROCKWELL'S TRAVELING SPACE
SALESMAN

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the February issue of the Diner's Club's Signature magazine

carries a most interesting article on Robert Anderson, president of North American Rockwell which is located in my 31st Congressional District. Through Mr. Anderson's expert management and ability to keep costs down, North American Rockwell won the coveted space shuttle contract from NASA—a tribute to its past performance in manufacturing such vital defense items as the B-1 strategic bomber. I commend this article to my colleagues:

ROCKWELL'S TRAVELING SPACE SALESMAN

A six-foot-one, 180-pound businessman was understandably botching his shots in a championship PGA Pro-Am foursome on the Laurel Valley golf course in Ligonier, Pennsylvania, last July 26th. On the 12th hole, someone handed him a telephone message. "After that, I could hardly hit the ball," recalls the man, a 7-handicap golfer. Though he finished the match in a three-way tie for first place, one of his opponents, Sam Snead, noted, "You'd think a fella who just won a \$2.6 billion space contract could afford to take some golf lessons."

Smiling broadly, Robert Anderson, president and chief operating officer of North American Rockwell, hustled to his telephone-equipped Cadillac, was driven to the nearby airport and, in his company-made, twin-engine Sabre jetliner, was flown in his golf clothes to Los Angeles where a champagne bash awaited him.

A dynamic, youthful 52, Anderson spends about a third of his time in his new, embarrassingly (to him) ornate office high in a 64-floor downtown Pittsburgh skyscraper, and almost another third in his office in Los Angeles, where he also maintains a multi-level apartment. Most of his remaining hours are spent airborne. To keep on top of his job, he must make firing-line decisions for North American Rockwell's more than 100 diversified operations in aerospace, automotive equipment, electronics and burgeoning industrial products of other kinds in 26 states and 21 countries. "I feel like a Yo-Yo just trying to keep up with him," says his secretary.

In one typical week recently, Anderson was in Downey, California, checking progress on the space shuttle, the only new manned space venture planned by Uncle Sam; in Los Angeles inspecting the B-1 strategic bomber being built for the Air Force to replace the B-52; in Bethany, Oklahoma, test-flying NR's newest entries into the business pleasure and agricultural aircraft markets; in Chicago observing Rockwell's printing presses, on which two out of every three newspapers in the United States are printed; in Almont, Michigan, assessing land for testing automotive equipment by Rockwell, the nation's largest independent manufacturer of car parts; in Reading, Pennsylvania, watching the elimination of a production snag in the Electro-Knit 48 textile machine. He wound up the week flying to England to review his company's recent acquisition of a major truck axle plant.

Sometimes Anderson goes to Washington—reluctantly. "I was never much interested in politics," he says, "until I learned that you had to know a lot of politicians who have some control over government contracts."

Two months before Senator McGovern was nominated for President last July, Anderson visited the Washington office of the legislator, who had never concealed his opposition to both the B-1 and space-shuttle programs.

"Why don't you apply your aerospace know-how to making automobiles, Mr. Anderson?" asked the future Democratic Presidential nominee.

"Senator, there are many companies now making automobiles who know more about it than North American Rockwell," replied

February 27, 1973

Anderson. "I spent 22 years in the automobile business myself."

"How about making refrigerators or washing machines then?"

"Frankly, we don't know anything about either making or selling them."

"Why don't you manufacture radio and television sets instead of missiles and bombers?"

"Foreign manufacturers have captured a big share of that market and it would be difficult for us to start competing from scratch. But we're now making \$100 calculators."

Anderson lit his pipe, which he hasn't the patience to keep lit (he chain-smokes cigarettes instead), and McGovern sized up his visitor. "Tell me, Mr. Anderson," slowly inquired the former political science professor. "Why must we be in first place in intercontinental ballistic missiles and other weapons you make?"

"Senator, there's nothing wrong with second, third, or even fourth place—if the American people want that. But peace is constantly challenged by first-place force."

That evening, the president of North American Rockwell told an associate, "I spent a very pleasant hour with Senator McGovern. He's a fine, decent man. But I made absolutely no impression upon him. Our professional backgrounds are so different."

Robert (no middle name) Anderson, who was born in Columbus, Nebraska, was the eldest of three boys. His father a traveling salesman for the Swift meat-packing company, was transferred among numerous cities, and Bob recalls arriving in Los Angeles when he was 9. "I remember seeing orange groves and lettuce fields in L.A. where today there are aircraft companies," he says.

His boyhood was all Horatio Alger—Andy Hardy. He played tackle on the Fairfax High football team, delivered the morning newspaper in the neighborhood, and clerked in a local supermarket on Saturdays. Because his family could not afford to send him to college during the Depression, at 17 Anderson plunked down \$100 of his own savings to enroll in a commercial aeronautics school. Later he was offered a four-year football scholarship at Colarado A & M (now Colorado State University). He tried to get his money refunded by the aeronautics school, but without success. "Boy, losing that hundred bucks still hurts," he reminisces. Throughout college he earned \$15 a week as handyman and floor sweeper at the local Chevrolet agency. "That's where I got my feel of the automobile business," he deadpans.

Anderson's automotive itch spread during and after World War II, when he taught motor maintenance at Fort Sill, Fort Knox and later in Japan, as a captain in Field Artillery.

After his discharge, Anderson enrolled as one of 30 graduate students in the Chrysler Institute of Engineering in Detroit, attending school two hours a day and working six hours in the Chrysler plant. He was now 26 years old, married to a former secretary, Constance Severy, and they had a son to support. He supplemented his \$225 monthly salary—just half of his Army pay—by teaching math at night.

One morning he was ordered by his Institute supervisor to spend the day transporting hundreds of cans of Prestone antifreeze from one end of the garage to the other. "That was fairly humiliating for a former captain," he says, "but the next morning when my boss told me to move them all back, the Chrysler Corporation nearly lost an engineer." He stuck it out—and graduated first in his class in 1948.

Chrysler was known as a company dominated by engineers, and corporation officials quickly recognized Anderson's talents by assigning him to a series of trouble-shooting problems. "I was Mr. Go-Between," he says.

As resident engineer, he represented Chrysler at the Briggs Manufacturing Company in 1950 and 51, then moved up to supervising engineer for the Chrysler Division and body engineer for all the company's cars. He was chief engineer of the Plymouth Division until 1957, when he became top man in the Central Engineering Division serving the whole corporation.

Anderson's professional savvy did not escape the notice of other companies. He was even wooed by Proctor & Gamble. "But I decided that I liked cars more than soap," he says.

The prospect of losing Anderson impelled the Chrysler brass to take a long, hard look at their prize engineer's broadening potential, and in 1958 he was suddenly named Director of Product Planning and Cost Estimating. "This was the turning point," he says. "I got into management then. I was a babe in the woods. I had to thoroughly understand the sales, finances, merchandising and business management objectives. Planning a successful automobile requires tremendous clairvoyance. It is like throwing a forward pass and catching it yourself. I had to run faster and faster just to keep up with our competitors. But I learned invaluable lessons. If you cut just one dollar from the cost of manufacturing a single car, for instance, that could be another million bucks in profits at the end of the year." For three years Anderson slashed costs and improved efficiency. Result: in 1961 he was named Vice-President of Production Planning.

His next promotion came in 1964, when he was appointed Group Vice-President of Corporate Automotive Management. Walter Cooper, later president of the National Automobile Dealers Association, wisecracked at the time: "Bob is well equipped to be production vice-president. He was the star janitor at my Fort Collins Chevy place 25 years ago."

A still bigger Chrysler prize lay ahead. In November 1965 Vice-President Anderson was named General Manager of the Plymouth Division. He launched the Plymouth Fury and boosted his division's sales by 200,000 cars in two years. His own annual compensation went up to six figures.

"But Bob was never an ivory tower executive," says Ez Koeppel, a Jamaica, New York, dealer. "He spent a lot of time calling on us in our showrooms, listening to our problems and breaking bread with us. At conventions, he was always the most popular Chrysler official."

Anderson even drove his company's official pace cars at the Indianapolis and Daytona "500's," whipping around the courses in a Plymouth at 130 m.p.h. He drove Chrysler's experimental bronze turbine car through midtown New York City to demonstrate its new engine. In the middle of heavy Fifth Avenue traffic, the car ran out of fuel. Horns honked. Cabbies cursed. "Bob never lost his cool," recollects an observer. "He simply ran across the street to the nearest drugstore, bought an \$80 bottle of Arpège perfume and emptied it into the gas tank. The car started moving again because the turbine engine can run on anything alcoholic." It also must have been the sweetest smelling car in the whole Chrysler line.

Then in 1967 Anderson faced a big decision at Chrysler when the job of president had to be filled. Although he was one of the frontrunners, the job went to Virgil E. Boyd.

At that time, Rockwell-Standard, a profitable, old-line Pittsburgh parts supplier to Chrysler and nearly all other American car manufacturers, merged with North American Aviation to form North American Rockwell. Though legally a "statutory merger" Rockwell, in effect, purchased control of North American, a company which had fallen on lean times after being blamed for the capsule flash fire that killed three Apollo astronauts at Cape Kennedy. It was a strange marriage

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

of a stable Pittsburgh groom and a mercurial California bride.

To make the union work, Willard (Al) Rockwell Jr., chairman of North American Rockwell, decided that he needed Bob Anderson. "I could still be in automobiles but have a chance to work in aviation—my second love," reasoned Anderson. After 22 years with Chrysler he resigned in early 1968, walking away from retirement and bonus benefits that were estimated at around a quarter-million dollars. "Sure, it hurt then, but deep down I didn't really care, because of my new challenge," Anderson says now.

He began as president of the commercial products group, heading up the industrial and automotive divisions. A year later he was named vice-president; in February 1970, president and chief operating officer.

One of his first acts was to secure a pilot's license—at the age of 47. "I couldn't sell airplanes if I didn't know how to fly them," he says.

On the ground, he brought hardnosed Detroit automobile efficiency into an aerospace industry plagued with cost overruns. At monthly operations reviews with group and division managers, Anderson asked them to match current accomplishments against their own one-year plans and, if necessary, to take immediate corrective action. A result of his tight cost controls was his company's performance on the Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missile: the Air Force announced in 1971 that North American Rockwell *undercut* contract costs by more than \$10 million.

Unproductive real estate—including North American's two office buildings in El Segundo, California—was disposed of. "We sold one to the telephone company for \$5 million, transferred our staff into the other building, and still had plenty of space," says Anderson. Similarly, fat was trimmed from projects already launched. "We kept nagging our aerospace people to diversify," he explains. "But they would either spend money over-designing or try to produce something for which there was no market." Anderson put an end to that.

Despite his toughness in keeping down costs, Anderson has never appeared as a dictator to his company's 80,000 employees. One high-ranking associate, a former football great, observes, "Bob is a team player. He's still a star tackle who does the blocking and lets his teammates carry the ball." Anderson himself says, "Successful managers set high standards, explain their expectations, encourage open, frank, two-way discussions, delegate properly and measure performance accurately."

One of his unhappiest chores was chopping the company's aerospace personnel from 37,000 to 6,000. But after Uncle Sam won the moon race, Rockwell had no major airplane or military contracts to justify its head count. "I'd like to see an end to the present peaks and valleys in aerospace," Anderson now says. "These cycles of demand are just not a good way to do business, whether you're making space shuttles or shoes. If General Motors had to cut their work force 80 percent and then build back up again every few years, we wouldn't be able to buy cars at today's prices."

Meanwhile, Anderson is determined that his company won't stay in any valleys very long. "We lost the F-15 fighter contract to McDonnell Douglas just before Christmas 1969," he remembers. "This was after we had spent nearly \$66 million on research. But we turned right around and went after the B-1 bomber contract, and won that one within six months."

The B-1, which is only two-thirds the size of the B-52, will fly at low altitudes at nearly the speed of sound (750 m.p.h.) and more than twice that at high altitudes. And it will carry twice the B-52 weapons load over the same intercontinental distances. "In building the B-1, we're taking advantage of many

aerospace advances made during the past decade," explains Anderson. "It's a tribute to the pilots, flight and ground crews that the present B-52's are still doing such a splendid job. Aside from its age, the B-52's most serious drawback is that it can't penetrate sophisticated enemy defenses efficiently, especially at low altitudes. By contrast the B-1 can streak to a target at near sonic speed, skimming the treetops to avert detection by radar, making it an almost invisible target. It will be a strong addition to America's protective armament."

Though the Air Force anticipates buying 241 of them, the B-1 program is the first to be structured under the "fly-before-buy" concept adopted by the Department of Defense in 1970. This means that the B-1 will undergo a year of intensive testing before any decision is made on full production.

The space shuttle, which Rockwell is now building for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, is currently the only major space program to follow Apollo. In awarding the prime contract after intense competition, NASA cited NR's strength of management. Shortly afterwards, *Fortune* magazine commented: "North American Rockwell overnight soared into a dominant position in the U.S. space program, its pre-eminence all but assured for this decade, and perhaps even beyond." Designed as America's first real transportation system in outer space, the shuttle will be a reusable space vehicle able to fly more than 100 times into orbit and back, landing on conventional runways.

"Building this shuttle is requiring the best brains we can get, and not all of the brains are at Rockwell," says Anderson. Immediately after winning the prime contract, he flew to Grumman's Long Island, New York, plant to assure disappointed experts there that he hoped to use their talents in subcontracting for needed parts.

Anderson finds himself appalled at the enormous amount of paperwork involved in fulfilling any government contract. "In some aerospace programs, 30 percent of the total cost is represented by paper," he notes sadly. Just the same, Anderson makes a continuous effort to keep his company soundly diversified and not overly dependent on aerospace. Today about 54 percent of Rockwell's sales are to the federal government and the remaining 46 percent to commercial markets—including the manufacture and sale of many new "spin-off" products. All NR lines now point upward—sales, profits and earnings per share flourishing alike under the company slogan: "Where Science Gets Down to Business."

Anderson works hard and plays hard. Because he doesn't have much time for golf nowadays, he recently took up tennis—usually playing an easy and relaxed game of doubles. Although he bought a cycling machine for his Pittsburgh bedroom, he rarely uses it. "My big exercise is getting out of bed," he says. But he loves to tinker. He's the kind of man who prefers to take the lawn mower apart rather than to cut the lawn.

Bullfighting is a lingering passion. "I used to enjoy taking people to bullfights in Mexico and Spain, but because most of them didn't enjoy the sport as much as I do. I've stopped doing this. Too many times I'd hear, 'Gee, Bob, it's getting cold. I'm going back to the hotel.' "

Last November 2nd in Los Angeles his intimate friends—including John DeLorean, Mark McCormack and Arnold Palmer—attended Bob Anderson's 52nd birthday party. On that occasion he announced his engagement to Diane Lowe, a tall, comely brunette model from Fort Lauderdale. (His first marriage had ended in divorce after 30 years.)

Anderson has a son, Robert, 27, an Air Force doctor at California's Edwards Air Force Base, who is determinedly building his own B-29 airplane in his garage. His 22-year-

old daughter, Kit, is a senior at Colorado State University. Anderson's mother lives in Southern California, as do his brothers—James, an obstetrician, and Chuck, who works in aerospace.

When Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard resigned last year, Anderson was mentioned for the post, a job he neither sought nor wanted. But he has a statesman's knack for overview, and it follows perhaps that a man so involved with future space travel would be equally involved with the future of America and the world. "We can't return to the simple, 18th-century bucolic life," he says. "America is an urbanized society and we should work toward new standards of living for everyone. Global unity in travel, trade and communications is one of the greatest passports to peace and prosperity. Satisfying today's world economic demands should never be thought of in terms of a new colonial conquest, but as as a means of unifying people. Sure, some people want to cut off the heads of the British Parliament in the morning, guillotine the French Senate in the afternoon, and sink the Japanese Diet at midnight. But before dawn, our own industrial heads would be rolling in retaliation. A much better alternative is free competition in the world's free market places."

Bob Anderson always takes a global view of things. And don't be surprised if the fast-moving fellow who helped put a man out there in orbit is an early passenger on one of his own spacecraft shuttling from the earth to the moon. After all, how can he sell the thing if he doesn't know how to fly it?

MISS TOBY LIND: ESSAY ON FREEDOM

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE OF NEW JERSEY IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, Miss Toby A. Lind believes that with freedom comes responsibility. Her thoughts about freedom should be read by every young American who wants to seek change and improvements in society.

Miss Lind, of Westmont, N.J., recently offered the winning speech from our State in the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Ladies Auxiliary annual Voice of Democracy Contest.

I am proud to represent Miss Lind in the Congress, and I want to share her thoughts with my colleagues. Herewith is the text of her prize-winning address:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

(By Toby A. Lind)

"In the future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential freedoms. The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world. The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world. The third is freedom from want . . . The fourth is freedom from fear." The quote I have just read was said by Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I truly believe these are the four components of freedom. Our freedom of speech allows us to express our emotions, whether they be of rebellion, joy or sorrow. Being able to relate to God in our own way—following certain traditions and beliefs is an important factor in our daily living. Freedom from want is easily summed up. A person should not have to want happiness, he should have it. And finally the freedom from fear—everyone should feel a certain type of security in living in a united country.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

I feel too many people do not realize what it is to be able to have these freedoms. They are taken for granted too often. As a young person of today I must set an example to other people. My responsibility is to my country and the unification of my countrymen as one. Yet I must respect my fellow man also. I must only guide people, I cannot force my religion, morals or emotions upon them. Instead it is imperative that I listen with an open mind and learn myself by observations which I make.

I should never be destructive. Institutions are made for the benefit of the people. I can rebel through expressing myself in speech and make my thoughts known but I should never hurt someone else or an enterprise of all the people. Being a friend to all man is one of my most important responsibilities. I must strive to understand him. If I interfere, destroying someone's property, feelings or whatever, I am hindering his freedom from want. Therefore it is my duty, above all, to learn to respect his property, feelings and religion for they are his freedoms too.

Freedom is not something that upon turning eighteen years of age you receive. Freedom grows inside of you all the time. Now that I am older, more rights are given to me. To be a more effective citizen, I certainly must be a participant. This includes voting. I must vote for someone who believes in my freedoms and will stand behind them. If I were to join groups, I could work for the betterment of my community, state and country. This means not to build a small niche only for myself. That, I truly believe is selfish. If I work for the improvement of all men, then I improve also. Patience and optimism are the key factors here. The patience to understand and help people and the optimism to go each and every day. We will take part together, not for a short period of time but always to make sure we do not allow our freedoms to slip away. We must use them carefully and properly.

By getting involved with my country and working with all allows the four essential freedoms to flourish. I must help people realize that things will not get better by revolution but instead a combined striving through evolution. We will not improve and strengthen separately. We will rise together and our optimism in this idea, our patience to strive for better unification and retaining it will make the rise a faster and more continuous one. Yes, together we stand but divided we fall. I must stand together with my countrymen and appreciate what we do have, and will have in the future days to come.

A MORE EQUITABLE RETIREMENT BILL

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE OF CALIFORNIA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, many Federal employees have in the past served in federally funded and supervised programs which have been actually administered by State and local authorities. Under existing statute, these Federal employees are not able to credit the time they served in these federally funded programs toward the calculation of their Federal retirement annuity.

Therefore, I am today introducing a bill which will permit certain Federal employees to buy into the civil service retirement system, based on employment in federally funded programs operated by State and local governments.

February 27, 1973

In order to be eligible under this act, an employee must have 5 years of Federal service in addition to service in a State or locally administered program, and the time of service in such a State or local program must not be creditable toward the purchase of an annuity under any other program.

Under this act, Federal employees would be permitted to buy into the Federal retirement system by either depositing to the credit of the civil service retirement and disability fund a lump sum equal to the amount that would have been deducted during the period in question—plus interest calculated at 3 percent per annum; or by making the deposit in 12 equal monthly payments withheld from their annuity as it accrues, each payment comprising one-twelfth of the deposit and interest computed at the rate of 3 percent per annum.

Application for coverage under the provisions of this act must be made within 1 year of the enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this act would correct a serious inequity dealt many current Federal employees, and I, therefore, submit it for the careful consideration of the Members.

I include the full text of the bill in the RECORD:

H.R. 4884

A bill to encourage earlier retirement by permitting Federal employees to purchase into the Civil Service Retirement System benefits unduplicated in any other retirement system based on employment in Federal programs operated by State and local governments under Federal funding and supervision

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8332 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

(L) Subject to sections 8334(c) and 8339(b) of this title, an employee or Member shall be allowed credit for any period of service performed by him (unless the employee or Member was certified as being eligible for relief) in the employment of a State, a political subdivision thereof, or an instrumentality of either, primarily in the carrying out of any program authorized by Act of Congress to be conducted in accordance with standards prescribed by Federal law and all or part of which is financed directly or indirectly by Federal funds if—

(1) the head of the Executive agency, or his designee, administering the program or assuming the function or program makes a certification to the Civil Service Commission, in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Commission, concerning the service under this subsection, or such service is otherwise established to the satisfaction of the Commission;

(2) the employee or Member has at least 5 years of accrues, each payment comprising one-twelfth of the deposit and interest computed at the rate of 3 per centum per annum.

For purposes of this subsection, "State" means the several States and Puerto Rico.

Sec. 2. The annuity of any person who shall have performed service of the type described in subsection (L) of section 8332 of title 5 United States Code, as added by the first section of this Act, and who before the date of enactment of this Act shall have been retired on annuity under the provisions of sub-chapter III of chapter 8 of such title, or prior provision of law, shall, upon application filed by any such person within one year after the date of enactment of this Act and

in accordance with the provisions of such subsection (L), be adjusted effective as of the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this Act, so that the amount of such annuity will be the same as if such subsection (L) had been in effect at the time of such person's retirement.

Similarly, the annuity of a person qualifying under the deferred annuity provisions of section 8338 and performing service described in subsection (L) shall, upon application filed by such person within one year after qualifying under section 8338, be adjusted effective as of the first day of the month in which he qualifies for the annuity.

CONSTRUCTIVE INVOLVEMENT OF YOUNG PEOPLE

HON. WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III OF INDIANA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. HEDNUT. Mr. Speaker, so frequently, the news we read about our young people is the bad news—and the printers' ink is devoted to narratives describing the peccadilloes and misadventures, the rebelliousness, and lawlessness, of a small minority of young men and women in our country; so that we neglect the majority of them who are not breaking laws, pushing drugs, getting divorces, dodging the draft, laying down on floors of deans' offices, turning on and turning out, and so on. Many people lose perspective on the younger generation, because what they read in the papers and see on TV misleads them into thinking the whole group is worse than it really is. Rarely ever do we read or hear about the good things the young people are doing.

I have always believed that in the current generation of young people in our country, there is much nobility and idealism that is exceedingly praiseworthy, much patriotism and devotion to duty, much dedication and unselfishness. They have spoken valid protests against the depersonalization and hollow materialism so characteristic of our culture. They have tried to teach us the values of authenticity and individuality, deplored the dehumanizing and brutalizing effects of some aspects of modern life. They have tried to express love for their fellow man in new and different ways. They have shouldered their responsibilities on the campus and the battlefields. They have tried to lead meaningful lives. They have involved themselves in the great work of building a better society by helping to transform the human race into the human family.

I would like to share one instance of this constructive involvement in useful living, on the part of our young people, with my colleagues in the Congress. It helps me keep my faith intact to read the kind of letter that came to me from a group of students in Indianapolis, dated February 3, 1973. This letter describes some of the activities of a group of fraternity men during the past year—Phi Delt at Butler University—for which I think they deserve special commendation. Their spokesman wrote me as follows:

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,
February 3, 1973.

DEAR MR. HEDNUT: I am a sophomore at Butler University and a member of Phi Delta Theta Fraternity. The press and many people in the news media only seem to recognize and mention the radical and violent actions by students on campus. I would like to tell you, sir, how members of Indiana Gamma of Phi Delta Theta have gone out into the community and helped their fellow man.

Three years ago, David L. Shore, a fraternity brother, died of cancer. Brother Shore came from Rochester, Indiana and was an outstanding football player for Butler as well as an excellent student. In memory of him, we started the David L. Shore Memorial Cancer Fund. The money the Phi's collect goes into Dave's private fund and serves a two fold purpose. Ninety percent of the money goes toward the research of cancer and the other ten percent toward education and advertisement. At the Butler vs. St. Joseph football game, the Phi Deltas collected a grand total of \$323.23. We have received a certificate from the Cancer Society for outstanding work in the fight against cancer. We have just finished a neighborhood drive and still planning on collecting at a basketball game.

The Phi Deltas felt a necessity to get involved in the 1972 election. Being new voters and enthusiastic about the 1972 Presidential and Gubernatorial election, many of us campaigned for Mr. Nixon and Otis Bowen from mid-October to election day. We worked throughout Indianapolis and even made trips to Terre Haute (Indiana State University) and Muncie (Ball State University) to take campaign material to these headquarters. On election night to mid-afternoon the next day, many Phi's worked down at the City County Building tabulating votes. Our fraternity house, on election day, was used as a voting precinct.

One Saturday, we went out to the Little Sisters of the Poor or otherwise known as the St. Augustine's Home for the Aged. During the morning we put to use some of our talents by painting lawn furniture, cleaning rooms, ceilings, light fixtures, walls, and anything else that was dirty. We even cleaned the kitchen from top to bottom and even had time to do some baking, tailoring of old clothes, and even straightened the pantry and rearranged all the canned goods in their proper places. In the afternoon, we hosted a Bingo game for the old folks in Lanagan Hall. All the old people, who were present in the house (more than 100), came down to play Bingo. We played twenty-five games with the winners receiving cash gifts and merchandise. It was quite satisfying to see the old folks be so happy knowing that someone cared and was interested in their well-being and that there was not a generation gap.

To beautify the neighborhood around Butler University, the Phi Deltas have gone out and raked leaves several times. To help the ecology minded people and fight air pollution, we have had neighborhood drives collecting leaves so that they would not have to be burned and clutter up the air with debris and smoke.

We have also worked with Walker Research participating in consumer market studies. We have tested orange juices, hamburgers, carbonated beverages, and aspirin. By participating in these studies and giving our opinions, I feel that we have helped the manufacturers of various products determine what the consumer really wants.

We have also held a public survey for the Department of Public Safety. We took the survey to help determine how drinking and driving contribute to traffic accidents.

The Phi's have hosted an Orphan's Christmas Party. We invited children from the Indiana Methodist Children's Orphanage over

to our fraternity. We then took the children over to the observatory. They learned how the telescope worked and had an opportunity to look out of it. They also took a trip to the planetarium where they learned about the planets in our solar system. That night they ate dinner at our fraternity house. While many of the brothers were playing with the kids, Santa Claus made a surprise visit and gave the kids their presents. The only sad moment came when they had to leave and there were tears in their eyes.

The Phi Deltas, just recently, gave money to the Cathy Strange Fund and multiple sclerosis fund.

What lies ahead in our future? The members of Indiana Gamma of Phi Delta Theta hope to work down at the juvenile center, have a retarded children's track meet, work with the inner city children, collect for the Ruth Lyons Fund and our own David L. Shore Memorial Cancer Fund, and anything else that would better our community where we live.

Sincerely,

JAMES BAGNOLI,
Phi Delta Theta, Butler University,

A CENTENNIAL MEDALLION FOR COLORADO

HON. DONALD G. BROTHMAN OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. BROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the Nation is busily preparing for a gala celebration of its 200th birthday, it is my hope that we not forget another birthday to be celebrated in 1976. That year, on August 1, Colorado will mark its 100th anniversary as a State.

Colorado has come a long way since its "Rush to the Rockies" era in the 1860's. She now has the honor of being one of the leaders of the Great Plains in industry, agriculture, recreational, and educational facilities.

Denver, the State capitol, has earned its place as the "Queen City of the Plains" for its development as the industrial and social center of the area. From a boom town and supply depot for gold seekers in 1859, Denver has grown through stages to become the economic warehouse and shipping conduit for the western Great Plains from Canada to Mexico. Denver now services this western half of America's breadbasket with a majority of the consumer and industrial goods brought into the area.

Denver and Colorado in general afford some of the best recreational areas the United States has to offer. Millions of tourists each year enjoy its tremendous skiing, boating, fishing, hiking, and hunting. A spectacular array of scenic views are provided the casual visitor.

The people of Colorado are proud of their heritage and will undoubtedly put on a colorful and entertaining celebration for their State's 100th anniversary. Events are scheduled throughout the State and spectators from across the country will certainly be treated to a rare and exciting view of the past century of development in the American West.

One of the most significant events to take place in the history of Colorado was the location of a branch of the U.S. Mint

there. This one act insured the continued existence of Denver as a commercial center of the western Great Plains, thus attracting even more industry to the Centennial State. I think it would be most fitting, therefore, for the U.S. Mint in Denver to take an active role in the centennial celebration.

Accordingly, I am today joined by the entire House delegation from the State of Colorado in introducing legislation to authorize the Denver Mint to strike a special commemorative medallion honoring the hundred years of Colorado statehood. Of course, all expenses of the Mint would be on a reimbursable basis so that the Colorado Centennial-Bicentennial Commission, in charge of supervising the State's celebration, would shoulder all costs associated with striking a special run of medallions.

I should also add that this bill I am today introducing is based on similar legislation enacted in the last several Congresses to commemorate other historical events of a national interest in this regard.

The bill sets a limit of 250,000 on the number of medallions to be minted and establishes a final date for striking of the medals as December 31, 1976. Sales of the medallions by the Centennial-Bicentennial Commission will help defray the costs of staging events throughout the State for all of the people to come and enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, Colorado has shared a great pioneer tradition with its sister States of the Union. Its introduction into the United States of America marks a significant national event which I feel the people of the entire country will want to help celebrate. At no expense to the Federal Government, we have an opportunity to see this celebration be a success.

My colleagues from Colorado and I join together in asking the House Banking and Currency Committee to respond to this opportunity by bringing our bill to the floor of the House at an early date.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE OPPOSE NIXON BUDGET CUTS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, if President Nixon heretofore believed that the only Americans opposed to his proposed budget cuts in antipoverty and Great Society social programs were the underprivileged citizens directly benefiting from the programs, then it might very well be that he is sadly mistaken.

I submit for your attention and the attention of my colleagues, the results of a Harris survey that appeared in the Washington Post of February 26 entitled "Public Disagrees With Most of Nixon Welfare Cutbacks."

This is the first clear evidence that a majority of Americans are not fooled by the President's rhetoric, and that they support the continuation of the war on poverty.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The article follows:

THE HARRIS SURVEY: PUBLIC DISAGREES WITH MOST OF NIXON WELFARE CUTBACKS

(By Louis Harris)

The American people are not in agreement for the most part with the budget recommendations of the Nixon administration to cut back a number of long-established federal social welfare programs. The decision to eliminate the Office of Economic Opportunity, the coordination agency for the antipoverty program, for example, is opposed by 46 to 39 per cent.

The major finding of an intensive, special Harris Survey on the Nixon budget shows the public to be in favor of increased spending for such things as job training, rural electrification, Head Start and new hospital construction, even though a majority agrees, by 59 to 28 per cent, that "President Nixon is right in saying that inflation cannot be controlled unless federal spending is cut to the bone."

Between Feb. 14 and 17, a cross-section of 1,505 households was asked:

President Nixon has ordered a sharp halt in rises in spending by the federal government, pledging to keep spending at no more than \$269 billions a year. How likely do you feel it is that President Nixon will be able to keep federal spending from going above that limit—very likely, only somewhat likely or highly unlikely?

[In percent]

	Total public
Very likely	15
Only somewhat likely	42
Highly unlikely	34
Not sure	9

Of course, one reason for the public's pessimism on achieving a ceiling in federal spending is that the public, itself, is inclined to oppose many of the major cuts proposed by the President.

To determine attitudes on specific budget recommendations the cross-section was asked:

Let me read you some of the areas of federal spending where President Nixon has proposed some major changes. For each, tell me if you tend to agree or disagree with what President Nixon has proposed. (Read list):

[In percent]

	Agree	Disagree	Not sure
Increase social security payments	70	25	5
Increase pay for military personnel to prepare for Volunteer Army	68	24	3
Increase federal aid for education to State and local government	66	26	3
Eliminate Model Cities program	48	31	21
Expand program to aid minority-owner businesses	48	38	14
Cut down farm price support paid to farmers	44	44	12
Cut back spending for urban renewal programs	43	42	15
Eliminate Office of Economic Opportunity, the agency running the anti-poverty programs	39	46	15
Increase spending for research into new weapons systems	33	68	9
Cut back loan aid under rural electrification	31	47	22
Cut back Job Corps, designed to help train disadvantaged young people	29	64	7
Place less emphasis on enforcing minority rights and more emphasis on enforcing rights of women	27	50	23
Eliminate the Headstart program, designed to help disadvantaged children prepare for school	25	69	6
Cut back on federal aid for building new hospitals	24	70	6
Cut back free milk in school lunch programs	18	79	3
Make older people pay more than they now pay for medicare	5	92	3

February 27, 1973

MILLIONS FOR DEFENSE BUT NOT ONE CENT FOR TRIBUTE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, there are many protests against the paying of reparations—tribute—to Hanoi, North Vietnam.

This is especially true in view of the fact that the administration is proposing to terminate, cut back and reduce vital programs of important domestic needs.

In this connection and because of the interest of the American people in this most important subject, I place my recent newsletter, Capitol Comments, in the RECORD herewith.

The newsletter follows:

ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL TO PAY BILLIONS TO NORTH VIETNAM AS REPARATIONS ONE OF CRUCIAL ISSUES FACING THE CONGRESS

The Congress is faced with many difficult and challenging current issues—and one of the most controversial is the proposal by the Administration to pay billions of dollars in reparations to the Communist government of Hanoi—North Vietnam.

The issue is made all the more controversial because of the announced action by the Administration in cutting back and terminating many progressive legislative measures for our people at home—including the denial of funding of such programs by impounding of more than \$12 billion in funds earmarked for domestic needs.

The consensus of letters from constituents and statements by many Congressmen and Senators—both Democrats and Republicans—is that priorities would be turned upside down if billions were given North Vietnam while domestic programs in education, health, economic development, housing, assistance to the needy, farm programs, student assistance, the school milk program for children, and even medicare benefits for our elderly, among others, are being cut back, emasculated or terminated.

The new Director of the Office of Management and Budget—Roy Ash—said at a recent Congressional hearing that the funds allocated for North Vietnam would be cut from domestic programs.

Already the Veterans Administration has proposed a cutback in disability compensation for Vietnam veterans at the very time that prisoners of war were being returned home—this was later rescinded temporarily because of the many protests from Members of Congress, veterans and citizens.

Mr. Ash on February 8 was asked this question while testifying before the Joint Economic Committee:

"Am I to understand that if there is a request for funds for assistance to North Vietnam, it means that it will have to come out of other programs included in the present budget?"

The answer by Mr. Ash:

"That certainly is our intention and expectation precisely as you have discussed it."

The Administration justification for these proposed payments to North Vietnam, explained by its chief foreign policy spokesman, Dr. Henry Kissinger, is that we should placate and encourage the North Vietnamese war lords to be peaceful and cooperative.

In the words of Dr. Kissinger:

"You should look at the economic aid program not in terms of a handout or ransom and not in terms of a program even of re-

construction alone, but as an attempt to enable the leaders of North Vietnam to work together with other countries, and particularly with Western countries, in a more constructive relationship and to provide in this manner an incentive toward a more peaceful evolution."

There exists a great reluctance in the Congress to endorse such an expensive and expansive program designed to rehabilitate the attitudes of North Vietnamese leaders who are responsible for the deaths of more than 46,000 Americans.

A great American once said:

"Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

Your Representative subscribes to this philosophy. As a matter of fact, it is my feeling that we cannot afford billions for defense and billions for North Vietnam at the expense of shortchanging the vital needs of our people at home.

It is my information that although the United States hopes to disguise, to some extent, the assistance to North Vietnam through a multi-lateral effort involving other nations, our country will bear the brunt of the costs—paying the lion's share—because many of the same nations who refused the United States support in South Vietnam are now refusing assistance in rebuilding North Vietnam.

Reports of the total amount to be requested for North Vietnam appropriations range from \$2 billion to \$5 billion to \$7 billion—even more—and the effort could well be to channel this assistance through some agency such as the Export-Import Bank by an indirect authorization in another attempt to bypass and circumvent the Congress and the Constitution.

Efforts to find out precisely what the Administration is committed to provide for North Vietnam have been unavailing and unsuccessful.

Congress also will be asked to provide funds for reconstruction in South Vietnam which, we can rest assured, will not be bolstered by any assistance from Russia or China. Many are asking why the responsibility for North Vietnamese reconstruction cannot be left to its allies while the United States continues to assist South Vietnam.

With the war over, the defense budget request is up by almost \$5 billion—from \$76.4 billion to \$81.1 billion in Fiscal 1974.

The Congress will carefully scrutinize the defense budget which continues to rise, although the unfortunate and costly Vietnam War is over—and cuts and reductions are predicted, together with the setting of some priorities which favor the people of America.

RESULTS OF ABORTION LAWS IN EUROPE

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been nearly a month now since I introduced my constitutional amendment to protect the life of the unborn, House Joint Resolution 261, and daily hundreds of letters in support of my amendment pour into my office.

One of the most interesting and revealing of these thousands of letters came from Dr. S. G. Barber, of Newcastle University Hospitals, Newcastle, England.

Dr. Barber's letter points out some of the results of the various abortion laws in Europe. I think his letter is most revealing and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The text of the letter follows:

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NEWCASTLE, ENGLAND,

February 11, 1973.

DEAR SIR: May I offer my best wishes for the success of your proposed Constitutional Amendment for protection of individuals from conception. Many in the rest of the "Western" World hope you succeed!

The various abortion law reforms, particularly in Europe have not achieved the relief of suffering that had been hoped for. Several patients I have met rue the day they were "scraped".

As a physician with a separate Science degree in human reproduction, development and anthropology, I defy anyone to outline a fundamental biological difference between fetuses before and after the magic 28th or 40th week of gestation—apart from their mode of nutrition (of which the cardiorespiratory changes at birth are a secondary feature).

I am glad you decided not to resign from Congress—and hope you will continue to speak for those of us who have a somewhat smaller and less awesome audience!

Yours sincerely,

STEPHEN A. BARBER.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, recently we commemorated the 55th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Estonia. The northernmost Baltic country, Estonia is a land where people yearn for the freedom and independence that was once theirs. On February 24, 1918, Estonia proclaimed independence from all foreign rule and won its freedom from Soviet Russia in 1920. Regrettably, that freedom was shortlived, and in 1940 Estonia once again found herself dominated by the Soviet Union. With the exception of a brief interlude of Nazi occupation between 1941 and 1944, Estonia has remained in the clutches of Soviet influence to this day.

History has been less than kind to the Estonians, who have inhabited their present territory for the past 6,000 years. Their quest for independence was thwarted by the Crusades of the 13th century, and the Estonians have been fighting subjugation from foreign nations ever since. In the 18th century the Great Northern War completely devastated the country and Estonia became a province of Russia.

The Estonians have always been able to recover and rebuild their country, which became an outpost of western culture and an important center of industrial activity in Eastern Europe. Every 5 years since 1869, music festivals are held which attract more than 100,000 people to hear choirs that range in size from 20,000 to 25,000 singers. The Estonians have contributed to world progress in many ways, including the development of the oil shale industry. In this industry, oil is distilled from oil shale to produce fuel oil, gasoline, asphalt, and other important chemical products.

Despite their achievements, Estonians

have reaped few rewards while under Soviet influence. For more than three decades the Soviet Union has denied basic human rights to the people of Estonia. Yet, with great courage and national pride, Estonians continue to seek the liberty and independence that they have enjoyed during their brief glimpses of freedom. It is my hope that Estonians will once again be able to fulfill their dreams of freedom and self-determination.

OLDER AMERICANS ACT

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce a bill to extend and improve the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, H.R. 4813. Enactment of this bill would be a victory for those of us who are concerned about the well-being of the Nation's 20 million elderly persons.

This bill was prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is similar to the bill the administration submitted last year, S. 3391. Although the Older Americans Act amendments finally passed by the Congress—H.R. 15657—included many of the initiatives originally proposed by the administration, the bill had objectionable provisions that caused the President to veto it. These included excessively high authorization levels, categorical programs which overlapped existing authorities and a provision legislating an unnecessary change in the organizational placement of the Administration on Aging.

It is now time for the Congress again to consider proposals to extend the Older Americans Act. The bill that I have introduced builds on the conviction that community resources exist that can be made to work for the elderly, and that community institutions can be made more responsive to the special problems of the aged.

These amendments in my bill would strengthen the State agencies and create areawide planning agencies on the local level. This local agency would assist the elderly in each area and formulate an areawide plan to create services or take advantage of existing services that would enable the elderly to meet their needs. The plan would build on the social services already available in a community, describing how they could be better coordinated to serve the aged. Federal funds would be provided to fund services that were not available, including nutrition, health, recreation, counseling, and transportation services.

The President's veto of the bill passed by the Congress last year was not a veto of programs for the elderly, but rather, the veto of a bill that was fiscally irresponsible and that contained a number of programs unrelated to the existing Older Americans Act on to the Administration on Aging.

In fact, the administration's support of programs and legislation for the elderly

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

February 27, 1973

ly is clear. For example, under President Nixon, the budget for the Administration on Aging rose from \$27.507 million in fiscal year 1969 to a budget request of \$244.6 million for fiscal year 1974. In addition to these expenditures for services to the aged, I should note the projected fiscal year 1974 level of other benefits for the aged. The President's fiscal year 1974 budget reflects a total of \$69.1 billion in income security benefits for the aged. This figure includes over \$31 billion in annuities to primary beneficiaries and over \$37 billion in benefits

to aged persons who are not primary beneficiaries. These figures mean that roughly 20 percent of the entire Federal budget for fiscal year 1974 will be devoted to benefits for the aged who make up about 10 percent of our population. I will submit with these remarks tables which break this figure down. This level of income security for our Nation's elderly has resulted from the joint action of the President and the Congress and testifies to our shared concern in the problems of the aged.

I urge my colleagues to join with me

in working for the speedy passage of my bill. The creative restructuring of title III that was proposed by the administration and adopted almost fully by Congress in H.R. 15657 is the heart of this bill, but it contains none of the objectionable features.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in extending and improving the Older Americans Act in a responsible and workable manner by supporting H.R. 4813 and helping to move it to early enactment.

I include the following tables:

TABLE K-3—INCOME SECURITY BENEFITS FOR THE AGED

	Benefits (millions)			Percent change 1972-74		Benefits (millions)			Percent change 1972-74
	1972 actual	1973 estimate	1974 estimate			1972 actual	1973 estimate	1974 estimate	
Covered employment:									
Social security (OASI) members	30,205	37,148	41,478	37		Medicare	8,363	9,090	9,819
Railroad employees	1,865	2,173	2,293	23	Medicaid	1,726	1,477	1,679	-3
Federal civilian employees	2,707	3,269	3,676	36	Other in-kind	394	522	497	26
Uniformed services members	1,039	1,153	1,259	21	Subtotal, in-kind benefit outlays	10,483	11,089	11,995	14
Coal miners' widows	97	166	158	63	Tax transfers	4,300	4,730	5,590	30
Public assistance and other income-tested	2,168	2,179	2,671	23	Total	52,864	61,907	69,120	31
Subtotal, cash benefit outlays	38,081	46,088	51,535	35					

TABLE K-4.—ANNUITIES TO PRIMARY BENEFICIARIES IN CONTRIBUTORY RETIREMENT SYSTEMS: ANNUITY BENEFITS, BENEFICIARIES, AND AVERAGE PAYMENTS

	Benefit outlays (millions)			Number of primary beneficiaries (thousands)			Average monthly payments		
	1972 actual	1973 estimate	1974 estimate	1972 actual	1973 estimate	1974 estimate	1972 actual	1973 estimate	1974 estimate
Old-age and survivors insurance									
Railroad Retirement Board	19,630	24,064	26,731	11,172	11,686	12,226	148	180	183
Civil Service Commission	1,162	1,346	1,423	391	394	384	247	284	299
Foreign service retirement	2,399	2,922	3,292	562	618	649	355	394	423
Total	22	24	27	2	2	2	883	905	919
	23,213	28,356	31,473						

TABLE K-5.—BENEFITS FOR THE AGED EXCEPT ANNUITIES TO PRIMARY BENEFICIARIES: BENEFITS, BENEFICIARIES, AND AVERAGE PAYMENT

	Benefits (millions)			Number of beneficiaries (thousands)			Average monthly payments		
	1972 actual	1973 estimate	1974 estimate	1972 actual	1973 estimate	1974 estimate	1972 actual	1973 estimate	1974 estimate
Benefits to aged widows:									
Social security (OASDI) members	5,797	7,525	8,896	3,919	4,113	4,453	113	138	157
Railroad employees	403	497	522	282	284	286	117	146	150
Federal civilian employees	286	323	357	161	166	178	147	162	166
Uniformed services members	684	737	755	611	634	661	93	96	95
Coal miners	97	166	158	42	60	81	161	161	161
Benefits to aged wives of living retirees:	2,812	3,381	3,697	3,128	3,192	3,280	74	88	93
Social security (OASDI) members	282	309	326	212	213	214	111	121	125
Railroad employees	18	21	21	16	15	14	93	118	125
Minimum benefit payments:	1,623	1,758	1,683	2,258	2,152	2,043	59	68	68
Social security (OASDI) members	1,623	1,758	1,683	2,258	2,152	2,043	59	68	68
Railroad employees	18	21	21	16	15	14	93	118	125
Dependents of aged retirees: Social security (OASDI) members	360	440	492	565	587	624	53	62	65
Aged retirees uniformed services	354	416	504	70	75	80	421	462	526
Aged veterans	1,002	1,004	901	1,161	1,170	1,162	108	109	96
Medicare	8,363	9,090	9,819	10,600	10,700	10,700	66	71	76
Public assistance to the aged, including refugees and Indians:	1,166	1,174	1,570	2,083	2,048	2,041	48	48	46
Old-age assistance	1,166	1,174	1,570	2,083	2,048	2,041	48	48	46
Supplemental security income			2,100	2,048	2,041	2,041			43
Medicaid	1,726	1,477	1,679	3,800	4,000	5,152	37	30	27
In-kind benefits to needy aged:	164	180	95	1,300	1,297	1,281	10	11	6
Food	164	180	95	1,300	1,297	1,281	10	11	6
Housing	230	343	402	304	346	408	62	84	84
Tax transfers	4,300	4,730	5,590						
Total	29,667	33,571	37,667						

¹ Benefits for first half of year.

² Benefits for second half of year.

FREEDOM HAS A PRICE

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to call to the attention of my

colleagues the essay, "Freedom Has a Price," written by Cadet Staff Sergeant Mark W. Jordan, son of Mr. and Mrs. Winston L. Jordan of Route 1, Box 136, Crestview, Fla. Cadet Staff Sergeant Jordan is a member of the Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps Cadets of Crestview Senior High School and his essay has won the Freedom Foundation's George Washington Honor Medal Award.

He is one of six winners throughout the United States. I think you will find his essay most impressive.

The essay follows:

FREEDOM HAS A PRICE

(By Mark W. Jordan)

The time worn cliche, "the best things in life are free," is hardly true. Just about everything has its price.

"I regret that I have but one life to give

for my country," the trap was sprung, a young life snuffed out and an installment was paid on freedom. If we are to continue to be free, then we must continue the installations—for freedom indeed has a price.

The young men of today's R.O.T.C. programs, led by dedicated leaders who have themselves been tempered in battle, are following in the footsteps of the great men of our country who have paid the price of freedom.

While a small percentage of our youth indulge in the self destruction of drugs, while a small percentage rant against the "establishment" or for that matter any form of government, while a few led by some insane teachers ask the asinine question, "who am I," there are those whose feet are on solid ground. The hallowed ground tred by leaders such as Washington, Lee, Patton and countless others.

These young men many of whom are in R.O.T.C., know not only who they are, but where they are going.

Within no more than ten years this country will be led by these youths, these young men being taught leadership, duty, devotion to God and Country, or this nation given to us by the grace of God and the blood of the thousands who died to make and keep it free, will perish from the earth. In the words of Patrick Henry, "... forbid it almighty God." Yes, freedom indeed has a price and that price is measured in blood.

But there is hope. While the loudmouth few try to find themselves in the dark deadly fog of drugs, while the gutless cowards who refused to help their country loll about free, even aided by some senators and congressmen, while the whole lot of these try to disrupt our country, leaders are being made.

If we shall continue to be free, then there must always be those who will place their life on the line to insure it. When we run out of these men we will run out of freedom—for freedom indeed has a price.

COMMEMORATING HARRY S TRUMAN

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, we were deeply saddened this past December when Harry S Truman, the 33d President of the United States died. All of us in the Congress, as well as the American people, and indeed, people all over this world, remember Harry Truman—a "not so average" man of the people.

We knew of his battles in life, of how he so valiantly overcame adversity after adversity, and we admired this man who so often took the measure of the most difficult decisions with that characteristic phrase of his after the task was finished, "that's all there was to it."

But there was so much to Harry S Truman, enough courage, enough determination, enough belief in America and our people to bring him all the way from a humble beginning in Lamar, Mo., to the Presidency of the United States of America.

Harry Truman knew war—from personal experience in World War I—and the decision to use atomic bombs to shorten the course of World War II and to save lives was, as he afterward said, "the toughest one of my life." Yet, as he said "Had we invaded Japan, millions might have died." It was a fateful deci-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

sion, but Harry Truman was there to make it, and for that we can be thankful.

After the war, there was a difficult period of readjustment for the Nation— inflation, shortages, unemployment, strikes, but Harry Truman stuck to his course and helped to steer the Nation through it all.

The cold war descended upon the world, and Harry Truman met the challenge of militant communism from Greece to Korea. He saw to it that the people of Berlin would not be starved into submission, and he worked through the United Nations Organization to help build a better world for all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, all of us were so much richer for having had Mr. Truman as our leader during those fateful years—and, we are so much poorer now at his loss. Now, as we pay our respects to his memory, and as our Nation emerges from the long shadow of war in Southeast Asia, we may well recall the words of Harry Truman, thirty-third President of the United States of America:

For it is all too obvious that if we do not abolish war on this earth, then surely, one day, war will abolish us from the earth.

DR. PAUL F. LANDIS RECEIVES VETERINARIAN AWARD

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, recently a leading citizen of Norfolk, Va., a city I proudly represent and serve in the 93d Congress, received statewide recognition for his outstanding service and abilities in the practice of veterinary medicine. Dr. Paul F. Landis has long been one of the top veterinarians in Tidewater. His service and dedication have set a high standard for those who would follow in his footsteps.

At a meeting of the Virginia Veterinary Medical Association, Dr. Landis received the Virginia Veterinarian of the Year Award. It was reported in the Virginian-Pilot, one of the Old Dominion's leading newspapers, and I include it at this point in the RECORD. The report follows:

NORFOLKIAN TOP ANIMAL PHYSICIAN

FREDERICKSBURG.—Dr. Paul F. Landis of Norfolk was named Virginia Veterinarian of the Year at a banquet Sunday night during the annual convention of the Virginia Veterinary Medical Association and its Women's Auxiliary.

Dr. Landis, a small-animal practitioner and partner at the Dog and Cat Hospital in Norfolk, was presented the award by Dr. Preston M. Givens of Hot Springs, chairman of the selection committee.

Dr. Roger P. Link, president of the American Veterinary Medical Association, in remarks at the banquet, said "veterinary medical practice primarily is a service profession and we must change to satisfy the demands from a changing society."

Dr. Link discussed plans to train paramedical personnel to assist veterinarians.

Dr. Landis, a native of Pennsylvania, received his degree from the School of Veterinary Medicine at the University of Pennsylvania.

He came to Virginia when he began a five-year hitch in the Army at Ft. Story. He

is married to the former Madge Taliaferro of Norfolk.

He began his practice in 1946.

Dr. Landis was the first president of the Tidewater Veterinary Medical Association and is a director and past president of the Virginia VMA.

Last October, he was elected president of the Southern Veterinary Medical Association.

He has for years served as Virginia's member of the House of Delegates of the American Veterinary Medical Association.

Dr. Landis was appointed by the governor to a five-year term on the Virginia State Board of Veterinary Medical Examiners. The term expires in 1976.

He is also Tidewater regional vice president for the Virginia Association of Professions.

Dr. Landis is on the board of directors of the Norfolk Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and is a past president of the Norfolk Kiwanis Club.

GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial on gun control legislation appearing on Station WTRX, Flint, Mich., which merits careful consideration in legislative bodies in these difficult times. That editorial, given by the able president of station WTRX, Mr. Robert E. Eastman II, points out a sensible approach to criminal violence and criminal violence by firearms:

GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION

WTRX, Flint and the Nation are all stricken with grief and sorrow caused by the senseless shooting of Senator Stennis. We are all concerned about the alarming crime rate and the violent shooting of the Senator for just a few dollars. This shooting, once again, brings this problem to center stage. Our do-gooder liberals in Congress will be pressing hard for legislation to ban or severely restrict the ownership of guns. These anti-gun laws will do nothing but penalize the law-abiding citizens by taking weapons out of their hands and leaving the ownership of weapons solely in the criminals' hands. Why can't our lawmakers put the emphasis where it belongs? Why should the rights of the true sportsmen be diminished when they have consistently supported conservation and proper gun training for our youth?

Why can't our "do-gooder" liberal lawmakers realize that it is those people who willfully use guns to commit crimes who are the ones who should pay the price, not you and I? WTRX would suggest the following remedies.

First, let us again, as a nation, legalize the death penalty for certain crimes. If when someone willfully takes the life of a policeman, elected official or citizen why shouldn't this person pay the ultimate price? WTRX believes that far fewer killings with guns would occur if it were made abundantly clear through the use of the death penalty that this kind of crime doesn't pay. WTRX believes that strong legislation is needed to force some of our liberal judges in giving the maximum sentence when any crime is committed with a gun. WTRX believes the time has come for society to start demanding that those criminals who commit crimes with a gun pay their debt to society and that debt should be equivalent to their crime, including the death penalty. Let us not restrict the rights and freedoms of the vast majority of

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

us because we haven't been tough enough in the past on the criminals.

DR. ROBERT WILLIAM BAIRD—AN INVOLVED AMERICAN

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of discussion in the American society about narcotics addiction, about crime, and about race relations. While some use flamboyant rhetoric in their attempts to solve very human problems with grandiose expenditures of public money, others have taken important steps, at great sacrifice to themselves, to do something which will really make life better.

One such man is Dr. Robert William Baird. During the day he has a thriving medical practice in midtown New York. Every evening he works with narcotics addicts in Harlem, and in 15 years he has treated more than 1,000, ranging in age from 9 to 72.

Discussing this remarkable man in a Reader's Digest article, writer William Schultz notes that—

Baird keeps a schedule that would likely finish anyone else. Up at 6:45, he works out for 45 minutes—lifting weights, shadowboxing, doing pushups—then practices voice for a half-hour (An old fashioned patriot, he sings the national anthem before 63,000 football fans at New York Jets home games). By 8 a.m. he is on his way to Flower and Fifth Avenue Hospitals to see his paying patients, then he works the rest of the morning at the Metropolitan Hospital Diabetic Clinic. Skipping lunch, Baird sees more private patients, makes late-afternoon hospital calls, then holds evening office hours.

Haven, which he purchased for his work with drug addicts, is a one-man narcotics clinic. In a field where cures are virtually nonexistent, where 98 of every 100 addicts return to drugs, Dr. Baird has claimed an extraordinary success rate of 60 percent. He accepts no Government aid, but uses his own funds for his work.

Mr. Schultz points out that—

Baird has no illusions that he can single-handedly combat the drug explosion. Thus, every spare minute he battles to wake an apathetic public. He accuses fellow doctors of doing little to help. In speeches to teachers and parents he rips into his audiences. "Discipline—loving but unyielding—is the answer," he says. "You are not the kids' friend. You are a parent or a teacher, with very different responsibilities."

Dr. Baird has sought congressional action in the drug field, and has repeatedly charged the government of Communist China with involvement in the narcotics traffic. This charge, however, simply meets with indifference in Washington.

Men such as Dr. Baird are sacrificing their own lives to create a better and more decent society. All who are concerned about the problem of narcotics should carefully read the story of what one man who really cares can accomplish.

I wish to share with my colleagues the article, "Dr. Baird's Double Life," which appeared in the January 1973 Reader's

Digest, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

DR. BAIRD'S DOUBLE LIFE

(By William Schulz)

It is night in New York's squalid East Harlem. At 9:45, a blue sedan pulls up outside a four-story house at 222 East 116 Street, and a powerfully built man wearing a white medical jacket hops out. "Let's go," he says to the dozen or so people standing on the sidewalk, and they all file into the tiny, first-floor waiting room of Haven, an extraordinary one-man narcotics clinic.

For the next four hours, Dr. Robert William Baird will work with these victims of America's drug epidemic—a Vietnam veteran, a homeless girl of 16, a middle-aged laboratory technician, a surgeon's son. Rich and poor, white and black, they have one thing in common: they are addicts trying to go straight.

In 15 years, Dr. Baird has worked with more than 1000 addicts, ranging in age from 9 to 72. And in a field where cures are virtually nonexistent, where 98 of every 100 addicts go back to drugs, he has claimed an unheard-of success rate of 60 percent. Accepting no government funds, rejecting methadone as a "fraud that replaces one drug with another," the blunt, outspoken doctor has become a legend among those who have witnessed his work. A New Jersey narcotics agent calls him "a miracle man." A mother whose son was still an addict after thousands of dollars' worth of psychiatry says, "Dr. Baird wouldn't take a cent. But he gave me back my boy." Adds a 56-year-old addict who has been clean for three years, "The man saved my life. I love him."

Handsome, blond-haired Robert Baird was born 49 years ago in Newark, N.J., the son of immigrant parents. Raised in Brooklyn tenements, he financed his first year of college by washing dishes at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. When war broke out, he enlisted in the Navy, made officer, and saw action in the South Pacific. After the war, he completed his last three years of college in just two, and entered medical school in 1947, paying his way by playing bit parts in television shows. He took his internship and residency at Flower and Fifth Avenue Hospitals on the edge of East Harlem, and finished specialized training in endocrinology.

In 1955, Baird was asked to give a talk on diabetes to a New York City civic group. Afterward, a skinny, nine-year-old boy approached him timidly. The lad rolled up his sleeve, showed the doctor fresh needle marks and blurted out a tragic story. Turned on to heroin by a member of his church choir, he was now financing his habit by robbing neighborhood stores.

"Nine years old, and the kid is an addict," Baird thought bitterly. Investigating further, he learned that the boy wasn't alone. "There were thousands of addicts, thousands, and nobody was doing a damn thing." So Baird did something.

He opened an office in midtown New York, and quickly established a thriving practice. With money coming in, he bought a row house in Harlem, opened offices on the ground floor and moved in upstairs. Each day, he'd tend to his midtown patients; each night, he'd return to work with addicts.

A bachelor ("What wife would put up with a life like this?"), Baird keeps a schedule that would likely finish off anyone else. Up at 6:45 he works out for 45 minutes—lifting weights, shadowboxing, doing pushups—then practices voice for a half-hour. (An old-fashioned patriot, he sings the national anthem before 63,000 football fans at New York Jets home games.) By 8 a.m. he is on his way to Flower and Fifth Avenue Hospitals to see his paying patients, then he works the rest of the morning at the Metropolitan Hospital Diabetic Clinic.

Skipping lunch (just as he missed breakfast), Baird sees more private patients,

February 27, 1973

makes late-afternoon hospital calls, then holds evening office hours. Squeezed in somehow are dinner, lectures, teaching assignments at two hospitals, work on a book on addiction, phone calls at all hours from addict patients or their anxious parents—and perhaps three or four hours' sleep.

Baird's first drug patient, 15 years ago, was the 16-year-old leader of an East Harlem gang. The youngster stayed straight for eight months—until his parents moved him to a "better environment." Away from Baird's rigid discipline, he slid back—the doctor's first failure.

Initially, there were more failures than successes. "I'd work with an addict a couple of times a week," Baird recalls. "When he seemed to be straightened out, I'd have him come in every week or two, finally every month. What I didn't realize was that the drug culture is so pervasive that an addict needs daily surveillance and therapy."

Every Thursday, Baird lectures to addicts coming to Haven for the first time. "There are no miracle solutions," he warns. "But you can kick junk."

One by one, addicts who have done it get up and tell their stories. A 25-year-old cab driver, his career as a policeman ended by heroin, says, "Here I am in a filthy hallway and my friends—other junkies—are holding guns at my head for my bread. Suddenly, it dawns on me, 'Man, you can't live much longer if you keep this up.' So I came to the doctor, and I went cold turkey. It's hell for a while, but it can be done."

A good-looking young black, hooked in Vietnam, tells of "living, not for my wife, not for my kids, but for junk. Here I was into black pride, and I'm mugging brothers and sisters. It was so disgusting that even I, an addict, couldn't stand it. Now I'm clean 30 days."

Anyone interested in joining Haven must attend three or four Thursday sessions to demonstrate his motivation. Once accepted, he is given non-narcotic medicine to ease the physical withdrawal. "It is a simple medical matter to detoxify an addict physically," says Baird. "But it takes skilled management over a prolonged period to detoxify him psychologically. I pull in the parents, or the husband or wife. Without their co-operation—their love, their discipline and, to put it bluntly, their surveillance—the addict doesn't stand a chance."

The addict returns to Baird every weeknight for a year. With some, Baird is a firm but sympathetic father figure, cajoling, building up confidence. Tom,* a 19-year-old college student, has been clean for five weeks, yet is plagued by frightening flashbacks from bad trips. He tells of episodes in class when his teacher seems to melt, her eyes floating out of her skull. "I know, it's terrible," Baird says softly. "Call me when these come on. You can beat them. They'll become fewer and fewer with time. But if you turn back to drugs, you'll never shake them."

To the wealthy young kid who says his psychiatrist "told me it's my parents' fault," Baird is tough. "Listen, boy, it's *your* fault, and if you don't accept that, you can't possibly get straight."

And, occasionally, Baird must come across like a Marine drill instructor. Danny, a slender 17-year-old from a broken family, had been clean for a month when Baird spotted a fresh needle mark. Slamming Danny against the wall, he exploded, "What the hell are you doing?"

"That must be an old one," Danny mumbles.

"Listen, kid, you're not conning me. I know a fresh needle mark." Jabbing his finger at the frightened youngster, Baird demands: "Ever been in a morgue? They stretch you out on a steel table, and there's nothing on you except a cardboard name tag hanging

* All addicts' names have been disguised.

from your big toe. Keep this up and you'll end like that. I'm pleading with you—I want you to live!"

A month later, Danny is hanging on. He may slip back again. But if he is like most of Baird's patients, ultimately he'll kick the habit.

Baird has no illusions that he can single-handedly combat the drug explosion. Thus, every spare minute, he battles to wake an apathetic public. He accuses fellow doctors of doing little to help. In speeches to teachers and parents, he rips into his audiences. "Discipline—loving, but unyielding—is the answer," he says. "You are not the kids' friend. You are a parent or a teacher, with very different responsibilities."

At every opportunity, Baird appears on radio and television, or before Congress, to plead for antidrug-abuse action. In 1966, he told a Senate committee that there were 10,000 to 15,000 heroin addicts in the armed services. Pentagon officials laughed off the allegation. Not until 1971 did these same officials admit that there was a massive drug crisis by initiating an identification and treatment program.

It is 2 a.m., and Baird has just finished with the last of his addicts. Walking a visitor to his car, the doctor says, "It's so easy to get depressed. You look around you and see more junk every day." But then his eyes light up and he says, "Did you see Joey tonight? Clean for a month and a half, 20 pounds heavier, appreciating life for the first time in five years. You see things like that, and it's all worth it."

JOB FOR RETURNING VIETNAM VETERANS

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the Michigan Chapter of the Associated General Contractors of America has addressed the following resolution to me and other Members of my State's delegation in the Congress, and I am pleased to insert it in the RECORD for the information of all my colleagues:

A Resolution seeking the assistance of the Michigan Congressional delegation to encourage the immediate letting of federal construction contracts to provide jobs for returning Vietnam veterans.

Whereas, a cease-fire in Vietnam is in effect; and

Whereas, a vast number of young men now serving their country in the armed forces will soon be returning to the continental United States; and

Whereas, many of these young men will be seeking jobs in various fields of endeavor and particularly in the construction trades; and

Whereas, both private and federal construction projects have been minimal during the last three years and particularly so in the state of Michigan; and

Whereas, the immediate letting of federal construction projects would provide jobs for many of our returning veterans and also for those people in Michigan's construction trades who have been without employment during these three years; and

Whereas, new construction would greatly assist in bolstering the economy of Michigan and the United States during the transition from a war economy to a peace economy; now therefore be it,

Resolved, that the good offices of the Sena-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tors, and Representatives of the state of Michigan be sought in a diligent joint effort to bring new construction and reconstruction into being as an economic factor.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, in a significant act, the board of directors of the Public Relations Society of America has reaffirmed its resolution calling for freedom of information, which the board originally passed on April 25, 1952.

In the words of Betsy Ann Plank, chairman of the society—

Today there appears to be a renewed threat to that fundamental process of democracy and for this reason the 1973 Board is again underscoring its commitment to safeguard this freedom.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the free flow of information is essential to the protection and development of our democratic society and is possible only so long as are preserved the constitutional guarantees of the freedom of the press, radio, television, and other sources upon which the American people rely for information, and,

Whereas the denial of information about local and national government affairs to the people, in whose interest all agencies of government should operate and to whom all administrations are responsible, is a threat to our institutions, and,

Whereas the freedom of press and speech, hitherto considered inviolate and secure against government interference, is now a matter of deep public concern.

Therefore be it resolved that the Board of Directors of the Public Relations Society of America reaffirms its belief in the freedom of information and press as a basic principle of public relations and Americanism and authorize and direct the Society's officers to work zealously to safeguard these freedoms, taking appropriate action for the Society, or in cooperation with other organizations dedicated to the same principles.

In a statement accompanying the 1973 resolution reaffirming the 1952 action, the Board said—

As an integral part of the communications industry, we believe that the free exchange of information, ideas, and opinions is a fundamental condition of a free society. We believe that the existence of a democracy is predicated on the ability of its citizens to make decisions and choices on the basis of unrestricted access to information. Essential to this access is the privacy in news gathering which assures the flow of information and the function of a free press to inform and serve American citizens.

More than ever before in our nation's history, individuals and institutions are striving to understand new forces and pressures and to communicate their objectives more effectively. Paradoxically, we are witnessing unprecedented threats which menace press freedoms and thus the free flow of communication essential to our American democratic process.

Mr. Speaker, Betsy Ann Plank—Mrs. Sherman V. Rosenfield—is the first woman president of the Public Relations Society of America, and I am proud to

have her as my constituent. The society is the largest public relations organization in the world, being composed of 7,000 public relations professionals representing companies, industry associations, civic, governmental, military, health and welfare organizations, and public relations counseling firms.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the society upon its sound and forthright position. It comes at a most opportune time, a time when the first amendment to the Bill of Rights guaranteeing free speech and a free press is under attack. This resolution will serve a most constructive purpose.

MEDICAL CARE "RIP-OFF"

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time Congress and the present administration take a hard look at the problems in our medical care systems. The following is the fourth in a series of New York Daily News articles which I recommend to my colleagues on the subject of medicaid abuses in New York:

[From the Daily News, Jan. 29, 1973]

YOU DON'T NEED GLASSES TO SEE THROUGH THIS

(By William Sherman)

A News reporter with a medicaid card and 20-20 vision walked into a lower East Side optical center to have his eyes examined and discovered that what you see is not necessarily what you get. To put it another way, he got eyeglasses when they were not needed.

Accompanied by a News photographer posing as his cousin, the reporter strolled into Sol Moscot Opticians at 118 Orchard St.

Five minutes earlier at the Delancey Medical Building across the street at 80 Delancey St., an optometrist had examined the reporter, who was in the same guise, and said, "You have 20-20 vision. You don't need glasses."

Once inside the Moscot offices, the reporter was directed upstairs to the second floor, where he met a young receptionist at a desk and said, "I'd like to have my eyes examined."

"Are you medicaid?" asked the receptionist.

"Yes," he replied. The reporter had been issued a temporary medicaid card by the city as part of The News Medicaid Probe into abuses of the medical assistance program.

"Okay," she said, "give me your card and then go into that room and pick out the frames you want."

"I haven't had my eyes examined yet," protested the patient.

"Yes, I know, but it will save you and us time."

"Okay," said the reporter, and the receptionist escorted him to a rack of eyeglass frames.

Then the patient was directed to choose from the frames that the receptionist said "are for medicaid people only."

How Are Your Eyes?

He tried on a pair of thin brown frames without lenses and said, "I like these."

The receptionist then directed the patient outside into the waiting area.

Five minutes later, the door to a 5-by-10-foot examining room opened and a stocky

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

balding man beckoned the patient inside and onto a chair in the back of the room.

"Ever wear glasses?" he asked.

"No," said the reporter.

"How are your eyes?"

"Perfect, I think."

"When was the last time you had them tested?"

"About four years ago."

"Okay," said the optometrist, Richard Fleissig. He turned out the lights in the room, shut the door and shone what appeared to be a tiny flashlight mounted on a thick barrel into the patient's eyes from a distance of about four feet.

Then he opened the door and directed the patient to read letters on a chart about 30 feet away.

TRY LENSES

The patient read the letters on three lines of the chart. Fleissig put a model, or "trial," frame on the patient, and began slipping different lenses into the frame.

"Can you see better with these?" he asked.

"No, things look fuzzy."

"How about these?"

"No, not really."

Fleissig slipped in about three more sets of lenses and then the patient said he could "see better."

Fleissig handed the patient a piece of paper and said, "Give this to the people at the desk downstairs. Come back at 4:30, then you can pick up your glasses."

NEWS WILL PAY

On the way out, a woman measured the distance between the patient's pupils, and at 4:30 p.m. the reporter picked up his glasses.

The examination took about five minutes and, according to the medicaid fee schedule, will cost \$8. The glasses will cost \$10. The cost of both will be paid to the city by THE NEWS, if the Health Department finds that the charges were legitimate.

Later, the reporter went to the Optometric Center of New York, 122 E. 25th St., where the Health Department has medicaid patient's glasses examined.

Dr. Edward Johnston, an associate administrator of the center, examined the reporter for more than 30 minutes and gave an accounting of Fleissig's examination.

TESTS UNDONE

Johnston found the following, based on the reporter's experience:

Fleissig performed only about six of the 21 tests required under city medicaid regulations.

He tested for clarity at a distance but failed to test for near vision clarity.

He did not test for binocularly, or how well the two eyes worked together.

He failed to test for convergence, or the aiming of the eyes.

He failed to test for accommodation, or focusing of the eyes.

He did not take a proper case history.

Johnston also said that Fleissig did not check properly for pathology, a close examination of the eyes for abnormalities. Then Johnston carefully examined the eyeglasses themselves.

At the end of the examination, Johnston said, "I would not have prescribed you any glasses. In my opinion they are not necessary."

The reporter was not the only patient to receive unsatisfactory care, for Health Department surveys show that 50% of all glasses dispensed to medicaid patients since the program was begun in 1966 have been unsatisfactory. Surveys also show that about 15% of all optometric examinations performed on medicaid patients, 66.7% were unsatisfactory.

From 1969 through 1971, \$18,129,082 was paid to optometrists, many of whom do their own dispensing. During the same period \$2,176,751 was paid to ophthalmic dispensers.

Sol Moscot Opticians, the second highest biller for the first six months of last year, billed for \$56,010. The highest biller was the Sterling Lens Co., and from January through June 1972, it billed the city for \$95,224. A survey of Sterling's eyeglasses by the Health Department showed that of 66.7% were unsatisfactory.

Meanwhile, an investigation of Health Department records revealed that the reporter's optometrist, Richard Fleissig, had voluntarily suspended himself from the medicaid program on Oct. 31, 1971, after department investigators found that he was billing medicaid contrary to city regulations.

THE REGULATIONS

The investigation showed that Fleissig was not a self-employed optometrist, as required by medicaid regulations, but that, in fact, his office was part and parcel of Sol Moscot Opticians, which dispensed nearly all of the glasses Fleissig prescribed. After October 1971, Fleissig joined Moscot as an employee.

Stuart Laurence, an attorney for the Health Department, explained, "We have this law so that no pressure is created on optometrists to prescribe glasses for patients who don't need them or to push people through examinations to fulfill an obligation to an optical company."

Fleissig billed medicaid for \$41,064 in 1970 and \$43,491 in 1971, and during those two years Moscot billed for \$184,210. They were billing separately for the services that, the Health Department said, they were providing as a unit.

Furthermore, a lease between Fleissig and Sol Moscot, which was in effect since December 1967, said, "The lessee (Fleissig) shall pay to the lessor (Moscot) 80% of any moneys received by the lessee from the city, state, or federal governmental agencies for payment for eye examinations of patients receiving medical aid from said governmental authorities. The remainder of such fee shall be retained by the lessee."

In addition, Fleissig agreed "not to charge any customer an amount in excess of \$3 for an eye examination and to cooperate with the lessor in rendering such services to lessor's customers as he may be called upon from time to time."

After he "voluntarily suspended" himself from the medicaid business, Fleissig went to work directly for Sol Moscot. They no longer bill separately, and now Moscot bills for both the eye examination and the glasses dispensed.

Fleissig said he receives "free rent" in return for examining Moscot's medicaid patients. No action, other than a warning letter, was ever taken against Moscot Opticians.

TRIBUTE TO WINTHROP ROCKEFELLER

HON. RAY THORNTON

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

MR. THORNTON. Mr. Speaker, this winter has been a season of intense grieving for all of us in Arkansas.

When the air first chilled, we mourned the passing of President Harry S Truman, our neighbor from Missouri. When the holiday season came to a close, we mourned the passing of President Lyndon B. Johnson, our neighbor from Texas. And now—sadly, we mourn the passing of another distinguished leader and friend, our own former Governor, Winthrop Rockefeller.

February 27, 1973

In our efforts to preserve the memory of this fine man, we will talk about and write about his outstanding work to improve the quality of life in Arkansas.

We will note his achievements in the field of economic development.

We will note his achievements in the field of constitutional revision.

We will note his achievements in the field of governmental efficiency.

But, while we catalog his contributions as a Governor of our State, we must not fail to remember that he was, above all, a deeply committed, uncommonly compassionate advocate of social reform.

Although Arkansas was his adopted home, Winthrop Rockefeller served its people's needs with the special understanding of a native son.

NEWSDAY—A PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

MR. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, Newsday, the Long Island newspaper has performed a most important and valuable service, not only for the people of Long Island but, indeed, for the people of all the United States. In a series of articles, a team of outstanding reporters have traced the heroin trail from Turkey to France, Italy, and finally the United States. They have exposed the dealers and traffickers. They have brought one of the Nation's most serious problems to the forefront and are to be congratulated for their efforts. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert the following article, "What Every Smart Pusher Knows," as it appeared in the February 21, 1973, issue of Newsday:

WHAT EVERY SMART PUSHER KNOWS

Why is it that some heroin dealers manage to stay out of jail even after they have become known to junkies, informants, police and every 12-year-old on the block? There are many reasons, including these three:

1. STREET SAVVY

"Anyone with any smarts can deal heroin for a long time and not get caught if he sticks to a couple of basic rules," one federal enforcement official said. "If he doesn't sell to strangers, he isn't going to be selling to undercover agents. If he always has someone else handle the stuff and stash it for him, he's not going to get caught for possession." These are not trade secrets. These are things that every street-savvy dope pusher knows. "A lot of them have been informants in the past, and they know a lot about how police operate," he said. "They know how much cops in an area can pay for a buy [without going back to the office for special permission]. If they know there's a \$50 limit, they won't sell less than \$55 worth of stuff. They know they can sell with impunity on Saturday nights and Sunday mornings because narcotics don't like to work weekends any more than anyone else."

2. INEFFICIENT ENFORCEMENT

In the past year, the New York City Police Department Narcotics Division has been reorganized in an attempt to eliminate corruption and increase its effectiveness. One reason for the change was a report by the N.Y. State Commission of Investigation that said: "A study by the commission staff showed that

during 1970, officers of the Undercover Unit of the Narcotics Division made 7,266 buys of narcotics, and made 4,007 arrests in connection therewith. In all these city-wide arrests made in a year's time, a total of only 4.9 pounds of highly adulterated heroin were obtained, or about eight ounces of pure heroin. The cash used by the police to make these purchases amounted to \$91,197.50, over \$11,000 an ounce. Surely, these [minor] arrests and seizures, at tremendous cost of manpower and actual cash outlay, have no impact upon the narcotics traffic in this city, and no impact upon organized crime."

3. THE COURTS

"One of the biggest problems that we have today is getting the pusher to trial . . .," a BNDD official in Washington said. "If we spend \$10,000 to make a buy, and indict him, we've taken our shot and he's back on the street, and maybe out waiting two or three years before he comes to trial. We've got 300 to 400 people here in the East who have heroin cases pending against them who are out [on bail] and still peddling dope. And when they do get sentenced, the average sentence is 48 months, so you can see it's a kind of merry-go-round . . . A full 18 per cent of the people charged with heroin sales are put out on probation, and our intelligence shows they are still out there dealing."

Mr. Speaker, that the problem is a serious one is evident and it is now time that we concentrate on eliminating this cancer which has stricken many American homes.

CAN WE HELP? YES

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, youthful enthusiasm is reputed to be short-lived, but the pupils at West Chicago Junior High School in West Chicago, Ill., have proved that their enthusiasm has the stamina to stay alive until the job is finished.

They had an assembly Monday afternoon—and I wish I could have been there—to hear an announcement that they have raised enough money to build two schools in the little community of La Vega Miguel, Guatemala. They have raised this money themselves, without the usual demands on local merchants or the usual handouts from their parents.

Raymond Kobald, the industrial arts teacher, started it when he read of the Peace Corps' plea for funds to build schools where there have been none, to build schools where illiteracy runs to 99 percent. Mr. Kobald got the assent of Duane Thayer, the principal.

They informed the youngsters of the problem and asked if they would help. Yes. Could the seventh and eighth graders of West Chicago raise \$1,200, the amount required? Yes.

The Peace Corps had a long list of places around the world where schools are needed. The student leaders, remembering that many of their classmates are of Spanish extraction, voted for La Vega Miguel.

Mr. Thayer, the principal, and Mr. Kobald, the teacher, have been custodians

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

of the fund. Not until Monday did they tell the young people that they had raised, not \$1,200 which was the goal, but more than \$2,400.

Twice the goal. Enough for two schools.

A teacher learned of the problem; an administrator posed the question, "Can we help?" The pupils replied, "We can," and they meant it.

IMPOUNDMENT OF REAP FUNDS HURT COUNTY FARMS

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, recently an outstanding newspaper in my district, the Mebane, N.C., Enterprise-Journal, contained an article explaining very clearly the impact of REAP funds on farmers in its area.

I think the article which follows demonstrates the wisdom of the House in passing legislation to require the Secretary of Agriculture to spend funds appropriated for this program:

IMPOUNDMENT OF REAP FUNDS HURT COUNTY FARMS

"The impact won't be felt this year, or the next year. It could be several years before we see erosion and things this program has prevented. It's not just important for the farmers, it's important to everybody that we protect the soil."

John Boswell is talking about how President Nixon's impoundment of Congressionally approved funds has finally come down home to the farm.

As Alamance County office manager for the Agricultural Stabilization Conservation Service (ASCS), Boswell administers—or used to administer—matching funds provided by the federal government encouraging farmers to practice good conservation.

Under the Rural Environmental Assistance Program (REAP) farmers grew vegetative covers, planted trees, practiced strip cropping, sodded water ways, and built small ponds to prevent water and wind erosion. The workhorse of the program was liming fields and such to grow good vegetative covers.

Now, however, "As far as we are concerned, the program is terminated. No funds have been released to us, so it isn't a program as of right now," says Boswell.

The 92d Congress appropriated \$225.5 million for REAP. Nixon impounded all but \$15 million of the program, and that small amount hasn't trickled down to the farmers yet, at least not in Alamance County.

In 1972, 700 Alamance County farmers received a total of \$60,000 toward practicing good conservation. A farmer usually matches or pays more than half when he receives REAP help on a project.

"It won't put us in no strain," says William F. "Bill" Covington, one of Alamance County's big dairy farmers. "Some people it would. What it amounts to is that we may not have quite as good a cover crop to keep the soil from washing away."

Last year Covington more than matched the \$1,000 he received from the federal government to grow vegetative covers and sod waterways on his 250 acres and the 300 acres he rents to herd his 280 beef and dairy cows.

Liming under REAP has always been strictly regulated to prevent its use in production.

Lime could be used only on new pastureland, or land which would be used for pasture the next year. In some cases lime would be used on alfalfa, wheat, or other grains, but the next year the land had to be pasture.

In 1970 the federal government felt lime was being used too much in production and began to clamp down. Policy makers tried to shift the focus of the program even more to pollution abatement. One practice they encouraged was growing winter cover crops, such as crimson clover.

Another step in the water pollution fight also was begun in 1970. Farmers began receiving financial assistance to build holding lagoons near their dairy barns to prevent effluent from going directly into streams.

But now that is out, too.

"The effluent is a serious problem. They will still make us do something. But it will be rather costly and all at our expense," points out Covington, who has been receiving REAP funds for over 20 years.

Alamance County's 1,600 farms did over \$19 million worth of business last year, and the loss of REAP funds shouldn't be a knockout punch.

But like Bill Covington says, "It's one more added thing like when they raised the feed costs. It's not going to determine whether a man stays in business. But if you add ten of those 'added things,' it mounts up.

The public doesn't realize that even though farmers own the land, it's for the good of the public to keep the land in a good fertility condition."

POW RETIREMENT CREDITS

HON. DONALD G. BROTHMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. BROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today joined by 19 colleagues in the House in introducing legislation to see that former prisoners of war will not have to sacrifice further for their service to their country. Originally, I introduced this legislation as H.R. 17070 and H.R. 17071 in the last Congress.

To date 164 American prisoners have been released by the Communist forces in Southeast Asia. They are on their way back to reconstruct their lives. For most the wait has been nearly 7 years since last seeing home and family.

Just now the tales of the Communist prison camps are beginning to leak out. Needless to say, no full accounting will be given by the returning men until all prisoners are returned and all missing in action accounted for by the Communists. We cannot know what physical abuse they have suffered at the hands of their captors, but we do know that most of those returning from the south have been drained by malnutrition and disease.

What effect will all of this have on the men as they attempt to pick up the thread of their life again? Medical experts are cautious about predicting the physical and emotional reactions of these men as they are taken from a harsh existence in Communist prisons and dropped in a hectic and demanding society such as our own. I have twice before cited medical findings before the Congress from studies conducted on those POW's who returned from World War II and the Korean conflict.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

If the same pattern holds true, these men will have suffered disease, malnutrition, and physical and emotional abuse. Such treatment will leave the returning prisoners with a lower life expectancy than that of the general American public.

Broken health or emotional instability will take time from which to recover. This time will be lost to these men in their efforts to catch up to those of their same age who remained in the United States. Thus, either the returning prisoners will find less time to accumulate retirement credits in a new job, or less time to enjoy the golden years of retirement itself.

I do not feel that we, in the Congress, can allow this to happen to these men who have given so much already for their country. Justice demands that they not be made to do so.

Accordingly, the bills which I have introduced would allow former prisoners of war to accelerate their retirement credits in either the armed services or the civil service system. This would permit them to "catch up," with their age group in the United States.

Let me give a brief explanation of how my proposal would work. A civilian or a man in the military who is captured by a force hostile to the United States in time of conflict is, of course, already entitled to receive straight retirement credit for all time spent in captivity, since during that time he is still in the service of his Government. What my bills would serve to do, in short, is grant double credit for all time spent in captivity.

This legislation applies to all former prisoners of war who were serving the U.S. Government during a period of conflict as defined by existing law. This includes those from both World Wars and Korea, as well as Vietnam.

Finally, one other point which has been brought to my attention is that such a system of double credit might be used to force retirement on a member of the military who does not wish it. Let me assure all who fear this that I will certainly support an amendment in Committee to correct this oversight on my part.

This legislation has the full support of the National League of Families of American Prisoners of War and Missing in Action, the largest group of its kind in the United States. From discussions with members of this organization, I have also discovered that my proposal is also endorsed in spirit by a majority of the men yet held captive by the Communists.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Congress must act soon to ease the movement of Vietnam POW's back into their careers and give them assurances that they will be able to enjoy a full and fruitful retirement. Accordingly, I ask both the Armed Services Committee and the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to hold expeditious hearings on this matter and to report my bills to the floor as rapidly as possible. Hopefully, before the last POW gets off the plane in California he will be able to effectively plan his future based on the successful passage of this legislation.

GUNS OVER PEOPLE IS A MISPLACED PRIORITY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker—

Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed.

The world in crisis is not spending money alone. It is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists and the hopes of its children.

This is not a way of life at all in any true sense. Under the cloud of threatening war, it is humanity hanging from a cross of iron.

These were the words of President Dwight D. Eisenhower in a speech he gave on the military budget in 1953.

President Nixon's proposed budget calls for a \$4.7 billion increase in defense spending. This fiscal policy is paralleled by the cancellation of funds for many "Great Society" social programs, including community action and legal services programs.

SANE, a citizens' organization for a sane world, is a group that has long advocated a more prudent and sensible defense policy.

I submit for your attention, and the attention of my colleagues, a SANE report on the proposed Nixon budget entitled "A Quick Hard Look at the Military Budget."

The report follows:

SANE REPORT, FEBRUARY 23, 1973

A QUICK HARD LOOK AT THE MILITARY BUDGET

The American military role in Indo-China is ending, relations with China and the Soviet Union are warming, and we are embarked on "a generation of peace". Yet, the military budget continues to mount.

Between 1946 and the middle of 1972, the United States spent \$1.3 trillion on the military, and deployed 5,900 nuclear warheads—each warhead capable of destroying a city ("Peace, National Security, and the SALT Agreements," Bureau of Public Affairs, Department of State, August 1, 1972). But the Soviet Union has only 219 major cities.

The Administration is asking Congress to approve 1974 outlays of \$81.1 billion for "national defense" (including the AEC and defense-related activities), a hike of \$4.7 billion over the estimated 1973 spending level. Included in the proposed budget are funds for more strategic nuclear overkill—the Trident submarine, B-1 bomber, and conversion of land-based and sea-based missiles to multiple warheads.

The Navy wants to add a CVN-70 nuclear aircraft carrier to its fleet of 16 carriers. A nuclear aircraft carrier costs \$1 billion without equipment or escorts, \$3 billion equipped and escorted.

An estimated 56% of Defense Department funds will be spent on manpower. This reflects the top-heavy ratio of 1.7 officers and non-coms for every enlisted man, recent pay hikes, and very generous retirement pay for officers. Annual retirement costs are now approximately \$5 billion and rising.

ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET VERSUS UNIFIED BUDGET

When the \$81.1 billion for "national defense" is added to the \$11.5 billion for veterans and \$24.7 billion for interest on the national debt (most of which is war-incurred),

February 27, 1973

we see that the costs of military programs and past wars are:

Current military programs—\$81.1 billion;

Veterans payments—11.5;

Interest on national debt—24.7; \$117.3 billion (costs of military programs and past wars).

The total Federal 1974 budget of \$268.7 billion includes the outlays of trust funds such as Social Security, the Highway Trust Fund, and Railroad Retirement. These trust funds were set up years ago to provide specific benefits (such as survivors' payments), and are financed by separate taxes. Congress can regulate the benefits but cannot spend the money in these trust funds. If the trust funds are not included in the federal budget, as was the case until 1968 (the former Administrative Budget), the budget looks like this:

Today's Unified Budget, \$268.7 billion.

Money in trust funds: intragovernmental transactions, \$69.6 billion.

Former Administrative Budget (funds Congress can spend) \$199.1 billion.

In short, Congress can allocate only \$199.1 billion in the next fiscal year.

When the \$117.3 billion for military programs and past wars is subtracted from the money Congress can spend, here's what's left:

Funds Congress can spend, \$199.1 billion.

Military program and past wars, \$117.3 billion.

Funds available for all civilian costs of government, \$81.8 billion.

Thus, in rough percentages, 50% of the money Congress can allocate would be spent under the Nixon budget on military programs and past wars, while 41% would go to all civilian costs of government. This represents a shift of only 1% from last year's 60% for military-related programs. While these percentages should be used as estimates, they do reflect the real thrust of the Administration's priorities. The Administration, however, hides this reality by taking credit for outlays from the long-established trust funds under the category of "human resources", by placing veterans payments under "human resources" instead of a cost of past wars, and by failing to acknowledge interest on the national debt as a cost of past wars.

Mr. George Brite of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, calculates the Administrative Budget every year for those Members of Congress who make such a request.

SOME MILITARY-CIVILIAN TRADEOFFS

The Administration proposes in Fiscal 1974:

A cut of \$1.5 billion in elementary and secondary education, and expenditure of \$1.7 billion for the Trident submarine;

A cut of \$200 million in child nutrition for elementary and secondary education, and expenditure of \$194.2 million for SAM-D missiles.

A cut of \$86 million in federally-aided health training and education, and an increase of \$92 million in Air Force research, development, test and evaluation.

A cut of \$33.9 million for library resources, and an increase of \$29 million for the B-1 bomber.

ILLEGAL ALIENS

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation identical to a bill approved by the House last year to put teeth in the law against illegal aliens.

On March 6 and 7 House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 1 will hold hearings on

this bill. It is my hope that the House and Senate will be able to agree on a bill this year. The bill which I have introduced makes it unlawful to knowingly hire aliens who have not been legally admitted to the United States. It provides a three-step procedure for penalties against the employers of illegal aliens.

During the hearings last year it was estimated that nearly 2 million illegal aliens are in America today. Among some of the effects of these aliens are the taking of jobs which would normally be filled by American workers, the depression of wages, and they are highly susceptible for exploitation due to their illegal status.

During our hearings we will hear from Members of Congress and the Department of Justice. The committee will insure that basic civil rights are protected. But the committee will act for this is an area where legislation is needed.

NOW MORE THAN EVER: EFFECTIVE PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I testified before the House Select Subcommittee on Labor on H.R. 1415, my "jobs now" bill to provide 500,000 public service jobs for the unemployed, which was introduced in January and now has 85 cosponsors.

A list of the cosponsors, and the text of my remarks before the Select Subcommittee, follow:

LIST OF SPONSORS

Bella S. Abzug of New York.
Brock Adams of Washington.
Joseph P. Addabbo of New York.
Les Aspin of Wisconsin.
Herman Badillo of New York.
Alphonzo Bell of California.
Bob Bergland of Minnesota.
Tom Bevill of Alabama.
Jonathan B. Bingham of New York.
Edward P. Boland of Massachusetts.
John Brademas of Indiana.
John B. Breaux of Louisiana.
George E. Brown, Jr. of California.
Phillip Burton of California.
Charles J. Carney of Ohio.
Shirley Chisholm of New York.
Frank M. Clark of Pennsylvania.
John Conyers, Jr. of Michigan.
James C. Corman of California.
William R. Cötter of Connecticut.
Paul W. Cronin of Massachusetts.
W. C. (Dan) Daniel of Virginia.
George E. Danielson of California.
Charles C. Diggs, Jr. of Michigan.
John D. Dingell of Michigan.
Robert F. Drinan of Massachusetts.
Thaddeus J. Dulski of New York.
Bob Eckhardt of Texas.
Don Edwards of California.
Joshua Eilberg of Pennsylvania.
Walter E. Fauntroy of District of Columbia.
Hamilton Fish, Jr. of New York.
Daniel J. Flood of Pennsylvania.
William D. Ford of Michigan.
Joseph M. Gaydos of Pennsylvania.
Sam Gibbons of Florida.
William J. Green of Pennsylvania.
Michael Harrington of Massachusetts.
Wayne L. Hays of Ohio.
Ken Hechler of West Virginia.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Henry Heistoski of New Jersey.
Floyd V. Hicks of Washington.
Barbara Jordan of Texas.
Robert W. Kastenmeier of Wisconsin.
Edward I. Koch of New York.
Peter N. Kyros of Maine.
Robert L. Leggett of California.
William Lehman of Florida.
Ray J. Madden of Indiana.
Lloyd Meeds of Washington.
Ralph H. Metcalfe of Illinois.
Patsy T. Mink of Hawaii.
Parren J. Mitchell of Maryland.
John Moakley of Massachusetts.
William S. Moorhead of Pennsylvania.
Thomas E. Morgan of Pennsylvania.
John E. Moss of California.
Morgan F. Murphy of Illinois.
Lucien N. Nedzi of Michigan.
Robert N. C. Nix of Pennsylvania.
David R. Obey of Wisconsin.
Claude Pepper of Florida.
Bertram L. Podell of New York.
Melvin Price of Illinois.
Thomas M. Rees of California.
Peter W. Rodino, Jr. of New Jersey.
Robert A. Roe of New Jersey.
Fred B. Rooney of Pennsylvania.
Benjamin S. Rosenthal of New York.
Edward R. Roybal of California.
Paul S. Sarbanes of Maryland.
John F. Seiberling of Ohio.
James V. Stanton of Ohio.
Fortney H. (Pete) Stark of California.
Robert H. Steele of Connecticut.
Louis Stokes of Ohio.
Gerry E. Studds of Massachusetts.
James W. Symington of Missouri.
Frank Thompson, Jr. of New Jersey.
Robert O. Tiernan of Rhode Island.
Jerome R. Waldie of California.
Charles H. Wilson of California.
Lester L. Wolff of New York.
Gus Yatron of Pennsylvania.

TESTIMONY

Thank you for letting me testify.

I support H.R. 4204, sponsored by Rep. Daniels and by Education and Labor Committee Chairman Perkins. This bill continues the Emergency Employment Act—which the Administration intends to phase out by December 31, 1973—at a slightly higher funding level for two more years. I also support H.R. 3987, introduced by Rep. Hawkins, which would provide over one million public service jobs—though it may prove too much in terms of political realities.

My own "Jobs Now" bill, H.R. 1415, introduced in January with 85 cosponsors, would provide jobs at once for 500,000 people. It need not add a penny to the budget deficit. Its \$3.5 billion annual cost can readily be found by plugging tax loopholes enjoyed by wealthy tax avoiders, as H.R. 967, my "Quick-Yield" tax reform bill, with 57 cosponsors, would do.

So my remarks today go, quite generally, to the need now for "Jobs Now".

IS UNEMPLOYMENT STILL A PROBLEM?

The overall unemployment rate is now 5.0 percent. While this is an improvement over rates close to 6.0 percent a year ago, we are still far from full employment. 4,366,000 workers cannot find jobs in this country; hundreds of thousands more are underemployed, or have been discouraged by long and unsuccessful jobhunting and are no longer counted among the officially unemployed.

The burden of unemployment falls most severely on certain socioeconomic groups: on the young, on blacks, on women. While the unemployment rate for white adult men is now only 3.2 percent, 1,152,000 workers aged 16 to 19 (or 14.3 percent of young workers), 857,000 non-whites (8.9 percent), and 2,131,000 women (6.4 percent) are out of work. The reason for this differential is obvious: young people, blacks, and women tend to be concentrated in unskilled or semi-skilled occupations—the labor categories for which there is the least market demand.

The composition of the labor force is changing. In 1957, adult males constituted 74 percent of the civilian labor force and 55 percent of all unemployed. In 1971, they accounted for only 67 percent of the civilian labor force, and 42 percent of the unemployed. Because "unemployment-prone" groups are growing as a proportion of the labor force, it will be increasingly difficult in the future to achieve and maintain full employment.

WHAT IS THE ADMINISTRATION DOING ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT?

President Nixon's 1974 economic program completely ignores the Employment Act of 1946, which established as a national goal full employment with dollar stability. The fiscal policy outlined in the 1974 Budget promises to give us both excessive unemployment and excessive inflation for some time to come.

In the private sector, heavy and sophisticated industry is booming because of government subsidies on both the expenditure and the revenue sides. Government spending on armaments, ship building, space, even on the SST, is to continue at high levels. On the revenue side, tax subsidies to capital goods industries, notably rapid depreciation and the investment tax credit, are producing a second straight 14 percent annual increase in plant and equipment—a boom of overbuilding that may well lead to a bust.

Already, bottlenecks in the labor market are beginning to appear. Government incentives to capital spending have led to excess demand for skilled labor, bringing inflationary labor shortages in the heavy manufacturing sector. While unemployment affected 6.5 percent of all blue-collar workers in 1972, only 3.5 percent of machinists were out of work, and only 2.7 percent of mechanics. These bottlenecks bid up wages and prices, lower productivity, and worsen the U.S. balance of payments position.

In the public sector, meanwhile, President Nixon plans to phase out those programs aimed at providing suitable jobs for the less skilled (largely young, black, or female) who make up the great mass of our 5 percent unemployed. The Public Employment Program, OEO, Model Cities, economic development—all programs providing little jobs for little people—are frozen or terminated. Many education, health, and environmental programs which also offer service jobs to semiskilled and unskilled workers are drastically curtailed.

Thus, Administration policy cuts the programs that could put the unemployed to work, and pours inflationary fuel on the rapidly bottlenecking skilled-labor sector.

HOW DOES THE ADMINISTRATION JUSTIFY ITS POLICY?

The 1974 Budget discusses the termination of Emergency Employment Assistance as follows:

"Since the program began, unemployment has fallen. . . . Most of the remaining unemployed need more assistance than is possible under this program and they can be more effectively served by regular manpower training programs."—(1974 Budget, p. 131.)

It is true that the EEA is inadequate: at its peak, it provided only 185,000 jobs for 4,500,000 unemployed. But is this a reason to abolish the program? Such action is to refuse bread to a starving man, with apologies for not being able to provide caviar.

An additional irony is to be noted on page 250 of the Budget: manpower expenditures (excluding the uncontrollable trust funds) will be reduced in fiscal 1974 by about \$1 billion. The Administration has left no room there to accommodate 4,366,000 unemployed.

Herbert Stein, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors, justified Administration policy before the Joint Economic Committee on February 12 in a different way:

"We have learned that the kind of employment provided under the public service employment programs is essentially the same kind of employment that is provided by state and local governments generally, that all we did was to provide them with a kind of revenue-sharing which they could use to spend for whatever purposes they had in mind which employed labor."

Yet when I asked another Committee witness, Edward K. Hamilton, Deputy Mayor of the City of New York, the following day whether general revenue sharing funds were sufficient to finance public service employment, he responded vehemently:

"Absolute nonsense, Mr. Reuss! . . . There is no possibility of funding these people with general revenue sharing."

NEEDED, NOW MORE THAN EVER: AN EFFECTIVE PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

H.R. 1415, the "Jobs Now" bill, would provide federal funding for 500,000 jobs at the state and local level at once.

Why 500,000?

First, with a 2-to-1 multiplier, creating 500,000 jobs in the public sector could bring an additional 1,000,000 jobs in the private sector, thus reducing unemployment to below 4 percent. With full employment, we could expect a \$38 billion increase in Gross National Product and a corresponding \$12 billion increase in federal revenues.

Second, creating 500,000 jobs for less-skilled workers, while relieving unemployment significantly, would not be inflationary. If coupled with repeal or modification of the Asset Depreciation Range system and the Investment Tax Credit, the measure would actually decrease inflationary pressure caused by skilled labor bottlenecks.

HOW DOES "JOBS NOW" IMPROVE ON THE EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT?

The "Jobs Now" bill will encourage state and local governments to come up with entirely new types of public service projects. A criticism made of the EEA by such disparate observers as Herbert Stein (quoted above), the National Manpower Policy Task Force, and the Urban Coalition, is that it merely substituted one relatively qualified bureaucrat for another at federal expense.

Of course, the EEA was implemented in great haste; many problems could have been avoided if the need had not been so urgent to provide jobs immediately. But there are three fundamental problems with the EEA which have limited the effectiveness of the program: (a) its small size, (b) its "transitional" nature, and (c) its confusing funding formulae.

a. The EEA provided a small number of jobs (185,000 at its July, 1972, high point). State and local governments had easily that many existing vacant slots—vacant because of lack of local funds. The first wave of EEA unemployed swept into these empty slots. On the average, EEA employed people with better than average education and with relatively short periods of unemployment. A 500,000-job program cannot help but have a different effect. State and local governments cannot possibly absorb 500,000 new workers into existing job slots or even job categories. New projects will have to be created.

b. EEA is triggered statutorily by a national unemployment rate of 4.5 percent (although President Nixon seeks to defuse it administratively at 5.0 percent). Knowing that EEA funds may be withdrawn at any time, state and local program agents have tended to put EEA employees in "easy-in, easy-out" jobs rather than to undertake far-reaching, long-term projects. "Jobs Now" has no such trigger and no such stop-and-go financing. It is not "emergency" legislation, as the 1971 Act was. "Jobs Now" is based on the belief that as long as people able and willing to work are unable to find jobs, there is a need for public service employment. Secure in their funding levels, state and local

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

governments will feel free to undertake more significant and innovative programs.

c. Under the EEA, funds are allocated in three different ways: first, 80 percent of Section 5 funds go to all states and local units, "taking into consideration" the proportion which the number of unemployed in the state bears to the national number of unemployed (with a similar formula for local units within a state); second, the remaining 20 percent of Section 5 funds may be spent at the Secretary's discretion, and third, Section 6 funds are allocated to areas with unemployment rates of 6 percent or more. This complexity—made even more Byzantine by the Administration's "double-dip" implementation—has resulted often in unfair and ineffective distribution. The most notable example of this seems to be the "pilot programs," as in California and South Carolina, established at the Secretary's initiative to fulfill what are considered by some critics to be political rather than economic goals.

"Jobs Now" has a simple formula: all funds are to be allocated to the states (and within the states to localities) strictly on the basis of proportional unemployment. There will be no special Section 6 program, no discretionary funds for the Secretary. The formula will ensure that the most money goes where there is most need—to areas with the largest number of unemployed.

THE JOBS ARE THERE TO DO

The public service projects instituted to employ these jobless—an increasing proportion of whom are unskilled or semi-skilled—will not correspond to Mr. Stein's bureaucratic stereotype. Instead, they will be jobs in auxiliary police protection, education, anti-polition, recreation, transportation, child care, health care.

I say it is wicked that a returned medical corpsman from Vietnam should be walking the streets looking for work at a time when the local hospital, desperately needing a medical orderly, lacks the wherewithal to hire him. It is self-defeating that our forests, federal and state, are going untended because we lack the junior foresters to manage them. It is ironic that the museums in our great cities are often closed several days a week because we lack auxiliary guards. It is criminal that teachers should be afraid to go to school because of violence in the schoolyard which the presence of a playground guard would prevent. And it would be shameful if many of the good federal programs eliminated in President Nixon's budget—Community Action Agencies, community mental health centers, social services—should have to fold when millions of unemployed ask nothing better than to work in them.

We heard a great deal during the last campaign about the "work ethic" and, in intended contrast, about "welfare scroungers . . . always wanting something for nothing." Why not give people a chance to get off welfare and on to a job?

There can be no doubt that in America, work has an importance far greater than its purely economic significance. A man's job defines not only his relationship to his community but even, to a large extent, what he thinks of himself. It is not too old-fashioned to say, simply, that a job in our society means dignity and self-respect.

So what does the work ethic really imply for public policy? It does not imply, as the Administration would say, that we should throw the unskilled unemployed on the mercies of a private sector which has no jobs for them. It does not imply that we should wash our hands of the federal government's statutory responsibility to strive for full employment without inflation. It does not imply that we should cut almost every major federal program providing jobs for the less skilled.

It does mean finding a job for every person who wants one.

February 27, 1973

It does mean actively helping families to get off welfare. It does mean showing the unemployed workers of this country that the federal government cares, that Congress, at any rate, is ready to go the extra mile and enact a truly effective public service employment program to provide jobs now.

And if anyone tries to impound the program, let's impound him.

DR. GEORGE E. MOORE TO TAKE CANCER POST IN DENVER

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, Dr. George E. Moore, a distinguished cancer specialist and researcher, is closing out 20 years with the New York State Department of Health and will become chief of the oncology section of the Denver General Hospital.

Throughout his career with the State, he has been associated with the Roswell Park Memorial Institute in Buffalo, first as director and then as State director of public health research.

Dr. Moore will continue his research on cancer at the Denver Hospital, working closely with the University of Colorado School of Medicine. The hospital is operated by the city and county of Denver.

Dr. Hollis S. Ingraham, New York State health commissioner, has praised the dedicated research efforts of Dr. Moore and his role in Roswell's achievements. Roswell Park has pioneered in cancer research and is one of the foremost cancer institutes in the world. Dr. Moore has contributed significantly to Roswell research on this dread disease for which the world still seeks a cure.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include a newspaper column salute to Dr. Moore:

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier-Express, Feb. 23, 1973]

A FAREWELL TO DR. MOORE

(By Anne McIlhenney Matthews)

I agree that there should be more than a small salute to the retirement of Dr. George E. Moore, director of public health research for the State Dept. of Health since 1967 and a former director of Roswell Park Memorial Institute in Buffalo who is retiring from those posts after 20 years of service on March 14.

He will move to professor of surgery and microbiology at the University of Colorado School of Medicine and to chief of the oncology section of Denver General Hospital.

I agree because one of Buffalo's greatest newspapermen, Alfred H. Kirchhofer, said somebody should do a real farewell on Dr. Moore, who is chiefly responsible for the development of the world renowned cancer complex in Buffalo and who is going on to help start another such research center . . . (and who would question the legendary Kirchhofer—the great retired editor of The Buffalo Evening News?) Not me—says the mouse! (me). So here are some facts in a hail and farewell! . . .

Dr. Moore was appointed director of Roswell Park Memorial Institute in 1953 by state health commissioner Herman E. Hilleboe. Under his direction, with the support of local legislators and other public figures in Buffalo and successive state administrations

in Albany, the institute expanded to become the second largest cancer research center in the world. It achieved international recognition for its creative approach to cancer research. More than 30 young scientists brought to the institute by Dr. Moore became department heads, professors or directors of institutions.

In 1967 Dr. Moore resigned the directorship of the institute to become director of public health research of the state health department. In this capacity he worked in association with state health commissioner Hollis S. Ingraham. He continued the surgical care of patients with complex problems and research on cancer cells, a field of special interest. He worked with the state health commissioner to develop new research programs related to public health.

Dr. Moore received wide public recognition for both his scientific and community activities. Several organizations designated him "Man of the Year." His development of the use of radio-active isotopes for the diagnosis and localization of brain tumors was awarded him the "Bronfman Prize" in 1964.

BROAD-BASED RESEARCH

Dr. Moore was known for the discovery of the use of radioisotopes to diagnose brain tumors, the long and continuing fight to reduce the health hazards of cigarettes, the establishment of the collaborative studies of surgical procedures and anticancer agents, and the development of special facilities for growing human white blood cells in the laboratory.

Under his direction the institute was quietly and firmly integrated many years before such activities became popular and the institute policy has remained one of equal responsibility, educational opportunity and reward for competence. He felt these accomplishments ranked with his role in the improvement of several cancer operations and the improved care of patients with anticancer agents and immune therapy.

Dr. Moore is the author of two books and about 500 articles, and has delivered over 800 special lectures.

Dr. Moore took pride in his directorship in the Manufacturers & Traders Trust Co. He remarked about the great disparity between banker and doctor jokes, but the similarity of "people problems" and the kinds of interaction that lead to good and bad judgments.

Dr. Moore commented that he and his family have always found Buffalo a very exciting community and an exceptional place for diverse outdoor activities. He expressed a sentimental attachment to their home in a canyon of the Boston Hills with its waterfalls and dense forest. He noted that they hope to revisit Buffalo and continue exploring the superb fossil beds of the community.

GOVERNOR WEST PROCLAIMS VIETNAM VETERANS DAY

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, our great and good Governor of South Carolina, the Honorable John C. West, has officially designated today, February 27, 1973, as Vietnam Veterans Recognition Day. This special day is in honor of South Carolinians and, indeed, veterans throughout the Nation who served during the Vietnam conflict. The Governor has directed that special efforts be made by the State to provide jobs and educational opportunities for these Vietnam era veterans. As chairman of the Veterans' Affairs

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Committee, Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to express our thanks and commendation to the Governor for this important proclamation. There is no more fitting and proper gesture of thanks and appreciation a grateful Nation and State could make to our veterans than to see to it that sufficient jobs and education opportunities are available for them.

Mr. Speaker, we pledge to Governor West, to South Carolina Vietnam veterans and our veterans everywhere our complete support, and again express our appreciation for the designation of February 27, 1973, as Vietnam Veterans Recognition Day in South Carolina.

CONSTITUENT QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. CHARLES THONE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, for my constituents I have developed a questionnaire which is somewhat unique. It will give residents of my district an opportunity to express their sense of priorities on most problems facing the Nation. From a list encompassing nearly all fields in which the Federal Government is involved, each voter is asked to list no more than three areas for which he or she thinks that Federal spending should be increased and no more than three areas where the individual feels that Federal spending should be reduced. The returns from the questionnaire will be compiled and will be published in a later CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so as to be informative and of use to its readers.

The text of the questionnaire follows:

CONGRESSMAN CHARLES THONE ASKS YOUR OPINION

Please check the appropriate box after each question. So that more than one voter per household can express opinions, his and her boxes are included.

Check the box describing where you live:

Farm

Town under 5,000

Town above 5,000

1. Do you favor adoption by Congress of the ceiling on federal spending proposed by the President even though it means cutting existing programs?

- (a) Favor
- (b) Oppose
- (c) Undecided

2. Current farm support programs expire this year. Check the alternative you prefer.

- (a) Extend present programs
- (b) Enact more rigid supports
- (c) Enact more flexible supports

3. Should the federal government turn over more of its responsibilities and financial resources to state and local governments?

- (a) Favor
- (b) Oppose
- (c) Undecided

4. If prisoners are returned, missing in action accounted for, and a firm cease-fire is established, should the U.S. extend economic assistance to North Vietnam?

- (a) Favor
- (b) Oppose
- (c) Undecided

5. Your views on specifics of federal spending are desired. Please list below no more

than three areas for which you think federal spending should be increased. Also list no more than three areas where cuts in federal spending are most needed. Reduce spending or increase spending.

- (a) Anti-poverty program
- (b) Civil rights
- (c) Combating drugs
- (d) Crime prevention
- (e) Consumer protection
- (f) Defense
- (g) Education
- (h) Elderly programs
- (i) Farm programs
- (j) Foreign aid
- (k) Health and medical care
- (l) Highways
- (m) Job training
- (n) Pollution control
- (o) Public housing
- (p) Rural development
- (q) Space explorations
- (r) Welfare
- (s) (Other)

The letter accompanying the questionnaire reads as follows:

DEAR FRIENDS: Your views on important issues will be extremely helpful to me.

Congress faces many tough decisions in the months ahead. Day-by-day I will be voting on critical matters facing the nation. One of the important factors in deciding how to vote will be knowing how you and all others in the Nebraska First Congressional District feel about the issues.

Please spare me 2-or-3 minutes from your busy day. Answer the questions on the other side of this card and mail it to me. I will be most appreciative. If you will work with me, we can make this representative system a little better.

Sincerely,

NEVER TO BE REPAYED

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, the honor and respect of our country for the men and women who served in combat is expressed in some measure by the benefits provided for service and disability to veterans and their families.

The prisoners of war, like the wounded, can never be properly compensated for their anguish and their suffering. However, we can demonstrate our gratitude and our concern by legislation to assist them in their return from captivity.

Accordingly, I am today introducing and cosponsoring a legislative package of seven bills to benefit former U.S. POW's who are now returning from Vietnam. The two bills I am introducing include a measure which would give a one-time bonus of between \$1,000 and \$10,000 to each POW who was held for at least 30 days. The amount of the bonus would depend on pay grade, length of imprisonment and other factors.

The bills I am cosponsoring include a measure to freeze the present veterans' disability rating schedule and provide that any proposed changes will not be made without congressional approval. Another bill would provide each returning POW with 2 days of credit toward

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

either his military or civil service retirement for every day of captivity. Other bills would provide certain per diem bonuses, waiver of import duties on household goods purchased overseas for one year after repatriation, extension of time allowed to leave their deposit in the Uniformed Services Savings Deposit program, and long-range psychological and physical health care benefits to POW's, even if they decide not to remain in the military.

Mr. Speaker, American prisoners of war have given so much of themselves through years of suffering and deprivation. Enactment of these bills would express in a meaningful way our Nation's deep appreciation for their sacrifice.

REMARKS ON VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1973

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today H.R. 4814, a bill to extend and revise the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, which expired June 30, 1972. These amendments would continue and improve one of the most successful Federal-State programs, a program that enables handicapped men and women to achieve economic independence through vocational rehabilitation. The bill that I am submitting today was developed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. A summary of the major provisions of the bill is provided below.

The services provided under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act have a two-fold benefit. First, persons who directly receive services, benefit through enhanced independence, sense of dignity and self-reliance. Second, our society, which provides these services, benefits too. A handicapped individual may, during his lifetime, receive anywhere from \$30,000 to \$100,000 in public assistance payments when he is unemployed. But if this same person had an average annual income of \$8,000, the same individual in a family of four would pay taxes totalling \$42,000 over his or her lifetime.

The vocational rehabilitation program has been a very successful one, and its success is primarily due to three factors. The most important factor is the program's clear goal: the achievement of self-sufficiency through employment. Second, the program is cost-effective, as I have noted. Finally, a sound Federal-State partnership has developed in this program, one which gives the States a great deal of initiative in setting priorities and providing services.

The administration's strong support of the existing vocational rehabilitation program is reflected in these amendments, which would extend and strengthen the program, in the testimony of administration officials before the Congress, and in the President's response to the needs of the Nation's handicapped: In fiscal year 1969 the basic VR program

was funded at \$343 million, while the President's fiscal year 1974 budget calls for \$610 million. This average—almost a doubling of VR funds under the Nixon administration testifies to the importance which this administration attaches to providing services to the Nation's handicapped.

As my colleagues know, the President vetoed H.R. 8395 the VR bill passed by the 92d Congress. The remarks I have just made and the fact that the administration is proposing to extend and improve the VR program show that the President's veto did not indicate disapproval of the vocational rehabilitation program. Rather, the President was disapproving the financially irresponsible, organizationally unworkable and programmatically unnecessary provisions of H.R. 8395. The veto was demanded by the outrageous authorization levels, combined with a hodgepodge of nonvocational, medically oriented, categorical programs and legislative imperatives dictating the management of the program. In brief, the President's disapproval of H.R. 8395 was a matter of program and fiscal integrity.

I join with the administration and other friends of the vocational rehabilitation program in the hope that Congress will speedily enact legislation which would be responsive to the needs of the Nation's handicapped.

I urge my colleagues to join with me and the President in support of H.R. 4314 and in opposition to VR legislation which would be unacceptable to the administration.

TRIBUTE TO AZALEA QUEENS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a particularly beautiful time is rapidly approaching in southern California. The eighth annual Azalea Festival will celebrate the gorgeous azalea season in South Gate from March 9 to 17.

Two special ladies will make the festivities even more enjoyable.

Both the new Azalea Festival Queen, Mrs. Leland R. "Dorotha" Weaver and the outgoing Queen, Mrs. Bill "Alyce" Coleman will commemorate the azalea's beauty with their appearances at the week's events.

The Azalea Festival queen is chosen from the mature ladies of South Gate by a panel of judges on the basis of service to youth, home, church, and community. Both Mrs. Weaver and Mrs. Coleman are the epitome of women who have given much service to South Gate.

While Dorotha Weaver's late husband, Leland, was mayor and councilman of South Gate, Dorotha stood proudly alongside him. Mayor Weaver was one of the founders of the Azalea Festival.

Mrs. Weaver, for many years, joined her husband in the insurance business, so that Mayor Weaver could be free to work for the city.

February 27, 1973

Dorotha is a past Girl Scout troop leader and aided her husband with his Boy Scout troops.

But, most of all, Dorotha Weaver is loved and respected by the citizens of South Gate for her unselfish help to others.

She "does her thing" quietly so that no one will notice lest attention be called to herself. She is a brave, courageous lady, although she would be the last to think so.

As Dorotha begins her reign with the parade and other festival events, last year's Queen Alyce Coleman will watch and remember her experiences as queen. Particularly memorable of Queen Alyce's reign is her work with the city's beautification committee on all their cleanup campaigns.

Mrs. Coleman's year as queen began last year as her son, Walter Karstens Dods, and daughter, Mrs. Catherine Marie McPherson, came from northern California to watch the Azalea ball festivities. In addition, Bill, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Philip Kerr of Downey, Queen Alyce's sister and brother-in-law, all shared the royal table with Mr. and Mrs. Coleman that evening.

Alyce is a most gracious lady and was a most gracious queen.

In addition to the Azalea ball and parade, the festival will include church participation in Azalea Sunday, participation by schoolchildren in art contests and programs, service club night, hobby night, a musicale, art show, theatre guild performance, and dinners sponsored by local civic clubs.

This year's "Golden Notes" festival is sure to be an exciting Azalea Festival under the leadership of Cochairman Wilbur Lunday and Robert E. Girardin.

The entire festival has developed since the South Gate Chamber of Commerce organized the South Gate Beautification Committee which selected the azalea as the city's flower.

Due largely to the efforts of the beautification committee, South Gate has received six awards from Los Angeles Beautiful; one national award from Keep America Beautiful, Inc.; and recognition from the California State Assembly. In 1972 South Gate received the coveted Silver Valley Kundsen trophy for best use of color from Los Angeles Beautiful.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will agree that the citizens of South Gate have much to be proud of in their Azalea Festival, and those community leaders, particularly their queens, who have made it so successful.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE U.S. SENATOR ROBERT S. KERR

HON. CLEM ROGERS McSPADDEN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. McSPADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following: A copy of an article by Joseph Kraft which appeared in the Washington Post, Tuesday,

February 27, 1973, and points to the wisdom and foresight of the late U.S. Senator Robert S. Kerr of Oklahoma for predicting the economic boon to be brought about by the Arkansas River Basin navigational canal:

A RIVER—AND A STATE—REVITALIZED

(By Joseph Kraft)

LITTLE ROCK, ARK.—Headlong growth, bringing pollution and congestion and a riot of other ills, is visibly destroying many parts of the country along the Atlantic and Pacific coastlines. But how can growth be arrested in a country where the national ethic is to give maximum scope to individual initiative?

The answer is that instead of trying to restrict growth, it makes better sense to disperse it to less advanced parts of the country. A good case in point is the tonic effect on the area around Little Rock of the Arkansas River project.

That project has made the river navigable for 450 miles from its juncture with the Mississippi to Tulsa, Okla. Dredging and construction of 18 dams and locks cost an estimated \$1.3 billion spread over 15 years beginning in 1957 with formal completion last year. During the 1960s the project became known as the "biggest pork barrel in history."

I remember flying over the project about 10 years ago with its most powerful sponsor, the late Sen. Robert Kerr of Oklahoma. The stream below us was a muddy trickle. Sen. Kerr stopped along the way to open (with a golden bulldozer) construction on various ports so obscure that I do not remember their names.

At the end of the day I asked an officer from the Army Corps of Engineers which was building the project whether it wasn't unduly expensive. "Hell," he said, "it would have been cheaper to pave the river."

But that judgment, which echoed my own sentiments, has been unsaid by the results. The river has been totally transformed.

The dams have stopped the silting, and with the sediment gone, the tiny organisms known as plankton have reappeared, reopening the river to the life-giving force of the sun. The river has become greenish-blue in color, instead of brown. Bass and other fresh-water fish, rare 10 years ago, are now abundant. A fresh-water shrimp, unknown before, has turned up.

The cleaning up of the river and the lakes created back of the dams has made the area exceedingly attractive for recreational purposes. Arkansas has become a magnet for retirees from Illinois, Missouri and Kansas. Many companies which value recreation highly in their choice of sites are turning toward the state. The town of Russellville, 65 miles from Little Rock, is one good example.

The Firestone Company is putting in a plant. So is a food division of the conglomerate company, International Telephone and Telegraph. Middle South Utilities, the chief power company in the area, is investing an estimated \$300 million in new generating facilities.

Improved navigation facilities have quickened commerce throughout the area. Hundreds of thousands of tons of Arkansas rice and soy beans go down river and across the oceans to Europe and Japan every year.

Bauxite from the Caribbean feeds aluminum plants near Little Rock. Steel from Japan is building a new bridge across the river. Over last weekend, two new foreign auto agencies, stocked with cars shipped direct to Little Rock by sea, opened their doors here.

The result of all this activity is a mild population boom. This state lost population throughout the 1930s, the 1940s and most of the 1950s. With the Arkansas River project, the adverse trend has been turned

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

around. Population is now back where it was in 1940—at about 2 million—and steadily rising.

No one in this state doubts that the project has paid off. "It has exceeded the highest hopes of all its sponsors by far," Dale Bumpers, the attractive and energetic young Democratic governor said the other day.

More important are the national implications of what has been done here. Ecologists and environmentalists cannot on their own check forever the pressure for more and more development along the coasts.

At best they can slow down the headlong growth. They can achieve full success only if the pressure for growth which comes from individuals and families and companies is channeled elsewhere, as it has been here in the Arkansas River Valley.

THE ECONOMISTS VIEW THE FARM

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

MR. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, attempts by the State to regulate agriculture go back at least as far as ancient Egypt which held the theory that the production and sale of food should be regulated by the State for the benefit of the State.

Today we still seem to have the same idea in spite of its failures through the centuries. That philosophy is of no benefit to the food producer who is operating below parity level.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Renville Star Farmer: "The Economists View the Farm."

In the weeks ahead we will be discussing a lot of agricultural legislation and a new farm bill. I am sure this editorial by Tom Licklider will help my colleagues understand the problems of cheap food production we are facing.

The article follows:

THE ECONOMISTS VIEW THE FARM

The history of Imperial Egypt gives man the first recorded history of agricultural economics, under the theory that the production and sale of food should be regulated by the state for the benefit of the state.

The Roman Empire, and later England, sought to control agriculture with the same philosophy. And it wasn't until the 19th Century that nations began generally to give much thought to the idea of regulating agriculture for the benefit of the agriculturalists, with the resultant benefits thus accruing to the state.

Is the American philosophy of agricultural economics, after generations of stressing benefit to the farmer, turning now to the goals of the ancient empires? The words of two economists cited last week by Congressman John M. Zwach would indicate that trend.

Zwach referred to a report by the National Farmers Union that economics textbooks being used in many American colleges are teaching that farmers are not justified in parity support for their crops. One of the textbooks were quoted: "The remedy is not to provide the owners of the resources (farmer's) with price and income support—but to subsidize them to get out."

If the contentions made in textbooks are inserted for the sake of argument, that may be well and good. But economists have a dis-

concerting habit of reaching conclusions and then developing issues to substantiate their claims.

It can be presumed that subsidies help the consumer more than they help the farmer. If the consumer is willing, or able, to pay the actual cost of producing food there is little need to assume that farm subsidies are needed.

But the facts tend to point in the opposite direction. This has been evidenced in recent months as food prices have risen generally, in belated response to the inflation which has swept the nation for years. The cries which have come from consumers have been far louder than those of farmers during years of soaring costs.

Perhaps the economists see larger farms as the only means of providing low cost food during the years to come. If that is their conclusion, they will be hard put to develop any arguments to enforce their position. Any cursory study of contemporary economic trends will show that.

SEVEN MYTHS OF CIVIL DEFENSE

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

MR. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, considerable confusion exists in the minds of the American population with respect to the meaning of civil defense. Two few people know what it is, what are its objectives, and how it functions.

In order to dissipate this uncertainty that hangs like a heavy fog over this subject, Col. John E. Bex, director of the Region II Defense Civil Preparedness Agency, and a well-known constituent of mine, has written an article entitled "Seven Myths of Civil Defense," which appeared in the January-February 1973 issue of the American Journal of Civil Defense.

Because this is an informative and meaningful article, I insert it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend it to the attention of all who are interested in gaining an accurate perspective on the true significance of civil defense:

SEVEN MYTHS OF CIVIL DEFENSE

(By John E. Bex)

In every field where information is not widely disseminated and the public is not well informed, myths tend to accumulate. Civil Defense has been peculiarly afflicted with such myths since it has been treated as a very minor affair and neglected for so many years. The result is a sort of vicious dwindling spiral, since the effect works both ways and neglect fosters myths which bring about still further neglect.

Any progress in stopping this dangerous downward tendency in Civil Defense requires facing squarely all of these myths and combatting them vigorously. In few fields has the discrepancy between myth and reality grown so great.

We can summarize this unfortunate mythology under the following general points which we will list before proceeding to discuss them in detail:

1. Civil Defense is an essentially futile exercise since if war doesn't come, it's unnecessary, while if war does come, it can't help enough to be worthwhile.

2. All efforts toward improving Civil Defense merely further increase the war danger since they are provocative.

3. With our huge defense budgets over the years, so many billions have already been spent on Civil Defense that everything reasonable and practical has already been done.

4. Civil Defense is a military affair of limited interest to civilians.

5. Civil Defense is a Federal Government show and whatever is to be done will be taken care of at the Federal Government level.

6. Civil Defense is concerned only with the effects of nuclear warfare.

7. The general public is uninterested in or opposed to Civil Defense.

Now everyone of these myths is false or a twisted half truth at best, yet each one is a major obstacle and acts as a really formidable roadblock against progress. Time and again you will run across these myths or fragments of them in the minds and public statements of not merely ordinary citizens, but high officials and national leaders as well. An adequate treatment would, for some of them, require many pages or separate essays; but let us dig in and cover the high points.

MYTH NO. 1

Is Civil Defense futile? War or no war, it is not futile. If war is to be avoided, Civil Defense can play an important role helping to discourage war. A strong Civil Defense system means that any aggressor will not be able to achieve victory in a single knockout blow, but must reckon with the consequences, perhaps long drawn out, of his actions. It adds weight to the counsels of caution and subdues the blitz-krieg fanatics.

Can Civil Defense actually be effective and make a difference? It most definitely can; and difference is in terms of millions of lives. In the American case, the difference between the loss of over 100,000,000 and less than 20,000,000 lives in the initial assault. (Eugene P. Wigner claims that the Soviet Union would lose less than 10,000,000 in these same circumstances due to its organized civil defense.)

Civil Defense is independent of the issue of pacifism, since it is non-aggressive passive defense upon which both pacifists and non-pacifists can agree. Its essence is simple survival. If anyone were asked to name the principle pacifist nations and international leaders of pacifism, Sweden and Switzerland would certainly appear on anyone's list. It is precisely these two countries which have developed the world's best systems of Civil Defense. Their systems are miles ahead of our own, and include things like deep rock blast shelters.

There is indeed a great hope and a good chance of avoiding nuclear war, but this can best be accomplished by taking appropriate defensive action and not depending on hope, drifting along. Men have complained of the burden and disaster of war since the time of Homer, but war has come. There is no guarantee that it will never strike again. We owe it to ourselves and to our civilization to ensure some sort of survival no matter how bad our luck may be. Mankind survived the attacks of the black plague in the Middle Ages which killed as much as one-third to one-half of the population in many regions. People didn't give up but went on living.

MYTH NO. 2

The example of the Swedes and the Swiss points up the falsity of the second myth, that Civil Defense increases the war danger by being a provocation. No reasonable person could accuse these nations of meaning to be provocative of war. They just intend to survive and have had the courage to face the unpleasant realities and take sensible, active steps to foster their own survival if worst comes to worst. Both reason and a sense of moral responsibility decree that we do the same.

Let us put the matter finally in these terms. Let us suppose that both Russia and

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the U.S. maintained the same total defense budget or perhaps reduced it at some constant rate each year. Consider case A where the proportions of that total budget for each nation were shifted away from offensive weapons and toward passive Civil Defense, and case B where the shift was made in the opposite direction. Which would be a better augury for peace?

MYTH NO. 3

According to myth three, since we've spent so much on defense, a lot of this must have gone for Civil Defense. Nothing could be more mistaken. Ask anyone who holds such a view what he thinks the percentage is which the Civil Defense budget represents of the total defense budget, just approximately. Keeping in mind that this is for the Civil Defense of over 200 million people, should one guess 10% perhaps, or maybe 5%? Such answers are not even in the right ball park, since the actual figure is approximately one-tenth of one percent. The annual Civil Defense budget has ranged around 70 million. The hard and simple facts of life are that we are unprotected today because we have not yet decided to undertake adequate programs, and spend the still fairly modest amount of additional money which is required.

MYTH NO. 4

Civil Defense is not a military affair at all, but it is run entirely by and for civilians from the National Director of Civil Defense down through the various regional, state, and local officials. It is of concern to civilians, or at least should be, since its whole purpose is to ensure their survival. It is a sad state of affairs for any normal, mentally healthy individual to be uninterested in his own survival, since survival is such an elemental instinct. But an external observer, like a man from Mars, would be almost forced by the available evidence regarding Civil Defense, to conclude that the mass of citizens of the U.S., the land of the free and home of the brave, had reached that strange state.

MYTH NO. 5

Myth number five, that the Federal Government is or should be taking care of everything in the way of Civil Defense for us, is completely opposed to the facts. The main responsibility and work for Civil Defense lies with the State and local authorities, where Congress has thought best to place it. The Federal Government's role is much more that of a coordinating and planning agency. The Federal agency does research, operates a national warning system, provides training and publications, makes grants of money and equipment, and makes suggestions and recommendations. But the substantive work of providing shelter, etc., to the extent that it gets done at all, must be done at the local level. Citizens must realize that Big Brother, on the whole, is not taking care of you, but will help you to take care of yourself if you and your local government officials are interested.

MYTH NO. 6

Civilian defense certainly originated as a response to the threat of nuclear warfare, but it has been considerably broadened since then, so that myth six is now widely at variance with reality. Responsibility for aid in all types of peace-time disasters such as floods, earthquakes, and the like, has long been an intrinsic part of Civil Defense. Active help has accordingly been given in many such disasters occurring in recent years, though the public has generally not been aware of the fact. In this respect, as in many others, one might well agree with one Senator who remarked that the public relations work of Civil Defense seemed to be about one generation behind.

This role of Civil Defense is growing. Logic and psychology both favor further developments in this direction. After all, the role

February 27, 1973

of a general responsibility for disaster aid and prevention at the national level is still unfilled. But then the same might be said about Civil Defense itself insofar as any really adequate system is concerned.

MYTH NO. 7

Finally, let us consider myth seven, which asserts that people on the whole are either uninterested or opposed. This is a dangerous sort of half truth. Certainly evidences of apathy, if not actual hostility, are abundant enough. But then the people have never been told about Civil Defense. No serious effort has yet been made to get the message across. As a result, people are better acquainted with the myths than the realities.

As a matter of fact, experience has shown that efforts which are occasionally made to break through this barrier of ignorance, silence, and misinformation are most rewarding. It turns out that people are interested once the facts have been correctly and properly presented to them. This shouldn't be surprising.

After all, survival is everybody's business.

THE CHARLES L. HORN STORY

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following superb editorial from the Minnesota Spokesman gives an indication of the wide-ranging contributions that Hon. Charles L. Horn has made to the cause of education and public service. At Clemson University, in my own congressional district, the philanthropy of the Olin Foundation, of which Mr. Horn is president, has been largely responsible for the construction of Olin Hall, Clemson's ceramic engineering building, and of Earle Hall, Clemson's chemical engineering building. Mr. Horn has played a leading role in the development of Clemson University as one of the Nation's leading institutions of higher learning.

Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the Congress the following editorial which is a splendid tribute to a great American, a true humanitarian, an outstanding business leader, and a warm friend:

THE CHARLES L. HORN STORY

The January resignation of Charles Lilly Horn from the Minneapolis Housing and Redevelopment Authority while expected for some time, came at a time when the public housing picture in Minneapolis and all over the nation was in a flux due to anticipated changes in federal guidelines and funding for agencies like the local authority.

If Mr. Horn whose keen insight and business experience could have been available for just a little longer, at least until the crisis is over it would have been much better for public housing in Minneapolis.

Nevertheless, if ever an individual earned a rest or relief from burdensome non-compensatory public duties Charles Horn did. His leadership of the urban renewal and public housing field for all of the 24 years in which he served on the authority helped earn for that body the reputation of being the best run housing, and redevelopment authority in the whole United States.

Horn a successful industrialist in his own right, a conservationist of national stature and president of the prestigious Olin Foundation, one of the largest philanthropic groups

in America gave unstintedly of his busy life to seeing that Minneapolis developed an excellent urban renewal program.

Anyone who walks through downtown Minneapolis, and is knowledgeable knows how it happened that the downtown changed from incipient almost slum to an area of handsome buildings, housing thriving business concerns.

Horn and his colleagues on the authority, inspired by his dedication saw to it that downtown Minneapolis got a real break in urban renewal, through wise painstaking planning. He and the authority have never been given full credit for the job accomplished but this never bothered Charles Horn—getting the job accomplished was the important thing to him.

Hundreds of senior citizens living in well kept modern apartments, say a prayer every night for Charles Horn, one of them told this newspaper, because under his push and leadership Minneapolis developed hundreds of pleasant living spaces for its older residents.

A measure of a city, a community, a state or a nation is the manner in which it cares for its senior citizens. The older people of Minneapolis, many of them on modest pensions know that Minneapolis leads the nation in supplying living quarters at reasonable cost and most of them give Mr. Horn credit for his long interest in bringing such a program about. Minneapolis boasts the best senior citizens housing in these United States.

In a story in the Minneapolis STAR it was indicated by a reporter that some members of the black community had expressed some skepticism about Mr. Horn. To many hundreds of blacks and many thousands of whites too, this must have been really amusing in view of the record. For the facts are that Charles L. Horn has been in the lonely forefront for many years in the advocacy of opportunity for the black man. There were times years ago when his was a single voice against anti-Negro bigotry.

In the authority itself he was the chief advocate for the naming of Archie Givens, Sr. a successful black businessman to the agency. Along with Mr. Givens he insisted that a young qualified Negro attorney be given the position of first assistant to the housing authority director and in the number of promotions where black personnel moved up in the agency the fine hand of Mr. Horn could always be seen.

As a matter of fact way back in 1940, a full 32 years ago Horn insisted that he was going to operate a defense plant in Minnesota where the color of a man's skin was not going to prevent him from working at any job he could perform.

He did so well in keeping that promise at the Twin Cities Ordnance Plant, at New Brighton, that President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed him to the wartime Federal FEPC which he set up to force war plant employers to hire blacks, after A. Phillip Randolph and Walter White had threatened a March On Washington.

Horn's policies at TCOP changed hiring policies in most Twin City industry opening up job opportunities for minorities in many plants.

The first thing Mr. Horn did when he went to Washington with the President's Fair Employment Practices Committee was to point out the race discrimination in government employment and in private employment from offices and plants to such things as busses and street cars!

Over 20 years ago he pushed through a resolution in the Minneapolis Authority which set forth a policy of non-discrimination in housing in all buildings owned or operated by the authority which at that time was most revolutionary, because none of the big city housing authorities of that period appeared to have the courage to meet the race situation courageously.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

During most all of the years Mr. Horn served on the Minneapolis Housing Authority, the agency has attracted topflight members because in the past the mayors who have appointed them have sensed that the public wanted high-grade individuals on the authority.

The agency has spent millions of dollars of public money without even a whisper of a major scandal of any type. The "wheelers and dealers" who have infested housing authorities and housing agencies in other cities have left the Minneapolis body severely alone, chiefly because of the "tough no foolishness" attitude of "Charley" Horn.

It is not often that a single man can afford to make such a contribution to society as has Charles L. Horn. We could name his interest in boys camps in the deep South, in colleges and schools, big and little but we think his great service to Minneapolis a city he loves, in a sense expresses the greatness of the man. For many years this city and Anoka, Minn., where his principal plant is located will be a monument to his dedication of making man's surroundings as he moves through life a better place to live and be. For this, our area owes Charles Lilly Horn, a hearty "well done" and sincere thanks for his great contribution to its well-being.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following book review—as well as the book—to all of my colleagues who are interested in the Government's role in biomedical research with special reference to the National Institutes of Health. The first-rate book is by Stephen Strickland, and the book review is by Charles Kidd, formerly Chief of the Office of Research Planning at the National Institutes of Health.

I am especially pleased that it recognizes PAUL ROGERS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment, as the worthy successor of Congressman John Fogarty and Senator Lister Hill as "Mr. Health" in Congress and in the Nation. All of us, in Congress, will agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Kidd's comment that PAUL ROGERS has "emerged as a thoughtful, solid, and effective congressional leader" of the new coalition on health.

[From *Science* magazine, January, 1973]

THE NIH PHENOMENON

Politics, Science, and Dread Disease. A Short History of United States Medical Research Policy. STEPHEN P. STRICKLAND. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1972. xvi, 330 p. \$9.95. A Commonwealth Fund Book.

This book is the definitive history of a phenomenon unique in the history of science—the rise to political power of biomedical research. After World War II, what had been the National Institute of Health, a small-time microbiological laboratory, was transformed into the National Institutes of Health, a vast machine for the support of a nationwide biomedical research effort. Stephen Strickland has meticulously put together an absolutely first-rate historical account of the political aspects of this metamorphosis, with all of the pressure, tension, and personality affinities and conflicts in-

volved. He has done this with a remarkable sensitivity to all the forces that were at work and with an evenhanded, skeptical, humorous, and penetrating understanding of a most remarkable cast of characters and series of events. I say these things with a high degree of confidence because over most of the years covered by the book it was my privilege to be the chief of the Office of Research Planning at the National Institutes of Health. Only those who were firsthand participants in the movement can appreciate the comic irony of that title. Planning research from that vantage point at that time was like controlling a meat grinder from the inside. Anyhow, it did provide day-to-day contact with many of the significant events chronicled in the book, and an opportunity to help shape some of them.

The central thesis of the book (to reduce a rich story to a threadbare outline) is that a set of strong forces combined after the war to produce a research program of great scope, scientific force, and effectiveness. These forces were—believe me, not in order of significance—Congressman John Fogarty and Senator Lister Hill as strong proponents in Congress; a strong lobby led by Mary Lasker; a brigade of extraordinarily persuasive scientists and physicians who understood the importance of convincing Congress of the power of biomedical research; a group of nonprofessional lobbyists who served the cause more for love than money; and James A. Shannon as the leader of NIH and the political spokesman for the academic community. One of the most amusing threads that runs through Strickland's account of affairs aptly traces the manner in which each of the major figures in the drama claims the central role.

Finding some critical remarks to make about the book has been difficult. The author might have given more emphasis to the ripeness of the scientific conditions in the years following the war. He does take the importance of "readiness" into account in dealing with the cancer chemotherapy program, but he does not generalize the point, which is an important one. The NIH expansion would have been a gigantic boondoggle if the biosciences had not been at the point where further scientific advances were possible over very broad fronts. Indeed, it is dangerous to use the NIH experience as a precedent for analogous efforts in other areas unless scientific readiness is carefully assessed.

In fact, scientific readiness was not as sessed in the early days of NIH. It was simply fortunate that when the political steamroller went into action the field was ready, and, moreover, a large group of scientists left scientifically underemployed by the conclusion of the war could turn their minds and hands to biomedical research. Thus, the rapidly rising investment caused increases in scientific output rather than simply the inflation that would have been the consequence of pouring money into the work of a fixed number of investigators. One can in fact, as the current phrase goes, attack problems by throwing money at them, but it will go down a well if the basic preconditions for effectiveness are not present. In this connection, one thinks of the history of community mental health programs, regional medical programs, and recent experiments with elementary and secondary education.

The generally cavalier way in which NIH, safe from coercion or retaliation by reason of its allies outside the Administration, treated its nominal hierarchical superiors in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the White House raises interesting questions related to the operation of the federal government. A thoughtful friend once scolded me gently after I had described to a university seminar the way NIH operated in defiance of the executive branch, the President, and the Bureau of the Budget. He said, "What would happen if all agencies operated that

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

way?" The answer is, of course, that government would be in a complete shambles, rather than in its chronic state of substantial disarray. I felt a twinge of conscience at the time at being a party to such a subversion of orderly government. But since then, three conclusions have eased my mind: (i) government is likely to sit on its dead center if there are not occasional revolts in the hills, (ii) one need not worry too much that the grouping of forces required to produce the NIH phenomenon will come about often enough to subvert the government, and (iii) it is a relief to have a life-oriented powerhouse at work now and then to demonstrate that the general welfare is as important as the common defense. So if anybody or any group can put together a coalition that will do as much for the common cause, or for any special worthy cause, as the NIH coalition did, applause is in order—even at the risk of irritating the political satrap.

One important aspect of the NIH story is missing from the book, that is, the ambassadorial role it played as the link between the world of politics and the world of science. On the one hand, NIH was head over heels in the political game that Strickland describes sensitively and accurately. The purpose of this frenetic activity was to get money. On the other hand, the people at NIH bore a heavy responsibility for nurturing a scientific enterprise of great significance. The record of NIH in using federal funds to foster science deserves the highest marks on all essential counts. Look at the record:

(1) Maintenance of a high degree of freedom for investigators and institutions while federal funds for them grew in absolute and relative terms.

(2) Sensitive awareness and judicious fostering of new scientific fields, such as physical chemistry and molecular biology.

(3) Establishment of the first institutional support grants.

(4) Maintenance of an adequate balance between the legitimate needs of institutions and those of individual investigators.

(5) Fostering of wide direct participation of scientists in the decision-making process. (This point alone is most significant in a general political sense. The peer review, "study section" device of assessing requests for support is a powerful means not only of securing broad participation but of ensuring the decentralization of decisions, improving communication within the system, and monitoring all aspects of its operation.)

(6) Deliberate efforts to diversify the medical science structure of the nation.

(7) Fostering basic medical sciences while operating a system based essentially upon a disease approach.

(8) Developing broad, integrated approaches to investigation through the establishment of research centers, while enlarging the scope of the system based essentially on the project grant to the individual investigator.

(9) Deliberate expansion of the manpower base for biomedical research, through expansion of fellowships and training grants.

(10) Avoidance of political interference with the operation of the system of support of science.

It was no minor accomplishment to guide such a scientific effort on the one hand while simultaneously engaging in the complementary political game on which Strickland concentrates. The pressures were often diametrically opposed. Speed, expansion, action, flashy public appeal, and the glamor of public figures characterized the lobbying effort, as was appropriate. The NIH contingent, led by Shannon, attempted to moderate or redirect the force of the more politically oriented lobbyists with a view to making the total effort more productive. This was an equally appropriate effort, but this objective view of the situation conveys no sense of the

ferocity of the will of the two parties to prevail. The NIH staff, on whom fell almost the whole responsibility for designing the strategic elements of the scientific effort, had to act simultaneously as scientific statesmen, administrators, and political figures. Who did what in this complex arena would make an interesting book in itself. In fact, the two areas of effort—working out the policies essential to a sound scientific effort and getting the money to support the research—were not entirely separate. Take one example from among many that might be chosen. Congressional support for a large element of basic science was clearly essential if the total undertaking was to be productive. Yet most congressmen and senators were interested in the cure of disease and not at all concerned with the essential underpinning of basic work. I say "most" because Fogarty, Hill, and some others understood the role of basic research fully, and supported it. Their attitude, as Fogarty said to me one time, was, "We'll get the money. You fellows spend it." This was not *entirely* the case because, as Strickland points out, Fogarty and others in Congress did press for specific, focused support for research on disease entities. But these areas of support were a minor part of the entire budget; the NIH apparatus had and still has a remarkably free hand in deciding what to spend money on, and the conditions surrounding the expenditure of funds.

Lest I be misunderstood, it must be added that the institutes and the NIH director's office did not interfere at all with the "retail" decisions on who would get what grant. What the central apparatus at NIH did was to influence the "wholesale" distribution of funds by broad area. It left the specific "retail" decisions to study sections. There is a mode of operation that can reconcile the conflicting requirements that science be responsive to the general public will and that professional judgments determine the quality of the investigators.

How was congressional assent to the use of categorical disease funds for basic research to be secured? First, the record of the appropriations committees in both the House and the Senate was packed with testimony by persuasive and articulate scientists on the need for basic research. This helped. More important, a deal was struck with John Fogarty. Over the years a congenial accommodation was reached on the preparation of the reports of the House and Senate committees on appropriations—a document having the force of law and one which in the absence of authorization hearings actually substituted for substantive legislation. The deal was that Fogarty would insist on backing research on a series of specific diseases that had not been the subject of intensive research. (Here he and the lobbyists were right and the NIH view was generally too conservative.) In return, he gave NIH a free hand to write language supporting basic research, and within limits, setting the support levels for basic research. The NIH staff actually wrote the reports of the House and Senate appropriations committees for a number of years. In this capacity, the NIH staff scolded itself for lack of vision, urged itself on to new heights, made miscellaneous pronouncements on the state of science, and plugged for support of research on neglected diseases. Interestingly enough, the necessary lobbying with the members of the House and Senate, apart from Fogarty and Hill, was done by the extraordinarily effective lobbyists drawn together by Mary Lasker and the disease-oriented associations. The NIH role in Congress was confined almost entirely to working with Hill and Fogarty.

These observations on the times gone by are offered not to criticize Strickland's book for omissions but to indicate the kinds of thoughts that a good book can provoke. Any-

February 27, 1973

one who has a serious interest in the relationships between government and science ought to read the book, not only to absorb history but to think upon the changing scene and the relevance of the NIH story to the present and the future.

The book concludes with an account of the enactment of the Cancer Act of 1971. But what an extraordinary conglomeration of people and pressures it took to stave off by narrow margins a series of strongly supported and potentially disastrous proposals. Senator Edward Kennedy and his staff, with an eye to political aggrandizement as much as to cancer research, proposed that a new National Cancer Authority be established under the direction of an administrator appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. A new Cancer Advisory Board would be established with an equal number of lay and professional members. Adoption of this proposal would have separated cancer research from the mainstream of biomedical research, and would have weakened NIH and thereby weakened the most effective structure for support of biomedical research that the world has ever known. The bill passed the Senate by a vote of 79 to 1, after Ann Landers, confidential adviser to some 50 million readers, at the request of Mary Lasker stimulated an avalanche of mail in its behalf.

Then the Senate action was upset in the House by a campaign that brought into action a new coalition. Paul Rogers, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, emerged as a thoughtful, solid, and effective congressional leader. The Association of American Medical Colleges exerted new strength as a spokesman for the academic community. Equally important, the scientific community was aroused and vocal. The new array of forces was basically different from the alignment during the '60's. Then John Fogarty's appropriation subcommittee both controlled appropriations and in effect wrote substantive law. In 1971, the legislative committee took control of the substantive decisions. The scientific and academic community took on the Lasker forces and won. The position of the White House was somewhat different during the two periods. Earlier the Administration simply opposed increases in appropriations for medical research on the scale proposed by Congress, and was routinely overridden. During the debate over the Cancer Authority, the White House wobbled so severely in a search for immediate political advantage that it had only minor influence on the ultimate outcome.

So the saga continues to unfold. The "heart people" will certainly seek parity with cancer research, and the other major disease entities will not be far behind. At this point it looks as if the cancer episode will initiate a new cycle of increasing federal appropriations for biomedical research after the doldrums of the last few years.

Finally, and this is a point which Strickland does not stress, biomedical research is now debated in the context of the full range of problems related to the maintenance of health-delivery systems, the economics of health, the development of an adequate cadre of health manpower, and so forth. From 1945 to about 1970, biomedical research was the major national health program. Over that period, the nation was in no mood to consider seriously the nature of the public responsibility for the health of the population, and how this responsibility might be exercised. Hence research was the happy beneficiary of a national aspiration which could during those times be expressed only indirectly and partially. This accounted in large part for the outpouring of funds through the federal government. Support of research was the only respectable way in which legislators could simultaneously re-

spond to the desire of people to do something about disease and their aversion to anything smacking of—to use a quaint phrase—socialized medicine. Other avenues are now opening before them.

Note added in proof. The recent dismissal of the director of NIH, Robert Q. Marston, was an event foreshadowed by the extension of NIH activities into areas of direct concern to the President. However, Marston was dismissed apparently not because of policy differences but simply because he was appointed during the Johnson Administration. Some way must be found to recognize both that the director of NIH does indeed have broad policy responsibilities and that back-of-the-hand treatment of this post as if it were a routine administrative job can cause irreparable harm to an important national institution. The answer must be to establish by law new selection procedures and criteria for the position, roughly analogous to those governing selection of the director of the National Science Foundation. The entire problem should be thoroughly reviewed in congressional hearings. This is something the scientific community could help to bring about.

CHARLES V. KIDD.

DOUBLE BENEFITS IN THE TAX TREATMENT OF OIL AND GAS

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, Monday, at a very enlightening panel discussion before the Ways and Means Committee, Prof. J. Reid Hambrick, professor of law at George Washington University Law School, submitted one of the most useful and constructive contributions given to the committee on the unreasonable tax advantages of the resource industries.

As Professor Hambrick states,

We have two income tax systems. One for the oil and gas industry, and one for everybody else.

Professor Hambrick makes very modest and well-deliberated suggestions which should be carefully considered by the Ways and Means Committee and by the Congress. These recommendations recognize the need for more energy development and a tax system which will foster it.

Following is that part of Professor Hambrick's statement which deals with the percentage depletion allowance, and which I submit to the Members of this body for analysis and action:

THE ELIMINATION OF DOUBLE BENEFITS IN THE INCOME TAX TREATMENT OF OIL AND GAS PRODUCTION: FOUR MODEST PROPOSALS

(By J. Reid Hambrick)

I. INTRODUCTION

The producing segment of the oil and gas industry is the beneficiary of a number of very favorable advantages in the federal income tax. These include percentage depletion at the highest permissible rate, 22 percent of gross income from production; the privilege of deducting currently intangible drilling and development costs (which constitute approximately 75 percent of the total cost of drilling and completing a producing well); investment tax credits and depreciation for tangible well equipment; and the foreign tax credit. Percentage depletion allowances to the oil and gas industry allow actual capital in-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

vestment to be recovered many times over, and duplicate *pro tanto* intangible drilling costs which are independently deducted, as well as depreciation deductions taken in respect of tangible well assets, since all of these are part and parcel of the well itself, the costs of which are supposed to be recoverable through the depletion allowance. Yet, no adjustments have been provided to prevent or mitigate the duplicate deductions which result. This situation is further exacerbated by the allowance of the investment tax credit for tangible equipment installed in producing wells. Finally, in foreign oil and gas operations, where the operating rights have been granted by the host country itself, those operations not only receive a credit against the U.S. income tax for the foreign income taxes paid, but are allowed percentage depletion in respect of production equal in amount to the so-called foreign taxes paid. Thus, percentage depletion is permitted on the same amount that represents in form a foreign income tax, adding up to another double benefit.

Percentage depletion and the treatment of intangible drilling costs are both open to attack as unjustified tax subsidies to the oil and gas industry. However, the recommendations in this paper will be confined to the elimination of double or multiple benefits. Whatever may be said in derogation of the special tax treatment of the oil and gas industry, it is believed that the deduction of the same dollar of costs, not just once, but twice or more, in computing income tax liability is beyond all rationalization or justification. A deduction of \$2 or more for each dollar of costs of any kind cannot be reconciled with equitable tax policy or fair treatment.

The discussion which follows attempts to analyze the details of double or multiple benefits which should be eliminated.

II. DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

1. *Percentage Depletion.* The federal income tax has allowed percentage depletion in respect of oil and gas production since 1925. In the Revenue Act of 1926, which was retroactive to the beginning of 1925, percentage depletion was substituted for discovery value depletion which had been introduced in 1918. The objective of discovery value depletion was to provide an incentive for exploration and development of the oil and gas resources of this country. The basis for depletion was the fair market value of the oil and gas property, determined as of the date of discovery or within 30 days thereafter. This is the origin of the notion that the capital value of the producing property is the amount to be recovered through the depletion allowance, not merely the taxpayer's capital investment in the property. Thus, discovery depletion was the daddy of the multiple tax benefit. However, the advantages of the discovery method were limited to the taxpayer who undertook the financial risk of exploration and development and who was responsible for a new discovery.

When discovery depletion proved difficult to administer and degenerated into a public scandal, Congress switched to percentage depletion at the rate of 27½ percent. See Revenue Act of 1926, §§ 204(c)(2), 214(a)(9), 234(a)(8), 286; Staff of the Joint Comm. on Internal Revenue Taxation, Legislative History of Depletion Allowances, 81st Cong., 2d Sess. (Comm. Print 1950). The discovery method was continued in the 1926 Act for minerals other than oil and gas. During the ensuing years there was a gradual substitution of percentage depletion for the discovery method, culminating with the 1954 Code, when discovery value was supplanted entirely by the percentage method, with different rates for various minerals. The transition to percentage depletion for oil and gas in 1926 carried over the previous limitation on discovery depletion to 50 percent of the

net income from the property, a restriction originally imposed in 1924. The 27½ percent rate was reduced to 22 percent in the Tax Reform Act of 1969.

Percentage depletion is allowable without regard to whether the taxpayer has recovered his actual capital investment or, indeed, whether the taxpayer ever had any actual investment in the deposit. In the light of this feature percentage depletion has been aptly called a "special deduction for imaginary costs." Eisenstein, *The Ideologies of Taxation* 123 (1961). Percentage depletion is a much more generous allowance than discovery depletion had been. The latter was computed in the same manner as cost depletion, except that the fair market value of the property on the date of discovery was used in lieu of actual adjusted basis of the property. When discovery value had been recovered through depletion allowances, no further deductions were permitted. On the other hand percentage depletion is an on-going, enduring allowance that may be taken so long as the taxpayer has any net income from the property.

The incentive effect that was implicit in discovery depletion was abandoned when percentage depletion was adopted. Landowners, for example, receiving royalty income, had not been allowed discovery depletion, because they seldom had any part in the exploration and discovery of a new producing field. Under the discovery method they had been limited to actual cost depletion, based on investment in the oil and gas rights in their land. Such a cost was typically nonexistent. Under percentage depletion, however, anyone receiving a share of the income from mineral production by virtue of having a capital interest attributable to the mineral in place is entitled to percentage depletion. Thus, royalty-owners, who had undertaken no financial risks in expanding the petroleum reserves of this country, were rewarded under percentage depletion with a handsome windfall. Even people in the oil business have confessed privately their inability to see the relevance of a so-called incentive for those who only stand and wait. Of course, there are many operators who likewise take no risks in the exploration of large producing properties. The layoff of risks is a standard feature of the industry, such as, for example, the familiar "farm out" transaction to secure the drilling of exploration wells at the financial risk of others.

It is fatuous to suggest that percentage depletion is an incentive to exploration and development, or that the country has received its money's worth in the form of exploration and development of our reserves that would not have been undertaken without it. The expansion of oil and gas reserves was assured by the rise of the automobile industry, which was a foregone conclusion in 1926 when percentage depletion was introduced. This was the only incentive that the oil and gas industry ever needed to spur its fantastic growth. Not to mention the excitement that follows the hunt for oil, the spirit of Spindletop that gets in the blood of every oil man.

Undoubtedly, there was incentive in discovery depletion, but it fell by the wayside when we substituted percentage depletion. This allowance is merely a means—one of several—of reducing the income tax contribution of the oil industry far below what it would otherwise be.

The "Depletion Survey, 1958-1960," released by the Treasury Department in 1963, indicated that for those years the excess of percentage depletion claimed by the oil and gas industry over cost depletion was about 95 percent! In other words, the depletion allowance claimed was almost 20 times what the allowance would be if it were limited to the actual adjusted basis in the properties. In 1960, of course, the rate was 27½ percent. Since 1969 the rate has been 22 percent, a

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

reduction of 20 percent. Conforming the finding of the Depletion Survey to a rate of 22 percent, percentage depletion would now be approximately 16 times cost depletion! Percentage depletion at the 22 percent rate still recovers actual capitalized investment 16 times over! At a loss of revenue of more than \$1 billion a year!

How can this enormous subsidy be justified? Why should this industry receive a handout from the U.S. Treasury on the magnitude of \$1 billion a year? What benefits is the country deriving from this gigantic remission of revenues? We have always been told that percentage depletion is necessary to provide the incentive needed by the industry to maintain the oil and gas reserves of the country at levels sufficient to safeguard the national security! Now we are being told that we are facing an energy crisis of frightening proportions, and that it is more essential than ever to continue, if not increase, percentage depletion. Is this a credible claim? If we are approaching the limits of our domestic oil and gas resources, what is the sense of continuing an "incentive" to exploration and development? We don't provide incentives to anyone to extract blood from turnips!

One finds all discussion of percentage depletion for oil and gas stultifying. Any recovery of capital investment in excess of actual outlay is a curious anomaly, without rational support in any known principles of law, accounting, or economics. At that, what else is there to say? To understand the tax-pampering accorded the oil and gas industry, the careerist must look outside the field of his competence. For those whose sights are set on reason and justice, fair play and equal treatment of all taxpayers, for those who live out their days mulling over the legal aspects of federal taxation and pondering the social costs and benefits of alternative policies, the stubborn persistence of percentage depletion epitomizes the malaise that grips our country. It is apathy personified. It is a fortress of greed. It is national priorities gone awry!

On the other hand, for those responsible for fashioning practical compromises of conflicting interests, tranquilizing clashing groups in the society, for working our way out of percentage depletion, for example, they must necessarily use discretion. For them the first question will be whether readjustment is called for, and then, how much retrenchment will the industry accept. For the politician it is a delicate and probing task, and one that is in the highest service to his fellow man. My own view is that the industry may well be prepared to absorb another cut in the depletion rate. The time is not far off when the industry will perceive that its future is more jeopardized than helped by unjustified tax preferences.

Accordingly, I am questioning here the secondary aspects of percentage depletion, rather than urging its total repeal. Do the exigencies of our time make it imperative that the oil and gas industry recover its capital investment in producing properties 16 times over? Could this industry resolve itself to accept 10 times over? 12 times over? If, as the President insists in his recent Budget Message to the Congress, the elderly in our society, living on social security, must give up an additional \$1 billion this year out of their meager incomes for the same health care they received last year, is it too much to ask the oil and gas industry to give up 16 times over for 10 times over? Have the national priorities gone that awry? Is our sense of values that warned? If so, it may be time to start building some fires!

Recommendations: It is recommended that the rate for percentage depletion in the case of oil and gas wells be reduced from the present 22 percent to 17 percent.

Alternative: It is recommended that the rate for percentage depletion in the case of

oil and gas wells be reduced to 12 percent over a period of four years, with a decrease of 2½ percentage points each year.

Alternative: In the alternative, it is recommended that in the case of oil and gas wells—

(i) after the allowances for percentage depletion under § 613 aggregate an amount equal to 10 times the adjusted basis for depletion in respect of the property, determined under § 612 as of the first day of the first taxable year beginning after the effective date of the amendment,

(ii) no further allowance for depletion shall be allowed in respect of such property.

NIXON BUDGET IMPERILS WORTH WHILE LOCAL PROGRAMS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, built on the streets ravaged by the Watts riots of 1965, the South Central Multipurpose Health Services Corp., serves as proof of the effectiveness and workability of Office of Economic Opportunity funded programs. This Los Angeles health center, one of the largest community-controlled centers in the country, serves approximately 400 patients daily, and brings some two and a half million dollars of revenue to the residents of the Watts area of Los Angeles.

Unless OEO continues its funding of this project, it will be forced to shut down. As the President claims victory in Vietnam and contemplates his election mandate, he acts to cut social programs and the people suffer. Bureaucrats and Presidential staffers may believe the White House gobbledegook that Federal moneys cannot and will not help people, but those who struggle to keep the Watts Health Center open, and all those Americans devoting themselves to helping less fortunate Americans know otherwise.

I submit for your attention, and the attention of my colleagues, an article that appeared in the Washington Post of February 26 entitled "OEO Cutback Threatening Watts Clinic."

There are people and programs continuing the war on poverty. It is up to us to see to it that they are given the fiscal support to keep on fighting.

The article follows:

OEO CUTBACK THREATENING WATTS CLINIC

(By Austin Scott)

The man who administers one of the largest community-controlled health centers in the country says it will have to close its doors to the depressed Watts area of Los Angeles after this week, unless it can pry some commitments about its future out of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Clifton A. Cole, executive director of the \$8.3 million South Central Multipurpose Health Services Corp., said a shutdown would end services to an estimated 400 patients a day, most of them poor, as well as chop off a payroll that pumps more than \$2.5 million a year into the pockets of citizens of Watts.

Cole said OEO Director Howard Phillips has given no definitive word on his overdue 1973 funding, despite inquiries from the state of California whose governor, Ronald Reagan, has in past years approved the OEO grants.

February 27, 1973

"I am pessimistic," Cole said.

Last August, before President Nixon announced his plan to dismantle OEO, Cole got a letter from the agency saying the center would be funded in 1973, although at a lower level of \$5.4 million.

On Jan. 5, five days after his 1972 budget had run out, Cole got a telegram from OEO authorizing him to borrow \$500,000 "to cover payrolls and other necessary operating expenses" through the end of February.

"The interest may be paid from your project grant monies," the telegram said.

Cole borrowed the money from the Bank of America. It is due to be paid back, with interest, on Wednesday.

Even though he visited OEO last week, Cole said, he has been unable to find out whether the center will be funded for 30 days, six months, a year, or not funded at all, or even allowed to borrow more money to keep its doors open.

"I've received no word whatsoever on how I am to pay the note," he said. "It's rumored that we will be funded month by month until June 30, when OEO goes out of business, but we've receive no formal communication of that fact and no evidence of any money . . ."

"No real mechanism has been set up for [that kind of funding]," he continued, "and if it follows the regular process it has to go through the governor's office and wait 30 days for approval. So we can't see any immediate relief from the situation until someone says something."

Four hundred patients a day use the center, most unable to pay private medical fees and needing a wide range of medical and dental services. About half its employees live in Watts, Cole said.

"I run out of money on March 2," Cole said.

"Unless I have some relief, either borrowing additional funds or something, we will have to close down operations."

The only alternative, he said, would be to fire "more than half" of the 565 people on the staff, and no longer try to run a comprehensive health center.

The staff includes 22 doctors, 12 dentists, 40 nurses and 46 family health workers.

"We figured our budget in the community in terms of payroll to those residents runs a little over \$2.5 million a year. That's money directly into the community."

Earlier this month, the center signed a \$3.5 million contract with the state of California to provide medical services under California's "Medi-Cal" program, a pre-paid group health plan for the poor that operates much like the Kaiser plan or Washington's Group Health, Inc.

But "Medi-Cal," which Cole hopes will expand to eventually serve 30,000 people, will be in jeopardy too if word from OEO doesn't come soon, he said.

Cole said he tried to see Phillips "through regular channels" when he was in Washington last week. "He's not seeing anyone as I understand," he said.

Asked yesterday for comment, Barry Locke, public affairs director of OEO, said he had no specific information about the center.

Cole said the uncertainty is playing havoc with the morale of his 565-person staff, and added that there is far more at stake than just their futures.

Founded in 1966, in the aftermath of the 1965 Watts riots, the center—commonly called the Watts Health Center—is the only one to transfer from its original sponsor, the University of Southern California, and become a private, community-controlled corporation.

That happened in 1970, when a 25-member governing board was picked, 17 of them residents of the Watts area, and the rest medical professionals.

Of the 20 board members currently serving, 17 are black and two are Chicano, Cole said, adding, "that seems to disturb the people up there [at OEO]."

The center was built on 103d Street, the section of Watts most heavily burned in 1965.

Large nearby areas have since been razed for urban renewal, and the center had planned to put up a new building on one of them. The series of 93 10-by-60 foot temporary modules that have housed it since its beginning only have about three more years of life in them, Cole said.

"Last year we were awarded a small Hill-Burton grant of \$1 million to either revamp or replace our existing center," he said. "We've got private financing for \$4.7 million. That's going to bring a \$5 million construction project into the community, and in the contract that we've written with the developer, we have put in a very good fair employment practice clause that obligates the contractor to employ people from the community and to train them and upgrade them."

That, too, is being seriously-hampered by the center's uncertain future, he said.

On Feb. 12, Cole sent a letter to Phillips that began, "Our current financial situation is critical."

"Only minimum expenditures have been made since the beginning of the year pending the receipt of grant funds," it continued.

"Vendors are requesting payment for their services . . . Our budget this year includes a substantial phase-out of federal grant dollars which we can adequately handle if the Medi-Cal contract is consummated, but we must survive until such time as that becomes a reality . . . We appreciate your immediate attention and an early reply."

That letter was never answered, Cole said.

On Feb. 20, he sent an almost identically worded telegram to Phillips.

"I have received no answer as yet," he said yesterday.

"The last word I had was on Thursday when I was talking to the person who has been our program analyst," Cole said.

"Verbally he told me they were planning to do some evaluations of the project and a couple of other things. I learned Friday from one of the other analysts that they are planning to do an audit of the program before they release any funds. But I have not received anything in writing. An audit normally takes four to six weeks."

Cole said he thinks the Bank of America "would be willing to give us a line of credit so we could have a cash flow if we could pay back the first note. But they have to have some indication from OEO that they are going to fund us."

He planned to contact the bank manager this morning, he said, to see if they could get an answer from OEO.

"I can't get anywhere," he said.

BRITISH COMMANDOS, TRAINED IN UNITED STATES, MAY BE USED IN NORTHERN IRELAND

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, as we enter the post-Vietnam era, the bloodshed that occurs in Northern Ireland continues to weigh heavily upon the conscience of the world. Along with many other Americans, I was dismayed to learn recently that British commandos who had been, and shall again, be used in patrolling Northern Ireland were training at the U.S. Marine base, Camp Lejeune, N.C. Defense De-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

partment spokesmen have indicated that these troops were here as part of a NATO exercise.

The current mission of these troops can in no way be construed as consistent with NATO's objective of repelling external aggression. I believe that for the United States to provide them with training therefore is totally unjustified and unwarranted. I find it particularly inappropriate that these troops reportedly were the first British troops to be quartered in America since 1812. The U.S. Government must never be placed in the position of training foreign troops who are involved essentially in police work in a domestic conflict.

In accord with this position, I am today introducing, along with Representatives ADDABBO, CAREY of New York and WOLFF, a concurrent resolution stating it is the sense of Congress that no troops of the NATO pact countries may be trained in this country, except for these troops whose mission is consistent with the purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty.

I hope that both the House and the Senate will act promptly upon this resolution in order that there will be no further actions on the part of the U.S. Government which may constitute an intrusion upon this volatile situation.

AID TO NORTH VIETNAM

HON. K. GUNN McKAY

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Speaker, I believe that in light of the present domestic situation, and the administration's proposed budget cuts, the consideration of aid to North Vietnam is both premature and paradoxical.

I recognize that it is in our best interest to assure stability in Southeast Asia. Once hostilities have ceased, it may well be necessary to help in the reconstruction of Vietnam. But, I am not convinced, even now, that the military situation has been resolved. Prisoner exchanges are not yet complete and fighting continues in several regions.

The wide range of domestic programs suffering because of funding cuts makes aid considerations especially untimely. I cite the REAP program, REA, and RTA loans, and emergency FHA loans as examples of useful domestic programs which face stringent budget restraint. The President has cut domestic programs by nearly \$9 billion. By his actions, Mr. Nixon has obviously established priorities for his spending, he feels North Vietnam should be rebuilt, while domestic programs are being cut.

My priorities are different, I feel that we should not rebuild North Vietnam at the expense of American domestic programs. Mr. Kissinger suggests that we may do both, but the administration's domestic cutbacks suggest otherwise.

I realize that we cannot close our eyes to the problems in Vietnam, North and South, but I feel that aid to North Viet-

nam should be preceded by an absolute end to the conflict and a thorough accounting of prisoners and MIA's. Furthermore, I feel that aid of this kind is unjustifiable in the face of domestic budget cuts.

VIETNAM SURVEYED

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme leads the government of a progressive, democratic sister nation. There are differences between our Nation and the Swedish nation. Recently, the most publicized difference is the political one between our two governments concerning the war in Vietnam.

Prime Minister Palme has spoken his mind on this issue. Some of his words have received widespread publicity. Others are less well-known and I thought excerpts from his statement of January 31, 1973 opening the general political debate of the Riksdag deserved a wider audience.

While there may be political, economic, and social differences between our nations, our two countries do share a very fundamental and basic belief in what we commonly call western values. These values are the bedrock upon which our societies rest. We ought not dismiss with petulance views expressed by political leaders of sister states sharing our value system. They may be wrong. But on the other hand they may be right.

VIETNAM SURVEYED

(Excerpts from Prime Minister Olof Palme's statement of January 31, 1973, opening the general political debate of the Riksdag)

At last an agreement has been reached on the cessation of hostilities in Vietnam.

We are now starting along the arduous and difficult road leading towards reconciliation and reconstruction. The many years of war have created bitterness and wounds which will take a long time to heal. The news of fighting during the last days has worried us all. But we hope that the killing and destruction will cease, that the children of Vietnam will be able to look up at the sky without fear, that the night will no longer mean terror and anguish but rest and quiet, that the days will no longer be filled with the clamour of war and fleeing refugees but with work in the rice fields, with the rebuilding of devastated towns and villages.

The war has been going on for many years. Its aftermath is terrible. Eight million tons of bombs have been dropped on Indochina since 1965. That is three times as much as the allied forces dropped on all fronts throughout the second world war.

How many have been killed and wounded we do not know with any certainty. According to American sources, the number of dead and wounded combatants was 2.8 million. The number of civilians killed in South Vietnam is estimated at 400,000, the number of wounded at 900,000. The war has made 8 million people in South Vietnam refugees in their own country. That is nearly half of the population.

The material destruction is tremendous. The ecological environment, that is to say the very conditions essential to human life,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

February 27, 1973

has been seriously damaged. 90,000 tons of chemical weapons have been dropped on Indochina. The bombing, the streams of refugees, the removal of people to strategic villages, urbanized and the growth of the slum areas in South Vietnam have shattered the social structure.

What remains is the will to live and to shape a future of their own. What remains is the solidarity and the will to resist, which aroused the admiration of the many visitors to Vietnam. The possibilities of creating a lasting peace are founded on this self-respect and dignity and on safe-guarding the terms of the agreement which has now been reached.

The agreement now signed corresponds almost entirely with the preliminary agreement drawn up in October. The first article establishes the independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of Vietnam as already prescribed in the 1954 Geneva agreement. This appears to be the most important political issue in the long term. These are the principles the Vietnamese nationalists have always fought for, whether they have been communists, socialists, buddhists or members of any other movement. The principles were confirmed in Geneva when the long struggle against the French was over and the colonial power of France was broken in this area. These principles have now, once again, been confirmed.

By and large, the agreement means that we have returned to the situation that was created when the French left Vietnam. Consequently, this war has not only been cruel and destructive. It has also been meaningless. If the provisions of the Geneva agreement had been observed there would have been no war.

What now faces dismantlement, if this agreement is observed, is colonial power. After the second world war the French tried to re-incorporate Indochina into the French empire. They failed. Later developments meant that the United States took over a war the French had lost. The motives were different. But their allies in South Vietnam were the same as those who had backed up the French: the landowners, the privileged classes. Their adversaries were the same as those who had fought the French: Ho Chi Minh, the nationalist, the people who wanted land and bread. Therefore, the U.S. war became a war fought in the shadows cast by the past. It could never be won.

While colonial might had fallen, and while it was accepted elsewhere that nations became free and determined their own policies, their own form of government, the fate of the Americans was to take over the role of old colonial imperialism. The American entry on the scene meant that the process of liberation from colonialism and internal strife were drawn into the field of conflicting global interests. Whereas nearly everybody could agree that the British did the right thing in leaving India and the African colonies, that the Dutch were right in leaving Indonesia and the French in leaving Indochina and Algeria, it was much more difficult for the western democracies to dissociate themselves from American intervention in Indochina.

Criticism of U.S. involvement in Vietnam has been regarded as anti-Americanism. The demand that the people of Vietnam be given the same self-evident right to national independence as gained by other formerly colonized peoples has been depicted as support of communist expansionism. If the United States left Vietnam, then European security would be in danger. Grossly inaccurate parallels were drawn with the situation of Europe after the second world war. But that meant that the support of a brutal oppressive regime could be presented as an effort to defend democracy. This has caused infinite damage to the ideas of democracy.

If this attitude had been applied in other parts of the world it would have meant that

the West had remained and fought on the barricades of colonialism. Fortunately, it has not. The states which have gained national freedom have come to apply widely differing social orders. This fact has not been used as a reason for military intervention. It is not possible to compel by force a developing country to adopt a western social order. And it is still an illusion to believe that demands for social justice can be met with violence and military force.

The war in South Vietnam has been regarded as an attempt on the part of North Vietnam to force a particular kind of social order on another state. Such a view overlooks the fact that the war started as a revolt of the people against a hated oppressive regime. Moreover, this view implies in fact that, in conflict with the Geneva agreement, the provisional line of demarcation is regarded as a permanent political boundary.

Great efforts to mold opinion and a great deal of information has been necessary to * * * causes of a war which was gradually foisted on to the world, a war, which to start with practically unknown, which was gradually escalated and which was later defended on the grounds of the democratic ideals with which the United States is so rightly associated.

I should like to stress the role played by the young people. They have made a tremendous contribution, been responsible for a political and intellectual spring-cleaning which augurs well for the future of a democracy. It is a clear-sighted and ideologically conscious younger generation which will shape the future. That is the main impression which should be in the foreground today.

The role of the popular movements, of the trade union movement and of the churches, should also be acknowledged. Thanks to them our efforts have been given breadth and stability. Journalists have also played an important part in giving the facts and analysing the situation.

The work done in enlightening the public has resulted in Swedish public opinion being united in its attitude to the war in Vietnam. This unanimity has been a source of strength when we have presented our views in the international field, when we have made our contribution to molding public opinion beyond our own borders, which has undoubtedly played an important role. The collecting of signatures, which was a concrete expression of national feeling, was an outstanding success. The far more than 2 million signatures show the massive support of the Swedish people for the demand for peace.

This unity is also one strength as we now do all within our power to assist in reconstruction work in Vietnam. One sign of this unity is the nation-wide collections being made for the people of Indochina and for the reconstruction of the Bach Mai hospital. For a number of years we have been co-operating in the field of aid programmes with the one side where the preconditions have been present for planning and practically carrying out assistance programmes on a larger scale. So far our assistance has been humanitarian. Now the conditions are being created for also extending reconstruction aid. Furthermore we are planning increasing aid in South Vietnam. I also hope that there will be a world-wide effort in this field.

Our unity and our openly expressed opinions on this question are also of importance when it comes to matters of principle, fundamental to our own position as a small nation. For the conflict in Vietnam has also concerned the right of a small nation to live and survive.

There is the risk in our time of a hegemony of the super-powers in the world. One divides the world into areas of interest and attempts to maintain the status quo. A small nation which tries to assert its own individ-

uality and its particular interests in this order of things runs very serious risks. We have seen frightening examples of this both in the East and in the West. No one in this house has forgotten Czechoslovakia.

This is a development to which we, a small nation, must object. To keep silent about what has been happening in Vietnam could be interpreted as acceptance of the principle that the small nations of the world shall not voice their demands or assert their rights. Our united opinion on the conflict in Vietnam thus means that we have also upheld our own fundamental interests, our own demands for security.

We have not hesitated to speak our minds about the American policy in Vietnam. This we have done for reasons of humanity. This we have done also because we have believed that certain principles were at stake, principles that are important when considering how relations between states in a peaceful world should be and which, in the final analysis, are also important to our own security. They are principles we have consistently upheld in all quarters.

For a long time we have had differences of opinion—and grave ones—with the United States. The American government has chilled down our diplomatic relations. This was not our wish. Our wish is that normal diplomatic relations shall exist between us.

The people of Vietnam bleeds. Vietnam's fields, forests and villages are mangled and destroyed. But they have defended their country and their independence. For them, the war has not been meaningless.

They have shown us that human resistance is not broken by the massive attacks of technology, that also the terror of our time finally stands powerless, panting with exhaustion, shaking with its own impotence. Therefore, Vietnam's sacrifice has also a meaning for us. We have experienced similar events in our own civilization, such as the winter war in Finland in 1939 and the London blitz in 1940. Then we felt the same kind of admiration for a people's unbreakable will to resist.

The guilt of western civilization is great and the West will rightly fear the judgment of history. The way to national reconciliation may be a difficult task. We have to make peace with our own conscience, to try once again to give meaning and content to values, ideals and a civilization seriously damaged in Vietnam.

Therefore, and for the sake of the Vietnamese people, we must look to the future. The agreement—if it is observed—provides a good foundation for peace and reconciliation. Admittedly, the events of the last few days give us good reason to be apprehensive of the possibilities of applying the provisions. For the time being, we must confine ourselves to pinning our hopes on the sincerity of the parties and on their own interest in ensuring that the agreement is observed. One thing is plain: the long struggle of the Vietnamese people to free themselves from colonial dependence has gained significant success. It will, in the end, be crowned with victory.

ALLEN DALE RADIO POLL ON AID TO
NORTH VIETNAM SHOWED 137
AGAINST AND 37 FOR

HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, Allen Dale, a popular reporter who is heard daily on San Antonio's radio station KITE, has informed me of the results of a recent telephone poll he conducted on the subject of whether U.S. aid should be given

to North Vietnam. His letter to me, which contains the results of the query, follows:

One of the big questions facing our Nation today is the post-war help we give North Vietnam. With this in mind, we let the listeners to our 'Conversation Society' voice their opinions on the question: "Should we as a Nation spend money to rebuild our former enemy North Vietnam?" In the two hours we were able to take 174 calls. 137 voted "No" and 37 voted "Yes."

We advised the listeners that a tape of the show would be sent to the President of the United States and also to the Congress of the United States through you.

This is just the voice of a small part of the United States but we think you will find it interesting.

NEW THREATS TO NATIONAL HEALTH EMPHASIZE NEED FOR PURE FOOD LEGISLATION

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 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 purity and safety to the American consumer.

Again, the urgency of this long overdue legislation has been brought to public attention. Regrettably, for the consumer, there have been several new incidents of food contamination.

This month, the Government Accounting Office exposed the U.S. Department of Agriculture for its failure to report food products which do not meet minimum quality levels prescribed by the FDA, thereby subjecting the public to possible health hazards.

Reports of food contamination have become more numerous and include the recent recall of canned mushroom and canned tuna. Unfortunately, 3,954 cans of mushrooms from the contaminated lot were already distributed in five States, including my home State of New York. Canned tuna distributed by Star Kist Foods was also recalled. It may cause influenza-like illness, according to the Food and Drug Administration.

These situations underscore the need for speedy enactment of tougher food processing and inspection legislation.

The newspaper articles describing these incidents are as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 19, 1973]
CANS OF MUSHROOMS RECALLED BY FDA FOR BOTULISM CHECK

WASHINGTON, February 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 FDA 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 FDA said.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

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 FDA 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 FDA 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 Washington Post, Feb. 24, 1973]
NATIONAL RECALL OF TUNA STARTED

Star Kist Foods has started a nationwide recall of more than 172,000 cans of contaminated tuna that may cause a temporary flu-like illness, the Food and Drug Administration announced yesterday.

Initial reports of outbreaks of the illness came Thursday from Ellsworth, Wis., St. Paul, Minn., and Mitchell, S.D. The FDA said the tuna was distributed to warehouses throughout the country and there was no immediate way of knowing how much of it is stocked on store shelves.

The cans are 6½-ounce containers of Star Kist chunk light tuna, and may be identified by numbers stamped on the cans. On the top line is the letter "G" and the last digits on the bottom line are either "D 419" or "D 417."

There are other numbers but only those mentioned are involved in the recall, the FDA said. Persons who have bought cans of tuna bearing those numbers should return them to the store where they were purchased, it said.

The illness starts a few minutes to an hour after the tuna is eaten. Among the symptoms are a burning sensation in the mouth, vomiting, dizziness and nausea. Recovery is usual within a few hours, the FDA said.

The agency said a preliminary inquiry indicated the contamination by a histamine-like substance resulted from improper handling of the tuna before packing.

The agency said information from Star Kist Foods of Terminal Island, Calif., indicated the product was distributed to warehouses in Hopkins and St. Paul, Minn., Gloucester City, N.J., Kansas City, Mo.; Mobile, Ala.; Chicago, Billings, Mont., and Milwaukee, Ore.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 24, 1973]
AGENCY NONCOOPERATION BLAMED FOR FILTHY FOOD

(By Nancy L. Ross)

Some American consumers are getting filthy processed fruits and vegetables because one branch of the federal government refuses to tell another when it discovers unsanitary conditions in food plants, the General Accounting Office reported yesterday.

The GAO said excessive amounts of worms, insects, mold, rot, mud, oil or grease, stones, rust, paint flakes, hair, glass, brass filings and other foreign material were found in 39 million pounds of canned and frozen products at 132 plants between Jan. 1, 1970, and March 31, 1971.

The 39 million pounds represent about one-fourth of 1 per cent of the 15 billion pounds of products that manufacturers submitted

during that period for grading by the Agricultural Marketing Service of the Department of Agriculture.

Agriculture's failure to notify the Food and Drug Administration that these 39 million pounds were too filthy to meet its minimum grade subjected the public to possible health hazards, the GAO said. The FDA has the power to seize adulterated foodstuffs.

Both Agriculture and the FDA allow specified, minute amounts of contaminants in processed foods on the theory that all of it cannot be eliminated.

Agriculture's grading service is a voluntary program. In one recent year, about 75 per cent of U.S. frozen fruits and vegetables were graded, as were about 35 per cent of the canned fruits and vegetables.

If Agriculture inspectors find a plant to be unsanitary, it can continue to operate but cannot use any official Department of Agriculture mark, such as Grade A or Fancy, on its products.

In a Nov. 29, 1972, letter to the GAO the auditing agency of Congress—acting administrator John C. Blum of the Agricultural Marketing Service said his agency would not turn over all reports of excess filth found in plants, but would only supply specific information requested by the FDA. The reason, he said, was the voluntary nature of the grading program.

Agriculture's reasoning is that if a participating manufacturer were found to have a sub-standard product and the FDA seize it, he could suffer economic loss and bad publicity. By contrast, a processor who chose not to open his doors to voluntary inspection would have an unfair economic advantage over his competitor. So, Agriculture argued, manufacturers might tend to leave the grading program rather than risk detection by the FDA.

Agriculture has agreed to report to the FDA if it finds products presenting a hazard to health, but as of Jan. 31 the two agencies had not yet agreed on how to define that.

The GAO urged the Secretary of Agriculture to reconsider its policy of not reporting to FDA so as "to better protect consumers and to enable FDA to use its already scarce resources in the most effective and efficient way."

The FDA's "already scarce resources" were themselves the target of another GAO report last year. The GAO found that 40 per cent of the food plants it inspected were unsanitary. Because FDA had only 210 inspectors to make the rounds of 9,400 food establishments, the GAO said, each plant was inspected on an average of once every seven years.

The FDA has primary federal responsibility for inspection of foods—except meat, poultry and egg products.

In July, 1971, GAO asked the FDA to check what had happened to the 39 million pounds of substandard food. The FDA investigated 31 sample lots, or 545,000 pounds, and found that most of the lots had been distributed. Of the only two lots found and tested, both were adulterated.

In addition to examining Agricultural Marketing Service records and asking the FDA to investigate, GAO inspectors visited 40 plants participating in the marketing program. Inspectors found only one plant with no deficiencies.

TERMINATING THE SST

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent action by major American airlines to

drop their option on the Concorde SST reaffirms the wisdom of Congress in its 1971 decision to end the American SST program.

Along with most other citizens, I had thought the matter to be long settled, but a review of the President's proposed budget for fiscal year 1974 shows that the termination of the SST has become a significant Federal project in its own right.

In fiscal year 1974 we will spend \$3.57 million on civil supersonic aircraft development termination. While much of this money is for contract closeouts, over three-quarters of a million dollars will be spent on the salaries and expenses of the termination staff.

Even more interesting is the fact that the average salary for a termination staff member is to reach \$21,870 in fiscal year 1974—a comforting thought for our 4.4 million citizens who are presently unemployed.

This year Congress will take the lead in reshaping our national priorities. As we proceed, let us take a look at the Federal SST termination program to insure that it does its job expeditiously and then disappears completely.

MOORHEAD BILL ESTABLISHES CONGRESSIONAL OFFICE OF BUDGET ANALYSIS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the need to equip the Congress with the proper tools to participate ably in the budget process is recognized by all Members, no matter their party.

That is why today, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) and I have joined to introduce legislation to establish a congressional Office of Budget Analysis and Program Evaluation to serve both the House and the Senate.

The interim report of the Joint Study Committee on Budget Control calls for the establishment of a congressional mechanism to determine a proper level of expenditures along with a projection of revenues to allow for the determination by the Congress of realistic budget needs.

This is precisely what my bill would do.

The Office of Budget Analysis and Program Evaluation would operate under the supervision of the Joint Economic Committee and have four sectional offices to serve each committee, subcommittee, and Member of Congress: The information section, analytic section, the program evaluation section, and the special studies section.

Essentially the office would perform an OMB role for the Congress.

Shortly before formal receipt of the budget, our budget office would establish, after considerable study and analysis, a proposed level of expenditures, along with a projection of revenues and a decision as to whether the Nation would best be served that fiscal year by deficit

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

spending or a budget of less than expected revenues.

It would then forward to the respective Appropriations Committees its report. The committees would, within 15 days, establish a congressional budget ceiling. That figure, which would be voted by the membership, would then be transmitted to the various authorizing committees. The ultimate discretion to allocate funds within the overall ceiling would rest with our authorizing committees.

The bill also calls for the executive branch to circulate its expected budget proposals to various State and local officials for commentary on program impact and to hold, whenever possible, public hearings to serve the same end.

In addition, the legislation establishes needed framework for the Congress to vote on presidential impoundments and utilizes the office of the Comptroller General to transmit to the Congress assessments on program impoundments to facilitate congressional response to that action.

My bill would forbid impoundments if they result in the termination of a program which was voted by the Congress.

The individual sections of the Budget Analysis Office will serve the House and Senate membership and provide data on, but not limited to the following areas:

First, budget requested by Federal departments and agencies;

Second, budget requests as set forth in the budget submitted by the President;

Third, amounts authorized to be appropriated for programs and activities, together with the legislative history of the laws authorizing such appropriations;

Fourth, estimates of projected costs of programs and activities, not extending beyond a 5-year period;

Fifth, amounts appropriated for programs and activities, amounts of other types of budget authority, including contract authority, authority to spend debt receipts, loan authority, and supplemental budget authority;

Sixth, amounts apportioned by the Office of Management and Budget; and

Seventh, amounts appropriated which have been obligated by Federal departments and agencies and balances of unobligated appropriations.

I have long believed that the Joint Economic Committee should serve a greater function than it has to date.

I am sure that it is the one unit which would have the respect of the revenue raising and spending committees of the Congress and could provide the leadership and unity which so many of us feel is crucial if we are to truly participate in budget considerations.

I hope to amplify the pluses of this legislation next Tuesday, when I appear, with my colleague in the other body, before the Joint Study Committee on Budget Control.

While some may not find all in my bill desirable, I believe that the parameters of congressional budget action called for in the legislation is the direction in which we have to move if we are to become more than an anachronism, blandly rubberstamping Executive actions.

February 27, 1973

We will hear many proposals in the coming months to reestablish congressional prerogatives. This is but one of them. It is one which I feel has great promise, but certainly not the only way to untrack ourselves from institutional suicide.

However, we are wasting an important asset by under-utilizing the Joint Economic Committee. It is a committee which has been far ahead of the executive branch in its appraisals and reports. It has been a committee of vision and great endeavor.

If we will it, it can be the committee that makes us a fiscal participant rather than a fiscal observer.

MORATORIUM ON HOUSING AID UPSETS RENEWAL EFFORTS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the administration's 18-month moratorium on housing subsidies is raising havoc on replacement housing in my home city of Buffalo, N.Y.

Our city has been pushing for urban renewal since I came to Congress 14 years ago and we really are beginning to see the light with several major projects in various stages of development.

The Federal moratorium will mean a delay in the start of construction of some 2,000 units which were due to be underway this year.

Urban renewal is a frustrating exercise at best, because of the inevitable delays, first, in arranging clearance of the land and, second, in arranging for suitable replacement housing.

Added to urban renewal is the effect upon other housing of the construction of traffic arteries such as the Kensington Expressway and the mass transit system now in the planning stage.

The Oak Street renewal project in Buffalo will remain a wide-open space and a shattered dream under the moratorium.

Only a third of the waterfront renewal area will be utilized for housing—the rest will remain vacant land.

This federally ordered delay adds to broken promises and hopes that have occurred in earlier stages of the sincere local attempt to rejuvenate the center city.

I have grave doubts about the legal authority of the administration to impound funds duly authorized and appropriated by Congress. It is the job of Congress to approve and fund programs; it is the job of the administration to administer—not gut.

Mr. Speaker, the impoundment of various Federal funds—and in this case the moratorium on housing subsidies—cannot help but wreak chaos in much-needed public projects. If a program clearly is not working, then there certainly is reason for reassessment.

But the need for housing and renewal is without question—and overdue in the area I have the honor and privilege to represent.

As part of my remarks, I include a newspaper account of a conference on this subject last week in Rochester, N.Y.: **FUND CUTS CALLED BLOW TO HOUSING PLANS HERE: MORATORIUM PUTS BUFFALO IN BIND**

(By Richard J. Roth)

ROCHESTER—Two-thirds of the Buffalo Waterfront Renewal Area will remain as vacant land and the Oak St. Renewal project will remain houseless if President Nixon's 18-month moratorium on housing subsidies remains in effect, Buffalo Mayor-designate Stanley Makowski said Friday.

Makowski and two other Buffalo city officials were here to attend a state-wide conference called to coordinate urban and rural opposition to the moratorium, which began Jan. 5.

Though Makowski did not address the conference, he told The Courier-Express that the moratorium would set Buffalo back, and just at the time it was beginning to catch up with its housing problems.

PLAN IN PERIL

Also, the moratorium and other Nixon-proposed budget cuts could thwart Makowski's plan to afford Buffalo taxpayers a cut—albeit small—in their real property tax rates this year.

Accompanied by Richard L. Miller, commissioner of community development, and George E. Wyatt Jr., executive director of the Municipal Housing Authority, Makowski joined the conference in its demand that President Nixon release the impounded housing funds.

Makowski, in fact, told conference organizers that he would help arrange a similar conference in Buffalo.

Makowski told The Courier-Express that Nixon's decree would mean two-thirds of the Waterfront Urban Renewal area would remain vacant land and the Oak St. housing project would be stopped even before the first-phase of construction could begin. In those two areas, 660 units valued at more than \$14.5 million were expected to be under construction in this year alone.

Also, Makowski was informed by Wyatt that the moratorium would scuttle plans for 1,400 housing authority units scheduled to be under construction this year.

BUDGET FROZEN

Wyatt also said the HUD cutbacks have resulted in the housing authority being told its federal operating budget would not be raised and that its \$2.9 million modernization money would be cut off as of June 30.

The freezing of the federal share to the MHA will, because salaries continue to raise, undoubtedly mean that the city will have to pick up an MHA deficit substantially higher than the \$900,000 which results from the state's freeze on funds for its projects. There are six times as many federally funded projects as state projects in Buffalo.

JOB THREATENED

The cut-off of modernization money will mean that funds for boiler conversions, plumbing work and painting in the projects will either have to be provided by the already strapped city or will not exist.

Nationally, the moratorium will mean a loss of 2.2 million jobs, according to a Washington attorney who spoke. The actual number of jobs—mostly in the trades—expected to be lost in Buffalo was not known, but was expected to number in the hundreds.

"Mr. Nixon's housing plans," said Sen. James Abourezk, D-S.D., "smell like a conspiracy to drive two-fifths of the American public into trailer parks." Abourezk was the keynote speaker at the state-wide conference.

Howard J. Samuels, president of the New York City Off-Track Betting Corp. and the undersecretary of commerce under the late President Johnson, also addressed the conference, saying:

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"Sure, housing is going to be expensive—it'll cost a minimum of \$9 billion or \$10 billion a year—but where is our perspective. Compare that minimum figure to an inflated \$80 billion military budget. The war is over, but the military budget goes up and the human needs budget goes down. Where is Mr. Nixon's perspective?"

RURAL JOINING URBAN

Makowski said he was impressed with the conference because rural Americans had joined the cities in the fight to have the housing funds released. "Now, even without the suburbs, maybe we can do something," Makowski said.

Makowski also said that the City of Buffalo, just beginning to catch up with its housing needs, "might never recover" if the moratorium lasts the full 18 months.

Besides the city's urban renewal and MHA housing, Makowski noted, the moratorium would also halt private federally subsidized housing such as was being carried on by the Niagara Frontier Housing Development Corp. D. Garry Munson, president of that not-for-profit corporation, told Makowski and the conference that only two days ago he was informed that \$22 million expected for this year had been caught in the President's freeze. Almost half of that was planned to be spent for low-income and middle-income housing in Buffalo.

Another Western New York mayor, Richard Betsch of Lockport, also attended the conference.

LONG BEACH NAVAL SHIPYARD

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call to the attention of the House of Representatives the 30th anniversary of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard located on Terminal Island, Calif.—the largest drydock on the Pacific coast.

Last week, the men and women of the shipyard celebrated the shipyard's productive history with an eye toward an equally productive and energetic future.

The events included a ceremony, open house, and celebration party, all of which were well attended by both civic and military leaders.

During the ceremony, I had the opportunity to speak before the assembly and relate to them how proud the California congressional delegation is of the outstanding record that they have achieved over the years.

The celebration brought back memories to the shipyard's personnel, as they danced on the *Queen Mary* which was docked at the yard while being converted into a maritime museum, and convention center.

Since 1940, when Congress appropriated funds to build the shipyard to maintain and repair warships, the facility has grown to a current excess of \$125 million in industrial work on naval ships annually, with a civilian employment of 6,689 persons and 50 military personnel.

The shipyard is of vital importance to our Nation as it now services 64 percent of the Pacific fleet. Although it is the newest, and one of the Navy's most mod-

ern shipyards, the reputation for excellence, built by skilled and dedicated employees, and the progressive leadership, is world renowned.

In addition to their primary function of maintaining the Pacific fleet, the persons working in the yard have developed a strong ecology program, as they are constantly testing—and implementing—equipment and methods to combat pollution.

Away from the shipyard, Terminal Island's personnel are active in community affairs, especially in work with underprivileged children and minority groups.

It is only fitting that we join with the citizens of California to honor the work of the personnel of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard, especially their commander—Capt. Richard C. Fay, during their 30th anniversary as a vital link in our defense structure.

A STAINLESS STEEL WHISTLE

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, Jessop Steel of Washington, Pa., deserves, in my judgment, the commendation of every American concerned over the present condition of his country's economy.

This specialty steel producer has successfully blown the whistle on an instance of price cutting in the U.S. market by foreign competitors and thus set in motion retaliatory governmental action.

Specifically, Jessop last April filed a complaint with the Federal Bureau of Customs against Swedish steelmakers which it contended were "dumping" stainless steel plates here at prices less than "fair value," that is, below that being charged in Sweden.

It was a clearcut case of "dumping," that devious practice by which foreign producers unload their surpluses here while being subsidized in one way or another by their governments in order to hold up their employment rates.

The Jessop accusation now has been sustained by the Bureau of Customs and matter turned over to the Tariff Commission for proper action. The Commission can up the duties on the Swedish imports and also order penalties for the past infractions.

Robert L. Loughhead, executive vice president of Jessop, told newsmen that similar actions have been taken by other U.S. firms against foreign producers. But Jessop has the rare distinction of having made its charges stick and thus scoring what William H. Wylie, business writer, terms "a big blow" against "cheap" imports.

The importance of the Jessop action can be appreciated when we see our dollar skidding in the international money markets as the result, in large part, of the balance of payments against us, and the time of import products still rising high above the level of our exports.

Moreover, we have the recent statement by a spokesman for the United Steelworkers Union that steel imports,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

despite a small tonnage drop in 1972 from the 1971 figure, still account for the loss of some 180,000 union jobs in the country.

Though Jessop is not one of the major American steelmakers, it is a highly regarded manufacturer of stainless plate and 2 years ago installed a new and costly 110-inch mill which provides employment to some of the best millmen in the land. It and other steel companies deserves to be protected fully by our Government against unfair trade practices from abroad. What mystifies me is that it has appeared necessary for the Jessops of the country to blow the whistles and institute action when the day-by-day policing of our trade relationships should be the primary responsibility of the Government.

POSTAL "SERVICE" IS QUESTIONED

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, with the numerous complaints that are being raised about the U.S. Postal Service, I felt that this article from the New York Times would be most interesting and pertinent. It appeared in the Times on Sunday, February 18, 1973, as follows:

A SLOWING OF MAIL DELIVERY CONCEDED BY POSTAL CHIEF

(By Peter Kihss)

A letter deposited last month at the Grand Central Post Office got to Carol Brownell—15 blocks away—11 days later. In Greenwich, Conn., Edward W. Barrett received two letters one recent day—one letter 12 days en route from Columbia University in Manhattan, the other 12 days from Peking.

Three million customers of the Consolidated Edison Company in New York City and Westchester County have been getting notes with their bills, explaining "we may owe you an apology" if slowed holiday mails led to unwarranted claims for arrears.

In Washington, Postmaster General Elmer T. Klassen confirmed that mail delivery had "deteriorated seriously" during December and January. He said he was "hell-bent" to pinpoint where and why, and had started overhauls.

TARGET ACHIEVED

For the last 16 months, the Postal Service has aimed at an ambitious self-imposed standard—"next business-day delivery of more than 95 per cent" of the "qualified mail."

This involves first-class zip-coded letters put in a mail box before 5 P.M. The promise for some areas only involves about 50 miles. For the New York postal region, the commitment is for a tri-state area—all of Long Island, upstate to Monticello and Hudson, New Jersey south to Asbury Park, Connecticut east to Stamford.

By Postal Service statistics, such next-day delivery targets were achieved nationally 93.8 per cent of the time in the five months from last July 8 to Dec. 8. The difficult New York region did not do as well, but still averaged 88.7 per cent.

But then came the seasonal Christmas-New Year's avalanche. Reports showed even this best "qualified mail" sagged to 67 per cent next-day delivery nationally Dec. 9 to 22, and as low as 53 per cent in the New York region.

MANAGERS CONFER

National measurement edged up to 74 per cent Dec. 23-Jan. 5, with the New York region still slumping at 52 per cent. The next reports, Jan. 6-19, showed the national level up to 89 per cent, but the New York region only at 76.

The latest, Jan. 20-Feb. 2, count reported nationwide next-day delivery of such letters as 90 per cent, with New York still down at 75. New York region experts say recovery here may take until March.

Nevertheless, even in the New York metropolitan area, second-day delivery is claimed in the latest count for 96 percent of this "qualified mail," third-day delivery for 98 percent and fourth-day for 99 percent.

Postmaster General Klassen, who has headed the Postal Service since Jan. 1, 1972, summoned the nation's 85 postal-district managers to an unprecedented three-day conference in Washington this month when he found complaints addressed to him tripling—to 700 a week.

He ordered more authority and budget flexibility for local officials. He promised a review this month of a controversial system that has been sending mail to state centers for sorting before distribution to localities.

He announced plans to crack down on airlines blamed for intercity delays. Thirty to 35 percent of first-class mail actually moves by airlines on a "space-available basis," according to Harold F. Faught, senior assistant postmaster general for mail processing.

SIXTY-FOUR MILLION A DAY

Mr. Klassen declared airlines had been leaving mail sacks behind to take on the more-profitable passengers, and said he would demand guarantees of space. Mr. Faught said the Postal Service had been studying whether it should own an air-transport system itself.

The numbers in the mail service are enormous. All kinds of mail originating within the New York region totaled 12,475 million pieces between last June 24 and Jan. 5—which works out to 64 million a day.

While Mr. Klassen has expressed concern that customers might shift to "increasingly competitive" alternatives, especially as postal rates have increased, mail volume has resumed an upward climb in the current fiscal year, which started July 1. It is running 3.2 percent higher nationally, 5 percent more in the New York region.

In fiscal 1971-72, the increase had leveled off to 0.2 percent nationally, compared with average annual increases of 2.8 percent for the five preceding years.

While postal volume has gone up, the service's labor force has shrunk—down to 686,834 employees throughout the country last month, a 7 percent decrease from the peak of 741,216 reached during the 1969-70 fiscal year.

MORE MECHANIZATION

In Manhattan, John R. Strachan, Postmaster for New York, reported that his staff was reduced by attrition from 38,390 on April 1, 1970, to 33,320 as of last Jan. 20—a 13 percent decrease.

Mechanization has intensified. An advanced "optical character reader" went into service last Dec. 1 at the General Post Office, Eighth Avenue and 31st Street.

The O.C.R. operation starts with trays of letters placed on a belt. They pass a cathode-ray scanner that reads the lowest line on an envelope for a zip code.

The scanner then moves up to check the number and street address—and it corrects the zip code if necessary. For instance, it looks at "100 East 45th Street," and decides the letter should go to zone 10017 instead of the mistaken "10007" written by the sender.

The letters hurtle out to 305 sorting bins for different geographic areas, and the pace speeds along at 43,000 letters an hour, 20

February 27, 1973

hours a day. One floor below, human workers with trained memories still sort letters by hand—averaging 1,100 an hour.

Phenomenal as it is, the O.C.R. can only handle "compatible" mail—standard-sized envelopes with typed or printed addresses, not handwritten. Humans cope with the rest of the tide.

THIRD TO BE TRIED

The General Post Office has cleared a wide expanse of parquet floor for another, different O.C.R. machine, and the Postal Service will test a third type in Boston.

The new O.C.R. will be able to sort incoming as well as outgoing mail, differing from 20 earlier-generation O.C.R.'s around the country, such as the machine that began operating four years ago at the Church Street station.

Productivity is going up. Postmaster Strachan divides the total pieces handled by his staff here to average 190 items an hour for each employee for the year started last July 1—up 16.6 per cent from the year before.

So far this fiscal year, the Postal Service reports that clerk-mail handlers are processing an average of 1,165 pieces of mail an hour—up 11.7 per cent; the New York region is below the average at 952, but still up 12.8 per cent.

The national average for carriers has been 47.3 deliveries an hour so far this fiscal year, up 5.4 per cent—with New York close at 47.1, up 7.2 per cent.

LITTLE DIFFERENCE SEEN

One outside assessment of mail service is regularly made by a major customer, the Reader's Digest. Since 1964, it has made test mailings of 300 first-class letters to each state, a total of 15,000 at a time, every April and October.

Its results average the time from leaving the company office in Pleasantville, N.Y., until the letter reaches a recipient.

Kent Rhodes, executive vice president, says that "based on our facts, the Postal Service has not been significantly different over the years."

In the test mailings, the national average has ranged from 2.5 days in transit in October, 1967, to 5.6 in April, 1969, counting weekends and holidays as well as business days.

The two mailings before the Postal Service began operating showed 4.2 days in October, 1970, and 3.3 in April, 1971. Thereafter, the averages were 5.3 days in October, 1971; 4.1 in April, 1972, and 4.7 last October—in line with a 3-to-5-day variation over the years, Mr. Rhodes said.

The old Post Office Department had a National Service Index, which reported an average of 1.72 days nationally for handling first-class mail in the second quarter of 1971. For the year ended last June 30, the Postal Service reported 1.6 days as average delivery time for 49 billion first-class letters.

More meaningful, in the Postal Service's opinion, is the present measure of efficiency—an Origin Destination Information System, nicknamed ODIS, aiming at the 95 per cent next day delivery of first-class zip-coded letters deposited before 5 P.M. for specified destinations.

HOLIDAY SLUMP

Albert S. Razzetti, director of logistics for the New York region, says the Manhattan-Bronx district averaged 90.5 per cent next-day delivery for such mail originating within the region from July 8 through Dec. 8. The Queens district averaged 90.7; Brooklyn-Staten Island, 86.1; Nassau-Suffolk, 90.4; Westchester-Eastern Fairfield, 88.5; and Northern New Jersey, 87.8.

The Holiday period, Dec. 23-Jan. 5, saw Manhattan-Bronx slump to 49 per cent, Queens, 61; Brooklyn-Staten Island, 47; Nassau-Suffolk, 46; Westchester-Eastern Fairfield, 55; and Northern New Jersey, 57.

While the region moved up to 75 per cent in the Jan. 20-Feb. 2 report, the Manhattan-Bronx district climbed back to 87.

Traffic congestion makes the New York region the most difficult problem for the Postal Service. Assistant Postmaster General Faught reports mail trucks in Manhattan average only six miles an hour.

Delays in the mail between New York and Washington puzzle the Postal Service. Mr. Faught says the only railway mail post office still working in the country sorts mail each night en route between the two cities. Despite this, Postmaster General Klassen says his impression is that typical letters may take four days—twice what his experts estimate.

One reason for delays anywhere is that mail may get processed out of sequence. A new management technique is being introduced this month—color-coding.

900 FEWER FLIGHTS

A pouch is to get a color to show its priority for delivery—orange for mail dispatched Monday, green for Tuesday, violet for Wednesday, yellow for Thursday, pink for Friday, blue for Saturday and Sunday.

A destination station is to handle top-priority mail at once, even on overtime, and avoid putting other pouches ahead of it.

The Postal Service has set an airmail standard aiming at next-day delivery for 95 per cent of mail deposited before 4 P.M. for destination within 600 miles, as well as second-day delivery for specified cities across the country.

This goal has been difficult to achieve. First-day deliveries were reported as running about 75 to 80 per cent even before winter weather set in.

Mr. Faught said his data indicated airmail—about 2 per cent of total air and first-class mailings—got next-day delivery in the 600-mile zones 61 per cent of the time last month and two-day delivery for 33 per cent more.

About 900 scheduled flights have been lost to the Postal Service since mid-1971 because of economy cutbacks by airlines. Mr. Faught says the service now has contracts for about 160 air-taxi flights every night, handling only regular airmail.

To spotlight trouble spots, Postal Service managers of the 80 largest offices now report daily on mail that did not make schedules.

Independent spot checks of Postal Service customers indicate large users here are generally satisfied with mail service, while many smaller mailers and individuals are critical.

Consolidated Edison said its recent problems had not actually been widespread, despite its areawide proffered apologies.

ONE CONCERN MOVES

The New York Telephone Company, which mails 6.2 million bills each month, said service was "excellent." The City Department of Social Services, which mails a half million welfare checks twice a month, called it "beautiful."

D. Kenneth Patton, the city's Economic Development Administrator, said he knew of only one company leaving the city and complaining of serious mail problems. This, he said, was Norcross, Inc., the greeting-card manufacturer, which is moving from four sites here in mid-1974 to West Goshen Township in Pennsylvania.

Among the critics of the Postal Service is Joseph F. Rizzo, with an export sales business in the Empire State Building. He has been complaining to postal officials for more than a year about delayed deliveries. He says scheduled third deliveries on Fridays and days before holidays are often missed, with such explanations as "the boys went home early."

Another critic is Guenter Reimann of International Reports, 200 Park Avenue South, publisher of an airmailed weekly financial report. His company delivers 1,750 copies by courier Friday afternoons to Kennedy In-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ternational Airport, aiming at Monday deliveries abroad.

TWO TO 10-DAY DELIVERY

Until six weeks ago, he said, such airmail left on the first available plane for the country of destination. He said this had been cut back to one assigned plane for each destination, causing a day's delay that could induce his company to move abroad for required prompt service.

District Council 37, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, says second-class mail delivery of its bimonthly publication to 125,000 recipients takes from two to 10 days.

Bernard Stephens, the editor, said first-class between its New York and Washington offices had so frequently taken three to five days that the union had first resorted to a telephone-facsimile alternative and now used bus service for important documents.

Representing postal employees, Philip Seligman, executive vice president of the Manhattan-Bronx Postal Union, said mail service was "hit-and-miss," and "the work load can't be carried by the staff."

Whatever the reason, there are peculiarities. One Forest Hills resident said his copies of The Louisville (Ky.) Times, mailed second-class, had been reaching him faster than first-class corporate mail from the same city.

The Jan. 18 newspaper arrived in four days; that day's letter took five. The Jan. 19 paper reached here in three days; a letter took five. The Jan. 22 paper came along in four days; a letter took five.

A-X CLOSE AIR SUPPORT AIRCRAFT

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, more than a month has passed since Fairchild won the A-X competition, but the contract still has not been signed.

On February 14 of this year, I initiated a letter to the Secretary of Defense, Elliot L. Richardson, which was signed by 26 Members, the text of which I include herewith:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We are disturbed about the furor which has arisen since the Republic Division of Fairchild Industries was picked to build the A-X Close Air Support Aircraft.

The arguments supporting the A-X award are clear.

First, the basic A-X Close Air Support concept has been closely studied and repeatedly supported by both Congress and the Pentagon. Nearly every qualified expert feels there is definite need for an airplane of this sort.

Further, selection of the Fairchild prototype for the A-X award was made pursuant to some of the most painstakingly careful procurement procedures ever used by the United States government. The A-X award was the first major weapons system selection to be made pursuant to the Administration's sensible "fly-before-buy" procurement process culminating in the competitive "fly-off" between the Fairchild and Northrop prototypes. Fairchild was judged to have the best plane.

Failure to adhere to the orderly A-X procurement schedule could have two very serious consequences:

It could mean the end of the A-X project which the experts feel is needed for our Nation's defense; and

It could mean the end of the recently adopted "fly-before-buy" procurement proc-

ess which now seems to be the best hope for making order out of the often chaotic defense procurement system and, thereby, protecting the best interests of our taxpayers as well as the national defense.

For all of the foregoing reasons, we respectfully urge that the A-X contract be signed and that production go forward as scheduled.

Very truly yours,

Jacob K. Javits, U.S. Senator, James L. Buckley, U.S. Senator, Thaddeus J. Dulski, Member of Congress, Joseph P. Addabbo, Member of Congress, Hugh L. Carey, Member of Congress, Carleton J. King, Member of Congress.

Angelo D. Roncallo, Member of Congress, Otis G. Pike, Member of Congress, James R. Grover, Jr., Member of Congress, John W. Wydler, Member of Congress, Norman F. Lent, Member of Congress, Frank Horton, Member of Congress.

John M. Murphy, Member of Congress, Jonathan B. Bingham, Member of Congress, Henry P. Smith III, Member of Congress, Mario Biaggi, Member of Congress, James F. Hastings, Member of Congress, Peter A. Peyer, Member of Congress, William F. Walsh, Member of Congress.

Ogden R. Reid, Member of Congress, Barber B. Conable, Jr., Member of Congress, Bertram L. Podell, Member of Congress, Hamilton Fish, Jr., Member of Congress, Jack F. Kemp, Member of Congress, Charles B. Rangel, Member of Congress, Howard W. Robison, Member of Congress.

To date, I have not received any reply to my letter. Is it possible that the fly-before-buy concept is about to be junked because of partisan political pressure?

TO THE VOTERS OF MONROE COUNTY

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I wish to share with my colleagues the true story of "Persimmon Jim" Bartley, as it appeared in the Tompkinsville, Ky., News several years ago.

"Persimmon Jim" has long since departed this life, but the warmth of his wit is held dear to the hearts of many of his fellow Monroe Countians. From his simple beginnings in a home with earthen floors, Jim rose to become one of the most respected businessmen in southern Kentucky.

His children have all become successful in their careers. Sons Powell, Homer, and Wallace have followed their father into the logging business, and daughter Ruth has become a respected educator in southern Kentucky. Wallace has been elected to five terms in the Kentucky State Legislature as well.

I believe the testimony of Mr. James L. Bartley illustrates how compassion and unselfish dedication can come to benefit a deserving man!

TO THE VOTERS OF MONROE COUNTY

General public approval met Persimmon Jim Bartley's announcement in last week's Tompkinsville News that he would cancel all debts owed him by widows, heirs, and those who had gone security for borrowers now dead. Having been in business 32 years in the northeast corner of Monroe county, Mr.

Bartley has debtors over a wide area in four counties. His generosity has been the subject of much favorable comment. He is spending his Sundays marking old accounts paid and issuing receipts to those who call for them.

Mr. Bartley is seeking no publicity for his generosity, and is keeping in strictest confidence all the debts he is cancelling. Considering the fact that he has engaged in logging, milling, threshing, contracting, and large scale farming all these years, the candidate for jailor thinks it remarkable that he has no more than four hundred accounts on his books. He has had 16 farm sales. He is grateful for the confidence his neighbors have shown in him and thankful for the promptness and honesty with which they have nearly all have acknowledged their just debts and paid when able.

Persimmon Jim was raised hard and lives simply. Fourteen Fox hounds and a splendid saddle horse bear witness to his principal extravagances, and Indian ancestry. He has conducted business for people of limited means. He has accommodated many. He never spent a cent for chewing or smoking, radio, gramaphones, musical instruments, or motor power, but paid as much interest as any man in the county. In 25 years, he has paid in interest to the little bank of Summer Shade \$10,636. Once in debt \$11,600, his total indebtedness is now only \$4,600.

Mr. Bartley is still a poor man, but never was, is now, and never will be too poor to serve as headquarters for any horse jockeys, fox hunters, preachers, drummers, or any other travelers who visit his neighborhood. While he will be living in Tompkinsville after the first of next year, his grown sons in charge of the farm will welcome any wayfaring man who comes their way.

The voters of Monroe county are urged to consider Mr. Bartley's life and reputation. If you think he has conducted his own business honestly and reasonably successfully, you know he will make a good jailer.

Persimmon Jim has said considerable this campaign about pledges and promises made him in past campaigns. The jailer's office has been promised him since youth as a reward for loyalty to the Republican party. There has never been a campaign in which he has not been an active party worker. He has ridden the county canvassing for three successful candidates for jailer who are again candidates this year. All have promised Mr. Bartley that they would vote for him when he ran for the office; now they oppose him. The other ten candidates, says Mr. Bartley, are making student trips learning how to campaign. He is glad to see them getting the experience and spending a little money in their home county. All Persimmon Jim asks is five per cent of the vote to which he is entitled for long fidelity to his friends, his party, and his county.

You believe Persimmon Jim is entitled to the jailer's office, and that he will make a good one. Shut your door, call the dogs, and go to the polls and vote for the ninth name on the jailer's ballot James L. Bartley.

THE LATE HONORABLE GEORGE W. COLLINS

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of our colleague, Congressman George Collins of Chicago, is a shocking loss to all who knew, admired, and served with him in this Congress.

He was a tireless fighter for social, ra-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

cial, and economic justice. As a member of the Congressional Black Caucus and as a Member of the House, George Collins voted his conviction that we in this Congress have a special obligation toward the Nation's millions of poor, the underskilled, and the malnourished.

His voice will be sorely missed by all of us who share his commitment.

I would like to extend to his family and many friends my most sincere sympathy.

THE STATE OF ASTRONOMY IN AMERICA

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, while the average man gazes at the stars and marvels at the wonder of the universe, the average astronomer is looking toward Capitol Hill and wondering where financial support for his work will be found.

Bart J. Bok, president of the American Astronomical Society, recently went on record as saying that if astronomy programs are not funded at a higher level in the future, research and development in this field of science will be seriously impaired.

In a speech to the AAS annual meeting in January, Bok said the astronomy section of the National Science Foundation budget must be nearly doubled to provide sufficient funds for research.

We in Congress can expect to hear from astronomers soon, for in his speech, Bok outlined a plan to involve individual scientists in a lobbying effort to get approval for the addition of \$8 million to the NSF appropriation.

Our universities do most of the research in optical and radio astronomy, and it is our universities which are hardest hit by lack of funds. The amount that NSF gives to astronomical research is not enough to make up for the general decline in research funding by NASA and the Defense Department.

NASA still plays an important role in America's astronomical progress; its total annual support of astronomical programs is roughly \$80 million, approximately \$10 million of which goes to ground-based research and development.

But NASA recently announced a budget cut that, in Bok's words, "shocked the astronomical community." On January 4, it suspended 80 percent, or about \$200 million, of the funds appropriated for the high energy astronomy observatory program—HEAO—a project to send a satellite into orbit in 1976 or 1977 or 1978 to gather information about galactic and extragalactic X-ray phenomena, gamma rays, and cosmic ray fluxes and origins.

Although NASA protested that the suspension was not a termination of the project, the scientific community was not reassured by this pronouncement, and the sudden and surprising cuts in federally funded programs has led to a great deal of insecurity on the part of many scientists.

February 27, 1973

If there are no other severe budget cuts, by the end of 1980 we may see fly-by missions to Mercury, Venus, Mars, and Jupiter, satellite studies of Saturn, the completion of the skylab project, and the construction of a large space telescope.

Educational programs of the AAS include the visiting professor in astronomy program, which is continuing despite withdrawal of NSF support; a task force group on education in astronomy, and a program designed to counteract the current astrology craze, which astronomers feel is dangerous to the public as well as damaging to the scientific reputation of astronomy.

THE "FATHER" OF REVENUE-SHARING NOW DISILLUSIONED BY HIS "BABY"

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I noted with great interest in a recent edition of the Washington Post a news account of testimony by Dr. Walter W. Heller, the University of Minnesota economics professor who is generally considered to be the "father" of the revenue-sharing concept.

Dr. Heller is now thoroughly disillusioned over revenue sharing, as conceived and implemented by the current administration, pointing out that revenue sharing is being used as a pretext for the Federal Government coping out of its responsibilities with respect to domestic programs.

Because of the intense interest in this matter among my colleagues and the American people, I place the article concerning Dr. Heller in the RECORD herewith.

The article follows:

HELLER ASSAILED NIXON CUTS IN SOCIAL OUTLAYS
(By David S. Broder)

The "father" of revenue-sharing told Congress yesterday that President Nixon is "beating the birth of his baby" as "grounds for justifiable homicide of national programs" to aid the poor and the ties.

Walter W. Heller, the University of Minnesota economics professor who played a major role in developing and publicizing the revenue-sharing idea during the 1960s, when he was chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, said Mr. Nixon in using the passage of revenue-sharing last year as "an excuse for a fiscal cop-out" by the federal government.

Keynoting a second day of hearings by Sen. Edmund S. Muskie's Intergovernmental Relations subcommittee, Heller endorsed the complaint of big-city mayors about "ruthless" cuts in categorical aid for housing, education and social services.

Heller's argument was seconded by University of Massachusetts President Robert Wood, former Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

The President's proposal to shift from categorical grants to expanded revenue-sharing is a "shell game," Wood said.

Whichever shell you look under, the federal funds you thought were there have vanished.

In contradiction to the two Democratic

academics' arguments, the Brookings Institution's Richard P. Nathan, a Budget Bureau official in Mr. Nixon's first term, argued that the outcry over budget cutbacks for social and urban programs is "exaggerated." New Federalism is unfolding in a logical and gradual fashion that deserves congressional support, he said.

Muskie and Nathan clashed, however, when the Maine Democrat insisted that Mr. Nixon's actions in transferring programs and impounding funds "have been arbitrary and abrupt."

Heller and Wood both sided with Muskie, with the former saying that Mr. Nixon "proposes to ram it (his New Federalism policy) down the throats" of Congress.

"That invites regurgitation, not digestion," Heller said.

The three academics represented three major strains of thinking about the direction of domestic policy.

Wood, who said he had been "uneasy" about revenue-sharing from the beginning, said the Nixon application of it means "smaller bones with less meat for the groups within the communities to scrap over."

He contended that revenue-sharing and impoundment of appropriated funds were two parts of a single strategy, aimed at "drastically weakening the Congress as a prime force in setting national priorities."

Heller, more enthusiastic about revenue-sharing from the start, said he still believed it was necessary, "to fill a gap" in the structure of federal programs and to help hard-pressed local governments "pay for humdrum local services not suffused with the national interest."

What is wrong with Mr. Nixon's approach, he said, is that it uses revenue-sharing as an excuse to end categorical-aid programs which do serve national purposes.

Nathan said Mr. Nixon's policy was not simply one of "putting the money on the stump and running." Rather, he said, the President was trying to "sort out" the functions that belong to various levels of government and decentralize those that can best be handled and financed at state and local levels.

But neither Muskie nor the two academics who supported him would agree the process was quite that benign in its intention or its effects.

Next week, Muskie is to hear the views of governors on the effect of revenue-sharing and the administration's budget.

REAL AMERICA IS RISING

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe, contrary to some, that this country ever lost its faith in itself. We have had our faith attacked—and, sad to note, most bitterly from within, from among our own citizens. But it has never wavered among the great majority of our people.

The following editorial from a recent Indianapolis Star makes this clear:

REAL AMERICA IS RISING

From the super think-tank, the Hudson Institute, Dr. Herman Kahn has seen a change going on all across the American Republic, picking up momentum day by day, thundering through the mountains, crackling across the heartland, ripping like a gale along the coast—the revolution of real America.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

This America is rising in its might and numbers, writes Kahn, waking up, regaining its faith—if it had ever really lost it—and once more becoming that power of old that settled the raw colonies, fought a revolution, conquered the wilderness, won the West and built a nation.

The blood of the pioneers and minutemen, that was spilled at Valley Forge and Gettysburg and the Argonne and Omaha Beach, that flowed in the veins of Boone and Crockett, Grant and Lee and G.I. Joe, the Indian fighters and 49-ers, the seekers of the New World that sailed in steerage past the Statue of Liberty to dock at Ellis Island—this blood is reasserting itself.

People who are not ashamed of believing in God or being proud of their flag and their country and its ideals are on the move again. America is off dead-center. The people who are glad they're Americans are coming into their own again.

They've had it with the "cultural revolution" that the self-chosen elite of academe and the media, the permissive, crime-coddling, welfare-ladling Pied Pipers of the drug culture, radical rebellion, pornography, promiscuity and self-flagellation have been trying to force on them from above.

They're fed up with having their ideals, beliefs and values trampled in the mud by their "betterers."

As for their "betterers," Dr. Kahn observed, they "have an unbelievable degree of what I call 'educated incapacity' to understand very simple issues—law and order, busing, gun laws, pornography, sex education in the public schools, the school tax revolt, attitude toward religion and the flag, and attitudes toward violent protests."

Dr. Kahn welcomes the swing of the pendulum away from the Epoch of the Freaks. He remarks, "As I get older I am increasingly friendly with square people and values. I don't think it's just because I am getting older. I think it's because in this country we're overshot. The pendulum has swung too far. We've abandoned too many traditional values and haven't replaced them with satisfactory new values."

He's right.

It took more than fads and flippancies and effete intellectual snobs to take this land and make this country and hold it, to hew and plow and farm and mine, to herd and haul and dig and build and invent, to create—whatever its faults, and they are many—the richest, most free, most promising society in the world.

It took work and heart and endurance and guts and imagination and faith. It took these to make the country, and the same free and independent people who made it have kept the perimeters of freedom far beyond our borders and manned freedom's ramparts at a heavy cost.

And now the people who do the country's work and fight its wars and keep its faith would like to have it back. Who's to stop them?

A CANAL ZONE STUDENT'S RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, my association with the residents of the Canal Zone goes back many years, first as a private citizen visiting friends in the zone on numerous occasions, then as a Member and for 14 years chairman of the Subcommittee on Panama Canal of the

House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and now as chairman of the parent committee.

Hence, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the Congress the winning speech from the Canal Zone this year in the annual voice of democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies auxiliary. The Canal Zone winner, Amy Jo McConkey, a senior at Balboa High School, will compete in Washington next month along with winners from the States for five scholarships ranging from \$1,500 to \$10,000 each. More than 500,000 students from more than 7,000 secondary schools have participated in this year's contest on the subject "My Responsibility to Freedom."

Miss McConkey, daughter of the Rev. and Mrs. Clarence M. McConkey, takes as her theme the words of Thomas Hobbes in 1624 that "Freedom is political power divided into small fragments." and reduces this to the smallest fragment—the individual—to stress the citizen's essential role as "the building block of freedom" helping to bear more than one's share of the weight of the edifice "when other supports around me give in."

The winning Canal Zone speech by Amy Jo McConkey is as follows:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

(By Amy McConkey)

In 1624 the English philosopher Thomas Hobbes wrote: "Freedom is political power divided into small fragments." Thomas Hobbes wrote those words at a time when the English nation was learning to place responsibility for political freedom in the hands of the people. Hobbes was thinking of small political subdivisions of counties and provinces. The success of this experiment in popular democracy, this effort toward the sharing of freedom with each citizen, made England a cradle of civil liberties and political freedom. Thomas Hobbes made a crucial point in his insistence that the groundwork of true freedom is found, not in a concentration of power in the hands of the few, but in the distribution of power among the many. This process worked toward participation in, and responsibility for, the ideal of freedom for men everywhere.

Today we understand that there is an even deeper meaning to these words than Hobbes knew. In America, in the 20th century, the smallest subdivision, the smallest fragment, is each individual citizen. This is the strength of American democracy. A rediscovery of these words of Thomas Hobbes could come at no better time in world affairs. Everywhere in the 20th century men seek freedom, but freedom continues to be an elusive goal. Even though freedom may be achieved by any nation, it continues to be abused by many nations.

Because I am one of the subdivisions of freedom it is my responsibility to use this freedom responsibly. To speak against the freedom which guarantees my right to be free is to abuse the freedom. To assemble for the purpose of causing disorder to the society which protects my right of assembly is to destroy the freedom of assembly. To proclaim liberty and practice irresponsibility, is to make the proclamation a hollow rhetoric, believed by no one.

My responsibility is to be willing to grant freedom to others as well as to be courageous enough to expect freedom from others. It is to live in such a way that my conduct, my values, my commitment to the principles of freedom, are seen as freedom's virtues. My responsibility is to understand

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

that freedom is directed toward the welfare of persons and that my abuse of freedom is an abuse of persons.

In this way, then, the smallest fragments of freedom become the building blocks of freedom. When one building block crumbles the entire structure is weakened. If many blocks give way the building falls. Each citizen, each community, each vote that is cast, must in some way be used to bear the weight of freedom. For we understand that there are times when that weight may demand much from us. In just those times when other supports around me give in, when weakness appears in the structure of this edifice of liberty, when cracks and breaks and shiftings appear, it becomes crucial that I stand fast in my support of this great building of human freedom. By my example, by my willingness to bear more than my share of responsibility, I may protect and strengthen the whole until the whole can be strengthened.

My responsibility to freedom does not exist only when my support of freedom is easy. That responsibility extends to that time and to those circumstances when that support is difficult. In support of freedom we do not become weary in well-doing. The practicing of liberty makes liberty perfect.

To have had freedom, and to have lost it, is among man's most tragic experiences. It is my responsibility to defend and promote the freedom now at hand. It is to work and vote and promote in every way the freedom process in such a way that that freedom proves to be neither elusive nor abused. It is my privilege to be free. It is my responsibility to remain free. It is my calling to make freedom a lasting part of the experience of mankind.

ADDRESS OF GOVERNOR ASKEW

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Florida delegation was treated to a unique meeting with the Governor of the State of Florida and his chief department heads to discuss some of the problems facing our State government. Because the Governor's remarks are timely, and I am certain bear directly on other States' problems, I would like to have his speech to the Florida delegation made a part of the RECORD.

The remarks of the Honorable Reubin O'D. Askew, Governor of Florida, follow:

REMARKS BY REUBIN O'D. ASKEW, GOVERNOR OF FLORIDA, AT THE FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONSHIP MEETING, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 26, 1973

First, let me thank each of you for joining us today. I know your time is valuable, and we appreciate this opportunity to share it. My hope is that before the day has ended, we'll have established between us a new level of understanding, one that will help all of us to work together more effectively in solving the problems of the people of Florida.

We're not here merely to tell you our needs and go home. Nor are we here to criticize the Congress, the President, or the Federal bureaucracy, and then disappear into our own various bureaucracies.

We're here to listen as well as to speak, to solve your problems with Tallahassee as well as to present our own with Washington, and we're here to form a lasting alliance of Florida leaders for Florida's people.

As the President and others speak of a "new federalism" in which power and responsibility are returned to State and local governments, I think it's important that we communicate with one another more often and more effectively than ever before. I'm hopeful this meeting will make it clear to all of us where and to whom we must go in solving problems that cross our respective levels of government.

In that regard, I'll be introducing to you representatives of various agencies of State government who are deeply affected by the decisions you make as Members of the United States Congress. They're the experts, and I invite you to listen, to question and, to correct them, if necessary, as they seek to give you Florida's views on various problems.

Before they begin, however, I'd like to share with you some general observations of my own on the new federalism, and what it means to our State.

I believe, along with the President, and most—if not all—of you here today, that too much power, too much money, and too much planning have been concentrated in Washington, and that it's time to return responsibility, initiative and financial resources to our State and local governments.

I also believe that the timing of this movement couldn't be better for State governments generally, and Florida's in particular.

State government has come to the end of a long and sleepy age from which many of us thought it might never recover.

It's beginning to show independence, imagination, and responsiveness again, the qualities that made historians at one time refer to the Nation's State capitols as "laboratories of democracy."

Tax reform, spending reform, government-in-the-sunshine, criminal justice reforms, pace-setting environmental programs, efforts on behalf of consumers, and an upcoming State conference on energy needs seem to demonstrate a new vitality and responsiveness in our State government in Tallahassee.

And I think that the trend is reflected in many of our local governments, and in other States as well.

The point is, we want to continue the search for a better day for all people, and we feel that our State and local governments can be effective and imaginative in doing so, if they have your support, and that of the President. We're ready, able and eager to help win the battle for a new federalism, but we want to do it by pursuing, rather than forsaking, the Nation's commitment to certain ideals and basic needs.

We can do this if the Federal Government "shares" its responsibilities with us, as implied by the rhetoric of the season; but we can't do it if Washington flatly *abdicates* its responsibilities, as seems to be the case in far too many critical areas.

It would be very difficult, for example, for the State to buy the Big Cypress Swamp on its own and save its precious wildlife for future generations. I fail to see the economic theory in the administration's decision to delay that project again as prices continue to inflate, and pressures of development continue to threaten a unique natural resource. The same applies to the administration's general decision to cut back on funds for purchase and preservation of park lands. It just doesn't make sense environmentally or economically.

The people of Florida have already demonstrated their commitment to save environmentally endangered lands statewide to the tune of \$240-million. If the new federalism is going to succeed environmentally, then Congress and the President must be willing to do their part.

The same applies to tax reform. We fought very hard in Florida to shift some of the tax

February 27, 1973

burden from average people who were paying more than their fair share to large multi-state corporations which were virtually enjoying a free ride. We were able, with the help of the people, to repeal \$50-million in consumer taxes and \$24-million in business taxes. We were able to roll back property taxes. Yet we also gave State Government the financial strength and stability it must have if it's ever to function properly as a key partner in the new federalism.

I am not unmindful of the commitment of the President to hold down the mounting deficit or the intention of the Congress to insist on the President faithfully executing its programs which become law.

I must share with you, however, some of the things that are happening to Florida as a result of the impoundments, cutbacks, and new budget proposals.

Unfortunately, we don't have a total figure on what the President's 1974 budget recommendation will mean in Florida because the Office of Management and Budget can't or won't give us one. At a time when we're striving at both levels of Government for a businesslike approach, in which we use sound management planning techniques, I find the lack of a central distributor of Federal budgetary information to be a severe handicap. And I hope this will change.

We've been able to project, nevertheless, possible losses in excess of \$100-million in human programs in Florida as a result of the President's 1974 budget. This includes about \$88-million in medical and other forms of aid for the aged, the blind, the disabled, for crippled children, for infants, for the mentally retarded, and for other Florida citizens who, through no fault of their own, have great difficulty helping themselves. They number more than a half-million.

About \$63-million of these losses, incidentally, would be the result of rather arbitrary regulations proposed recently by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. As you know, we all have about two weeks yet to voice objections to those regulations. I hope you join me in doing so.

In the present fiscal year, meanwhile, we find ourselves receiving far less in revenue sharing and other forms of Federal aid than we were led to expect. We face a loss of \$32.8-million this year in the human programs I've just mentioned. Our 1973 allocation of badly-needed funds to combat sewage pollution has been cut by \$109-million. Our allocation for highway construction this year is down \$27-million.

Time after time, we seem to find ourselves asked either to spend state and local funds on necessary programs that have heretofore been funded by the Federal Government or to watch those programs die.

Frankly, gentlemen, revenue sharing is beginning to look like good old-fashioned buck passing, which was never what the Congress intended. I'm willing to share the responsibility for the thrust which led to its enactment. I spoke in favor of it to most of you.

I have no intention, however, of asking the people of Florida to vote for new state and local taxes, for needs that should be met with what they're already sending to Washington.

I feel that legitimate spending reform must always be preceded by legitimate tax reform on the Federal level as it has been on the State level. After all, credits and exemptions are nothing more than spending on behalf of one group at the expense of another.

I also feel that legitimate spending reform must touch all areas of the budget.

Certainly some of our so-called social programs may have been wasteful, mismanaged and ineffective, and have to be phased out. But it seems to me that we should be determined to stop mismanagement and inefficiency throughout the Federal Govern-

ment, and not simply in programs that happen to be unpopular or controversial.

I think we all agree that the national security is the first responsibility of the President and Congress, and I would be the last to question the great emphasis we place on that function. But I think we also all agree that such things as excessive cost overruns have no place in a program of announced cost-cutting.

In other words, just as there's money to be saved in Tallahassee, I think there's money to be saved in Washington and used in the States on programs for people.

And I'm not just talking about poor people. I mean all people. For our problems with crime, health care, pollution, consumer protection, transportation, education and housing are problems that affect all kinds of people, regardless of income.

We would be foolish to ignore them as politicians, and irresponsible to turn away from them as public officials.

In Florida, I'm talking about such problems as the Big Cypress, the need for sewage treatment facilities, the need for swift completion of our interstate system and timely development of rapid transit facilities, better health care at lower cost for all people, economic development for rural areas and small towns and environmental controls over excessive development in cities and urban areas.

In closing, let me say that I think we've reached a promising period in the development of our country and our state.

We've learned that those who felt that Washington should do nothing were wrong. We've learned that those who felt Washington should do everything were also wrong. And we've learned that the best way to spread democracy abroad is probably to create a shining example of it here at home.

My hope then is that we Floridians can come together today and put those lessons to good use, by making the new federalism work as a genuine partnership for the people.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tion, has sought to effect a cease-fire in Vietnam by means of formal negotiation, an earnest dedication to peace and the return of prisoners of war; now, therefore,

Be it resolved, by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota, that commendation be extended to President Nixon for his achievement, and that the whole-hearted support of the Members of this House, as well as the American people as a whole, be given to the President.

Be it further resolved, that the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, and to the Minnesota Representatives and Senators in Congress.

A BRICK IN YOUR TANK

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned about preserving our national resources—including our water supply.

Recently I learned about a constituent, Mrs. Tilly Spetgang, who proposed placing a brick in toilet tanks to cut tank capacity and thus save water.

Since adoption by the town fathers, Cherry Hill has saved an estimated 34 million gallons of water annually.

The following is an article by Mrs. Spetgang, which appeared recently in Parade magazine. I want to share it with my colleagues:

A BRICK IN YOUR TANK

(By Tilly Spetgang)

CHERRY HILL, N.J.—A few months ago, I placed a brick in my toilet tank to help my town save water. Ever since, the idea has been making waves.

Of course, some people still think it's a goofy thing to do. When I walked into the City Council of my home town, Cherry Hill, N.J., carrying a brick, some of the councilmen ducked under their desks. They thought I was going to throw it. But all I wanted was for them to put one into every toilet tank in town.

Today Cherry Hill, which has 17,000 homes, has adopted the idea. We figure that we're saving about 34 million gallons of drinkable water a year. And all that at a cost of \$2000 which the council laid out for the bricks! How's that for low-cost conservation?

MORE THAN NEEDED

The logic behind the plan is simple. The standard toilet tank holds up to 8 gallons of water—far more than is needed for flushing. True, newer models are being built with a smaller cubic capacity—some only $3\frac{1}{2}$ gallons—but in the average town enough water is being wasted to float a battleship. So by putting an ordinary hard clay brick, which measures 2 by 4 by 8 inches and displaces over a quart of water, into each toilet tank, an enormous saving can be effected.

In a city like Seattle, for example, according to the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, the savings could be 1,495,428,350 gallons of water a year, from 409,679 bricks. The benefits would be felt in an enormous increase in water reserves, and an easing of the burden on overloaded water and sewer systems.

In Cherry Hill, we enlisted the whole town in our campaign. Once the Conservation Advisory Board, of which I'm a member, con-

vinced the City Council to invest in the bricks, all sort of people lent their support.

We figured on two bricks for each of our community's households. Who has a one-toilet home these days? So that meant 34,000 bricks, which, in case you never thought about it, add up to 68 tons.

FOOD FOR WORKERS

An amazing assortment of volunteers turned out to assist in the door-to-door delivery—students and engineers, bankers and teachers, carpenters and dentists, housewives and physicians, teen-agers and senior citizens. People brought fried chicken, hamburgers, coffee and malteds to the "brick depots" where the volunteers were loading cars and trucks. One woman showed up as a driver with a two-month-old infant asleep on the front seat. An elderly couple drove up in their own pickup truck to help out. Civil Defense used its two-way radio to link up our several depots.

Most enthusiastic of all were the young people. They pinned an ecology flag on the rear of a garbage truck loaded with bricks, they wore working outfits decorated with slogans and patches dealing with conservation and pollution, they organized themselves like an army, practically saluting each other. For many, it was their first chance to work alongside adults as equals, and they made the most of it.

Soon everybody around was talking about our "Put a Brick in Your Tank" caper. My husband Irwin, who is a business manager with RCA, found it the main topic at his office. Our youngest daughter, Valeri, 13, took quite a ribbing at school. Our eldest, Wendy, who is married and lives near Princeton, called us to say: "What's going on with these bricks? My phone hasn't stopped ringing!" We were so busy with the distribution that we'd forgotten to tell her.

But what was really amazing was the reaction—both pro and con—from people across the United States, and even abroad, who had heard about the Cherry Hill brick equipment through newspaper articles and radio and TV reports.

CAN'T PLEASE EVERYBODY

Some people astonished us by waxing indignant over the idea. One protester in Meadville, Pa., speculated that maybe my husband or somebody on the City Council was in the brick business. Alas, there wasn't a brick seller in sight. Another complaint came from a householder who tried to force a brick into his tank, pushed too hard, and broke a valve fitting. Well, we'd warned every one to be careful—bricks are bricks. More ingenious was an engineer who, when he found his brick too bulky, simply broke it in two and used the pieces separately.

Most virulent of all was a comment from Puyallup, Wash.: "The incredible ignorance and stupidity displayed by Mrs. Spetgang—if there really is such a name—and the concurring city officials, is shattering to those of us of reasonable intelligence. Is there no one there who knows that by the simple act of bending the arm of the float you can save water?"

Well, my answer to my friend in Puyallup, Wash.—if there really is such a place—is that we've all known that old trick of bending the float-rod for years. One problem is that bending the float lowers water pressure, which might cause a problem. But the main trouble is that people simply won't do it. They're afraid of damaging the mechanism. And they will put a brick in their tanks—that we've proved.

LONDON CALLING

Most of the reaction to our idea was favorable and even ecstatic. The British Broadcasting Corporation called me from London for a telephone interview, and the announcer said in his clipped English accent: "Oh, I understand, you put the brick in the toilet." To which I shrieked: "Lord, no, you put it

MINNESOTA HOUSE COMMENDS PRESIDENT

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have been provided with a copy of a resolution adopted by the Minnesota House of Representatives on February 12, which commends President Nixon for his achievements in negotiating a cease-fire in Vietnam as well as for his other contributions to world peace. In furtherance of these efforts, the resolution also extends to President Nixon the wholehearted support of a Minnesota House of Representatives.

I am sure the President is honored by this recognition by the people of my State, and I am delighted to include the full text of the resolution at this point in my remarks:

A HOUSE RESOLUTION COMMENDING PRESIDENT NIXON FOR HIS ACCOMPLISHMENTS REGARDING THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Whereas, President Nixon has served the American people for four years as Chief Executive; and

Whereas, he has contributed to the ideal of world peace by improving communication and understanding between the powers of East and West; and

Whereas, President Nixon, with determina-

in the tank. If you put it in the toilet you're in big trouble."

Judging by the extent of the interest aroused, people are about ready to get personally involved in the job of preserving our resources. Putting a brick in the toilet tank may seem like a prosaic, even a kind of silly way to start. But when it's done on a town-wide, or city-wide scale, it really works. Any enduring structure is built brick by brick. Why not attack our conservation problems the same way?

GAETA URGES CITY CURB ON ILLEGAL ALIENS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the problem of illegal aliens in this country has been growing steadily since 1965. Estimates of the number of persons living in the United States illegally run as high as 2 million.

These people take jobs from citizens and legal residents and those that do not work add to the already unbearable load on our service agencies.

The problem has become so great in New York City that a bill was recently introduced in the city council to bar illegal aliens from city jobs and housing, welfare, and education programs. This action is an attempt to deal with the problems in New York caused by the growing numbers of illegal aliens in the city.

However, it is up to the Federal Government to solve the problem by eliminating it. That can be done by removing the reason aliens come to this country illegally—jobs.

Last year the House passed a bill which penalizes employers who repeatedly hire illegal aliens. I ultimately have reintroduced this measure this year. If it becomes law, it will make it unprofitable for employers to hire illegal aliens and thus eliminate the possibility of jobs for these people.

At this time I enter into the RECORD an article from the New York Daily News describing the legislation proposed in New York:

GAETA URGES CITY CURB ON ILLEGAL ALIENS

(By John Toscano)

A bill to prevent illegal aliens from "victimizing New York City taxpayers of hundreds of millions of dollars through fraudulent use of municipal programs" was introduced in the City Council yesterday.

The measure, submitted by Councilman Anthony E. Gaeta (D-Staten Island), would bar illegal aliens from city jobs and housing, welfare and school programs by requiring proof of citizenship or legal alien registration identification from anyone seeking to enroll in those programs or applying for a Civil Service position.

In addition, the bill, co-sponsored by Councilman Edward V. Curry, also a Staten Island Democrat, would set up the same requirements for any person seeking any permit or license issued by the city.

350,000 IN CITY

Gaeta said there are 350,000 aliens living illegally in the city and nearly a million in the metropolitan area.

"There are an estimated 50,000 students in

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

public schools here who are in the country illegally," Gaeta said, "and each student costs the taxpayer \$1,200 a year . . . or \$60 million annually."

He said many illegal aliens receive welfare and medicaid assistance, occupy apartments in subsidized housing projects, and fill "countless" city jobs, especially in poverty programs.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE HEALTH FOUNDATION

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, a newsletter of the National Wildlife Health Foundation has recently come to my attention. This foundation has launched a program to enlist veterinarians on a national basis to participate in helping injured wildlife without regard to financial reimbursement.

The foundation has received recognition from the city and county of San Francisco for the foundation's field test of a new, safer improved cleaning solvent for cleaning oiled birds. San Francisco has bestowed the honorary title "Director of Operations for Wildlife Disasters" on the foundation's director, Dr. James L. Naviaux, D.V.M., for his effort in the field test which cleaned 17 birds that were accidentally "oiled" in Richmond, Calif.

This National Wildlife Health Foundation has 200 veterinarians on their membership roster. I think the Congress and the American citizens should be made aware of this meritorious program of the foundation.

I submit the full text of this newsletter for inclusion into the RECORD.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE HEALTH FOUNDATION

Pleasant Hill, Calif., December 1972.

DEAR MEMBERS AND FRIENDS: This last year has been very busy and productive for the Foundation. Despite the amount of work and time that is demanded of me to keep up my equine practice I have finally seen the completion of a book that I have been working on for the past 10 years entitled "Horses in Health and Disease." More important as far as the Foundation is concerned is our publication of the revised edition (Dec. 1972) of our book, "Aftercare of Oil Covered Birds."

With the continued help of Drs. Allen Pittman and Jim Roitman, we have been able to improve the safety of cleaning oiled birds by substituting a new cleaning solvent called Shell Sol 70 for the effective but more flammable Isoparaffin 150. The new procedure makes the cleaning of oiled birds very safe and practical to use by totally inexperienced help. The procedure has just recently been published by the European Council for distribution to countries throughout Europe and elsewhere in the world.

Again we had the chance to put the procedure to a field test when 17 birds were accidentally "oiled" in Richmond, California, this last month. All 17 were ready to be released in 48 hours but had to wait two weeks for their contaminated ponds to be cleaned.

In recognition of our efforts in this field, I was made "Director of Operations for Wildlife Disasters" by the city and county of San Francisco. I felt very appreciative for this honor and accepted the position as a

February 27, 1973

potential and planned function for the Foundation.

Also this last year has seen the launching of our program to involve veterinarians on a national basis to participate in helping injured wildlife through the National Wildlife Health Foundation. Mr. Duane Warren, a writer for one of the national veterinary journals—*Modern Veterinary Practice*—did a special article in their September issue entitled "Opening the Door to Wildlife Practice."

The issue was about veterinarians involved in wildlife work. The article outlined our program of developing a national roster of "Active Wildlife Veterinarians" willing to donate their time and skills to help injured wildlife. As a result, it brought an overwhelming response from my colleagues from all over the country and Canada who are willing to be so listed. Their response very much reconfirmed my feelings that so many of us in the veterinary profession truly care about our wildlife and animal life in general, without regard to financial reimbursement. Already we have some 200 veterinarians on this roster.

Also this year, as the Foundation has become better known, it has attracted many new members and we were very fortunate to have received a \$2,500 grant from the Lucius Beebe Foundation of San Francisco.

Our daily work of caring for the many injured, small creatures that are brought to us goes on, and it is rewarding to know that there are veterinarians throughout the United States doing the same thing—many having been treating wildlife for years.

Dear members and friends, we would like to thank you so much for all your past help and your continued support. With best wishes for you all; may the coming year bring days and months of happiness.

Very sincerely yours,

JAMES L. NAVAUX, D.V.M.,
Director.

THE RUTH LYONS CHRISTMAS FUND

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a rather unique and interesting fundraising program in Cincinnati which brings joy to thousands of hospitalized youngsters in Ohio, Kentucky, and Indiana.

The project, the Ruth Lyons Christmas Fund, is named after Ruth Lyons, a television personality who hosted the "50-50 Club" until her retirement in 1967.

The Christmas fund began in 1939 when Mrs. Lyons first broadcasted her "50-50 Club" radio show. Since that time more than \$7 million has been raised.

Today, almost 100 hospitals in Ohio, Kentucky, and Indiana participate in the project.

The money distributed to the hospitals is spent at the discretion of each hospital. The funds could be used to buy toys, games or dolls for each of the pediatric wards. The money also can be used to purchase pediatric medical equipment.

Since Ruth Lyons' retirement from the "50-50 Club" the show has been hosted by Bob Braun who can be seen on AVCO Broadcasting Stations in Cincinnati, Columbus, Dayton, and Indianapolis.

During the past 2 years, the viewers and listeners to the "50-50 Club" have contributed more than \$450,000 each year.

The total for the 1972 drive was \$460,395.36.

This money will go toward making life a little bit more enjoyable for youngsters who have to go through the experience of entering a hospital in the tri-State area.

It should be mentioned that Bob Braun not only directs the fundraising appeal from the station's studios but he also makes numerous appearances in the hospitals entertaining the youngsters.

Mr. Speaker, thousands of parents have expressed their thanks for the Ruth Lyons Christmas Fund which has gone a long way since 1939 to relieve the apprehension of each youngster who has entered one of our neighboring hospitals.

Bob Braun and his "50-50 Club" should be given a hearty thank you from all of us.

TAX STATUS FOR THE POW'S/MIA'S

HON. DONALD G. BROTMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. BROTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I joined last Thursday with a number of my colleagues on the House Ways and Means Committee in introducing legislation designed to provide more equitable tax treatment for certain prisoners of war and the families of those who remain in a missing status.

Specifically, this bill deals with four separate sections of the Internal Revenue Code. The first of these involves the tax status of combat pay received by a member of the armed services who is hospitalized as a result of injuries incurred in a combat zone.

Under existing law, such a man is allowed to exempt from his gross income all combat pay received prior to the cessation of hostilities. What of the man, however, who was injured in the waning days of the Vietnam conflict? If his hospitalization extends beyond the termination of combat activities, he will not receive such an exemption. Yet another man wounded earlier who completed hospitalization prior to the cease-fire could exempt all of his combat pay.

The bill I am introducing seeks to deal with this situation by exempting all combat pay up through the month hospitalization ceases even if all combatant activities have terminated. I feel that both cases I cited above are equally deserving and this bill would put them on an equal footing.

The second matter with which my bill deals involves the taxability of a man designated as missing in action and later determined to be dead. Current law would require his survivors to pay taxes on all income he received after his death. This provision would work an extreme hardship on many families and I do not believe that such was the intention of the Congress when it originally enacted this section.

Accordingly, this legislation would

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

change the law to forgive the tax liability of a serviceman who dies while in missing status for the entire period he was missing. In those instances where a widow has filed returns after the death of a deceased serviceman without claiming the benefits of existing law, this provision would permit her to claim the benefits of this tax forgiveness within 1 year from this bill's date of enactment, regardless of the statute of limitations.

The next provision of existing law which I feel works an injustice deals with the widow's rights to file a joint return up to the year of her husband's death. In the case of the MIA this date of death may not be known until years later, at which time the difference in tax liability between a joint and a separate return could weigh heavily on the financial resources of the widow.

This bill would seek to remedy this problem by permitting the spouse of a man listed in a missing status to file a joint return through the year in which final determination is made of his death by the Department of Defense, regardless of the actual date of that death.

Finally, the bill permits a wife or a representative of an estate of a man listed as an MIA to defer filing of any returns until either the serviceman returns or his MIA status is ended. Under this provision a wife could then file a joint return for the total period involved.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is with the utmost urgency that we deal with these problems as expeditiously as possible. April 15 is just around the corner and these people will have to be filing their tax returns for last year. We can solve a lot of problems and deal most equitably with these people if we enact the legislation I am suggesting at the earliest possible date.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE DISMANTLEMENT OF OEO AND LEGAL SERVICES MUST CEASE

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly disturbed by the administration's action in the past month with regard to the dismantling of the Office of Economic Opportunity. In my view, the administration has acted without legal authority and has violated clear congressional mandates in impounding some \$113.5 million in OEO funds appropriated for the current fiscal year and in ignoring Federal statutes requiring that the reorganization of executive agencies be submitted to Congress for review before they can become effective.

In addition, Acting OEO Director Howard Phillips sent a memorandum on January 29 to the chairman of all community action agencies informing them that their designation as the official local poverty agency had been rescinded. These actions were taken without first giving Congress or the public any prior notification or any opportunity to respond to the changes, as standard pro-

cedure requires. These community action agencies are the vital core of the antipoverty program and are essential to the coordination of antipoverty activities at the local level.

The problems faced by OEO's legal services program in particular illustrate very clearly the kind of administrative harassment which has threatened to disorganize totally the day-to-day functioning of legal services programs. The President's budget proposal provides for funding for legal services at the \$71.5 million level, but only if the program is administered by a new, still-to-be-created Legal Services Corporation. The administration has not yet submitted its legislation for the establishment of such a corporation, and judging from the wide-ranging debates last year in Congress over this very same issue, there is no guarantee that disagreements will be worked out and a satisfactory bill passed by Congress in time to prevent the disruption of existing legal services machinery.

Not only is the final status of legal services programs in jeopardy, but present programs, which have had their appropriations approved by Congress through June 30, 1973, have been required by OEO to renew their grants on a month-by-month basis. After a storm of public protest, Phillips today announced in testimony before a House Labor Subcommittee that the administration will resume normal funding cycles March 1.

As an indication of this type of harassment, the overall legal services agency for New York, Community Action for Legal Services—(CALS)—is presently being required to seek renewal of its grant every 30 days and is constantly having to adjust to unannounced changes in the rules governing the submission of these monthly budgets—all of this requiring considerable paperwork, duplication of effort, and most importantly valuable time lost which could otherwise have been spent in the representation of clients. Such disruptions tend to make it almost impossible for a program to receive its authorization for continued operation before it runs out of money. And once its funding has expired, the programs' operational expenses and staff uncertainties make it virtually impossible for the program to continue. Already in California 17 of the State's 34 legal services programs have stated they will have to close by the end of this month.

CALS has an excellent record of quality representation of tens of thousands of poor people in New York City. Its 160 well-trained and dedicated attorneys stand ready to carry out vital services in defending the legal rights of the poor, yet unless it receives notification of continued funding it cannot function efficiently. Hopefully the administration's decision today to resume normal funding cycles has come soon enough. What must be done now is to make certain that further, burdensome regulations will not be issued to sabotage the operation of present legal services programs.

I consider the legal services program to be one of the high points in the development of our antipoverty program, and

I am deeply concerned that the disruptions and demoralization caused by these administrative actions will result in serious diminution and perhaps elimination of such essential legal services representing the interests of the poor. I can see no purpose in Acting OEO Director Phillips' recent actions other than that of creating sufficient havoc so as to prohibit

effective program operation during the spring, while the continued dismantling of OEO is underway. Accordingly, I have joined other members of the New York delegation in writing to President Nixon, urging his intervention in ceasing the burdensome and unnecessary requirements being imposed on CALS by the national office of OEO.

In addition, I am cosponsoring legislation which would provide a procedure by which Congress can overrule the President's actions in impounding such congressionally appropriated funds as are presently being withheld from OEO. This is an extremely important issue, and I hope the Congress will consider it as a matter of first priority.

SENATE—Wednesday, February 28, 1973

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by Hon. SAM NUNN, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

PRAYER

Dr. Lawrence P. Fitzpatrick, National Chaplain, 1972-73, the American Legion, Coin, Iowa, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Father of us all, we pause at this time to acknowledge that we are Your children. Help us to become truly aware of the responsibilities that go with a seat in this Chamber. Make us awaken to the fact that we must put people before party; that men and women look to us for needed help; that children are waiting for us to free them from their shackles.

Keep us from the sin of administrivia; free us from temptations that waste our time; release us from all vices that prevent the fulfilling of our duties.

Finally, O God of mercy, direct our thoughts, actions, and words today that when we prepare for our night of rest we may look back and know that we have done our best this day for God and country. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., February 28, 1973.
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. SAM NUNN, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. NUNN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. NUNN) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submit-

ting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3577. An act to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 3577) to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 27, 1973, be dispensed with.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Robert E. Pursley, to be lieutenant general.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

U.S. ARMY

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. NAVY

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Louis Metzger, to be a lieutenant general.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army and in the Marine Corps, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LEST WE FORGET

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "The Vets: Heroes as Orphans" and an article entitled "The Permanent War Prisoners," both published in News-