

and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

62. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to funds for the construction of a bridge across the Snake River between Lewiston, Idaho, and Clarkston, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

63. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to Federal aid for highway construction; to the Committee on Public Works.

64. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to a Federal-aid Highway Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

65. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, relative to veterans' pensions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

66. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, relative to prevent-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ing welfare assistance or veterans' pensions from being reduced because of increases in social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CRANE:

H.R. 5188. A bill for the relief of Jack T. Arnold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 5189. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating to cause the vessel Anna Lynn to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastwise privileges; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 5190. A bill for the relief of Sherman E. Neblett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 5191. A bill for the relief of Samuel T. Ansley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 5192. A bill for the relief of Bora Kacarevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

57. The SPEAKER presented petition of William Moyer and Efrain Delgado, Joliet, Ill., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### WORLD FREEDOM DAY

#### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the great commemorative events celebrated in the Republic of China is World Freedom Day which was held on January 23 this past year. A featured speaker at the program was our respected colleague, Congressman Wilbur C. Daniel, of Virginia.

I am pleased to insert into the RECORD at this point addresses by His Excellency President Chiang Kai-shek, His Excellency President Park Chung Hee, of the Republic of Korea, His Excellency President Nguyen Van Thieu and people of the Republic of Vietnam, and a cable message from His Excellency Ferdinand E. Marcos, President of the Republic of the Philippines:

PRESIDENT CHIANG KAI-SHEK'S WORLD FREEDOM DAY MESSAGE

Nineteen years ago today more than 22,000 Chinese and Korean prisoners of war defied Communist intimidation and lures in a collective choice of freedom. This marked a glorious milestone in man's struggle for liberty. The voice of justice and righteousness was broadcast to every corner of the world and anti-Communists and freedom fighters were given immense encouragement. This is a time when the atmosphere of international appeasement is rampant. The Chinese Communists, who are the public enemies of mankind, are stepping up the tempo of their united front conspiracy abroad. It is at such a moment that people of all walks of life within our country are expanding the World Freedom Day Movement, and have invited outstanding anti-Communist leaders from five continents and representatives of freedom fighters in Vietnam and Korea to come here especially to attend the World Freedom Day Rally of the Republic of China, 1973. This really has the greatest significance and represents the shouldering up of a most solemn mission.

The world situation has been marked by turmoil and unrest during the last year. Some democratic countries have failed to distinguish right from wrong and have flouted principle and justice. This has created new opportunities for the Chinese Com-

munists to engage in struggle, to infiltrate under the guise of negotiation, to utilize the seat they usurped at the United Nations to further schemes of "revolution against the world" and to split the free nations by holding out false lures of trade and diplomatic relations. The basic contradiction between the democracies and the Communist camp can never be removed. There is no relaxation of the conflict on the surface; in actuality it has been sharpened.

The rules governing the evolution of mankind have indicated that justice has always prevailed over injustice and freedom has always triumphed over despotism. Wicked trickery and treacherous scheming may fool some of the people some of the time but can never fool all of the people all of the time. The Chinese Communists have exported violence and chaos the world over to support terrorist activities and encourage subversion and division. They have completely exposed their ugly face of aggressive expansionism. Unceasing waves of refugees from the mainland, serious shortage of food on the mainland, power struggle of the Chinese Communist leadership and the further intensification of the "criticism-revisionism-rectification" campaigns combine to demonstrate that the Peiping regime is internally barren and so weak as to be fast approaching collapse. Recently the Chinese Communists have resorted to underhanded attempts at so-called "unification, return and identification" to lure the overseas Chinese. Their heads are hidden but their tails are showing. Such conduct shows their fear and the holowness of their hearts; in the end they have no choice except to reveal the dangers they hold in their hands.

Our Republic of China, based on the Three Principles of the People, is the central magnetic pole to which Chinese everywhere give their allegiance, and is also the pillar of indestructible stone blocking the adverse current of international appeasement. The entire nation has been firm with dignity and self-reliant with vigor for the past year. People at home and abroad have worked hard and successfully with one heart and one soul, ever stronger in their confidence that the fate of the nation is in our own hands and that victory and success depend on our own efforts. We must henceforth unify culture and politics among compatriots in front of and behind the enemy lines, as well as those overseas. We must also join forces with the expanding forces of freedom and justice within the anti-Communist movement throughout the world. In doing so, we shall smash the united front tactics of the Chinese Communists, strengthen the forces of freedom and move forward in the struggle for to-

tal victory to assure the freedom of mankind. I hope that all of us will join together in achieving these ends.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY PARK CHUNG HEE, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

It is a great pleasure for me to extend my sincere greetings on the occasion of the 1973 "World Freedom Day."

Nineteen years ago today, north Korean and Communist Chinese prisoners of the Korean War decided of their own volition to put an end to their dark life under Communist rule, and chose to lead a bright and hopeful life in the Free World.

Now in observing the anniversary of this historic day, we come to appreciate an important lesson that only the courageous and the decisive can afford to enjoy priceless freedom.

Though trends of the world today are characterized by the decline of ideology and the emergence of power politics, this does not mean that the importance of freedom is being reduced.

Freedom, before anything else—even political ideology—is a basic requirement for human dignity, and freedom is a natural mode of life for all mankind.

We should now divorce ourselves from the past stance of defensive freedom when we were chiefly concerned about what to oppose in order to preserve our freedom. Instead, we should now be more concerned about active freedom; that is, how to adapt ourselves voluntarily to the changing situation of the times and strive more strenuously to realize this active freedom and further promote it.

Here I once again express my profound appreciation for your devoted efforts and accomplishments to assist the oppressed peoples of the world, and look forward to your continued and even more vigorous efforts to achieve and foster this active freedom.

I pray that your worthy efforts, coupled with the cooperation of all free peoples of the world, will bring about early realization of our common goal: freedom, peace and prosperity for all mankind.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY NGUYEN VAN THIEU, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF VIET-NAM, ON THE WORLD FREEDOM DAY

On behalf of the Government and people of the Republic of Viet-Nam, I wish to extend my cordial greetings and heartfelt congratulations to all freedom-loving people from every part of the world on the occasion of the World Freedom Day.

The year of 1972 witnessed crucial events and developments which profoundly altered the patterns of international relations, particularly in the Asian Pacific region.

In the face of these difficulties, it is important that freedom loving people everywhere consolidate their forces and unite their ranks in the fight for freedom and democracy.

In the year which has just elapsed, the people of South Viet-Nam have thwarted an all-out offensive launched by the North Vietnamese aggressors.

It is significant that during the North Vietnamese Communist invasion of South Viet-Nam, almost one million people fled their homes in the areas temporarily controlled by the Communists to seek freedom in resettlement centers under the Republic of Viet-Nam Government protection. This mass exodus once more eloquently demonstrated the Vietnamese people's yearning for freedom and recalled the historic exodus of one million people from North Viet-Nam in 1954, and the gallant deeds of 22,000 Chinese and North Korean prisoners of war who, under the United Nations principle of voluntary repatriation, resisted Communist inducements and elected to seek freedom on January 23, 1954.

The commemoration you are holding in the Republic of China today bespeaks free men's resolve to build a world of peace in liberty and justice. I sincerely wish you every success in the week long activities highlighting the human deep attachment to freedom everywhere.

**CABLE MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY FERNAND E. MARCOS, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES**

On the occasion of "World Freedom Day," the Filipino people affirm their oneness with all of those who champion freedom and dignity all over the world.

Freedom for us Filipinos is precious indeed, because we attained it through the dedication and sacrifices of countless men and women. Our commitment to freedom is a continuing one, sustained by the vigilance of our people and affirmed by our labors to make our nation strong.

Today when the battle for freedom is fought in many parts of the world by men who would not be enslaved, it is the duty of each of us to make the cause of human liberty, freedom and dignity a constant creed, an everyday task, an unending commitment.

**NATIONAL NUTRITION WEEK**

**HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.**

OF NEW YORK

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

*Monday, March 5, 1973*

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, the American Dietetic Association has proclaimed the week of March 5, 1973, National Nutrition Week. On this occasion, I would like to pay honor to the American Dietetic Association, who for the past 50 years has taken the lead in bringing to the American people the values and the necessity of proper nutrition as an integral part of good health.

The American Dietetic Association, 24,000 strong, has constantly brought good nutrition programs to the attention of every sector of the American public.

In a day when many things are taken for granted, I believe it is only appropriate that we pause and thank this organization which has done so much for the continued betterment of the health of the people of the United States.

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

**FIGHTING FILTH**

**HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

*Monday, March 5, 1973*

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, this country, despite the high moral values of the vast majority of our citizens, is in danger of being swamped by a tide of pornographic filth.

Many once fine movie houses have become smut palaces while a money-hungry band of film producers turns out a growing number of pictures of shocking and disgusting character.

This has resulted from the refusal of our courts to crack down. Instead of upholding decency, the jurists have quibbled and nit-picked over the question of what is and what is not an instance of obscenity and their constitutional right to deal with it.

I can point out to them that never since the adoption of the Constitution has there been such a wave of smut and that if those who drafted this cherished document has meant for it to give a green light to degeneracy then they would have allowed it in their time—and, most certainly, did not.

Singularly responsible for today's dirty movies and the scatology which passes for some of the so-called modern literature is that U.S. Supreme Court finding that an obvious obscenity is not illegal if it can claim some redeeming social or artistic value. We have seen what clever lawyers in the hire of venal producers and publishers have done with that loophole.

With this in mind and fearful, as is every truly concerned American, with the effects of this salacious binge on the morals of the rising generation, I am glad to note that the Justice Department has not given up entirely. Federal grand juries in Washington and Memphis, Tenn., now have indicted dozens of filth purveyors—producers, distributors, and exhibitors and the hope is that these cases will bring about new court decisions to allow our country to cleanse itself and, indeed, deal firmly with the pornography profiteers.

If these cases fail to produce such rulings, then it will become the responsibility of Congress to devise and submit whatever kind of constitutional amendment is required to clear up the legal confusion and correct this problem. I realize that the obscenity bit has become a cause celebre with certain groups of persons who consider themselves to be ultraliberals and advanced thinkers, far out beyond the mental precepts of ordinary folk. But how can these people with their vaunted notions about freedom actually condone as proper the lasciviousness of certain current movies and publications?

Aside from enriching their makers and merchants, these things can have no other purpose than to strip another layer from the civilization of our society and seek to turn mankind back toward the jungle. The courts backed by an aroused

public opinion and supporting the police either must bring a stop to this, or Congress must seek to do so by the amendment process.

*March 5, 1973*

**COMMONSENSE NEEDED FOR AUTOMOBILE EMISSIONS**

**HON. JAMES M. COLLINS**

OF TEXAS

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

*Monday, March 5, 1973*

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, pragmatic solutions are needed for pollution control in this years transition. The immediate actions required by our present legislation must be modified.

This is particularly true in regard to automobile emission levels. In the Clean Air Act passed in 1970 the Federal standards were so stringent that they required that by 1976, emissions of carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, and oxides of nitrogen be reduced to an average 5 percent of pre-1968 levels.

We would do well to consider changing Federal standards to the California level. The automobile industry has made tremendous strides. By 1972, the cars had 50 percent emission standards. However, by 1976, the standards will run over \$787 per car if we meet the Federal requirements. To meet the California standard, we would cost out around \$397 per car.

It is already much more expensive to drive an automobile. My car is now running on 10 miles to the gallon where I had expected to be getting 14. With the additional emission equipment I anticipate next year's car will be getting 7 miles to the gallon. One of the first positive actions we should take in Congress is to move this transitional date of 1975-76 to 1980. We have been spending 300 years developing our pollution economy. It would be more pragmatic to take 10 years to begin work on an effective transition to clean air.

The automobile makers need more time to improve the vitality of the new motors. Twice I have driven from home without allowing my car 10 minutes to warm up. On those two occasions I got about 50 yards down the street and the car konked out like it was flooded. The emission controls definitely limit an even supply of gasoline.

In this day of rising costs we should try to effect the clean air level while still keeping the cost of operating a car as low as possible. With more gasoline being required this means the cost of gasoline will be about 40 percent more for a new car owner. Optimistically, manufacturers hope that the emission control equipment overhaul will be every 50,000 miles, but to be realistic, it will probably be around 25,000 miles. Added to this comes all this new safety equipment with its electronic chances of shorting. With the limitations of skilled mechanics and an oil shortage within the United States we should be considering greater utilization of these resources.

## KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY WILLIAM J. GUSTE, JR.

## HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished attorney general of the State of Louisiana delivered the keynote address to the 42d Annual Convention of the National Housing Conference yesterday here in Washington. I believe his excellent speech will be of widespread interest and I am pleased to include it in the RECORD:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY WILLIAM J. GUSTE, JR., ATTORNEY GENERAL OF LOUISIANA TO THE NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE

Since its organization in 1931, the National Housing Conference has been recognized as the conscience of the public interest in programs for housing, urban renewal and community development. Its members include representatives of public interest organizations, local officials, labor officials, church, business and professional groups who share the goal of providing adequate housing for people of all income.

This 42nd Convention of NHC may well be the most important which has ever been held. For programs which it has taken years to develop and to bring to a reasonable point of productivity are threatened, and if it were left alone to the will of the Administration abolished.

This Convention then is a test of the depth of sincerity of every person in attendance and the constituencies which you represent. It is a test of the values which American people hold and the respect and compassion which they have for their fellow Americans.

Some new terminology has suddenly burst into the vocabulary of local and national officials and the public at large. Words like "general revenue sharing" and "special revenue sharing" and "community development".

Now I believe that it is most important that the National Housing Conference not let the Nation get confused with terminology. Here I refer specifically to the Administration's so-called "Community Development Special Revenue Sharing".

Actually, this is a program of consolidating several existing grant-in-aid programs into a single block grant to be allocated to units of local government.

We believe that in general this is a far superior method of administering grants for community facilities and services.

Suffice it to say that it would go a long way towards overcoming the difficulties implicit in applying for and securing separate, narrow, categorical programs for cities.

Furthermore, I am convinced that local governments do have the capacity to decide what programs are best for their communities.

Yes, our cities need a more efficient delivery of federal funds to serve their people. They need the grant procedures simplified and grants expanded.

But, they want these programs improved—not "canned".

They want these programs speeded up—not postponed.

They don't want programs abandoned, that are in fact serving a vital purpose, until Congress has created workable alternatives.

Yes, NHC believes that each community should decide upon a comprehensive community development plan which would include action to eliminate slums and blight and provide for housing its low and moderate income families and provide adequate facilities and social services and full employment opportunities for all its citizens.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

But this Conference does not want, and I don't believe the American people, when they realize what is being done, will want the promise of special revenue sharing if it means the phasing down and phasing out of vital programs for decent housing in suitable neighborhoods which have taken years to build to their present level of service.

We don't want the cities of this Nation to flounder for a year or more and in addition lose the momentum they have developed in meeting the needs of their people.

And that's what we're talking about: the needs of people with low and moderate incomes—for a home that is safe and warm, for plumbing and a sewer system that works and does not pollute, for better streets and drainage, for pure water. In a word, we're talking about things and services that affect human lives and alleviate real human miseries.

Certainly, we should eliminate flaws in the categorical programs. Certainly, the programs as a whole can be improved. This is precisely what National Housing Conference has been trying to do for years.

But, I don't believe we can tell the American people that they must wait two or three years for a house that doesn't leak and a better and safer neighborhood while the Administration tries to figure out ways to improve its administration.

Yes, we want block grants. But, we want the categorical grants—which have taken years to develop—to continue with full and, where necessary, increased funding, right up to the time that the community development block grant programs are put into effect.

This means that programs like urban renewal, neighborhood facilities, open space land basic water and sewer facilities and model cities programs should be continued without interruption.

This means that in addition to physical development, necessary social services and on-going planning and management activities should be continued without interruption.

And this means that adequate funds be authorized and appropriated, and not impounded, to cover the unmet needs of America's cities and their people without interruption.

But instead of following such a policy of continuity, the President has interrupted, suspended or terminated programs, imperative for the survival of American cities.

He has suspended the Housing Assistance programs: the Section 235 and 236 programs, the Public Housing Program, and the Non-Profit Sponsor Aid Program, all effective January 5, 1973.

He has suspended the program to improve Public Housing effective June 30, 1973.

He has announced the termination of the Community Development Programs: the Model Cities Program, the Neighborhood Facilities Program, the Urban Renewal Program, and the Rehabilitation Loans Program all effective June 30, 1973.

The Open Space Land Program, Water and Sewer Facilities Program, and Public Facility Loans Program, are all terminated January 5, 1973.

Furthermore he has suspended most housing programs of the Farmers Home Administration: the interest credit loans Program, the 502 and 515 home ownership and rental housing Programs water and waste disposal grants, and, all loans and grants for farm labor, all effective January 9, 1973.

But, beyond this, President Nixon has stated in his budget that the Department of Housing and Urban Development will not approve any new projects under any of these programs in 1974, and neither will the Farmers Home Administration.

And at a press conference following the budget submission, he announced that if Congress were to restore his cuts in programs, he would veto them; and if Congress passes

them over his veto, he would impound the funds.

The audacity and over-confidence of the President is unbelievable! His action and his posture is arbitrary, unilateral and flies in the face of the will of Congress. In effect, he is repealing laws enacted by Congress and signed by the President.

As State Senator, it was my privilege to be the author of Urban Renewal Enabling legislation for Louisiana. And later to bring the Model Cities Program to New Orleans. I don't propose to let those vital programs go down the drain for my State or for any other state.

Without them, the spread of slums and blight will continue, the flight to the suburbs will continue, crime will increase, and the expenses of operating city government will be left to a residuum population least able to support the costs of municipal services yet most requiring them.

As Attorney General, I am studying the possibility of a suit against the President and Executive Branch of government prohibiting the impoundment of funds which rightfully enure to the benefit of my State and its cities on the grounds that such impoundment denies Louisiana and each individual state the protection and the benefits of the separation of governmental powers assured each state in the United States Constitution.

But beyond this, I do not believe the Congress of the United States should lie supinely on its back and permit the President to trample on its programs. It cannot permit one man to override the vote of 535 members of Congress. It cannot permit government by presidential decree!

I believe that at this point, our Nation's legislators should rise above partisan politics. Every Congressman—Republican or Democrat—should recognize that the President's policy of impoundment—of in effect vetoing programs on a line item basis—and unilaterally repealing laws is an affront to Congress as a branch of National Government, and an affront to each individual member.

For the question which is involved here is not simply whether this Nation will continue to work toward the national goal of a decent house in a suitable living environment for all our people.

The question has now become whether we will change our constitutional form of government. The question is whether the Congress of the United States should become an Advisory Committee to the President.

For my part, I do not believe it should.

Congress must re-assert itself. Congress must enact laws to control impoundment. Congress must rewrite the budget. It must once again establish that housing our people in decent homes and good neighborhoods is still America's number one domestic problem.

Now the President argues that he is using the budget to prevent increased taxes and to control inflation. What is really happening is that he is telling the people in cities that if they want to prevent their city from dying, if they want to restore and revitalize it; if they want to help the poor and the elderly, the untrained, the unemployed, the sick, the school drop-out and other victims of poverty who are concentrated in our cities, then vote increased sales and property taxes.

When the Mayors of our Nation's cities sought revenue sharing—they were seeking a way to share in the national income derived from taxes based on ability to pay.

They were not seeking advice from the President to raise regressive local sales and property taxes!

They were seeking relief vital to their communities. They were not asking the President to dump an additional load on the backs of their local property taxpayers.

And then there is the myth about inflation.

And here I'd like to ask a few questions. What is worse a 5 or 6 or 7 per cent annual

March 5, 1973

increase in costs—or the total loss of a pay check through unemployment.

What is worse: a slight reduction in purchasing power—which for working Americans can and should be offset by a wage increase—or the loss of over 3 million man years of employment?

And that's what it's all about. The National Housing Conference has estimated that the President's Program to hold back on new housing starts in Fiscal years 1973 and 1974, and not use the contract authority under Section 235 and 236, and to hold back on related facilities and services, will result in a loss of 660,000 HUD commitments for homes and 100,000 Farmers Home Administration homes. And it will have a total economic impact loss of \$28.5 billion in expenditures.

And, I repeat, this represents an employment loss of over 3 million man years.

Now my question is this: Should we fight inflation by increasing unemployment?

Should we fight inflation by putting people out of work?

Should we fight inflation by putting working men on welfare?

No, I don't believe that that is the way to fight inflation. I don't believe the American people want to fight inflation that way.

Yes, cut the fat out of the budget to fight inflation.

But, don't cut programs designed to bring the under-privileged into the main stream of American life.

Don't cut programs designed to fight the cause of crime in the streets.

Don't cut programs which provide jobs for the jobless, and which can make it possible for all to find a job.

Yes, we must live within our means. But, let's not stifle the national economy in doing so. Yes, we must cut, but in doing so let's not bring on a recession. And let's not cut where it most effects the least fortunate people of our country.

Just one other point about inflation. If we cut down on housing production in the face of increased population, and hence increased demand for housing, there can be only one result. Since the demand is greater than the supply, the cost of housing will go up!

Since housing is in short supply, the average American of low and moderate income will have to pay more rent each month and more on his monthly note.

His cost of living will increase!

And this is the real inflation that threatens the American people if the President's budget and plans restricting the construction of decent homes is permitted to go unchallenged.

The President declares that he wants to restore to our cities and states the authority to determine their own fate. But, the fact is that through impoundment and veto he is imposing on the Nation's cities his personal choice of programs to be funded. He is depriving our cities the free choice they now have to participate or not to participate in programs designed to meet national goals.

If this is the new federalism, the American people cannot accept it.

NHC members know that an essential of a suitable living environment is employment.

Yet the Administration's budget proposes to eliminate more than 50 per cent of the funds presently available for manpower training and for jobs for those who really want to work and can't find jobs.

It would terminate the public employment programs so that there will be 180,000 less job opportunities for those in need, many of whom are Viet Nam Veterans.

It proposes no monies for summer programs which provided 740,000 jobs last year for young people. It cancels opportunities for 2 million youths to engage in summer recreational and cultural programs. And a million more will not get to a job or recreation because of lack of transportation.

And all of this is in addition to the count-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

less job opportunities which will be lost because of cutbacks on new housing and related facilities construction starts.

All of these people, these families, will be without a paycheck when these programs expire.

Last month, as Attorney General of Louisiana, I attended the National Conference on Criminal Justice sponsored by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the Department of Justice. Over and over, it was emphasized that the quality of life in the United States depends on curbing crime.

But, cracking down on criminals *alone* is not the answer.

Most cities need more and better policemen, swifter justice, and correction procedures that really correct.

But, the mere apprehension of an offender does not solve the problem that caused the crime in the first place.

If we are to fight crime and preserve domestic tranquility, we must fight the causes of crime.

And all of the evidence will support the fact that a great percentage of crime is bred in slums and blight, in poverty and ignorance and unemployment. It is bred in inner cities and rural areas where people have lost faith in the system; where people have lost hope; and where there no longer exists the opportunity, and the promise for them that America once held.

If we really want to make our streets safe and our homes secure, the best way to do it is to improve our homes and home life, and our neighborhoods, and provide adequate education and job training and jobs for all.

There is no better way to do this than to continue without postponement those programs designed to bring back to life and decency our rural areas as well as the hearts of American cities.

Through our individual states and cities, we must appeal to every Congressman. Congress must recapture its own soul. It must accept responsibility to reorder national priorities and to produce a balanced budget; it must control impoundments.

We must not let negativism capture our spirit.

We must get back to fundamentals.

The National Housing Conference and the Congress must renew the national commitment to meet the Nation's housing needs of 26 million homes in the decade of the 70's. It must step up the pace of construction if it is to reach the goal of 6 million new homes for low and moderate income families with related community facilities.

In this task, Congress will have the full support of the National Housing Conference. For there is no higher priority than decent homes in suitable environments in our rural areas, in our cities, and in our suburbs.

But over and beyond this, we can never forget that the poor, the ill-housed, the aged, the unemployed are not abstractions. They are living flesh and blood. And we cannot ignore their plight—for we are, under one God, indeed our brother's keepers.

## PAN AM TO SOLICIT UNICEF FUNDS FOR UNITED NATIONS

**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, donations to UNICEF are reportedly being solicited by Pan Am from their passengers returning from foreign travel.

Many American travelers finding themselves with foreign change may pre-

fer giving their donations to the Salvation Army to help underprivileged American children rather than supporting Red causes of the U.N. The Salvation Army Headquarters is located at 503 E Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20001.

I include a related news clipping at this point:

[From the State Times (Louisiana),

February 4, 1973]

### COINS GO TO UNICEF

Passengers on Pan American World Airways' flights to the United States soon will have an excellent use for all those foreign coins that seem to accumulate during a vacation or business trip abroad.

Pan Am cabin attendants will distribute envelopes addressed to the United Nations Children's Fund on all international flights to U.S. destinations. Passengers need only slip their unwanted foreign coins and currency in the envelope, and the money will be put to good use by UNICEF to provide food, medicine, and education for children in 111 countries around the world.

## SOUTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY URGES HIGH LEVEL OF HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

**HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the South Carolina General Assembly has approved a very timely concurrent resolution urging the Congress to continue Federal aid highway programs at present levels. The authors of this resolution, Representatives Jarvis Klapman, Norma C. Russell, George Dean Johnson, Richard T. Hines, James B. Brandt, Lucius O. Porth, Albert L. Kleckley, E. Jarvis Morris, James H. Moss, Thomas A. Hutto, and Charles N. Plowden are to be highly commended for their action. They are, in our opinion, absolutely right. Mr. Speaker, the concurrent resolution follows:

H. 1421

A concurrent resolution to memorialize the Congress of the United States to continue Federal aid to State highway construction at present levels to prevent serious deterioration of our highway system.

Whereas, federal aid to highway construction has for many years been a basic support to the construction and maintenance of highways throughout the nation; and

Whereas, state programs have been planned assuming federal assistance would be available; and

Whereas, federal revenue from gasoline taxes should properly be used for highways purposes; and

Whereas, there are present indications in the news media and elsewhere that federal assistance to state highway building programs will be substantially curtailed which, if true, would severely damage existing and planned state highway programs. Now, therefore,

Be it resolved, by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

That the Congress of the United States be, and hereby is, memorialized to maintain at least at present levels, the federal aid programs for highway construction in the state to insure continued progress and improved safety on these vital arteries of commerce and public and private transportation.

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

#### ONE-MAN RULE?

#### HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, some commentators say that the recent congressional protestations over Presidential encroachment on the other branches of Government are much ado about nothing.

I may agree that some Members of Congress, being politicians, have a proclivity to exaggerate. But mark my words, Mr. Speaker, that I am extremely serious when I note with alarm and shock the implications of a recent statement by John Ehrlichmann, the President's domestic affairs advisory.

Mr. Ehrlichmann, one of the most powerful men in America, due to his closeness to the President, has recently stated that the President is one-man rule, and that is the way it should be.

Mr. Ehrlichmann's statement lessens democracy, and weakens our Constitution. This statement makes any congressional protestations about the Constitution valid—so valid that it is frightening.

WCBS Radio, of New York, recently broadcast an editorial on Mr. Ehrlichmann's statement. I include the transcript of that editorial to be reprinted here in the RECORD, and I associate myself with the views of WCBS on this subject:

#### PRESIDENTIAL POWER

FEBRUARY 13, 1973.

The confrontation in Washington over Presidential power may seem a bit abstract to some people. The fine points of the Constitution are the province of the lawyers, the judges, the experts and the historians. Whether or not the President has the authority to refuse to spend money, for example, will probably be decided in the heady atmosphere of the Supreme Court.

But it's wrong for any of us to think we are removed from that debate. At stake is not only how money is spent, but the form of our government itself.

We were given insight into the Administration's viewpoint recently by John Ehrlichmann, the President's Domestic Affairs Advisor. He reasserted the right of the President to manage the budget with White House advisors, not answerable to Congress. He was asked by a reporter if this wasn't drifting into the area of "one-man rule."

(Tape insert)

JOHN EHRICHMANN. "That's what the President of the United States is, Mr. Rather."

DAN RATHER. "One-man rule?"

JOHN EHRICHMANN. "Yes, sir. He's the only elected officer elected by all the people of the United States, unlike the Senators or Congressmen."

(Tape ends)

Well, there we have it. One-man rule, endorsed by one of the President's closest advisors.

We're not qualified to comment on the fine points of the Constitution. But we are qual-

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

fied to comment on one-man rule. We don't like the idea. We think it's dangerous. It's certainly not part of the meaning of the word "democracy" as we understand it.

Mr. Ehrlichmann is right when he says the President is elected by the people. But not as a one-man ruler. He is elected in the context of checks and balances, a system designed to prevent one-man rule.

The President can make a strong argument for cutting back on wasteful spending. The Congress can make a strong argument against the President altering policies it has voted. As we said, the final answer in that dispute will come from the Supreme Court. Whatever the outcome, we hope that the principle of "majority rule" is reaffirmed.

#### TREES FOR CONGRESS

#### HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to be able to advise all Members of the Congress that during last week each congressional office received a 2-year-old noble fir tree seedling. I hope and trust each office will take great care with the seedling tree.

These seedling trees were grown in tree nurseries of the Industrial Forestry Association located in Canby, Oreg., in my congressional district. They were grown from seed-bearing cones collected on the slopes of Mount Hood and they are being given to each congressional office through the courtesy of the National Forest Products Association.

If you are careful with the care and feeding of your young noble fir seedling tree, you will have an opportunity to observe in microcosm what occurs in some of the great, managed forests of America from coast to coast. You should be aware that this seedling tree, later in the spring, can be moved outside and planted in a sunny spot. With frequent watering it will develop roots quickly. In time your seedling can grow and develop into a magnificent tree affording you many years of enjoyment.

The noble fir so-called because of its straight, majestic growth and excellent quality of its wood, is native to the mountainous regions of western Oregon and Washington. It grows best in climates with a short, cool growing season and abundant annual precipitation. However, it is adaptable enough to be planted and grown in most parts of the United States.

The environmental importance of trees such as your new noble fir seedling is, in my opinion, every bit as important as the economic significance of trees. Planting your small tree will someday, hopefully, enrich people you may never know. That is why the planting of trees and the growing of trees holds a special place in the minds of most people, including most of the Members of Congress. The regrowth of forests in this country is one of Nature's greatest benefits and one which, on both private and public lands, we in the Congress should give special attention to.

The forest products industries in the

United States plant more trees every year than any other group in the world. But they do not consider this an act of nobility; rather they view it as an act of wisdom. More than a million and a half acres of forest land are planted each year—or more than one tree for every tree we use.

Obviously of great importance are the products we obtain from our trees and forests, including particularly the lumber, plywood, and other products used in housing. I think it is important to recognize that wood is a basic structural material like steel, aluminum, brick, or concrete. It is potentially the most plentiful industrial raw material in North America, and the only one that can be perpetually renewed by nature. Equally significant, it does not require irreplaceable ores or fossil fuels in its formation which depends only on solar energy, soil and water.

I mention all of the above matters in connection with the story of the noble fir, because I am pleased that each congressional office will have an opportunity to share with me my enthusiasm for trees and for their regeneration and growth. I appreciate the thoughtfulness of the National Forest Products Association in making these 2-year old tree seedlings available and for arranging to have one delivered to each congressional office. I hope every Member will give his or her tree seedling the very best of care.

#### HANOI MUST ANSWER MIA QUESTIONS

#### HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial from Lansing's State Journal, which has recently come to my attention raises the question of the whereabouts of MIA's who were known to be prisoners and who have not shown up on Communist POW lists. As this article suggests, the concern that the United States should not consider economic aid to North Vietnam until Hanoi provides answers regarding MIA's is a very real and valid concern, and one that must be recognized. Mr. Speaker, I include this editorial in the RECORD:

#### HANOI MUST ANSWER MIA QUESTIONS

The joy and relief experienced by all Americans as prisoners of war trickle back from Vietnam will mount as more groups of POW's are released until the exchange is over sometime late in March.

By that time well over 500 American prisoners will be back home. Thousands of North and South Vietnamese prisoners also are being released.

But for many other Americans there remains only anxiety and uncertainty. The reason is that there are an estimated 1,300 Americans officially listed as missing in action throughout Indochina. As yet, they are unaccounted for by Communist forces.

The problem of accounting for the missing has been a staggering one in any war. It will be more so in the tangled jungles of Indo-

china, large portions of which are still occupied by Communist forces.

A sinister aspect of the current situation, however, is the growing evidence that some of the MIA's, the number is uncertain, were known to be prisoners at one time. Their names have not shown up on any of the official Communist POW lists—yet. Why Hanoi remains silent on this question is still a mystery.

Once the current exchange has been completed, it is essential that the U.S. Government wage a full scale diplomatic offensive demanding that Hanoi, the Viet Cong and other Communist units in Laos and Cambodia make an accounting on the MIA's.

There should be no serious thought of economic aid to North Vietnam until Hanoi provides some answers.

## OUR BLOATED STATE DEPARTMENT

### HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have all been impressed by the work of Dr. Henry Kissinger in formulating our foreign policy and handling our foreign affairs. Even more impressive is the fact that Dr. Kissinger handles his job with a staff of only 120 persons.

Since all of the important work in our foreign affairs is apparently now accomplished by Dr. Kissinger's office, for better or worse, the question arises as to the necessity of maintaining our State Department in its presently bloated and topheavy condition.

The President's proposed budget for fiscal year 1974 lists 22,671 State Department personnel who deal solely with the administration of our foreign affairs. This figure, an increase of 244 in the past 2 years, does not even include those persons involved in foreign aid, international organizations, educational exchange programs, or refugee assistance.

While the need for Ambassadors and visa clerks is clear to all, this huge overall personnel total averages out to 194 people for each of the 117 countries, large and small, where we now have Ambassadors.

This clearly excessive number commands a payroll of some \$83 million—up almost \$4 million in 1 year.

Even more astonishing is the great concentration of highly paid executives in this section of the State Department:

#### EXECUTIVE POSITIONS IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT, FISCAL YEAR 1974 (ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS)

| Class                | Salary range      | Positions |
|----------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| Ambassadors.....     | \$36,000-\$42,500 | 117       |
| Executive level..... | 36,000- 60,000    | 40        |
| Supergrades.....     | 29,472- 36,000    | 972       |
| High level.....      | 18,737- 33,260    | 2,706     |
| Total.....           |                   | 3,835     |

If you exclude ambassadors from the total, the State Department still has 31 times the number of executives that Dr. Kissinger feels he needs to run America's foreign affairs.

A thorough review of State Department personnel requirements is badly needed. As the Congress moves to reset

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

our national priorities, let us take a good, hard look at the wasteful numbers of bureaucrats filling the many costly positions at the State Department.

## SOCIAL SECURITY FOR INTERNED JAPANESE AMERICANS

### HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the Social Security Amendments of 1972, in one particular respect, moved to correct a longstanding injustice to a certain sector of American society—Japanese Americans. This particular provision in the 1972 amendments gave social security credit to those Japanese Americans who were interned during World War II.

This provision was a step in redressing the suffering and hardship imposed upon these people. However, it has come to my attention that an important segment was omitted from receiving these benefits—those Japanese-Americans who voluntarily evacuated restricted areas. These people—just as those who were interned—were forced on extremely short notice, to give up their personal possessions, leave their friends, and start life again in a totally different and often-times, hostile environment.

It might be argued that these people who voluntarily evacuated had an opportunity to work and therefore earn social security credits. However, if relying upon this argument, it would be good to remind oneself of the atmosphere and general societal attitude toward Japanese-Americans and then picture the discrimination they, in all probability, faced in attempting to obtain good, steady employment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the prompt and favorable consideration of this bill which would further rectify a grave injustice to a people who have contributed much to this country.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 5182

A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the coverage extended to individuals of Japanese ancestry who were interned in the United States during World War II shall also be extended to individuals of Japanese ancestry who voluntarily left the areas of their residence in order to avoid such internment

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 231(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(a)", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:*

"(2) Such term also includes an individual who—

"(A) resided on December 7, 1941, in a military or geographic area in the United States from which persons of Japanese ancestry were evacuated or excluded during World War II and interned as described in paragraph (1); and

"(B)(1) voluntarily departed from such area in anticipation of the order for such evacuation or exclusion, and remained outside such area (and all similar areas) during any period of time from December 7, 1941,

March 5, 1973

through December 31, 1946, with the consent or approval of the public authorities having jurisdiction therein, in order to avoid being interned as described in paragraphs (1), and (ii) would have been so interned but for such departure."

(b) Section 231(b)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "(in addition to any wages actually paid to him)", and by adding at the end thereof (after and below clause (B)) the following new sentence:

"Wages which an individual is deemed to have been paid during any period under the preceding sentence shall be in addition to any wages actually paid to him; except that, in the case of an individual who is an 'internee' with respect to the period involved solely by reason of subsection (a)(2), the amount of the wages which he is deemed to have been paid during such period under such sentence shall be reduced by the amount of any wages or self-employment income with which he is otherwise credited for such period on the records of the Secretary under section 205(c)."

Sec. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to monthly insurance benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act for months after December 1972, and with respect to lump-sum death payments under such title in the case of deaths occurring after such month.

## WINTHROP ROCKEFELLER

### HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the death of Winthrop Rockefeller is a loss not only to the State which he served so well as Governor, but a loss to the Nation as well.

Having been born to great riches as a grandson of John D. Rockefeller, he could have lived a life of ease. He chose instead to follow the example of his grandfather, who considered himself to be a steward of wealth rather than a mere possessor of it.

The many contributions of the Rockefeller family to numerous worthy causes are well known and I will not burden my colleagues with a lengthy recital. I do want to mention his activities in connection with the restoration of colonial Virginia's capital at Williamsburg.

The 500 restored or reconstructed buildings are a reminder of what life was like in the days when such giants as George Washington, the Father of His Country; Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence; Patrick Henry, who thrilled his hearers and posterity with "Give me liberty or give me death!", and George Mason, who penned the Bill of Rights. One can almost feel the presence of these and other famous men as he tours colonial Williamsburg. The restoration of this capital city was made possible by the philanthropy of Winthrop Rockefeller and his family.

Mr. Speaker, while a nation can no more live in the past than can an individual, it must nonetheless keep green the memory of the men who have contributed greatly to its advancement. A nation that completely obliterates its past will not have much of a future. Let us remember Winthrop Rockefeller, not

just for his business and political successes, but for his efforts to preserve our historical and cultural treasures.

**LEE HAMILTON'S WASHINGTON REPORT OF MARCH 5, 1973, CONCERNING CONTROL OF THE BUDGET**

**HON. LEE H. HAMILTON**

OF INDIANA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my March 5, 1973, Washington Report concerning the control of the budget.

**CONGRESSMAN LEE HAMILTON'S WASHINGTON REPORT**

A basic problem in the Federal government is the lack of control over the budget. In the 54 years since 1920 the federal budget has been in deficit 37 times. In 32 of these years Presidents submitted a budget to the Congress with a deficit. Since 1931 there have been only 6 surpluses (1947, '48, '51, '56, '60 and '69).

The largest deficits in the administrative budget have occurred in recent years, as follows: 1968—\$28 billion; 1970—\$13 billion; 1971—\$30 billion; 1972—\$29 billion; 1973—\$34 billion, (est.)

The need to get the budget under control is apparent. Presidents are fond of blaming the Congress for these deficits, but the Congress has approved reductions in the President's appropriations in each of the last 20 sessions of the Congress. Both the President and the Congress shape the budget and they must share the blame. The important step is not to fix the blame but to correct the procedure. I am encouraged that we are beginning to do it.

The fundamental reason the Congress cannot meet its fiscal responsibilities and match expenditures with revenues is that it is not structured to handle the budget effectively. Because of the structure of Congressional committees the raising and spending functions have been split. For example, in the House the Committee on Ways and Means drafts the laws to raise revenues, and an entirely separate committee (Appropriations) decides how to spend the money with only limited knowledge and attention to the amount of income. The Appropriations Committee is subdivided into 13 subcommittees which fragment the entire spending process and separate it from the acquisition of revenues even more. As a result there is a lack of coordination between tax and expenditure policies and the House can never put all the fiscal pieces together into the whole picture.

Another reason the federal budget is out of control is that not all federal spending is approved by the Appropriations Committee. Approximately 40 percent of budgetary expenditures bypass the Appropriations Committee. This "backdoor spending" is the authority to spend without the approval of the Appropriations Committees of the Congress and it includes huge sums of money for various purposes, for example, social security, interest on the national debt, funds for revenue sharing, student loan guarantees, black lung and veterans benefits.

Much of the federal budget is relatively uncontrollable because the President and the Congress are unable to make current adjustments in spending levels. In fiscal year 1975, it is estimated that 75 percent of the budget will be in this category, including social security, medicare and unemployment

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

and welfare benefits. These "uncontrollable" expenditures make it necessary that the President and Congress limit not only spending in any given year, but future spending too ("new obligatory authority" is the budget term).

A special joint study committee chartered by the Congress to study budget control now recommends that the Congress determine the proper level of spending for the year, establish a ceiling and determine the national priorities within that ceiling. The ceiling would apply to the "backdoor" spending as well as to the regular appropriations. To be effective the ceiling must be established promptly at the outset of a Congressional session and prior to other legislative actions affecting the budget, and it should apply to current and future spending.

The study committee also proposes that the Congress consider the effect of expenditures of existing and proposed legislation, not alone for the current year, but for 3 to 5 years ahead.

These control procedures are to be implemented by permanent legislative committees on the budget in both Houses, which committees would include representatives of the appropriations and tax committees. These committees would be responsible for overall review of tax and expenditure policy. They would have a non-partisan, professional staff which would be equipped with the computers and the technical ability to provide Congress with its own source of information and analysis of budgetary questions.

Today the President has an army of budget personnel working on his budget for as long as 16 months in advance of its presentation to the Congress. The Congress must adapt its structure and procedures so that it can carefully evaluate and adjust the President's budget, present constructive alternatives to it, and achieve these things in time to obtain appropriations at, or near, the beginning of the fiscal year (and not several months afterwards as is usually the case today). Authorizations should be timed at least one year in advance of the fiscal year so that appropriations can be made on time.

The federal government has no higher priority than to get the federal budget under control. The study committee, through its interim recommendations, has made significant contributions toward the goal of improving the Congress' ability to handle the budget. I endorse such reforms because they are necessary if the Congress is to be an equal partner with the President in meeting our responsibilities to the nation for prudent taxing and spending policies.

**RESOLUTION OF U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE**

**HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN**

OF MARYLAND  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce board of directors recently adopted a resolution concerning the cease-fire in Vietnam. I submit their resolution for the RECORD:

**U.S. CHAMBER BOARD OF DIRECTORS LAUDS NIXON'S SUCCESS IN VIETNAMESE CEASE-FIRE**

The Board of Directors of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, speaking for more than 3,700 chambers of commerce and business and professional associations, and 44,000 business firms, hereby congratulate and express its deep appreciation to President Nixon for his unprecedent leadership in terminating with honor the war in Vietnam

in which this nation had been involved for more than a decade.

His vision, his courage and his great fortitude have brought the results that millions of people were hoping for. We wish him well in his continuing efforts for world peace.

The world owes him a debt of gratitude.

**CONGRESS MUST REINSTATE THE CUTBACKS IN THE EDUCATION BUDGET**

**HON. EDWARD I. KOCH**

OF NEW YORK  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the administration's education budget proposals for fiscal year 1974 constitute a direct challenge to those of us in Congress who have voted time and time again in support of meaningful funding for various education programs.

The President's budget for the Education Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare proposes cutbacks of approximately \$5 million from last year's level. Within this overall decrease, there has been considerable shifting of moneys resulting in increased Federal control and direction of the remaining programs. Such cuts in spending for education, already only a fraction of the amounts authorized, represent a misplaced sense of rational priorities at a time when the proposed funding level for many less vital programs is the same as—or even greater than—that for the present fiscal year. In addition, the effect of such cutbacks is amplified by the failure of spending for education to keep pace with either inflation or the overall growth of the budget.

A most striking example of misplaced priorities is the proposed elimination of all Federal library resource programs. The amount of \$163,708,000 was appropriated under these in fiscal 1972 to assist community, school, and college libraries. New York State has been receiving approximately one-tenth of this aid, or \$17 million, and will suffer severely if this assistance is withdrawn.

The administration has totally disregarded the serious financial plight of the Nation's colleges and universities with its failure to request funding for several programs of higher education institutional assistance. These include the following: University Community Services, Language and Area Studies fellowships and research under the National Defense Education Act—NDEA—Undergraduate Instructional Equipment, the annual appropriation to Land-Grant colleges, and two new programs authorized by the Education Amendments of 1972—Public Law 92-318—General Institutional Aid and Veterans' Cost-of-Instruction Payments. New York State will be particularly hard hit by the loss of \$4.3 million under the Nurse Training Act, the loss of \$3 million for higher education facilities construction, and the loss of \$29 million for student assistance funneled through institutions of higher education.

Also proposed for zero-funding in the fiscal 1974 education budget are the fol-

lowing essential programs: Strengthening State Departments of Education—an Elementary and Secondary Education Act—ESEA—program which has fostered increased effort toward evaluation and reform of public education by State education agencies; funds for public school equipment and minor remodeling under the NDEA; all programs authorized by the new Indian Education Act—Title IV of Public Law 92-318; several Education Professions Development Act programs, aimed at the improvement teacher preparation and of the quality of classroom instruction; plus Environmental and Nutrition and Health education, and Installation of Exemplary Projects, to all of which the administration itself has referred as "National Priority Programs."

The list of programs for which a substantially reduced level of funding is requested by the administration is also distressing. These activities include: Vocational Education Research; College Teacher Fellowships; Dropout Prevention; the highly popular Sesame Street and Electric Company television programs; and Follow Through, an Economic Opportunity Act program designed to prevent disadvantaged children who have completed the Head Start program from losing the gains they have made thereby.

I was greatly alarmed when I first heard of these callous cutbacks in so many of our most important education programs. It is really beyond my comprehension how the President can speak in terms of individual self-improvement and at the same time almost totally emasculate the educational system by which this can be achieved. But I wish to remind my colleagues in Congress and the public at large that the President's proposals are only that—proposals. It is the Congress which must review, revise, and extend these. It is the Congress which in the end decides whether these essential programs will continue to be funded, and I call upon my colleagues here to confirm again this year our legislative commitment to quality education by supporting the reinstatement of these programs in the budget.

CAPT. EUGENE CERNAN

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week my distinguished colleague and congressional neighbor, HAROLD COLLIER, and I attended a banquet at the Sheraton-O'Hare Motor Hotel in Des Plaines, Ill., honoring Capt. Eugene Cernan, commander of the Apollo XVII moon flight. Captain Cernan, a Naval Academy graduate, was a resident of the village of Bellwood in suburban Cook County and his mother and other members of the family still reside there. He has maintained close contact with his friends and neighbors throughout his distinguished career. The great attachment which the community

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

holds for him and which he in turn reciprocates is dramatically described in an article by Paul Coffman which appeared in the Star-Sentinel Newspapers on Thursday, March 1, 1973.

The article follows:

### A GREAT DAY FOR BELLWOOD

(By Paul Coffman)

Last Sunday will be remembered by many Bellwoodians and residents of Proviso Township as a great day in the history of the community... for on that day thousands of local residents paid homage to Astronaut Eugene Cernan for his great contributions to the space program of our country.

The day was a typical Cernan day from start to finish. There was the parade throughout the village which attracted thousands to their windows and along the parade route to see their hero in his triumphant return to his home town, a personal appearance before hundreds of youngsters at Roosevelt Junior High School, a huge banquet attended by over 1000 at the Sheraton O'Hare Motel and two appearances the following morning before the student bodies of Proviso East and West high schools.

There wasn't a dull moment for Captain Cernan, his wife or his daughter as the admirers of this "home town" family showed their admiration wherever they appeared. It was a long to be remembered day for his mother as well, who shared in the accolades bestowed upon her son by a grateful community.

To say that we are proud to claim Astronaut Eugene Cernan as our very own is putting it very mildly. His dedication to the purpose of exploring space, his willingness to sacrifice for a program he considered so important to all of the world and his genuine love for the community in which he grew up should make us all proud that he is our ambassador of good will wherever he goes.

Proviso Township can be proud that so many of our young people have gone on to make their place in the world and bring fame to our local communities, but one young man who will always stand out as a leader among leaders is Captain Cernan.

He will not only be known for what he has contributed to our space program, but he will be revered in the hearts of many for the genuineness he portrays. He is a typical example of what most of us think on "All American" boy should be.

## MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, for more than 3 years, I have reminded my colleagues daily of the plight of our prisoners of war. Now, for most of us, the war is over. Yet despite the cease-fire agreement's provisions for the release of all prisoners, fewer than 600 of the more than 1,900 men who were lost while on active duty in Southeast Asia have been identified by the enemy as alive and captive. The remaining 1,220 men are still missing in action.

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

Until those men are accounted for, their families will continue to undergo

March 5, 1973

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?"

## ALABAMA'S VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. This year nearly 500,000 secondary school students participated in the contest competing for the five national scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. First prize is a \$10,000 scholarship, second prize is \$5,000, third prize is \$3,500, fourth prize is \$2,500, and the fifth prize is \$1,500. This year's contest theme was "My Responsibility to Freedom."

A young man from my district, the Second District of Alabama, Robert Calen Naftel, of Montgomery, has won the State contest and will soon be in Washington to compete with other State winners for the national awards.

Robert is a 16-year-old student at Sidney Lanier High School and works as a disc-jockey and sports announcer. He wants to continue his education and make a career in broadcasting.

I am extremely proud of Robert, as is the State of Alabama, and of his winning speech which sets forth his responsibility to freedom. I would like to place a copy of that speech in the RECORD at this time:

### MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

Why should I declare that I owe freedom anything? Is freedom actually qualified enough to deserve anyone's responsibility? After all, glance around you. To your right is a racial demonstration—people protesting a white bigotry of past generations. To your left is an "end the war" rally—people protesting a senseless and distasteful war. Behind you are union workers—people protesting low rates and long hours. And then in front of you is a wall. To define which side of it you are standing on would be useless. The decision is yours to be made. It may be thought of in one of two ways. You are standing within an enclosure. The rest of the world is on the outside blocked by this vast structure. You and only those about you are aware of the problems that surround you. The entire world is separated from you by this wall. Thus, they neither hear nor see these tensions. Accordingly, they can do nothing to solve these problems.

Now you are on the opposite side of the wall. The same situation exists with the

demonstrations, rallys, and protests about you. But now you are outside of the wall and everyone is made aware of the existing problem. A cure is sought and hopefully found. In a sense, this is freedom. Without freedom the problems may be enclosed by a wall and forgotten. After all, if a problem is not seen or heard, one may conclude it is not there. All the life as we know it is not much like this. It very well may be with the lack of freedom.

Inasmuch as our society is not a perfect one, it possibly would be much cruder, containing a higher scale of oppression in a country without freedom. With the advantage of freedom, we, as Americans, have an opportunity to take steps in solving our problems, instead of shutting them out and pretending they are non-existent.

Our society is not a faultless one by any means, but our task of solving the problems that plague us will be an easier one with the aid of freedom. Men will always contend that an injustice is being carried out against him, and in a society containing those who value freedom, its accusations, no matter how just or unjust they may be, will be heard. The problems may be solved by letting each side of an opposing viewpoint work out in good faith a meaningful, profitable, and just answer to the situation. This is done only with the expanded and dedicated use of freedom.

When is my responsibility to freedom? To do my part in working with the masses of this country and the world, to solve our nation's vast and numerous problems—to live to my fullest extent to better mankind and dedicate myself to nothing else.

Whether I agree or disagree with what is being said, I should do my part to get along with my fellowman. Problems will continue as long as man's inhumanity to man exists and I shall do my part to win this battle of injustice with the aid of man's strongest element, a desire for freedom. What is my responsibility to freedom? A large and vast one—containing a high respect and gratitude for it and a complete coherence to its calling, and to be able to return my gratitude by, if it so requires, dying for it.

#### AN UPDATE ON THE ACTIVITIES OF PHILIP BERRIGAN

#### HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, Daniel and Philip Berrigan have become folk heroes in some quarters over the past few years.

For whatever reason, some members of this very body have from time to time denounced the Federal Government for presuming to prosecute the brothers for destroying Government property.

So that we can remain up-to-date on the activities of Philip Berrigan, who was just released from jail in December, I ask that a UPI report which appeared in The State newspaper in Columbia, S.C., on February 19, 1973, be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

#### BERRIGAN: POW'S CRIMINALS

PHILADELPHIA.—Rev. Philip J. Berrigan, anti-war militant priest who was released from jail in December, has described America's returning prisoners of war as "war criminals."

"We are overpublicizing the war criminals that are coming home," the 49-year-old priest told a fund-raising dinner for the

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Camden "17" Saturday in suburban Wynnewood.

"But what else could we expect from the government, but to distort the true nature of the men? The returning prisoners are just what Nixon would want them to be, but they're going to have to come to terms with themselves."

The defendants in the Camden "28," now the Camden "17" are currently on trial in a U. S. District court in Camden, N.J., for destroying selective service records in August, 1971.

#### KATHY KAZEN REPRESENTS FLORIDA IN VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

#### HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conduct a Voice of Democracy Contest throughout the Nation. The theme for this year's contest was "My Responsibility to Freedom," and nearly 500,000 secondary school students throughout the Nation took part in this year's competition. Those selected among the top five State winners will share in scholarship awards including a first-prize scholarship of \$10,000. I am certainly pleased to announce that one of my constituents, Miss Kathy Kazen, of West Palm Beach, Fla., is representing the State of Florida in the national competition and I certainly extend my congratulations to her for a very fine speech. At this point I insert a copy of Kathy's speech in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues, and I would like to wish her continued success in the national competition:

#### MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

After she fell down that amazing rabbit hole, Alice knew exactly what to do. She knew she had to keep running if she was even to stay in the same position, let alone progress. Wonderland was quite a demanding place.

America is our Wonderland. It is a nation abounding in opportunities for self-fulfillment. It is a country that strives to maintain "liberty and justice for all." It is a country sympathetic to the needy. It is a country which aims to better the lives of all its citizens through health care and education. It is the homeland of widely different—yet miraculously alike—individuals.

But it is also a nation that is constantly evolving—and if we are to preserve the rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness for each individual, we, like Alice, must keep running. We have to follow her fine example and make action our key force. We cannot even afford to stay where we are—we have to move and change.

In third grade, I was taught that I lived in the greatest country in the world. We sang about our land and had a nice cake on George Washington's birthday because he is "the father of our country." At this time we were imbued with the fundamentals of patriotism. I advocate this. But I strongly oppose this great nation resting on its laurels concerning the issue of freedom.

Everyone wants to be free. I want to be free. But I want to feel all the refreshing manifestations of the concept of freedom—not just told I am free. I want to think and act freely. In other words, I want to keep running.

This is where my responsibility to freedom enters the picture. It is up to me to maintain a free, fluid state of mind. If I begin to feel cramped or abused, it is my duty to try and change things. If, as a young American, I feel unjustifiably threatened by authority, it is my obligation to petition, to let my feelings of frustration be known in a rational exhibition. Maintaining freedom is and should be a constant struggle. The longer we stand still in this kaleidoscopic Wonderland, the more problems will arise. The very essentials we strive for could be destroyed.

I, as an American, am proud of the dissent in our nation. I am proud that the people care enough to organize themselves in demonstration of their frustration. I am proud to live in a country where this public display of emotion is allowed, where unlike Alice's experience, there is no haughty queen to yell, "Off with her head!"

Our leaders should look upon this behavior as one of the strong points of America, not one of her weaknesses. If we as Americans could apply a positive attitude toward freedom of speech, if we could get away from the idea that perfect order is success, and if we could only see that there will always be dissatisfied persons and that they must be listened to, our country would see itself nearing utopia.

Because I want to work toward this goal, I feel my responsibility is to keep moving and to continually assess America's actions while still, and always recognizing the marvels of this Wonderland.

#### LYNDON B. JOHNSON

#### HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, all Americans, and especially those who were here in Washington during the "Johnson years" will deeply miss the late President. His strong leadership, his enormous sense of compassion and humanity, and his great drive to insure a better life for all Americans, combined to make this man a monumental figure in our time.

He will remain with us, however, in the effects of his efforts; in the programs he molded into being to help those less fortunate in our society; in his very basic belief that together we can do great things.

I personally found Lyndon Johnson an inspiration as I came to Washington and watched this man move through the Congress and the executive agencies, persuading, cajoling, molding, and developing programs and concepts which he felt would lead this Nation to a higher standard of ethical and national greatness. I did not always agree with him, but even in those areas where one did not agree, one had to deeply admire his courage and strength of character.

Mr. Speaker, I believe one of the most sensitive recollections I have read about our former President over these past weeks was written by Mr. Carl Rowan, and appeared in the Washington Post. I include it at this point in the RECORD: ONE MAN'S MEMORY OF LYNDON B. JOHNSON

(By Carl T. Rowan)

How shall I remember LBJ?

I think of a man I had scarcely met, poking his index finger against my chest one

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

sultry day in Saigon in 1961 and saying: "Mr. Roe-ann, you don't know me. But one of these days you're gonna discover that I'm a goddamn sight more liberal than most of these so-called liberals you've been cottoning up to."

And I shall remember that when the public mood turned mean and ugly in America and lesser liberals ran with the mob, Lyndon Johnson remained true to his decent convictions.

I shall remember LBJ as a man driven to success, a man who didn't know how to take it easy, whether ordered to by his doctor or begged to by the Secret Service.

There was that incredibly hot day in some unbelievably dusty villages on the outskirts of Agra, India, when he kept whispering to me: "Stay close to me—right by my shoulder." He was nurturing the illusion that I was some kind of expert on India just because I had written a book about it.

I gasped as I tried to stay near him as he plowed through the grasping crowds. As I wiped my sweaty forehead with the front of my hand and my parched lips with the back of it, I asked myself: "Is this a man who has suffered a massive heart attack?"

I remember his telephone call on March 15, 1965, asking if I would sit with his wife and daughters while he delivered his address on the Voting Rights Act to a joint session of Congress. That was the speech—the last touches written by him on the way to the Capitol as he cursed the slowness of his speechwriters—in which he startled millions of Americans by using the emotional slogan, "We shall overcome."

And after that speech I remember sitting with him in his living quarters as the White House operator fanned out long-distance calls all over the land.

"How did I do?" Johnson kept asking. He was a man who meant it when he talked about bringing Americans together, healing the nation's wounds, making this a land of equal opportunity. He wanted so badly to be reassured that what he had done that night was courageous, and good for all America.

Yet, I remember Lyndon B. Johnson as one of the most complicated men I ever met. He could seem petty, even mean, about trifling things and then display the broadest vision about the human needs of men and nations.

Johnson was at heart a sentimental—the kind of man who would weep in San Antonio during the 1964 campaign when an aged black man stood in the back of a pickup truck at a shopping center and said: "I'm a black man, born two blocks from this spot. I never dreamed I'd live to see the day when a Mexican congressman (Henry B. Gonzalez) would introduce me so I could ask you to vote for a white Texan for President."

And Johnson would dismiss his tears with the comment that "A man ain't worth a goddamn if he can't cry at the right time."

I always felt that a lot of Johnson's toughness, even ruthlessness, was part of his effort to hide his sentimentality.

I felt that he waded deeper into Vietnam, and for a longer time, than his instincts and intellect dictated because he never wanted the Joint Chiefs of Staff to think they had a sentimental sissy in the White House. He seemed to want to say to Gen. Curtis LeMay: "I don't puff a one-foot cigar, but I'm as tough as you are."

There is special irony and tragedy in the coincidence that the war that killed Johnson politically should be grinding to a close just as the fates snuffed out his life completely.

There is double irony in the fact that he died on the eve of a White House campaign to erase much of the "Great Society" whose foundation Johnson built.

We have had our truce in the war on poverty; we have our moratoriums on federal subsidies for housing for the poor and middle classes; we have had vetoes of education

bills and public works projects. We are told not to ask what government can do for us, but what we can do for ourselves.

There will be more of this. But not in 4 years nor 40 will they erase all that Lyndon Johnson did to change this society—not any more than they have been able to erase the mark of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Maybe it's a little girl sleeping in a night-gown that won't go up in flames at the slightest spark—because Johnson believed in consumer protection; maybe it's a "hillbilly" girl who in June will become the first of her family ever to graduate from college—because Johnson insisted that higher education be put within reach of all; maybe it's a black family, walking into a motel in Mississippi tonight where in years past they would have been chased away—because Johnson wanted a public accommodations act sincerely enough to browbeat Congress into passing it.

I shall remember him as a man who, for all that Simon Legree posture he could assume, truly respected integrity of viewpoint. I shall never forget the time in India when he was irked at me for two or three days because I disagreed on a policy matter. Johnson returned from a session with Jawaharlal Nehru and, apropos of nothing, said to me:

"You were right, goddammit, you were right."

As I fumbled for a modest reply he poked me in the chest and said, "Let me tell you something: It never hurts to get knocked down a few times for standing up for what you believe."

He walked perhaps 20 paces away, then turned sharply to shout: "But you'd know that, wouldn't you? Cause you've been getting knocked down all your life."

I knew then that, whatever else they might say, Lyndon Johnson was a man.

IN MEMORIAM: GEN. RALPH F.  
STEARLEY

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, a great and good friend of mine was laid to rest in Arlington National Cemetery. Gen. Ralph F. Stearley was one of the last of a vanishing breed of men who proudly, honorably, and nobly wore his country's uniform.

His military career extended from the horse cavalry days, when he served on the Mexican border, to commanding fleets of heavy bombers, in the atomic age. The Indianapolis News compiled a record of General Stearley's service to his country, and I am proud to include it in the RECORD as a tribute to him:

GEN. RALPH S. STEARLEY

He was graduated from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y., in 1918.

Gen. Stearley retired in 1963 after serving as commander of the 20th Air Force on Okinawa during the Korean War.

In the cavalry he developed his lifelong habit of rolling his own cigarettes, a custom he followed even at formal dinners.

Gen. Stearley transferred to the Army Air Corps in 1925 and soon became a pilot. He served a while in the Philippines and later was transferred to Chicago for duty with Army air mail operations. Later he was a flight instructor.

In 1942 Gen. Stearley was appointed chief of the air group of the Military Intelligence Service of the War Department General Staff in Washington.

In 1944 he joined the 9th Tactical Air Force in Europe as operations officer. Later the same year he became operations officer of the new Allied Airborne Army and in April, 1945, he was appointed commanding general of the 9th Tactical Air Division of the 9th Air Force which operated in France and Northern Germany.

Gen. Stearley became commander of the Air Section, 15th Army Theater General Board in the European theater of operations in September, 1945.

He returned to Air Force headquarters in 1946 as deputy chief of the legislative and liaison division of the War Department General Staff.

In 1948 he was appointed director of Legislative and Liaison Division of the directorate of public relations in the office of the secretary of the Air Force.

Gen. Stearley held several other assignments before being named commanding general of the 20th Air Force at Kadena Air Force Base, Okinawa, in July 1950.

On Okinawa he commanded a fleet of Strategic Air Command B29 bombers. During the same period he had conferences with Gen. Douglas MacArthur and Nationalist China's Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek.

Gen. Stearley's U.S. awards include the Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit, Air Medal, Bronze Star Medal and Commendation Ribbon.

His foreign decorations include commander of the Order of the British Empire, the French chevalier de la Legion d'honneur and Croix de Guerre with palm, and the Netherlands' Order of Orange Nassau, degree of commander.

Gen. Stearley returned to Brazil after retiring from the Air Force and served as president of the Chamber of Commerce and was active in various civic enterprises. He was a member of the Masonic and Elks Lodges, Rotary Club, First United Methodist Church and Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Survivor—wife Mildred.

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

HON. JOHN MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues and the public at this time the inspiring speech of the winner of Massachusetts' Voice of Democracy contest. The contest is sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its Ladies Auxiliary; and more than 500,000 students from over 7,000 secondary schools participated in this 26th annual program.

I am delighted to insert at this time the remarks of the 1973 contest winner, Miss Beth Kevill Lambert of 5 Greenbrier Road in Canton, Mass. Writing on this year's theme, "My Responsibility to Freedom," Ms. Lambert states that "the only way the ideals of this country are to be achieved is through the participation of every individual," a sentiment I wholeheartedly endorse.

Ms. Lambert is to be congratulated for her excellent essay, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars to be commended for providing this rewarding program for our young people.

The essay follows:

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

"If ever our freedoms are lost, it will not be because the enemy was so strong, but be-

March 5, 1973

cause we, ourselves, were so lazy that we preferred to play at piety rather than to work at responsibility." These are the words of Robert Cook, President of King's College and author of several books on Theology. The words seem rather harsh but I believe they aptly sum up my responsibility to freedom. If I am apathetic to the obligations of liberty, allow myself to be ruled and dictated by my situation rather than assume my role as a citizen then I have no right to freedom, or to hypocritically malign others for the same fault.

This brings us back to the basic question, "What are these responsibilities?" The first is a case of earning or acquiring freedom. The second, preservation of this idealistic quality. The third, protection. We must be ready to come to its defense at the slightest intimidation or threat. The fourth is a constant refreshing or renewing of our compact with freedom. It is a living quality whose lifespan depends on those who support it. The fifth is respect. Perhaps this is the most important, because it implies a mutual sharing. I must follow these five guidelines to be deserving of this high-priced quality.

To me Freedom is a challenge! It is not a duty, but it entails action. It is not possessed by everyone, but everyone works to attain it. I must reach out for my individual freedom in a world drowning in humanistic collectivism. In defining my role concerning liberty, I synthesize my responsibility to America. Our country, the helmsman of freedom, was founded on the democratic principles and individual liberties stated in our Declaration of Independence and the Constitution especially the Bill of Rights. The only way the ideals of this country are to be achieved is through the participation of every individual. I must be willing to take this step. Not after everyone has stormed the citadels of freedom. But now when the need is greatest. Be ready to stand up for the principles the founding fathers established—life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, Freedoms of Religion, Speech and the press. I must keep the documents of freedom from becoming dank, decadent papers, but rather preserve them as living contracts between myself and the government that represents me. But in my effort I will be careful not to coerce other men in my eagerness.

Freedom lives from day to day. If we let it rest, do not follow its challenges, then little by little it will disappear. One day we will turn to look for it but it will not be there. Then we will realize how much freedom was worth, and the penalty paid will be our own personal undoing. If ever our freedoms are lost, it will not be because the enemy was so strong, but because we ourselves were so lazy that we preferred to play at piety rather than to work at responsibility.

Thank you.

#### NATIONAL DE MOLAY WEEK OBSERVED

#### HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to call to the attention of my colleagues the forthcoming observance of National De Molay Week, March 11 through March 18, 1973. All across our country, bright-eyed youth between the ages of 13 and 21 years of age will be celebrating the 54th anniversary of the founding of this order.

In the 13th District of Illinois, I am most familiar with the Anchor and Ark Chapter, Order of De Molay, whose cur-

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

rent membership resides in the Waukegan, Zion-Benton, and Winthrop Harbor areas. Now in its 43d year of organization, the Anchor and Ark Chapter has 19 members whose religious dedication to God, country, and family renders them outstanding.

The Master Councilor is Fred King, who is in his junior year at Zion-Benton High School. In his immediate family, two of his brothers are also members of the Order of De Molay, with James King, Jr., a past Master Councilor and District Master Councilor.

Guiding Anchor and Ark Chapter members are several Dad Advisors including Messrs. Joseph Peterson, Tom Love, Clyde Golwitzer, and George Schumacher.

Encouraging the members by official notice—the mayors of the cities of Waukegan, North Chicago, and Zion have agreed to proclaim local observance of National De Molay Week. During the period of March 11 to March 18, 1973, Anchor and Ark members will visit the city halls and the Lake County Courthouse, where former De Molays are active in governmental affairs.

Included are Lake County Sheriff Orville "Pat" Clavey and Circuit Court Judges Fred H. Geiger and Harry D. Strouse, Jr.

These are names of former members which come readily to mind. However, in the 43 years that Anchor and Ark Chapter has been providing guidelines for the youth of our community, there are innumerable members who have advanced to leadership and prominence in all areas of community service. Many of them have gone into military service and achieved both rank and honor.

Mr. Speaker, I extend to all members of the Order of De Molay—wherever they are—my greetings and good wishes on the occasion of their founding anniversary. May they continue in the good works which they have begun.

#### TWO HUNDREDTH VICTORY

#### HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, in Cleveland, Tenn., the townfolk are justifiably excited about the Lee College basketball team which has just chalked up its 200th victory.

The driving force behind this enviable record is the coach of the team, Dale Hughes. At 30 years of age, Dale is one of the few coaches who has a string of 200 wins under his belt. But Dale is unimpressed with this achievement for he is far too busy with the many other interests which occupy his time to be impressed with himself.

Despite many demands on his time, Dale is vitally interested in the well-being of his country and takes an active role in political affairs. He is a member of the county school board. His participation in my campaign as Bradley County chairman influenced many students to become interested in political and gov-

ernmental affairs. I salute Dale Hughes as the kind of young man we can all admire and ask that the attached article from the Chattanooga News Free-Press be included in the RECORD at this point:

#### LEE'S DALE HUGHES GETS 200TH VICTORY

MARYVILLE, TENN.—Dale Hughes acted as though it were just another night in the life of the most successful small college basketball coaches in the nation . . . but it wasn't.

With Larry Carpenter putting on a brilliant performance from the floor, hitting on 17 of 20 shots and scoring 36 points, Lee College won its 20th game of the season here Thursday night, defeating Maryville 91-73.

But that wasn't the important thing.

It was also Dale Hughes' 200th win as a college coach. Several coaches have 200 wins, but not many of them are under 35. Hughes not only is under 35, he's only 30, which could make him the youngest coach in the nation to reach the 200-win plateau.

Even so, he was hardly excited.

"To be truthful, I didn't even think of it until Rudy (Felton, the team statistician) called it to my attention three weeks ago. Since then I've been looking forward to it, but, of course, we've got and we've had some fine players," Hughes said.

The handsome, young coach was escorted to the showers by his players, but his pleas for mercy were heeded.

I told them to wait until the tournament. I had some new shoes on. Actually, I think winning the SCAC tournament would mean more to me, and to us as a team, than winning this game," he continued.

Hughes, who has been head coach for only nine years, took over the Lee reins at the age of 22.

#### MARCH 5, 1770—THE BOSTON MASSACRE

#### HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, on this date more than 200 years ago, March 5, 1770, a few humble citizens of Boston, Mass., paid the first installment of the blood and sacrifice by which this country's independence was finally to be achieved.

The Boston Massacre, as the unfortunate incident has come to be called, marked an end as well as a beginning. The shots that rang out that cold evening on King Street—now State Street—can indeed be said to have started the Revolution—for their echoes rang up and down the continent. As John Adams, later our second President, said:

On that night, the foundation of American independence was laid.

Yet the musketry signaled also the death knell for a policy which a misguided imperial government had been foolishly trying to rivet onto the Americans for a decade.

In fact, if the Boston Massacre and the years of unwise taxation and attempts to maintain military strongarm order in Boston proved anything, it was that a government which will not understand the historical context in which it acts cannot ever succeed in governing.

The Parliament of Great Britain shortsightedly believed that whatever served English mercantile interests must automatically benefit the entire Empire,

and that anyone in America who failed to understand that simple "truth," must be either a fool or a traitor.

Mr. Speaker, the lessons of the Boston Massacre are relevant to the agony which faces this country today. Taken in their widest import, they teach us this: The material welfare of a great nation is not the lodestar of its continuing greatness; the magnitude of a government's power is no assurance that its power will prevail, if its policy is not founded upon reason and humanity; and neither violence nor repression can reverse the course of history.

The deaths on King Street, as Prof. Hiller B. Zobel has written in the Boston Massacre "were but an eddy in that growing tempest" which, fanning the flames of freedom in 1770, has not yet today spent its force. As we pause now to commemorate again what happened so long ago, we shall resolve so to dedicate ourselves that the fire shall warm the tabernacle of our democracy, rather than consume it utterly.

**AHEPA PRESIDENT URGES RESTORATION OF DEMOCRACY IN GREECE**

**HON. JOHN BRADEMAS**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the political situation in Greece is, I know, of great interest to many Americans.

Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, Dr. Michael Spiros of Ohio, the new supreme president of the Order of Ahepa, issued a public statement on the political situation in Greece, following a visit that he and other Ahepa officials paid last month to Athens, Nicosia, to the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Constantinople, and King Constantine the II.

Mr. Speaker, this statement is of special significance because Ahepa is the largest organization of Americans of Greek origin and because Dr. Spiros must be regarded as the principal spokesman of Americans of Greek descent.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of Dr. Spiros' statement, of February 24, 1973, in the RECORD:

**STATEMENT BY DR. MICHAEL SPIROS**

The Supreme Lodge of AHEPA has just returned from a trip to Europe, including visits to Athens, Nicosia, and the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Constantinople, and King Constantine the II of all Hellenes.

I wish to reiterate at this point that AHEPA is a non-political, non-partisan fraternal organization, expressing the ideals of the community of Americans of Hellenic descent.

This community, whose civic spirit has most recently been praised by President Nixon himself, has consistently supported the declared policies of the Government of the United States in the field of foreign affairs. One of these stated policies, which is of particular import to all Americans of Greek extraction, is the desire of the United States to see Greece return to democratic government as soon as possible.

The restoration of democracy in Greece has also been the declared intention of the pres-

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

ent Greek Government, expressed both in public statements and privately to the U.S. Ambassador, Henry Tasca.

For all the above reasons I cannot but express my disappointment in not observing any real direction toward constitutional government at the present time.

I consider it my duty as an American and as an Ahepa to speak in defense of our democratic ideals and to urge all brother Hellenes in positions of leadership to raise themselves to the heights of mature statesmanship dictated by our sacred Hellenic tradition of responsible citizenship.

**NICOLAUS COPERNICUS**

**HON. JOSHUA EILBERG**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, 1973 marks the 500th anniversary of the birth of the father of modern astronomy, Nicolaus Copernicus, in the Polish city of Torun. It is fitting that this man's contribution to mankind be commemorated.

Copernicus, or Mikolaj Kopernik in his native tongue, was born in Torun on February 19, 1473, the son of a wealthy merchant and the nephew of an influential bishop. He spent his boyhood in his native city and, from 1491 to 1496, studied mathematics, astronomy, theology, and medicine at the University of Krakow. He later enrolled as a student of canon law at the University of Bologna. However, even in turning to the study of church law during his years in Italy, he never gave up his passionate interest in scientific studies. In the jubilee year of 1500 the young priest traveled to the Rome of Alexander VI to lecture on mathematics and astronomy. He then studied medicine at Padua and later took his doctorate in canon law from Ferrara. Copernicus thus had the benefit of the finest education available in Renaissance Europe.

At an early stage in his career, Copernicus began to question the Ptolemaic astrological view that the earth was stationary and that all heavenly bodies revolved around it. He came to the conclusion that the sun rather than the earth was at the center of the universe. He understood that the earth was a planet revolving around the sun in the company of the other planets and, thus, like its fellow planets, was a heavenly body. Because the earth itself is in the heavens, he concluded, the contrast between heaven and earth vanished, being replaced by the concept of space. From 1503 to 1510 Copernicus worked on the outline of this theory of the construction of the universe. He conducted his observations, using instruments of his own construction, from the tower of his uncle's cathedral-church at Frombork.

Copernicus' research also obliged him to revise the then current conception of gravity. Prior to the development of the Copernican theory it was commonly thought that the fall of objects toward the center of the earth was, at the same time, a movement toward the center of the universe. Copernicus, however, pos-

ited that there was no single center of gravity in the universe and that every heavenly body had its own center of gravity. Such theories were sufficiently radical that initially their propounder dared not publish his findings lest, like other nonconformists, he be punished, possibly by death. Eventually he was encouraged to circulate his findings among a few friends and specialists, and finally his masterpiece, "The Revolution of the Heavenly Spheres," was published. It is interesting to note the tradition that the great professor received the first printed copy of his work on May 24, 1543, the day of his death. Since that spring day four and a half centuries ago "De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium" has become a cornerstone of modern scientific thought and stands as an ageless monument to one of the great minds history has known.

Mr. Speaker, through the efforts of Polish-American civic, fraternal, and cultural organizations in cooperation with academic leaders across the Nation the quinquecentennial of Copernicus' birth will be appropriately commemorated this year. In my own city of Philadelphia, the Kopernick Commemorative Committee, under the direction of Msgr. Peter J. Klekotka and Mr. Alex Macones, has undertaken the laudable task of erecting a monument to this great Polish scientist whose influence on men's thinking is still felt. The proposed Copernicus Monument in Philadelphia is to stand at 18th Street and the Benjamin Franklin Parkway.

It is also fitting that the U.S. Postal Service has authorized the issuance of a special commemorative stamp honoring the Father of Modern Astronomy.

**STATEMENT ON 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOUTHERN STATES INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL**

**HON. PHILIP M. CRANE**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, during a period when freedom and free enterprise have come under increasing attack, both at home and abroad, the Southern States Industrial Council has provided an important eloquent voice in their defense.

While many in America have held the mistaken view that they might oppose government intervention in the economy, yet themselves receive subsidization from that same government, your organization has been aware of the fact that, as Lord Acton said long ago, power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

Government never enters any area of life—whether it be education, business, medicine, or agriculture—without also seeking to control it. The Southern States Industrial Council has understood that the way to avoid that control is, at the beginning, to oppose that intervention.

Similarly, in foreign affairs, your organization has advocated a firm policy to-

March 5, 1973

ward aggression and tyranny and has repeatedly called for a strong national defense. You have learned the lessons of history which too many others in our country have refused to learn, that the best hope for peace is through strength, and the best way to maintain security is to repel aggression at the earliest possible moment. You understood that the war in Vietnam was a commitment against aggression, and that if that aggression was not stopped at that time and place it would have had to be stopped at a different time and place at a much higher cost.

I am confident that history will prove that the positions advocated so forcefully and effectively by the Southern States Industrial Council, since its founding in 1933, will be proven correct. I extend to you congratulations upon your 40th anniversary and the hope that your good work will continue for many years to come.

**POSTAL SERVICE ANNOUNCES  
JOB EVALUATION PROGRAM**

**HON. FRANK M. CLARK**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, we are aware of the difficulties inherent in managing an organization as large and geographically diverse as the U.S. Postal Service. The need for capable and innovative management personnel was recognized by Congress when postal reorganization was discussed and implemented. A Postal Service information release has come to my attention in which Postmaster General Klassen announces the implementation of a job evaluation program designed to maintain compensation and benefits for all employees on a standard comparable to compensation and benefits paid for comparable levels of work in the private sector of the economy.

Mr. Klassen points out that the Postal Service shall provide compensation, working conditions and career opportunities that will assure the attraction and retention of qualified personnel and that through the efforts of a well-trained and well-motivated force the effectiveness of postal operations will be increased.

I am certain that we, and our constituents, wish the Postal Service success in their efforts to improve service by offering incentive to their personnel. I include the information release to be printed in full for the convenience of my colleagues:

GENERAL RELEASE NO. 13

A job evaluation program designed to benefit immediately or potentially at least two-thirds of all management employees in the U.S. Postal Service was announced today by Postmaster General E. T. Klassen.

An estimated 77,000 postmasters, managers and supervisors are affected, with none due for any pay cut under this program.

Mr. Klassen also announced that the Postal Service was granting a \$500 across-the-board pay increase plus a \$166 temporary cost-of-living adjustment. Both will be granted

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

as if they had been put into effect November 14, 1972, rather than March 3, 1973, the date of job evaluation implementation. Adjustments for the November 14-March 3 period will be paid as quickly as procedurally practicable.

These increases will first appear in the March 22 and 23 paychecks, covering the period beginning March 3.

The increases are consistent with the decision in order of the Pay Board dated February 15.

The job evaluation program resulted from the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970, which states: "It shall be the policy of the Postal Service to maintain compensation and benefits for all officers and employees on a standard of comparability to the compensation and benefits paid for comparable levels of work in the private sector of the economy."

Accepting this as a mandate from Congress, Mr. Klassen announced last August that particular emphasis will be placed on opportunities for career advancement of all postal employees, and added:

"We shall provide compensation, working conditions and career opportunities that will assure the attraction and retention of qualified and capable supervisory and other managerial personnel.

"And we shall establish and maintain a program for all such personnel that reflects the essential importance of a well-trained and well-motivated force to improve the effectiveness of postal operations."

The Postmaster General said today that putting job evaluation into effect is in line with this expressed intent to make postal pay equal to compensation for comparable skills in private industry.

**THE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY  
CORPS**

**HON. DONALD G. BROTHMAN**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. BROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of America are getting fed up with costly Government programs that do not accomplish what they set out to do. Billions of dollars are being spent to find work for the unemployed and on welfare programs, for example, that are simply not giving the American people the return on their investment that I feel they deserve. There are plenty of things that need doing around this country and too many people without work.

Although unemployment is dropping slowly from its previous highs of last year, the young especially are still faced with an intolerably high unemployment rate. Such enforced idleness among the young contributes to their disillusionment with the system and has a direct correlation to their involvement in the Nation's high rate of crime. Although most do not turn to crime, the only other choice available is too often the Government dole, where they still represent a drain on the economy.

At the same time, many young people have expressed to me a deep and abiding commitment to helping the Nation solve its environmental problems.

Therefore, the bill I am today introducing would establish an Environmental Quality Corps, composed of 100,000 volunteers, to put America's youth to work on projects designed to

better the environmental lot of all Americans.

My bill would involve them in reforestation, park and campground construction and maintenance, recreational facilities construction in both urban and rural settings, and highway beautification. It would take them off the Government dole and give them a job they could point to in later life with pride.

Corpsmen, aged 18 through 26, would be selected from all walks of life, without regard to their race, social class, economic status, or sex. Veterans who have completed service with the Armed Forces and have been honorably discharged would be granted special consideration, however.

Service in the Corps would be for 1 year with an option to reenlist for a second year. Corpsmen would be provided with room and board, a modest allowance, and the training necessary to make them productive members of the Corps and more marketable laborers on the outside job market.

In providing these services for its volunteers, the corps has been directed in my bill to make extensive use of existing governmental facilities and equipment. Government units, including those on the State and local level, who contract for the services of corpsmen would be required to provide as much of the necessary equipment and facilities at their own expense as they are able. For those facilities they could not provide, the Corps would be authorized to utilize surplus Federal property made available by the General Services Administration and the various Federal agencies involved. Thus, it is my hope that the Corps could escape the largest portion of the overhead costs of equipment and facilities.

Benefits derived from the program would be manifold. Those agencies and levels of Government which cannot now afford new projects to better the physical environment for their constituents would suddenly find themselves with a new source of inexpensive labor. This in itself should encourage the development of more of these types of programs at the local level.

At the same time, however, careful precautions have been taken in the bill to assure that corpsmen are not used to replace regularly employed workers. The agency involved is further required to prove a maintenance of effort to protect and improve the quality of the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that such a program would prove a great asset to the national effort in this area. It would provide the Nation with a continuing means of absorbing our surplus manpower while at the same time giving the Nation something in return. Too few of our Federal assistance programs do this these days.

I plan to ask the chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee to take up this bill in its consideration of the authorizing legislation for the programs of Action. I understand hearings on this subject will be held this spring, and I hope we will be able to work together to see this program enacted as soon as possible, so that the

energies and talents of the young can be diverted to correcting the environmental problems of the country at an early date.

#### COMPLAINTS REGARDING THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE IN RURAL AREAS

##### HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago the U.S. Postal Service held a management conference working session in Washington to find ways to improve service performance. In a letter to me from the Congressional Liaison Officer, the Postal Service explained that a cooperative effort among Postal Service management was essential to improving mail service.

I make mention of this today, because I have been critical of the postal service we are receiving in rural areas, and because I do not share the optimism continually expressed in the many reports and press releases I receive from the U.S. Postal Service. Every day the mail is delivered to my office in Washington, I can count on an increasing amount of complaints regarding the postal service in rural areas. These complaints are in direct contrast to the reports I receive from the U.S. Postal Service—so much in contrast that I sometimes think we are talking about two different agencies.

The key, I think, to improving postal service is the cooperative effort mentioned in the recent management conference. Last week my office received an unusual telephone call from a good friend in behalf of a postal employee in Kansas. The question involved the alleged forced retirement of a postal employee, because of a new directive regarding termination of employees who have diabetes. This particular employee has 20 years of service with the Postal Service and, of course, wanted to know why the directive could not be limited to new employees. In other words, he asked the commonsense question:

Why did the Postal Service wait 20 years before telling me I was not suitable for work?

Now, in most cases our citizens in Kansas feel free to contact their elected public officials directly. But, this particular gentleman knew full well he could not do that. Because of his unique position as an employee within the Postal Service, he has been instructed not to contact his Congressman regarding any matters concerning postal policy. That is why he went through a mutual friend.

In an effort to be of help, my office contacted Mr. Jeff Krause, of the Postal Service Legislative Liaison Office, and asked whom we could visit with regard to the new directive concerning diabetics. We were trying to locate someone for the postal employee to call so that he, in turn, could ask about the new directive without making the matter the subject of an official complaint.

My office staff was informed, that postal policy states we could not talk to

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

anyone in the postal corporation. We were further informed that an employee could not talk to anyone at a policy level. The only recourse open to the employee was to work through the grievance procedure and his local postmaster.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any Federal agency, other than the U.S. Postal Service, where an elected representative of the people is not permitted to talk to anyone within that agency. I also do not know of any agency within our Government that either officially or unofficially does not permit their employees to contact their elected representatives.

We have here a case where an employee of the U.S. Postal Service has been forced to contact his Congressman through a "middleman" regarding a policy decision that sounds discriminatory and that may be in violation of his rights. Furthermore, we have been told that it is official postal policy that we cannot contact anyone within the Postal Service, only those in the liaison office. I have been down that road before. In the great majority of the cases our relationship with the liaison office has been good and our requests have been answered without delay. Of course, the answers we receive relative to employee problems, postal rates, closing of rural post offices, consolidation of routes, mail delay, and others, are not favorable, but they are always prompt and courteous.

I full well realize that there must be a "chain of command" within any organization and that employees should follow accepted policy relative to personnel problems. To do otherwise would be to invite mass confusion. Nevertheless, for my constituents, my office serves as a court of last resort with the bureaucracy. Any policy that denies any citizen the basic right to contact his or her Congressman should be changed.

I wonder what the reaction of Mr. Krause would be should he call my office and be refused permission to speak to me—that instead he must first go through my district office in Norton, Kans., then to my office in Dodge City, and then in turn to Salina, and then to my office here in Washington. I am considering adopting that policy, especially when the Congress is considering postal appropriations. In the meantime, if an emergency dictates immediate action, Mr. Krause could always utilize the Postal Service's overnight mail delivery service from Kansas to Washington. The letter should arrive in my office sometime within 10 days.

#### SUPREME COURT DECISION UP-HOLDING THE RIGHTS OF BLACKS

##### HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, last week the Supreme Court ruled unanimously that a suburban swimming club cannot refuse to accept blacks who live in the immediate neighborhood if the club gives a membership preference to residents of

March 5, 1973

the neighborhood. The decision was based on an 1866 civil rights statute which insures to all citizens the same right to buy, sell, and rent property as white citizens have. The Supreme Court, in an opinion written by Justice Harry A. Blackmun, overruled a fourth district court of appeals decision.

I applaud the Court's decision which protects the rights of blacks to enjoy the full benefits of residency when buying or leasing within an area. The decision of Moose Lodge last year which allowed the discriminatory membership practices to continue was a narrow decision based on lack of State involvement in the discrimination. The recent decision of the Court shows that the Court is still sympathetic to the rights of minorities.

#### CONGRESS' RESPONSIBILITY ON THE BUDGET

##### HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, many citizens are disturbed that the President has seen fit to simply hold back any funds for programs he personally dislikes. Following such a totally chaotic manner of reaching some kind of budget balance is simply not the way to handle the matter. Abruptly cutting off funds where States have already provided for their share of a program is confusing to the State officials. Likewise, with the knowledge that any program can be chopped out of the budget at the last minute, leaves them totally bewildered as to how to deal with their own planning and their own budgets.

Recently, Gov. Reubin Askew of Florida met with the State's congressional delegation to discuss the problem impoundment has presented to our State. There is no question other States are experiencing similar difficulties.

Governor Askew pointed out the impossibility of developing a meaningful State budget for programs already in being and often requiring matching funds, when it is not known from day to day which program will be in existence and which will be cut or abolished.

Mr. Speaker, this is no way for a responsible government to deal with other governmental entities. Aside from the question of the relative powers of the President and the Congress, we face the equally important question of the powers and duties of State legislators, Governors, mayors, school boards and county commissioners, charged by local and State law to arrive at a firm budget by a date certain. Impoundment has made this impossible. If we allow this trend to go unchecked, the congressional intent—counted on by State and local government—will be meaningless and important local level programs will not be requested or funded on congressional intent alone, but instead will be delayed without timely implementation on the chance the program will be chopped by Executive fiat, leaving the local govern-

ment out on the limb for a program it cannot fund by itself.

We in the Congress are faced with the total stripping of our responsibility to the people with respect to the budget if the trend toward impoundment continues. President Nixon, during his first 4 years, has impounded over \$40 billion. Since his recent election he has impounded funds to be used for housing, agriculture, and water pollution.

We are all concerned about the national debt. It is, of course, vital that we cut out every form of reckless spending and balance the budget. Certainly no individual can spend himself rich, and this country cannot accomplish that either. However, it is foolish for us to turn over the most powerful check that was given to us in the Constitution and allow any Chief Executive, whoever he might be, to completely take over the budget, spending or deleting as he deems appropriate without regard to the needs as presented to and determined by the Congress in its various committees nor for its positions as direct representative of the people. I think the people of the United States are neither ready nor willing to vest this much power in one man.

Many of us in the Congress have sponsored legislation to notify the Congress whenever the President impounds funds and to provide a procedure whereby the House of Representatives and Senate may approve the President's action or require him to cease such action. The bill, H.R. 3296, in effect, would again allow the checks and balances so necessary to the smooth operation of our Government and to the fairness it was intended to create.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member of the Congress to look closely at this type of legislation and to support this measure as a new thrust for the Congress assuming its responsibilities.

**SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION HAS IMPRESSIVE RECORD UNDER ADMINISTRATOR THOMAS S. KLEPPE**

**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, one of the primary concerns of our committee is the oversight over the operation of the Small Business Administration, the organization charged with aiding, counseling, assisting and protecting the interests of American small business.

I believe the country is indeed fortunate to have a man such as Thomas S. Kleppe, a former colleague of ours in the House, as Administrator. The able management of SBA by Administrator Kleppe has put this agency, serving the Nation, in the forefront.

In this connection, I insert in the Record a report on SBA's recent accomplishments.

The report follows:

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

U.S. SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D.C., January 11, 1973.  
Hon. JOE L. EVINS,  
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed is a status report in capsule form of some of our accomplishments here at SBA.

I think you will find the report to be very self-explanatory in brief terms but I would add that the dedication and attitude of our 4,000 people scattered throughout 80 offices in the United States have produced above and beyond what they themselves thought could result.

I am personally pleased with the overall status of the Agency today in connection with our legislative direction and our mission, but probably the last paragraph is the high point of management and efficiency. To be able to increase our work and our activities double, triple, or even quadruple in some areas and to do it all in light of serious demands upon our time and manpower for servicing disasters and yet to do it all with more than 200 people less than we had when I came here is probably the greatest accomplishment.

Thank you, Joe, for all of your wonderful cooperation.

Sincerely,

THOMAS S. KLEPPE,  
Administrator.

**THE SBA RECORD**

This year, during which we will observe the 20th anniversary of the creation of the U.S. Small Business Administration by the Congress, it is especially fitting that the dramatic record of this Agency be reviewed.

Congress has always recognized that the Nation's small businesses are an economic constituency that must be encouraged and protected. A healthy small business community lifts the entire economy.

Small, free, independent enterprise is the heritage of our past and the life blood of our future, providing all of our citizens with their most prized possession: opportunity.

Small Business was the fountainhead of our inventive achievements and industrial giants of today, and it remains the basic source of our invention and industry of tomorrow.

The number of small businesses has grown enormously—contrary to the general impression that it is declining. The Census Bureau reports there are 8 million small businesses in America today. That is one million more than we had 10 years ago. There are over two million small businesses than 20 years ago, when SBA began. Indeed, rather than being bypassed by bigness, small business is an ever-growing thing and is now providing jobs for half our people and contributing 44% of our Gross National Product.

SBA has kept stride with this growth. It has become one of the finest, well-organized, sensible, and valuable of Federal agencies. It has maintained an extremely modest posture in size, yet it has performed at a progressively increasing rate to the point of historic proportions.

Twenty years ago, SBA handled \$29 million in loans. Ten years ago it approved \$358 million. Today, for the calendar year just ended on December 31, the SBA made more than \$3 billion in loans of all kinds.

The potential of SBA has been most fully utilized during the past two years. This was brought about by a realistic reassessment of goals by its management. It concluded that in order to fulfill properly SBA's mandate as defined in the Small Business Act, the agency must motivate the private sector more, it must educate small business as to what the Agency has to offer, it must make better use of Federal funds available, it must decentralize its personnel, and it must get more productivity out of its employees.

The Agency put down its operational plans as follows:

1. Raise the level of its existing services;
2. Give minorities a bigger piece of the action;
3. Fill the increasing demands for new types of assistance;
4. Increase private sector help and counsel to small business;

5. Take politics out of the Agency because small business does not know the difference between a Republican, Democrat, or Independent any more than it knows the difference between a White, Black, Spanish-American, Indian, or any other group.

6. Communicate fully with the Executive Branch and the Congress as to its accomplishments and future plans.

The Agency's track record proves that it is doing something right. SBA has really "delivered" to small business. Fiscal year 1972 was particularly dramatic.

In 1972, SBA loaned more than \$1.5 billion to small business. This was 40% more than in 1971 and more than double 1969.

In 1972, SBA's total portfolio climbed to more than \$3.7 billion, 85% more than in fiscal 1969.

In 1972, SBA's Community Development Program funded 639 projects costing \$147 million. This was a 14% gain in projects and 43% more dollars than in the previous year. It reversed a downward trend that surfaced in 1971. Two-thirds of these projects were located in rural areas or small communities of less than 10,000 population.

In 1972, active Small Business Investment Companies (SBICs) became larger and their financings in small businesses greater. There were 274 SBICs reporting private capitalization of \$340 million, a gain of 5% over 1971. Their financing activity was \$169 million, a gain of 8%. These figures reversed previous decreases in the venture capital industry.

Even though small business received \$11.5 billion in prime and subcontracts from the Federal Government in 1971, its share of the total declined from the previous year. It was a continuation of the trend of several years. In 1972, that trend was reversed—the first turnaround since 1968. The dollars received by small business rose to \$12.6 billion, a 10% increase, and small business share of the total pie gained 1% and stood at nearly 29%.

Natural disasters have been rising and SBA has responded accordingly. In fiscal 1972, the number of disaster loans to businesses and homeowners jumped to a staggering 93,000, or 63% more than the previous year, 450% more than in 1970, and 40 times the volume in 1969. The dollar outlay was \$327 million, up 9% over the previous year.

In calendar year 1972, which incorporates Hurricane Agnes, the greatest natural disaster on record, SBA approved 183,000 disaster loans valued at more than \$1 billion. That is 90% more loans and 180% more dollars than in the previous 12 months.

SBA has done the largest share in the Federal Government in building minority enterprise. In 1972, SBA loans to minority businesses amounted to \$258 million, increasing 21% over the previous years, and 145% over 1969.

An average of 19% of the SBA business loan dollar has gone to minorities during the last three years.

The 8(a) program of setting aside Federal contracts for the socially and economically disadvantaged was up sharply. SBA had forecast a dollar value of \$100 million for 1972. It actually achieved \$152 million, a rise of 134% over 1971. The number of contracts—most of them going to minority businesses—was 1,700, compared with 28 in 1969.

A new Limited Small Business Investment Company concept, which is pioneering as a major source of equity money for minorities, had 31 operating firms in 1972, compared to 21 the previous year. Their capital invest-

ment was up 145% at \$10.3 million, and their financings in minority businesses were up 75% at \$3.5 million.

SBA has added many new assistance programs to its arsenal in order to meet the demands of small business. Many of these have just begun their growth:

Surety bonding, under which SBA guarantees bonds needed to obtain a contract . . . \$94 million, up from \$1 million;

The guaranteeing of rental payments on leases in class-A locations—\$150 million, up from \$121 million;

Establishing and guaranteeing a revolving line of bank credit for construction contractors—\$32 million, up from \$3 million;

And three programs just beginning their first year:

Liberalizing benefits to veterans—6 million Vietnam vets have been made eligible for Economic Opportunity Loans;

Expanding assistance to agriculture-related businesses;

Establishing secondary markets to give banks liquidity on SBA "paper".

SBA has been utilizing the private sector and its resources to an unparalleled degree.

It has conducted an ambitious sales campaign on banks, and they have responded favorably. Part of this positive reaction comes from the fact that SBA has made loan-making easier—cutting loan processing time in half and eliminating unnecessary red tape. Two-thirds of the Nation's 14,000 banks are now investing in SBA loans, compared to just 10% in 1969.

Ninety-five percent of all the funds provided for small firms under SBA's regular business loan program in 1972 came from these banks. They invested \$1.3 billion, 53% more than in the previous year.

The private sector is participating in other ways:

SBA's Community Development Program has fostered initiative among local individuals and groups to rebuild their own communities with the help of SBA money earmarked for such self-development.

The number of SCORE and ACE volunteers, comprising both retired and working executives, has risen to 6,800. These men and women are providing the bulk of SBA counseling and other management assistance;

Increasing agreements have been made with professional and trade organization to make their management skills available;

In a pilot program, business students at one university were used to help small businesses about to "belly up". Through their efforts, three-fourths of those businesses were saved. SBA has now established a new "Small Business Institute" program involving 37 universities, hundreds of students, and thousands of small firms.

All told, SBA has achieved its objectives to date.

The Agency loaned 125% more dollars to the small businessman in fiscal 1972 than it did just three years ago.

The total of business loans made during the last three fiscal years was \$3.4 billion.

Thus, 40% of all the business loan dollars in SBA's entire history were disbursed in the last three years.

Assistance to minorities during the last three years—nearly \$900 million in loans and contracts—also exceeds all previous SBA assistance historically.

SBA has stimulated the total economic growth of the country. There is an undetermined capital "gap" in the small business community—the annual needs for capital that are not met by banks and other commercial money sources. Some estimates put those needs at \$5 billion dollars. SBA is reducing the gap significantly.

In 1972, SBA loans and contracts, directly and indirectly, went to more than 150,000 companies throughout the Nation, 10,000 of these being new businesses.

SBA has meant more jobs. Its loan pro-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

grams generated new jobs and maintained existing employment for a total of 300,000 jobs in 1972.

Federal contracts to small business during the year meant another 1 million jobs.

The key to SBA's recent performance is that it has operated in a business-like way. This approach to Federal government has worked.

As a result of its efforts in administration and management, SBA has become a model in the President's Federal Assistance Review program (FAR).

The Agency has decentralized in fact, not just on paper. More authority has been given to the field offices. Its regional managers now sit on SBA's policy-making Management Board. A top-level position as chief of field operations has been created. People have been shifted from the Washington office to the field offices so they can be more responsive to local communities and Congressional districts.

SBA has streamlined its operations. Processing time on loans, contracts, and aid for disaster victims has been cut drastically. And the speed-up has actually improved its efficiency.

In administration, SBA has chopped away at bureaucracy, paperwork, and inefficiencies. It formed a more cohesive administrative staff. It computerized its administrative functions and cut in half the internal reports being made. It discovered that it could reduce the 2,400 different official forms used by the Agency to 1,600, and they are still trimming. It found that minority people can be effective workers, and they now constitute one-fifth of SBA's total 4,000 work force.

## ISRAELI OFFERS TO AID SOVIETS BY PUTTING LEAD IN THEIR PENCIL

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

#### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, an Israeli businessman has offered to help Soviet war production by supplying lead for their pencils.

Meantime, President Nixon gives Mrs. Meir reassurances that Israel does not stand alone, but will receive additional sophisticated aircraft and weaponry under an "Israelization plan," formulated as a balance of power against Soviet weaponry.

I insert a related newsclipping at this point:

[From the Evening Star-Daily News, March 1, 1973]

#### ISRAELI COMPANY OFFERING MARKED AID TO RUSSIANS

JERUSALEM.—An Israeli businessman has offered to sell the Soviet Union 35 million pencils.

Alex Raphaeli, owner of the Jerusalem Pencil Co., made the offer after the newspaper *Moskovskaya Pravda* reported the shortage in the Soviet Union.

The report blamed the pencil problem on inefficient production and irrational distribution.

The Soviet newspaper said one Moscow pencil factory lost 3,500 man-days of work last year because of mechanical breakdowns in the production line.

Raphaeli said he made the offer in writing through a neutral European country. Israel does not have diplomatic relations with the Russians.

March 5, 1973

THE AMERICAN LEGION PRESENTS THEIR DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVICE AWARD TO CONGRESSMAN GEORGE MAHON, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

#### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to be able to insert in the RECORD, the remarks of our colleague, GEORGE MAHON, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, following the presentation of the American Legion's Distinguished Public Service Award, February 28, 1973, at their annual congressional banquet.

There are few people in this country who deserve such an award for public service as does GEORGE MAHON. He is the man where, in the late Harry Truman's words, "the buck stops" when it comes to getting the Federal dollar. I have great admiration for GEORGE, he is a great American and truly a public servant. As chairman of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs Committee for many years, I was always most appreciative of the great consideration he and his committee always gave to the veterans and the veteran program of this country. He is most deserving of this award.

The speech follows:

#### REMARKS BY GEORGE MAHON

National Commander of the American Legion, Joe Matthews, Mrs. T. G. Chilton, National President of the Legion Auxiliary, distinguished head table guests, my colleagues from the Congress, distinguished Legionnaires, ladies and gentlemen:

My special greetings to the returned Prisoners of War at Table 117. We are greatly honored by your presence as just demonstrated by the audience.

I wish to express my deepest thanks for the honor which you have conferred upon me tonight. Thank you, Joe. The award is even more priceless because it comes during your Administration.

When I reflect on those who have received your award previously, all of them men who have contributed greatly to the strength of our nation, I am both humbled and greatly honored.

In the 32 years I have been working on military appropriations, the American Legion has been of great assistance to me, both in a direct and an indirect way. Your representatives regularly appear before my Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations. You have been of invaluable assistance to us in our efforts to maintain sufficient military strength for our nation. By your influence throughout the length and breadth of this land, you have helped create an atmosphere that has made it possible for us each year to pass through Congress a reasonably adequate defense appropriation bill. I give you my pledge that we shall continue our standard of performance.

This country owes more than it will ever know to the members of the American Legion who have unceasingly and in many ways served veterans, their families, and the nation as a whole. You have been an indispensable factor in providing the leadership which has helped shape the course of our country.

But your work is not over. You must continue to be watchful, well informed, and active in the cause of peace and stability and

in behalf of Veterans and their dependents to whom so much is owed.

More so than in recent years, this occasion tonight is a happy one. For the last six or seven years when we have met here together, there was fighting by U.S. ground forces in South Vietnam. Tonight we are grateful for the cease-fire and for the return of a number of our prisoners of war. We impatiently await the return of the others. We are saddened that there is not more hopeful news about the missing in action. We anxiously and prayerfully await further word. And we honor the memory of those who have suffered and sacrificed for our beloved country.

Mrs. Helene Knapp, you honor us in joining us here tonight representing the families of the prisoners of war and the missing in action. Thank you.

We all recognize the fact that our country is faced with many problems. I am concerned, but I am not pessimistic. The fact that enough of us are worried encourages me to believe that we will manage to deal adequately with the vitally important and highly complex challenges which confront us.

As we look to the State of the Nation, we wonder what should be done about the controversial Federal budget now before Congress, a budget which estimates that the national debt will increase this year by \$34 billion and next year by \$30 billion, a \$64 billion increase in just two years. And all of this is piled on top of debt increases which have been the pattern for years and which have contributed to inflation and the decline of the dollar and the loss of our position in world trade. In the coming fiscal year, interest on the national debt will increase to a new high of \$24.7 billion!

Do we as Americans have the will to discipline ourselves, to do what must be done for the environment, health, education, and welfare, and all the rest, and cope adequately with inflation and the rising national debt? Are we willing to move more nearly toward paying our way with funds on hand, not borrowed dollars?

In establishing priorities, will we have the good sense to continue national survival in a less than stable world as our number one priority? Do we have the capacity and courage to develop the fiscal restraint necessary to meet the needs of our people and to maintain the viability of our nation in the context of world responsibility?

Discipline among our people must become a major priority—more major than it is today. This means discipline in the homes. In the schools. And yes, discipline in the Armed Forces of the United States!

Spending for defense has remained fairly constant, with some pay raises and inflation escalations, but spending for the social programs and for government generally has skyrocketed. Defense spending in fiscal year 1974 is estimated to be about the same as in fiscal year 1969. On the other hand, non-defense spending for the coming year is estimated to exceed non-defense spending in 1969 by \$84 billion, about a 65% increase.

Now that our direct war costs have been sharply curtailed and there is evidence of a reduction in tensions between our country and Russia and China, there are those who speak in terms of a peace dividend making possible a sharp reduction in the defense budget. But I would warn that our best hope of peace and world stability lies in our willingness to maintain adequate military and economic strength. Only through the maintenance of strength can there be real hope that an era of peace and stability can be attained.

We must find a way—difficult and painful as it may be—to modify or weed out non-productive federal programs and provide effective methods to achieve our goals for all Americans.

In the area of foreign affairs, we must exploit the commendable initiatives by the

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

President in regard to China and the Soviet Union. We must not succumb to discouragement in our determination to move toward an extended era of peace and world stability.

These are some of the hard challenges facing Congress and the nation. Meaningful solutions must be found and implemented if this country is to continue its position of world leadership.

The policy of the American Legion and the policy of a majority of the Members of Congress has been in support of the President's effort to achieve peace with honor in Vietnam. Of course, we agree that many difficulties lie ahead.

It is estimated that 150,000 North Vietnamese troops remain in South Vietnam. Active fighting continues. The situation in Laos is critical. The cease-fire is a fragile thing. We are all pleased that the President has been able to achieve the cease-fire and that our direct participation in the fighting has almost ended. We, of course, all hope that the fighting will soon be ended throughout Southeast Asia.

There is room for much hope and encouragement provided we maintain the capacity to deal with friend and foe alike from a position of economic and military strength.

The same kind of steadfastness that has brought us thus far must be continued if we are to protect what we have already gained. The record clearly demonstrates that you of the Legion know what steadfastness means.

The American Legion, from its beginning, has been a vital and persistent force for the preservation of the American way of life. The strong voice of the Legion is needed today in every area of the United States.

As we proceed through the 1970s and into the remainder of this century, you the Legionnaire, will have a tremendous responsibility to exert your influence for the preservation of peace and security and the American way of life. You have not failed America in the past. I can say with confidence you will not fail her in the coming days.

I salute you and encourage you to continue to bear your heavy burden of responsibility to the Veteran and to the Nation.

In closing, let me say that tonight is a great moment for my wife, Helen, and for me. We are deeply grateful. In accepting this award, I do so with the feeling that we in this hall tonight share the same objectives for our nation and its well-being—a strong national defense as our number one priority, proper care for our veterans and a safe and happy land for all.

God bless America and enable us once again to live in the sunlight and starlight of peace.

## SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

### HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the House today will consider an important bill which will require the Secretary of Agriculture to make full use of the funds available to the Department of Agriculture during fiscal year 1973 for the purchase of commodities for school lunch programs.

According to the data gathered by the Education and Labor Committee, the USDA is far behind in its purchase of these commodities—it still has a total of \$52 million to expend in fiscal year 1973. It is reluctant to purchase these commodities due to the lack of substantial surpluses of goods for distribution and

the rising costs of food. However, this would seem to be even more of an impetus to insure that children receive at least one balanced and nutritious meal while they are at school—for it is unlikely that their families are able to afford nutritious, but unfortunately expensive, food in the home.

In view of the great benefits that the school lunch program has to children across the United States, Mr. Speaker, I am confident that this bill will receive the two-thirds vote necessary for passage.

## THE ENERGY CRISIS, AND WHAT WE CAN DO ABOUT IT

### HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, HENRY S. REUSS of Wisconsin, spoke today at an environmental seminar in Milwaukee on the topic of "The Energy Crisis, and What We Can Do About It." He kindly gave me a copy of the text of his speech. It is a concise and thoughtful analysis of the subject. I believe it will be very helpful to Members of this House and to the public, as we focus on the various problems relating to the "energy crisis." I, therefore include the text of his statement at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS.

## THE ENERGY CRISIS, AND WHAT WE CAN DO ABOUT IT

During the past year, there has been much talk about the "energy crisis"—shortages of fuel, rising prices, brownout after brownout since the big Northeast Blackout of November, 1965. This winter we saw schools closing in Denver because of insufficient natural gas to heat schoolrooms. factories shut down in Iowa because of lack of heating oil, and cold homes in the mid-west and New England.

The 1965 Northeast Blackout resulted from failure of a switch in Canada. But it showed up the weaknesses in electric utility interconnections and transmission facilities. The local shortages of heating oil and gas were partly due to unusually cold weather. An equal contributor, however, was the oil industry's use of refinery capacity to produce gasoline to take advantage of recent price increases rather than to refine less profitable heating oil.

But the shortages demonstrate that there are real problems of energy supply in these days of zooming demand for energy to run our factories; to heat, air condition, and light our homes; to operate our automobiles, trucks, buses and airplanes; and to provide the massive amounts of power and energy demanded by our modern electricity-oriented style of life.

The energy crisis, in some measure results from the fact that consumers—and that means all of us, in our homes, manufacturing plants, cities and farms—are accustomed to having energy available at all times, in any quantity required, and at relatively low prices, whenever we flick a switch or start a motor or jiggle the thermostat. But now we find the power is not always there, and we see prices for gas, electricity and oil rising rapidly.

Is there an "energy crisis"? What should we do about it?

Our present civilization is built on energy. During most of mankind's existence, our sources of energy were primarily human and

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

animal muscle-power, with later assistance from the wind (for propelling sailing vessels) and the burning of wood for heat. Then, a few hundred years ago, we began using coal, water power, oil and gas, and now nuclear energy, for heat, electricity, motive power for transportation, and for the enormous variety of work and activity that is characteristic of present day civilization.

Here in the United States we were blessed with abundant forests, many flowing rivers, and enormous deposits of coal, oil and gas. They made possible the great growth of our industry and technology. But this industrial expansion—together with our burgeoning population and the wasteful and inefficient manner in which we consume our forests, oil, gas and electricity, and pollute our air and waters—create skyrocketing demands on our energy supplies. Today, with hardly 6 percent of the world's population, the United States consumes about 35 percent of the world's energy.

Our energy supplies are not unlimited. We are told that our natural gas is being burned twice as fast as we are finding reserves; that our oil reserves are substantially less than in 1956; that there are few sites remaining for construction of hydroelectric plants.

Although we have large reserves of coal, more than half of all our coal contains over 2 percent sulfur. This is well beyond the sulfur emission limits now being promulgated by many States and cities and the proposed Federal 0.7 percent standard for new plants under air pollution abatement laws. Since present technology cannot as yet effectively remove the sulfur from stack gases of coal-burning power plants, electric utility plants are turning to low sulfur oil and natural gas. There is increasing pressure on our natural gas reserves. The potential for finding new gas fields is now more in relatively expensive and environmentally controversial areas such as Alaska and the continental shelf rather than in the lower 48 States. It is now generally acknowledged that unless natural gas needs are met by foreign and Alaskan imports and the gasification of coal and crude oil, natural gas cannot be considered a stable source of energy over the next 10 or 12 years.

Nuclear power is still in its infancy. As of June, 1972, there were 26 nuclear power plants, with a capacity of about 11,800 megawatts, or less than  $\frac{1}{10}$  of 1 percent of the energy now used in the United States. There are 51 additional nuclear plants being constructed and 66 planned, with reactors ordered, which will add a combined capacity of 109,000 megawatts. However, these light water reactor plants use only the rare isotope of Uranium-235, which constitutes hardly one percent of our limited supply of uranium. This fuel will be exhausted within the next 2 or  $\frac{1}{2}$  decades. Furthermore, there are still widespread fears about the possibility of catastrophic explosions, radioactive leakage, and the grave problems of disposing of wastes which will emit lethal radioactivity for thousands of years.

The spokesmen for the fuel industries are now waging a multi-million dollar campaign in the news media and on radio and TV. They are trying to convince the people of this country that we can solve our energy problems only by strip-mining more coal, by totally deregulating natural gas, by retaining import restrictions against foreign oil, by relaxing anti-pollution laws and standards, and by continuing tax loopholes for the minerals industry.

They assume, and want us to believe, that the most important objective of our national policy is to satisfy our ever-rising demands for power and energy, no matter how wastefully or inefficiently used, and no matter what environmental damage may result to our land, air, water, landscape, and work places.

They urge a return to the "efficient disciplines" of letting market prices balance en-

ergy demand with available supplies. They say it is in the national interest to expand development of our outer continental shelf resources, to accelerate the rape of our land in order to exploit its minerals, and to reject measures which place "unreasonable" restrictions and burdens on such development. This approach should be enshrined, they say, into a "national energy policy."

I agree that we must have abundant energy to fuel and power our civilization. But are the fuel industries' recommendations for "solving" our energy problems the total answer? I say they are not.

It no longer is—I doubt that it ever was—in the public interest:

To relax our newly strengthened air and water pollution control laws and regulations to permit use of polluting fuels;

To strip-mine our lands in order to extract coal without positive advance guarantees that effective reclamation of the land can and will be promptly undertaken and achieved;

To build the trans-Alaska pipeline;

To extract minerals from lands now dedicated as national forests and wilderness areas;

To build superports for oil tankers near our scarce public beaches, or refinery complexes in our valuable wetlands; or

To totally free natural gas from regulation.

We must tackle the gap between energy supply and energy demand with greater regard for our natural resources, the need to protect our environment and the health of our people, and with more efficient use of the finite amounts of energy available to us and to future generations.

On the supply side, we should:

*First. Greatly expand Federal research and development programs to achieve new and more efficient ways of generating and transmitting electric power.*

Although electric power is clean and convenient at the point of use, its generation and transmission often involve low efficiencies and environmental hazards. Reliance on coal-burning plants stimulates strip-mining and the devastation of thousands of acres of good land. They emit much of the sulfur dioxides and fly-ash which contaminate our atmosphere. They degrade our rivers and streams by discharging as waste heat about 60 percent of the heat produced. Although hydroelectric generating plants do not pollute the air, their reservoirs flood large acreages of fertile farmland and wildlife habitat, and their operations are often harmful to fishlife. The present light-water nuclear reactors are even more inefficient, consuming our limited supply of uranium, and discharging into rivers and streams about 65 percent of the heat produced.

Research on the fast breeder reactor, which will be able to produce more fissionable nuclear fuel than it consumes, should go forward. But I agree with nuclear physicist Edward Teller that if we do not keep "each step of the process . . . under control, the consequences could be terrifying."

We must also give equal emphasis to the development of other, and in the long run potentially better, methods of producing clean energy such as:

*Nuclear Fusion.* Its basic raw material, the heavy isotope of hydrogen in sea water, is almost limitless; it would discharge far less radioactivity than fission reactors; and it would not, unlike the breeder reactor, produce large amounts of plutonium which could be used for the production of nuclear bombs.

*Solar energy.* I am told that the sunlight that falls on a square mile of land would produce a million kilowatts of power if harnessed at 40 percent efficiency. Developing central station production of solar energy would require considerable capital cost. But so does a nuclear plant. Furthermore, the development of commercially available technology and

materials for direct cooling and heating of buildings would enable use of solar energy to supplement or substitute for presently used oil, and gas and electricity.

*The fuel-cell,* which is already being used on a small scale in space vehicles.

*Magnetohydrodynamics,* which would enable the extraction of 65 to 75 percent of the heat energy of coal without air pollution.

*Expanded development of geothermal energy,* which is already being used for generating electricity in several parts of the world.

*Commercial gasification of coal to supplement natural gas.*

*Desulfurization of coal.*

*Using solid wastes to generate power,* thus solving problems of waste disposal while generating energy. This is done in several cities in Europe. The first effort in this country was recently begun under an EPA grant to the City of St. Louis. There 300 tons per day of residential solid refuse are used to generate electricity at a Union Electric Company power plant.

*Energy from the tides and the winds.* There are many places where such energy can be developed to provide supplementary power, and some that can provide base-load energy. The Passamaquoddy project, which would have made tidal energy available to New England, was shelved when the interest rate was increased. But as the cost of fuel rises and energy becomes scarcer, the "Quoddy" project should again receive serious consideration.

*Second. We should scrap the Oil Import Quota system.* It keeps oil prices at artificially high levels, encourages the exhaustion of our domestic resources, and makes some parts of the United States vulnerable to interruption of imports while others remain self-sufficient. Instead, we should encourage the import of foreign oil to relieve our shortages. We should require the storage in the United States of sufficient oil to eliminate the possibility of abrupt cutoffs of imports from the Mid-East due to international friction or price blackmail. In any event, we should certainly seek improved arrangements for imports from Canada and the Western Hemisphere.

*Third. We should use the trans-Canada route.* The Interior Department is supporting the Trans-Alaska pipeline, to carry Alaska's North slope oil deposits across the fragile tundra of Alaska to the Port of Valdez, and thence by tanker to the Puget Sound area. Instead, we should bring that oil to the Mid-West by the trans-Canada route, which is far less environmentally hazardous than the trans-Alaska and tanker route. Incidentally, this could spur the development of much-needed refinery capacity in the Mid-West.

We must also look at the *demand* side of the energy problem if we are to survive comfortably for many more generations.

There are many ways to save energy. For example:

—many home appliances, such as air conditioners, are quite inefficient, using far more energy than needed to accomplish their purpose;

—we could save the equivalent of several hundred thousand barrels of oil per day simply by setting our home thermostats a couple of degrees lower in winter and a couple degrees higher in summer;

—since automobiles account for more than half of the consumption of energy used for transportation, we could save enormous amounts of energy by (a) using smaller cars which consume less gas per mile, and (b) shifting more of our national transportation from the high-energy-consuming airplane to railroads and buses, and from the inefficient automobile to the more efficient mass transit.

I have yet to see evidence that the Administration grasps the urgency of the urban transportation problem. For instance, the President impounded one-third of the \$900

March 5, 1973

million appropriated for fiscal year 1972 by Congress for construction grants and loans under the Urban Mass Transit Act.

Office buildings, apartments, and homes are still being built with little or no thought to the impact on energy conservation. Poor insulation, high ceilings, and large glass areas result in wasteful heat losses. Sealed windows in office buildings, factories, and schools require year-round air-conditioning simply to breathe. Offices without windows require increased lighting even on the sunniest days. All of these practices lead to high fuel consumption, wasting our resources, and unnecessarily increasing consumers' fuel costs.

Both in our role as purchasers of products and as individuals, we can help to conserve energy. Here are a few suggestions:

Let's rely less upon our automobiles, let's demand large-scale manufacture of small cars, and let's campaign for an aggressive mass transit program, using some of the heretofore sacred highway trust funds;

Let's insist that all appliances be labeled to show their electrical efficiency, so that consumers can compare and choose appliances that are economical in the long run.

Let's reduce unnecessary lighting in residences and office buildings;

Let's change our building designs to reduce the rate of exposed surface to usable volume;

Let's improve the thermal insulation of our homes.

Another fertile energy-saving area is the utility pricing structure. Utilities now charge lower rates to the larger consumers of electricity, thus penalizing those least able to pay, and fostering excessive consumption and waste.

Because it would help reverse our extravagant use of electricity and avoid putting an undue burden on the small consumer, I endorse an inversion of the present rate structure to make the first 500 kilowatt-hours per month the cheapest, and the higher levels of demand more expensive. This approach is working successfully in France, where power used during the day is costlier than that used in the off-peak night hours. It is being tried in some States, like Michigan. It should be a standard practice in all States.

Most importantly, effective environmental controls for the exploration, development and use of fuels, and the protection of workers in the energy industries, must be adopted and vigorously enforced. Environmental controls need not inhibit resource development. Rather, they will encourage the development of improved technology and better use of our resources without degradation of our environment and harm to workers.

We must develop a national policy of energy conservation to replace the policies of exploitation and extravagant promotion which now dominate our energy policies. Too much of the energy we produce or import is simply wasted. We can do our work, travel, light our homes and cities, keep warm in winter and reduce the heat of mid-summer, without wasting, as we now do, about  $\frac{1}{3}$  to  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the energy.

Let's save, not waste, energy—our nation's precious resource.

#### CONGRESS MUST ACT TO SAVE THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

**HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the 20,000 Americans who were in attendance on the Capitol steps on February 20 are

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

symbolic of the millions and millions more citizens who are outraged by the President's attempted dismantling of the Office of Economic Opportunity and its worthwhile programs. Concerned and compassionate people cannot comprehend a peacetime budget in which defense expenditures are increased and social programs erased. Neither can I.

The Economic Opportunity Compliance Act of 1973 that I have introduced in Congress forbids any unauthorized interference with the programs provided for in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

I now submit for your attention and the attention of my colleagues, a Washington Post editorial of February 22 commenting on the President's plan to dismantle OEO regardless of the will of Congress and entitled: "OEO: Cato Strikes by Night."

It must be the goal of every Representative in Congress to see to it that the hopes and needs of so many Americans are met by allowing OEO to continue.

The article follows:

##### OEO: CATO STRIKES BY NIGHT

Ever since the administration appointed Howard Phillips to be acting director and dismantler of the Office of Economic Opportunity, its zeal to destroy that office has become less and less seemly. Consider two recent disclosures concerning the way the present heads of the organization think and operate. The first is a highly self-revelatory comment made by Mr. Phillips to Ted Tetzlaff, the fired head of the Legal Services program, last summer.

"Every country needs its Cato . . . Well, I'm going to be this country's Cato. Carthage was destroyed because it was rotten. I think Legal Services is rotten, and it will be destroyed."

The second is an internal OEO memorandum discussing strategies for handling Congress as the process of dismantling OEO is accomplished. The memorandum says: "Thus, unless a focus on OEO is politically desirable, program transfers and shutdowns should be prompt, before the opposition musters strength (or will) to put Humpty Dumpty together again." And again, the memorandum calls for "a swift and successful dismemberment" of OEO by June 30, before there is time for "congressional opposition to gather and develop a legislative counterstrategy."

Despite a statement from OEO that the memorandum was nothing more than a staff paper reflecting the views of only one man, the events set in train by Mr. Phillips since his assumption of the office a couple of weeks ago, suggest that the main lines of thought embodied in his personal statement and in the congressional strategy paper are rapidly being put into practice. Without going through all the gory details of the dismantling, a few examples of what has happened during Mr. Phillips' brief tenure will demonstrate the pattern.

On January 29, Mr. Phillips sent out a directive announcing the phase-out of the grants under section 221 of the Economic Opportunity Act, which provide general support for the Community Action Agencies. The President's fiscal year 1974 budget contains no items to support the Community Action Agencies (CAAs). In the same directive, Mr. Phillips forbade community action directors to use OEO funds to travel, presumably to hinder them from getting together to generate any kind of protest against his course of action. The directive also suspended appeals and hearing procedures generally provided in cases of refusals to refund. And, over in Legal Services, although there

are promises that the administration will ask again for a corporation to shelter the program, the people in the field are being held on such a short financial tether that their morale is cracking. Some programs are borrowing money and others are closing down.

If bamboozling the Congress while Catoing the poverty programs and the hopes of the poor are indeed the aims of Mr. Phillips' program, then his efficiency and his success rival any governmental accomplishments we have seen in this town in a long time. Never mind that Congress may have intended something else, that the President's budget message seemed to promise continued Legal Services and never mind that workers are losing their jobs and the poor are losing hope. Under the Phillips assault, the walls are tumbling down.

But, that doesn't seem to be what Congress intended. Over the years, Congress has tightened up the broad discretion originally delegated to the director of OEO with respect to CAAs to the extent that last year in authorizing fiscal '73 and fiscal '74 funds it also specifically earmarked local initiative—that is, basic support for the Community Action Agencies—for both fiscal years. And the Duration of the Program section of the act mandates the director to carry out the program, including Community Action, through June 30, 1975. Never mind the intent of Congress, though, the strategy paper takes care of all of that. Give Sen. Norris Cotton (R-N.H.) "courtesy advice only." Give Sen. Warren G. Magnuson (D-Wash.) courtesy advice because he is "not thoroughly acquainted with programs and concerned about duplication of HEW and Labor activities."

There is touch-up strategy for a number of members of both Houses but mainly there are the admonitions to "avoid confrontation between the constitutional powers of the President and the Congress," to take the issues through the appropriations committees rather than those with legislative jurisdiction and, above all, to "present the Congress with a *fait accompli*." There is also arrogance and at least the appearance of lawlessness. There is impoundment and the apparent avoidance of the procedures Congress has set up for the reorganization of the government.

In a word, there is a brazen usurpation of the powers of Congress and as crass an assault on its prerogatives as we can imagine. All of this is being done by an administration which came to power on a law and order theme and by a director who has yet to utter a word of testimony before a congressional committee in confirmation hearings or elsewhere. The question finally comes down to whether the Congress has either the will or the initiative to stop this modern day Cato in his tracks. If it does not, it is not just the powers and the pride of the Congress that will have suffered—though suffer they surely will—it will be the poor who are blasted all over the landscape and it is our national decency and the quality of the fabric of the lives of all the rest of us that will have been severely eroded.

#### SAVE YOUR VISION WEEK

**HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY**

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to call the attention of my colleagues to President Nixon's proclaiming March 4-10, 1973, as "Save Your Vision Week." He said:

Like many precious possessions eyesight is usually taken for granted until it is lost.

It is a shame that this statement is all too true in this day and age when vision care is available to all.

In this regard, the president of the Optometric Center of the National Capital, Dr. Barry Ephraim, stated that the center's clinic cares for those who, because of financial reasons, could not receive needed vision care. He also reported that screening projects are being carried out in a number of schools in this area in order to find those children who have vision deficiencies.

He said:

Preventive measures for the preservation of vision should start at an early age. Regular professional vision care should begin at a very early age to detect any development vision problems and should continue throughout the school years into adulthood to detect and correct any physical or perceptual problems.

Because of the importance vision plays in all our lives, I join the President in recognizing Save Your Vision Week and insert his proclamation in its entirety:

PROCLAMATION 4184: SAVE YOUR VISION WEEK,

1973

(A proclamation by the President of the United States of America)

Like many precious possessions, eyesight is usually taken for granted until it is lost. Yet the preservation of vision—one of life's greatest blessings—need not be left to chance. There are steps all of can take to help keep our eyes healthy for a lifetime of useful service.

Simple safety precautions can substantially reduce the number of accidents which cause loss of vision. Potential sources of eye injury in the home, at work, and at school can be sought out and eliminated.

However, most blindness in the United States is the result not of injury, but of disease. Proper attention to hygiene, good nutrition, and, most important, regular professional eye examinations can minimize the risk of visual disability.

Glaucoma, one of the most common eye diseases, can be detected through a simple and painless test and, if detected early, can usually be arrested and controlled.

Many elderly Americans are unnecessarily blind because of cataracts. It is tragic that unwarranted fear of cataract surgery—successful in 95 percent of the cases—keeps many of our older citizens from regaining their sight.

For visual loss that can now neither be prevented nor cured, research such as that conducted by the Federal Government through the National Eye Institute offers new hope.

To encourage greater awareness of the importance of preserving sight, the Congress, by a joint resolution approved December 30, 1963 (77 Stat. 629), requested the President to proclaim the first week in March of each year as Save Your Vision Week.

Now, therefore, I, Richard Nixon, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the week of March 4, 1973, as Save Your Vision Week. I invite the Governors of the States and appropriate local government officials to issue similar proclamations, and I call upon the Nation's mass communications media to join in bringing to the attention of all Americans the importance of preventive vision care.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-ninth day of January, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred seventy-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred ninety-seventh.

RICHARD NIXON.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### RUSS DEEMPHASIZE 50TH ANNIVERSARY

#### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have emphasized to the Members the need to objectively recognize the complications within the Soviet Union so as to thoroughly understand the reasons why the rulers of the Kremlin must for a period of time adjust their policies and pursue certain economic contacts with the United States. A very interesting analysis of the situation in the Soviet Union is contained in an article by the distinguished international correspondent of the Copley Press, Dumitru Danielopol, which appeared in the Aurora, Ill., Beacon-News of February 6.

The article follows:

#### RUSS DEEMPHASIZE 50TH ANNIVERSARY

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—Last Dec. 21, the Kremlin celebrated the 50th anniversary of the founding of the USSR, but with considerably less fanfare than five years earlier when they celebrated the half century since the 1917 October revolution.

The reason is obvious. Soviet leaders would like to keep the spotlight away from a critical failure—the relationships between nationalities within the USSR.

The first Union of Soviet Socialist Republics created in December, 1922, merged the Russia, the Transcaucasian, the Ukrainian and Byelorussian Soviet Socialist republics.

After the October revolution in 1917 Lenin granted various non-Russian nationalities that had been part of Czarist Russia the right of self-determination. Many of them chose freedom, including Finland, Poland and the Baltic states, the Ukraine, Georgia, Bessarabia, etc., etc.

This obviously wasn't what Lenin had in mind.

As his Bolsheviks consolidated their power, Lenin sent the Red Army into most of the newly formed independent states to bring them back into the new Communist empire.

The Ukraine was one of the early victims after a little remembered but fierce war. Hitler helped the process along in the 1930s and now the USSR is composed of 15 Soviet republics.

But Lenin's dream that internationalism, propagated by the Communists would be so attractive that in the long run, nationalist feelings would erode and disappear has proved a fallacy. Not only did the Marxist experiment fail but nationalism survived, grew. Today the Soviet Union is a union only in name, although the Moscow police state wields unquestioned internal power.

Even this power is sometimes challenged by Nationalist demonstrations.

They have been reported from Tallin to Tashkent in recent years. The Ukraine appears to be seething against large-scale repression. The magnitude problem has been recognized within the USSR. In a memorandum addressed to party boss Leonid Brezhnev, the maverick intellectual Andrei D. Sakharov, developer of the Soviet hydrogen bomb, reviewed a series of ills that affect the Soviet Union. One's the "aggravation of the nationalities problem."

He suggested that Soviet republics be given the right to secede. You know how far he got with that idea!

The same unrest has been apparent in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe which since the 1940s have come under the

March 5, 1973

Moscow boot. Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria are really independent only in name. The facade serves Soviet interests, but no one can seriously doubt who is boss in any moment of crisis.

"For 20 years now Eastern Europe has remained unstable," says London's Soviet analyst, "and there is every reason to expect further convulsions there . . . A similar view may be taken in the Soviet Union."

Nationalist tendencies are held in check only by the power of the state and party, it says. "The demands of the people have not been faced," it claims. "This can work only in the short run. In the long run it is explosive."

## THOUGHTS ON TRADE AND MONETARY REFORM

### HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a speech delivered by Donald C. Platten, chairman of the board and chief executive officer of Chemical Bank, before the American Chamber of Commerce in Geneva, Switzerland, on February 27, 1973. The subject of international trade and monetary reform is an extremely important one, especially now with our balance-of-payments deficit and the recent dollar devaluation, and I recommend Mr. Platten's proposals to my colleagues for their thoughtful consideration:

#### WILL THERE BE A NIXON ROUND?

(By Donald C. Platten)

First, let me admit that this is a substitute title for my remarks today. Two months ago, when I received your kind invitation to come to Geneva, it did seem appropriate to discuss some aspects of world trade. Your city, the home of GATT, have become synonymous with the great advances in international commerce since World War II—advances made possible by the completion of six major rounds of trade negotiations.

I was aware that a seventh round was scheduled to begin in September, the so-called Nixon Round. And I knew the preparatory committee would be meeting here this month to begin defining the broad issues of the Nixon Round. It seemed likely that the most important issues would involve the three biggest trading blocks of GATT—Europe, America and Japan. My plan, two months ago, was to review with you today some of those issues under the speech title: "Old America, New Europe and Modern Japan." It seemed back in December that America's biggest problem in the Nixon Round would be an old problem, that Europe's newness would be its major problem, and that everyone would have a problem in not fully realizing they would be dealing with a modern Japan.

Back in December, I didn't think there was much question that there would be a Nixon Round. Now there seems to be reason to wonder whether or not there will be one. If there is one, then the comments you are about to hear on Old America, New Europe and Modern Japan may serve a useful purpose. If the Nixon Round—as I will define it—doesn't come to pass, we could all be in so much trouble by September that it won't matter much that I wasted a few minutes of your time today.

Incidentally, since the obligation of a speaker who raises a question is to at least suggest an answer, I intend a little later on

to offer an answer of sorts to the question of the day: Will there be a Nixon Round?

First, let's talk about America's old problem: the revival of protectionism.

In the 1930's, protectionism came out of the woodwork in the form of the Smoot-Hawley Bill. Today we call it Burke-Hartke. When Burke-Hartke was first proposed, it received only scattered support from some union leaders, some congressmen, some businessmen and a few university economists. But in the wake of America's \$6.5 billion trade deficit in 1972, support for Burke-Hartke has been spreading.

President Nixon does not want the Burke-Hartke Bill to become law. But he recognizes now that the revival of protectionism in the United States has become so forceful that it must be dealt with realistically. This became quite clear two weeks ago in Treasury Secretary George Shultz's dollar devaluation statement.

You will recall that in discussing trade legislation Mr. Shultz said, "The President has decided to send shortly to Congress proposals for comprehensive trade legislation. Prior to submitting that legislation, intensive consultations will be held with members of Congress, labor, agriculture and business to assure that the legislation reflects our needs as fully as possible."

And he added, "This legislation, among other things, should furnish the tools we need: First, to provide for lowering tariff and non-tariff barriers to trade, assuming our trading partners are willing to participate fully with us in that process; second, to provide for raising tariffs when such action would contribute to arrangements assuring that American exports have fair access to foreign markets; third, to provide safeguards against the disruption of particular markets and production from rapid changes in foreign trade; fourth, to protect our external position from large and persistent deficits."

It's too early to tell how successful the Nixon Administration will be in keeping the hard-line Burke-Hartke advocates at bay. But it seems obvious that whatever trade legislation emerges from Congress, it will be much more restrictive than the full-scale tariff-cutting authority which Congress gave the White House for the Kennedy Round 10 years ago.

Make no mistake: America's old problem of protectionism poses a real threat to the further liberalization of world trade.

Now for Europe, New Europe . . .

When the Kennedy Round got under way almost a decade ago, The Europe of The Six essentially was a Europe of the economies of The Six. Foreign policy, in the political sense, was still reserved to the six sovereign nations. The European Community made little effort to speak with one voice in the political arena of the world. As a result, the European Community of the 1960's had little, if any, political identity.

But in December 1969, all this began to change. In a really historic conference at The Hague, the heads of state of the six member nations and the functional heads of the European Community achieved a momentous breakthrough toward political union. Since then, developments have been coming hot and heavy. In June 1970, negotiations were undertaken which have brought Britain, Denmark and Ireland into the Community. In January 1971, new regulations came into effect under which the Community's major institutions will have their budgets financed from the Community's own revenues. On February 9, 1971, the Community took a giant step toward political union when it created a blueprint for establishing full-scale economic and monetary union before the end of the 1970's. And in 1972, the Community reaffirmed its goal of creating a common European currency in the 1980's.

This is a new Europe, one determined to build The Europe of The Six into a politically united Europe of The Nine. It is a Europe,

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

too, that now embraces special trade agreements between the Community and other important European countries such as Switzerland, Sweden and Austria. Intensely involved with its own internal affairs, could the new Europe achieve the necessary compromises with other trading blocks on which the success of the Nixon Round would hinge? That was Europe's problem as I saw it two months ago.

Japan's problem seemed somewhat different—different but not totally dissimilar.

We think of Japan largely as a big industrialized nation: Japan, the dynamic exporter of electronic products, textiles, iron and steel, big ships and a raft of lesser items; Japan, whose trade balance with America last year was over \$4 billion in surplus; Japan in commercial confrontation with America and increasingly with Europe.

But Japan can no longer be viewed merely as a big industrialized nation confronting the rest of the world with a chronic trade surplus. Japan has matured into a post-industrialized society. It's afflicted with labor shortages. Its raw material supplies are problematic. Its distribution problems are imposing severe limitations on further substantial expansion of manufacturing and processing plants beyond the main centers of the Japanese archipelago.

This is modern Japan. And to understand Japan's problems with the Nixon Round requires an understanding of Japan's problems at home. As a post-industrial society, the Japanese people do not think of world trade as their most urgent day-to-day problem. Health problems, substandard housing, pollution and traffic congestion are the passionate everyday concerns of the man-in-the-street in Tokyo.

And the Japanese government has determined to allocate a huge portion of the nation's financial resources to meet these internal demands.

Could the Japanese negotiators, mindful of their tremendous investment needs at home, be expected to give up a big slice of their trade surplus in the Nixon Round? And if so, in exchange for what?

Generally, that was the underlying problem I thought Japan would be bringing to the Nixon Round. I really didn't think, back in December, that there would be grave doubts today as to whether there would be a Nixon Round. Certainly, there were monetary problems. The Smithsonian Agreement, although only a year old, was splitting a bit here and a bit there at the seams. But like most people, I thought the fabric would hold together long enough to give us time to devise a new system of greater staying power.

We all should have known better. Patchwork solutions do not answer enduring problems. Today, in the midst of the ninth international monetary crisis since 1967, we have another patchwork response, the 10 percent dollar devaluation announced two weeks ago—another Band-Aid. When do you think the next monetary crisis will come?

On February 14, The Wall Street Journal said, "There's one school of thought in Europe that believes that from now on U.S. devaluations may come every year or two, Latin American style . . . psychology is heavily against the U.S. as a world leader as long as its dollar is ranked as little more than a piece of paper."

In fact, America's role as the leader of the western nations has been diminishing for some time. Indeed, any realistic assessment of the Nixon Round's prospects must begin with recognition of the significant shifts in world relationships in recent years.

After World War II and into the Sixties, the western nations continued to regard America as their political leader, with the Soviet Union the recognized leader among eastern nations. In both east and west, the political cement of defense alliances seemed, a decade ago—well, immutable may be too strong a word—but at least fairly enduring.

However, as we moved through the Sixties, it gradually became apparent to millions of people in both east and west that there would be nuclear stalemate rather than nuclear war. The political cement began to crack. There was first the Sino-Soviet split. Then, as France withdrew from NATO, there was the first sign of what one observer has described as "the transatlantic fault."

In the Seventies, we now see the political cement of the Fifties and Sixties crumbling in all directions at once. Instead of America and the Soviet Union exchanging threats, we are now exchanging trade missions. Commerce between the People's Republic and Japan increases every day across the China seas. In both Eastern and Western Berlin, a principal topic of conversation these days is Chancellor Willy Brandt's Ostpolitik. On both sides of the divided city hopes are high that the Berlin wall may soon be coming down.

In short, as political alliances have become a much less cohesive force in world relationships, the western nations have felt far more free to make their own economic decisions, indisputable evidence of this can be seen in the collapse of the Smithsonian Agreement. In less than a year, many of the major parties to the agreement—one after the other—felt compelled to discard the currency parities fixed in the agreement for either two-tier systems or outright floating.

It took 38 years before the dollar was devalued in 1971. In the space of 14 months, it has been devalued again. Today, the international monetary system reminds me of the patch on the back pocket of a boy in blue jeans that I saw recently. It said—"Don't follow me—I'm lost, too!"

The Smithsonian Agreement was intended as a stopgap arrangement to give the major trading nations two or three years' time to construct a new system of international payments. But as the momentous events of the past month have shown, time is a luxury we can no longer afford. For the clock has run out.

Will there be a Nixon Round?

In my view, there is no chance that Old America, New Europe and Modern Japan can reach a lasting trade accord unless and until it is based on a new international payments system. As I tried to indicate earlier, the fundamental interests of the three major trading blocks are in basic conflict. To reconcile these differences first requires recognition by all concerned that the time-frame of negotiations must be shortened. I freely admit that it would take a miracle of political compromise to create this climate by September when the formal negotiations of the Nixon Round are scheduled to begin.

I don't believe in political miracles. And so, to the question—Will there be a Nixon Round? My answer today is that I hope we don't even attempt another round of trade negotiations without simultaneously coming to grips with the need for monetary reform. To attempt one without the other would be to attempt an Alpine run on one ski.

In my view, President Nixon has been dead right in taking the position that our urgent trade and monetary problems can no longer be considered as separate problems. They are one ball of wax. And as Business Week magazine pointed out in a recent editorial: "The whole fabric of world trade woven so painstakingly since World War II could be shredded by special controls on currency flows, competitive devaluations, and beggar-my-neighbor trade policies."

What we must do is to go back to Bretton Woods and complete the unfinished business of history. Today when we speak of Bretton Woods, it's in reference only to the International Monetary Fund. But part of the original agreement at Bretton Woods was to include the establishment of a new International Trade Organization, the ITO. It was intended that the ITO would have a common membership with the IMF. The charter for the ITO actually was drawn up in 1948

but never was ratified. The reason for this was the expressed conviction of the Truman Administration that the U.S. Congress would not approve it.

Instead, trading rules eventually were agreed to here in Geneva which came to be known as GATT—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. There is no need to gild the lily. No need to cite in Geneva the accomplishments of GATT in cutting tariffs and reducing other barriers to world trade.

But that's the past, gentlemen. What of the future? IMF and GATT have developed as separate institutions with no political powers of their own. Are they strong enough in their present form to get the job done?

I don't think so. I feel that IMF and GATT must be united into a single International Monetary and Trade Organization if we are to deal effectively with our urgent monetary and trade problems. The new institution could be called IMTO. But whatever its acronym, it must be given political status and permanent political powers. Only then will there be any chance of avoiding the recurring crises of the recent past.

Obviously, however, political decisions of such prospective consequence can be made only by political leaders.

Our most urgent need at this point is not another round of trade negotiations as in the past. What we desperately need is a summit meeting of heads of state to create a new political institution for the future.

Our most urgent concern today should not be whether a Nixon Round of trade negotiations will begin in September but whether a Nixon Round of political negotiations will begin tomorrow.

A tremendous undertaking, but again—the clock has run out.

And so I leave with you today my original question but in a different context:

Will there be a Nixon Round—the political round we need?

#### EDWARD K. GAYLORD: AT AGE 100, STILL MINDING THE STORE

#### HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 100th birthday of E. K. Gaylord, the strongest editorial voice in the State of Oklahoma and one of its most successful businessmen.

In 1903, E. K. Gaylord bought the Daily Oklahoman which he developed into the most widely circulated newspaper in Oklahoma. His success in newspapering has been duplicated in magazines, radio, television, transportation, and other business endeavors. He has also been a leader in industrial development, aviation, economic growth, and civic work.

Not only has E. K. Gaylord witnessed Oklahoma's entire history from an excellent vantage point, but he has become an important part of that history. His influence will not soon be forgotten. Even today, at age 100, Mr. Gaylord still writes editorials and displays a powerful image in and beyond Oklahoma City area. Always active, and always involved. Mr. Gaylord works a full 6-day week and can be seen on any given day walking briskly in downtown Oklahoma City.

I am happy to insert at this point in the RECORD an article that recently appeared in the Quill magazine that de-

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

picts the remarkable career of E. K. Gaylord:

EDWARD KING GAYLORD: AT AGE 100, STILL MINDING THE STORE

(By Jack M. Bickham)

Every morning, six days a week, the editorial writers leave their paneled cubicles and walk down the carpeted corridor to the large office at the east end. They go through a reception room, exchanging greetings with the woman there, and enter the publisher's office. It is comfortable, arranged with leather chairs and couches, dominated by a single desk that faces the door. Draperies cover one wall. There is a color television set, and in one corner an old grandfather clock. The slight, gray-haired man at the desk greets each man as he enters; sometimes he allows himself a faint smile, sometimes he doesn't.

The writers sit down. The man at the desk looks at whatever materials he has on his desk, usually copies of the *Wall Street Journal* and his own publications, the *Daily Oklahoman* and *Oklahoma City Times*.

Usually it's very quiet in the room while the writers wait for the publisher to speak. The clock ticks softly. The publisher turns pages and seems to read.

Finally he looks up. "I see," he says softly, "that the governor . . ." (or the President, or the legislature), and mentions a news story.

This opens an area of discussion. The writers give their views, and he agrees or disagrees, often saying very little but indicating the line of his own thought. Sometimes the entire "conference" is discussion of a single topic; other times, a dozen items may be touched upon.

Either way, precisely 30 minutes after the meeting began, the publisher arranges his papers on the desk again says, "Thank you," and the writers file out. They go to their own offices, discuss what was said, select topics, and produce the next day's editorials.

Low-key. Polite. Formal. Typical, it would appear, for an operation conducted by E. K. Gaylord, president of the Oklahoma Publishing Co. in Oklahoma City.

Gaylord runs his empire, which includes television outlets in four states, Oklahoma City's premier radio station and numerous other subsidiaries, with this characteristic quiet firmness and attention to detail. He has been enormously successful, and his daily contribution to operations might not be so unusual if he were a younger man.

On March 5, 1973, he will be 100 years old. He does not look it. Obviously, he does not act it, either. Although he does not do all his own driving, as he did until only a few years ago, he can still walk younger men into the sidewalk, hiking back up the slope from the heart of downtown Oklahoma City to "The Hill," that slight rise at the city's NW Fourth and Broadway where his newspaper plant sprawls. And although he seldom visits the newsroom on the fourth floor of the company's modern new plant, his presence is still keenly felt by all those who work there.

"We need him," one long-time newsman said recently. "I don't care if he even knows my name—although I think he does."

"He's a newspaperman."

This feeling of reliance upon and dedication to E. K. Gaylord is not a bogus phenomenon. People outside the company refer to him as "E. K.;" a few very oldtimers sometimes call him "The Chief," while others, not quite so old, call him "The Old Man." But the usual appellation is "Mr. Gaylord" to his face or behind his back; it stands for respect, and admiration, and even love.

One way to measure authority is the stories they tell about a man.

They tell about the young editor on the *Oklahoman*'s state staff who was covering a tornado by telephone one night. It was late and he was near a tough deadline. A call for

March 5, 1973

information came from a voice that said, "This is Gaylord. What can you tell me about this story?"

The young editor thought it was an AP writer named Gaylord Shaw.

"Listen, Gaylord," he snapped, "I'm too busy to talk to you right now. Just leave me alone and you'll get your information when I can get to you."

The next morning, word filtered down that Mr. Gaylord had mentioned to the managing editor that one of the staff had been "somewhat short with him" on the telephone the previous night.

It was explained. The young editor stayed on. Nothing more was said.

They tell about the new girl in the women's department who happened to be riding up in the elevator with this nice elderly gentleman who wore an expensive-looking powder blue suit.

"That's a pretty suit," she told him. "It looks expensive. I can tell you don't work around here."

Nothing was ever said about that one, although other employees on the elevator almost shrieked in their tracks.

They also tell about an employee who had been loyal, and fell ill, and was kept on the payroll for a decade or so while bedridden.

But those are internal yarns, the kind only newsmen can appreciate. History may look more toward Gaylord's contributions to the business, the city and the state.

All have been noteworthy.

He was born Edward King Gaylord on March 5, 1873, on a farm near Muscotah, Kan. When he was six, the family moved west, living first in Denver and later in Grand Junction, Colo. Between the ages of 11 and 15, he picked strawberries for a truck farmer and worked in a second-hand store. In 1891, with \$17 in his pocket, he entered Colorado College in Colorado Springs. He became editor of the school paper, and in his junior year became a partner with his brother, Lewis, in buying the Colorado Springs *Telegraph*.

The story of Gaylord's rise to power began in December, 1902, when he was business manager of the *St. Joseph (Mo.) Gazette*. He was 29 years old at the time. As Gaylord tells it, as Christmas approached, he decided to go to St. Louis for a few day's rest.

"In reading the newspaper, I found an item in the *St. Louis Republic* which was a brief interview with Mayor Carter Harrison of Chicago. He said he had been in Texas and coming back through Oklahoma Territory on the train, he saw fields of cotton, white for the harvest. He said Oklahoma Territory could raise the crops both of the south and the north, and being between Texas and Kansas, some day it should develop into a state with comparable cities and towns. He further remarked that if he were a young man, he would go there to start his career.

"His statement electrified me with an intention to locate there and launch or acquire a newspaper of my own."

Of the two largest cities, Gaylord selected Oklahoma City over Guthrie because the former, he had been told, "had a live bunch of young men in business who were wide-awake and progressive." Oklahoma City when he arrived was living literally in the horse and buggy era. There were no automobiles, and all the streets except for a few blocks were dirt roads.

There was no wire service for either of the two existing newspapers. News was transmitted at intervals over the Western Union and by pony service.

"There was one morning paper, the *Daily Oklahoman*, and an evening paper, the *Times-Journal*," Gaylord said. "Before going to either of them, I went into a bank and interviewed the cashier. I told him I wanted to investigate the two newspapers and perhaps buy an interest in one if I could. I asked him which would be the better paper.

"He said, 'It won't make a damned bit of difference which one you buy; neither one of them is worth a whoop in Hell.'"

On Feb. 6, 1903, Gaylord and two others bought 45 per cent of the stock of the *Daily Oklahoman*, a then-struggling eight-year-old. In 1906, he bought the property at NW Fourth where the company now stands. In 1911, he started the *Oklahoma Farmer-Stockman*, an agricultural pioneer which continues to this day with regional publications in Kansas and Texas.

The Oklahoma Publishing Co. (Opubco) bought the *Oklahoma City Times* at a sheriff's sale for \$30,000 in 1916. Gaylord became president of Opubco in 1918. In 1928 he purchased radio station WKY in Oklahoma City.

Gaylord's son, Edward L., is executive vice president and treasurer of Opubco, and a daughter, Edith Gaylord Harper, is secretary of the organization.

As early as 1904 he began making innovations. In February of that year he installed a seven-day Associated Press wire even though his paper ordinarily did not publish on Sunday. When the Russo-Japanese war broke out, he ordered a Sunday extra that was distributed statewide and into portions of Kansas, beating all opposition. Other firsts have come regularly, including innovations in stereotype color plates and publication of the industry's first completely computer-set newspaper, that in 1963.

Gaylord's publications have always been synonymous with growth for Oklahoma City. Industrial growth has been spurred by his efforts not only on the editorial page, but in countless closed-door meetings. He was one of a handful of civic leaders who helped establish Tinker Air Force Base near the city, bringing in a 20,000-man payroll. When Oklahoma City faced repeated serious water shortages in the 1950s, it was Gaylord who spearheaded the drive to build a 100-mile water pipeline into southeastern Oklahoma, where water was abundant. (The pipeline met heavy opposition; Gaylord's private reservation about it today is said to be that it's too small—that another pipeline is needed.)

It's doubtful that many major state projects have been completed without a trek to Fourth and Broadway by one or more members of the planning organization. Turnpike construction and business development in remote areas have sometimes turned on Gaylord's decision. In a career spanning the entire life of Oklahoma as a state, he has probably held, and used, as much power as any individual in the history of the region.

Gaylord's recreations today are few. He neither smokes nor drinks. He says he gave up golf "when I was about 75." Looking back on a life that saw \$17 become a multi-million-dollar empire, he says, "It isn't easy work that gives you satisfaction. It's the hard things that we overcome that make us and make our business." He often cites another line as a personal conviction: "No man has the right to be less of a man than he can be."

Having risen from poverty to wealth in another age, Gaylord espouses an editorial policy on national and international affairs that is as conservative as his policies on urban development are progressive. Headlines on editorials such as "Foreign Aid Must Go" and "Red Menace Grows" are not uncommon. The most bellicose international editorials appear on the front page; this position indicates Gaylord himself wrote them. He seems to prefer writing an editorial himself if the alternative is to issue a direct order in the matter; he says no one on his staff is ordered to slant stories, and he would not employ a writer who would accept such an order.

Staffers bear this out. They feel free, as one put it, "to be just as good as we can be; that's the only limitation on us—our own talent." On the other hand, the papers lost an extraordinary managing editor a few years ago when he began campaigning against cer-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tain practices of the local business establishment. And serious coverage of the Oklahoma City ghetto does not exist, again reflecting a general tendency to view the city's only legitimate news as the events of the affluent.

These characteristics leave Gaylord with detractors as well as friends in Oklahoma. No one denies the enormous impact he and his publications have had on the city and state.

Oklahoma oil magnate Dean A. McGee, one who has had his differences with Gaylord, describes the seemingly ageless editor-publisher as "a wise and intellectual visionary builder of his community" and "a living legend."

"From the beginning," McGee said, "Mr. Gaylord and the newspapers, which his leadership and ingenuity guided to national eminence, have been active in promoting the progress of his adopted city and state. He personally led the fight for statehood which culminated in 1907 when Oklahoma became the 46th state to join the Union. He also successfully championed the establishment of the state capital in Oklahoma City. A great many of the good things we see about us in Oklahoma and especially in this community had their birth in the mind of this man."

## MORE EXCUSES FOR SOVIET FOOD FAILURES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Communist Party bureaucracy in the Soviet Union continues to fabricate excuses as to why its system fails to supply the incentive to feed its own people.

At first, Americans were told that the food shortages resulted from bad weather, then the two top Communist bureaucrats charged with agriculture production were discharged because of incompetency then we were advised that the Soviet farmer lacked sophisticated farm machinery to be able to plant and harvest the crop, and now we have the latest excuse. The Communist Party Daily, *Pravda*, reports that the seed grain is of inferior quality.

Interestingly enough, the Soviet seed grains were procured from Americans of Russian ancestry who came to this country to escape tyranny and brought their grain seeds with them. The story is reminiscent of the tales of Lysenko. The source of the American grain—Moscow, Kans.

I insert the related news clipping:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 2, 1973]

RUSSIAN FARMERS WARNED TO IMPROVE SEED GRAIN

Moscow.—Soviet farmers have been warned to improve the preparation and selection of seed grain needed for this year's crucial harvest.

A front-page report in *Pravda*, the Soviet Communist Party daily, says farms are behind schedule in this work in a number of republics including Tadzhikistan, usually one of the first to begin spring sowing.

Last year's poor harvest, which totaled 168 million tons and fell 22 tons below target, means that special attention should be given to this year's seed grain, the *Pravda* report says.

*Pravda* recalled that a drought in southern

harvest areas last summer stopped farmers obtaining high-quality seed grain, while wet weather during harvest work in the east also affected grain quality.

In addition, many areas intended for winter sowing were not sown with grain due to bad weather, and they would have to be sown with the most productive seed grains in the spring, the newspaper says.

Soviet agricultural planners are hoping to help offset last year's setback—which meant Western grain imports costing some \$2 billion—by sowing a larger area of land this spring.

Already this year there has been concern over the lack of snow cover for the winter crop which has left it vulnerable to killer frosts.

## WHAT JOHNSON DID FOR THE BLACKS

### HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Almena Lomax of Canoga Park, Calif., is a constituent of mine, and a reporter-staff writer for the San Francisco Examiner.

After the death of former President Johnson, Mrs. Lomax wrote an article that was included in the Examiner's coverage of President Johnson's death. She was uniquely qualified to write this piece, as she drew upon personal experience.

The article speaks for itself, and I would like to present it now:

#### WHAT JOHNSON DID FOR THE BLACKS

(By Almena Lomax)

Nine years ago is ancient history to young militants straining against the tensions of racial discrimination, oppression, and inequality of opportunity in urban ghettos today.

But nine years ago, July 2, 1964, Lyndon Baines Johnson cut the ties of a bondage which were but one step removed from actual slavery, giving American Negroes the greatest push forward since Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation 101 years before.

To any Negro who remembers pre-1964 America, Lyndon Johnson will always be regarded as the second Emancipator.

An instance in my life and that of my family will perhaps vividly illustrate this.

#### AUTO TRIP

On the night of July 2, 1964, I and my children were driving through Texas, running into detour after detour as we tried to reach Austin where there was a Negro-owned motel.

To any Negro traveling through the South and largely through the North before that day, getting to the Negro motel, hotel or the home of a friend, was as important as the mode of transportation. Otherwise, one would find oneself spending the night in his car, or in a bus, railroad station or airport, all of which I have done because there was "no room in the inn" for a person of my race.

#### MONEY TALKS

San Franciscans are largely ignorant of this because money was usually as important as race in determining where a person could eat or sleep in this city.

But in Los Angeles where I grew up, married and reared six children, only famous concert artists like Marian Anderson could stay in downtown hotels, and then they had room service, until former Gov. Edmund G.

March 5, 1973

Brown signed the 1958 fair employment practices law as his administration's first order of business.

The law didn't "take," however, in Southern California past San Bernardino and motorists usually went very fast through border towns like Blythe, called "a little bit of Texas" because, racially-speaking, it was a little bit of Texas.

#### LBJ RANCH

On that July 2 in 1964, traveling through Texas, we came to the gates of the LBJ Ranch.

It was almost midnight and the four youngest children were asleep, piled one on top of the other in the back seat.

My eldest daughter, Michele, alternated sleep with plucking her eyebrows—"My last touch with reality," she would say archly—throughout the five days of what was known as "another of Mother's journeys to the beginning."

There were five of them: I crossed Texas, all 880 miles of it 10 times in four years, either covering the civil rights struggle and trying to live down there where a responsive chord was struck in me, where, northern-bred, though Texas-born, I had, and have, deep feelings that it all began for me down there.

As Michele burrowed sleepily into the shoulder of my eldest son, Michael, he looked angrily and sleepily at the big double gates of the LBJ Ranch and said, "I bet he's sleeping behind those very gates."

"We ought to knock on the door and ask him, 'Is you is, or is you ain't the President of all the people and where in this God-for-saken state can a black man lay his head?'"

#### MORE THAN DECENT

A little ways on, Michael, then 16 and nowhere near a militant, spoke again.

"Look, Mother," he said, "I'm not going to drive all over Austin looking for THE Negro Motel. I'm sleepy. You pull into the first half-way decent-looking motel you come to."

As the saying goes, I had heard the man. I pulled into the first motel I came to when we reached Austin—it was more than half-way decent-looking, and Michael untangled his long legs from Michele's and we went into the office.

The clerk seemed to jump as he turned to face us in response to my "Good evening" but he replied, "Good evening."

Inwardly, I discounted that. White southerners will be polite even when they are doing something as monstrous as denying you a glass of water because of your race.

"I would like two connecting double rooms with two double beds for me and my family," I said.

"Yes, mam," he said promptly, and I could hear the tension drain out of my son's body.

I and the girls slept late, but the three boys got up and went swimming in the motel pool.

And all the little white children's parents called them out of the pool—but that had happened to the boys in Blythe where we had stayed overnight for car repairs.

When we had dressed and paid the bill to a blandly courteous clerk, we went to the coffee shop for brunch.

Enroute, I noticed Michele buy a copy of the Austin paper, take one look and fold it over quickly, with what I called her "Queen Nefertiti smile" of mystery on her face.

#### DINERS STARTLED

Inside the coffee room, several forkfuls of the blue plate special went past the holders' mouths into thin air as we sat down, but the waitress appeared promptly and willingly enough with the menus.

After we had ordered, Michele handed me the newspaper and I opened it.

"President Signs Civil Rights Act," the headline read.

"Austin Will Resist." From Austin on, that was a trip!

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

We decided on a first rate meal, rather than the fruit, carrots, candy, and soft drinks travelers between Negro accommodations customarily bought at grocery stores and gas stations after the shoe boxes of home-prepared lunch gave out on expeditions such as this.

We drove to the best looking motel in Beaumont, went into the dining room, and sat down while a white man led his family out, cursing "niggers" all the while.

The little blonde, bedizened waitress was a sport, however, and served us with a mixture of respect, satisfaction, and subdued excitement in her face.

#### V FOR VICTORY

After we were all set up and "boarding to beat the band," as Michael said, the Negro cook and dishwasher came and stood in the doorway and watched us, holding their fingers in the V-for-Victory sign, broad smiles on their faces.

In the five trips to Tuskegee, Eufaula, and Mobile, Ala., Albany and Atlanta, Ga., and back to Los Angeles, between 1961 and 1965, my kids integrated most of the restrooms of the gas stations on Highways 80 or 90.

They had a system. The youngest boy, who has my mother's blue eyes and auburn hair, would go first and get the "white key." Then his browner brothers would follow.

#### GIRLS, TOO

The youngest girl, who has the Mexican-Indian coloration of her paternal grandparents, would get the "white key" to the ladies' room, and her sisters would follow.

I have the strongest kidneys of man or beast and once drove from Eufaula, Ala., on the Georgia state line, across Alabama, Mississippi and to the Negro motel in Monroe, La., without moving from the driver's seat.

That was the Negro's lot before Lyndon Johnson, after watching George Wallace's mounted troopers ride women down on the Alabama River bridge to Selma, rared back and signed the greatest civil rights package—equal accommodations, voting rights, school desegregation, equal job opportunities—in the history of this country into law.

#### SIT-IN

In 1961, I and my children sat-in in a Greyhound bus depot cafeteria in Big Spring, Tex., because the proprietor wouldn't serve us unless we went to the dingy lunch counter outside, reserved for Negroes.

Only July 8, 1964, thanks to LBJ, I, and my family ate without incident in one of the finest French restaurants in Mobile.

When Martin Luther King was buried and I covered his funeral, I stayed in the finest hotel on Atlanta's famed Peachtree Street.

#### NEGRO TOWN

In 1961, when we went to Tuskegee, a predominantly Negro town, the downtown drugstore removed its seats rather than seat Negroes. The voting rolls were composed of dead, moved and infant white. Today, the town has a Negro mayor and a mixed City Council.

All of this came about because of Lyndon Johnson, a man who agonized, prayed, cried out, "Lord, let this cup pass me by," but then arose from his knees a bigger, stronger man and went before Congress and pledged, "We shall overcome."

## EXCERPTS FROM ABORTION DECISION

### HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court, in its recent abortion decisions

Roe against Wade and Doe, and others against Bolton, nowhere refers to medical evidence or evidence of any type which was developed by the trial courts. The reason there is no reference to facts developed in the trial courts is because no facts were developed. No depositions were taken and no witnesses testified in either of the two cases. The Supreme Court has at least tentatively—motion for rehearing is before the Court—decided probably the most important and far-reaching decision that it has ever made without the benefit of any testimony which had been subjected to the chaffing effect of cross-examination in the trial courts.

In contrast, legislatures throughout the country have spent literally thousands of hours listening to medical experts present the facts concerning human life before birth.

Why the Supreme Court chose to violate its own precedents and common-sense and decide such grave constitutional issues with a deficient record remains unknown; however, the reason the record was in such condition is not a matter of speculation. Roy Lucas, a New York City attorney who has traveled the length and breadth of the country promoting litigation to strike down protective abortion legislation in numerous jurisdictions, including the Texas and Georgia cases mentioned above, and decided by the Supreme Court, has advised his fellow litigants to avoid having live witnesses. His advice was founded on Mr. Lucas' failures to convince State courts that fetuses within the womb of human mothers were not human beings. One of the cases where it was not possible to follow Mr. Lucas' advice was in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, where pro-abortionists unsuccessfully intervened in a criminal abortion trial, Commonwealth against Brunelle.

Fortunately, excerpts from the Commonwealth against Brunelle trial have been printed in the scholarly quarterly publication *Child and Family*, volume 9, No. 2. With the permission of the editor of the publication, Herbert Ratner, M.D., who is also the public health director of Oak Park, Ill., I am pleased to insert these excerpts in the RECORD. These excerpts reveal the fallacies of the arguments given for abortion under cross-examination of witnesses and demonstrate the truth of the abortion matter; for example, the fetus is a living human being distinct from his mother, dependent upon her only for his life-support system as an astronaut in space is dependent upon his life-support system.

The material follows:

#### COMMONWEALTH V. BRUNELLE

##### INTRODUCTION

*Commonwealth v. Brunelle* is the case of Pierre Victor Brunelle, an unlicensed physician charged with performing an illegal operation. In concert with a national strategy, protagonists for abortion on demand seized upon this case as an opportunity to challenge the constitutionality of the Massachusetts' law. The defendant held, in the words of his lawyer, Mr. Joseph Oteri, that:

"The statute violates the Massachusetts Constitution, in that it compels citizens of the Commonwealth to complete an unwanted pregnancy which can result in shame to them, harm to their existing life mode, and unwanted economic consequences, all in

deprivation of their constitutional right to happiness" (1: 16V17, Dec. 9, 1969).

In pursuit of this challenge, Mr. Oteri was prepared to bring in numerous experts from the varied fields of theology, philosophy, gynecology, from all over the country (1:4).

The Court ruled, however, that witnesses would be limited to medical testimony, and these were subsequently brought to the stand on the basis of their alleged special knowledge of the abortion issue.

The following witnesses appeared for the defense:

1. Robert Hall, M.D., gynecologist, of New York City, who, among other credentials, identified himself as a member of the following organizations: International Planned Parenthood-World Population Federation; Population Association of America; American Association of Planned Parenthood Physicians; Abortion Reform Association, of which he was vice-president, and the Association for the Study of Abortion, of which he has been President for the past six years.

2. Christopher Tietze, M.D., demographer and statistician, and Associate Director of the Bio-Medical Division of the Population Council of New York City.

3. E. James Lieberman, M.D., psychiatrist, of Washington, D.C., a staff member of the National Institutes of Mental Health, Chevy Chase, Maryland.

4. Garrett Hardin, Ph.D., Professor of Biology at the University of California, Santa Barbara, who also identified himself as a member of the Ecological Society of America, the American Society of Human Genetics, the American Eugenics Society and the International General Semantics Society.

5. Malkah T. Notman, M.D., psychiatrist, of Brookline, Massachusetts, an instructor in psychiatry at Harvard Medical School, Associate in Psychiatry at Boston University School of Medicine and an Assistant Psychiatrist on the staff of Beth Israel Hospital, Boston.

Because of the preponderance of out-of-state witnesses, the attorney for the Commonwealth, Mr. John Irwin, decided on additional witnesses to the one local obstetrician originally scheduled. As a result, on Monday, December 15, 1969, the Editor of *CF* received and accepted a telephoned invitation to testify on December 17. He was informed that one other out-of-state witness, a psychiatrist from Baltimore, would also testify.

Witnesses for the Commonwealth were:

1. William A. Lynch, M.D., Brookline obstetrician and gynecologist who, among other credentials, identified himself as a member of the American Fertility Association, the Society for the Study of Sex in Marriage and as a founding member and trustee of the Human Life Foundation.

2. Frank J. Ayd, Jr., M.D., Baltimore psychiatrist and Associate Editor of *Medical Counterpoint*.

3. Herbert Ratner, M.D., preventive medicine specialist, Public Health Director of Oak Park, Illinois, former Editor of the *Bulletin of the American Association of Public Health Physicians* and present Editor of *Child and Family*.

Because this case held considerable interest as an early contemporary court test of the constitutionality of a restrictive state abortion law, the Editor studied the transcript of the entire trial. Of central interest was the testimony dealing with the nature of the fetus for this is the paramount question in the issue of abortion: Whether the target of the abortion procedure, the fetus, is or is not a human being. To read the testimony of "experts" under oath, speaking for or against the humanity of the fetus—testimony typical of contrasting view-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

points—and to see how these experts defend their representative positions under cross-examination is an intriguing experience which *CF* is eager to share with its readers.

Toward this end we have excerpted the testimony of all the witnesses bearing on this question. As an aid to this exercise we make available the following lexicon. It consists of standard concepts attached to key terms in the testimony.

**Abortion:** An untimely birth (L.); technically an abortion is a termination of pregnancy during the first 20 weeks—the period before current technology can maintain the child's viability outside the womb.

**Baby:** An infant (ME.).

**Being:** One that exists as an actuality or entity in time and place, e.g., a living person.

**Child:** An unborn or newborn son or daughter; baby, infant (AS.); *with child*, pregnant.

**Conceive:** To become pregnant with (a child or young) (OF.).

**Conception:** That which is conceived; a beginning.

**Embryo:** A young organism in the early stages of development (Gr.); the growing animal before its specific characters can be deciphered; in man, up to eight weeks.

**Fertilization:** *Biol.* Impregnation; the union of egg and sperm to form a new individual (*zygote*).

**Feticide:** The killing of an unborn child.

**Fetus:** Offspring, the young in the womb (L.); that period of growth during which specific characters can be recognized, technically the period from eight weeks to birth.

**Homicide:** The killing of one human being by another.

**Homo Sapiens:** Man, regarded as a biological species (L.).

**Homo:** Man (L.). The genus of mammals consisting of mankind.

**Sapient:** To know (L.).

**Human:** Pertaining to mankind (L.); characteristics of man.

**Infant:** One who cannot speak (L.); a child in the first period of life.

**Man:** A human being; a member of the human species (*Homo sapiens*).

**Mature:** Brought by natural process to completeness of growth and development; full-grown; ripe (L.).

**Organism:** *Biol.* An individual constituted to carry on the activities of life by means of organs (or parts) separate in function but mutually dependent; any living being.

**Person:** A human being; a particular individual.

**Potential:** Existing in possibility, not in actuality (L.).

**Pregnancy:** A state of being with young or child (L.); the period from conception until delivery.

**Stage:** *Biol.* One of several periods in the development and growth of many animals and plants, as in the *pupa* stage; a stage of one's life.

**Young:** New to life (AS.); the offspring of animals; *with young*, with child; pregnant.

**Zygote:** The union of an egg and sperm (Gr.).

### CROSS EXAMINATION OF ROBERT HALL, M.D., BY MR. IRWIN

Q. (by Mr. Irwin). Do you take into consideration when you advise an abortion the right of the fetus to be born?

A. (Dr. Hall). I regard the fetus as a potential human being, and in that sense I take it into consideration.

Q. At what times does it become a human being?

A. When it is born.

Q. When it is passed from the mother's womb?

A. Right.

Q. And that is the only time it becomes a human being; is that your testimony?

A. Prior to birth it is my belief, and most of the medical profession's, that it is a fetus.

Q. I am asking your opinion: Is it a human being prior to passing through the birth canal into the world?

A. Before it is born? Of course . . .

Q. Not?

A. Of course not.

Q. Do you know there are laws in Massachusetts and in your own State of New York on the civil side that designate the youngster in the mother's womb as a human being?

Do you know that?

A. Are you referring to it as a youngster?

Q. As a human being.

A. You referred to the "youngster," not human being.

Q. Strike the word "youngster." As a fetus in the human womb?

A. No, I am not aware of that.

\* \* \* \* \*

Q. Dr. Hall, I think you testified that, in answer to my question, that at some point a fetus becomes a human being, when it leaves the womb of its mother after it is born; is that correct?

A. Yes. Right. That is the only time it becomes a human being; right.

Q. Now, does that apply to the situations where the mother carries full term only?

A. I don't understand your question.

Q. Does this fetus become human only after it is carried full term and is expelled from the mother's womb by the phenomenon we know as birth?

A. It becomes full term, I mean it becomes human if it is born capable of surviving.

Q. Can you tell us how old it is when it becomes human; how long it has been living?

A. A fetus is incapable of surviving if it is born before the 20th week or fifth month of the pregnancy.

Q. I asked you at what age it becomes human.

A. I think that I have answered it insofar as I am able. It becomes human if it is born and capable of surviving.

Q. The point I am driving at, is it human at seven months?

A. If it is born, it is.

Q. If it was born prematurely at seven months, it is human?

A. Right.

Q. Your distinction is that it is human if it is expelled from the womb and capable of living, is that right?

A. Yes; exactly.

Q. Whether the fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth or ninth month?

Q. It has no human existence prior to that?

A. Prior to that, it is called "the fetus" and it is a potential human being, in my opinion.

Q. That is your opinion. Is that the accepted medical opinion of today?

A. It certainly is.

Q. That there is no human life until it leaves the mother's womb?

A. Would you pose the question again, please?

Q. Is it the accepted medical thesis in your field of medicine that the fetus is not human until it leaves the mother's womb?

A. Prior to the 20th week, as I said, it is regarded as a fetus, and a potential human being, not as a human being per se.

Q. Would you define for the Court what a potential human being is?

A. The potential human being, in the frame we are talking about, is the fetus that we are talking about, which . . .

Q. No, no. Define, will you, what a "potential human being" is, you just spoke about, prior to 20 weeks?

A. It is the fetus we are talking about, which continues to be nurtured in the mother's womb for a sufficiently long time and is born alive and may be capable of surviving.

Q. What is a potential human being?

A. I have defined it as best I can.

<sup>1</sup> The first number signifies the day in court, the numbers following the colon signify the pages of the official transcript.

March 5, 1973

Q. At what point is a human being that is eventually born that is leaving the mother's womb and is capable of living, at what point in the process of, the entire process of conception, fetus, birth—at what point does he receive the characteristics of life, such as his genes, his hair, his eyes, his shape of his body? Tell the Court those factors, will you please? When, for example, do the arm buds or the limb buds form?

A. These various characteristics of human form are assumed by a fetus in gradual stages. The chromosomes you mentioned are set at fertilization of the egg. The formation of eyes, limbs, and so forth are gradual processes of the first part of the pregnancy.

Q. It takes place at impregnation?

A. The chromosomes. Those are all the factors that do take place at that time.

Q. What are the chromosomal factors?

A. Genetic factors which determine the color of the eyes, and so forth.

Q. What are the genetic factors?

A. I am not a geneticist.

Q. You know, do you not?

A. I am not withholding anything. The genes, as far as I know, predetermine the color of the skin, the color of your eyes and hair, and that sort of thing.

Perhaps your stature.

Q. How about sex?

A. Sex.

Q. So that is determined from the moment of conception, is that correct?

A. Correct.

Q. To wit, when the sperm meets the ovum and fertilizes it?

A. Those are the characteristics of the potential human being.

Q. That forms what is known, immediately speaking, as a zygote?

A. Right.

Q. Is that zygote a human growth?

A. I have never heard that expression.

Q. That is a human . . .

A. It is potentially human.

Q. Would you tell the Court what you mean when you say a zygote is potentially human?

A. It has the genetic characters we have established, but very little else in common with human beings. It is incapable of independent survival.

Q. But if it is left to itself and is not bothered with or tampered with otherwise touched or inhibited in any way, it will, will it not, proceed to grow into a human being?

A. Sometimes.

Q. Most times?

A. Most times, but often it is miscarried spontaneously.

Q. Most times, but apart from when it is spontaneously miscarried?

A. That is how we all got here.

Q. Now, Doctor, in the oath that all doctors take, the Hippocratic Oath . . .

A. Pardon me?

Q. The physician's oath—did you take that oath?

A. I did.

Q. And in that oath, is there a reference to abortion?

A. I think there is.

Q. Would you tell us what it is?

A. I think the Hippocratic Oath, among other things, forbids abortion. Also forbids removal of a kidney stone.

Q. It forbids abortion, does it not?

A. I think so, among other things.

Q. Has it traditionally been the function of the physician, Doctor, to save life rather than to destroy it?

A. To save actual human life; it certainly has.

Q. Then I understand that you don't believe that when you, as a doctor, perform an abortion, if you do, that you are destroying human life?

A. I don't believe that abortion destroys actual human life?

Q. You do not believe that abortion destroys actual human life?

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A. Right.

Q. Regardless of what stage of the pregnancy?

A. Abortion is defined as termination of pregnancy during the first 20 weeks.

Q. Whose definition of abortion is that?

A. The medical community's. All the textbooks on obstetrics in this country.

Q. You would not recommend abortion after 20 weeks?

A. No, I would not.

Q. All right. Under any circumstances, is that correct?

A. It wouldn't be an abortion.

Q. What would it be?

A. At what time of pregnancy?

Q. Any time after 20 weeks.

A. They are different. Between the 20th and 28th week, it is called an immature birth; after, a premature birth; and finally a term birth.

\* \* \* \* \*

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF WILLIAM A. LYNCH,  
M.D., BY MR. IRWIN

Q. (by Mr. Irwin). Would you please tell us directly on what factors you base your determination that therapeutic abortion is not a medically competent procedure?

A. (Dr. Lynch). Whenever a woman applies for an abortion, she is looking for help and not an abortion. The proper management of the problem is to treat her disease, whatever it be, whether it be psychological, psychiatric or medical. She is looking for help when she comes to see a physician. When the patient comes to see a physician because of abortion, she comes because she knows she is pregnant. The doctor determines that she is pregnant. Under these conditions, it is, I believe, the doctor's duty to point out to her there's two patients here: the mother and the baby, and that that child has a right to live, and that anything that involves convenience, even though the convenience might be considerable, is not germane to the doctor's problem and the doctor's commitment to maintain human life and protect it.

\* \* \* \* \*

Q. As an obstetrician and gynecologist, you are familiar, are you not, with the whole process of human reproduction?

A. Yes.

Q. Would you tell us, sir, about the development of a child from fertilization to birth—and do you have some document with you by which you can illustrate this development at certain periods?

A. When the sperm and the egg are fused, there is formed a zygote, which is a new life, a new living being, which promptly goes on to develop from the zygote all of the facets and all of the notes that make up the human being into a fully formed state. Everything that the human being will become is found in the zygote: all inherent material is found there.

In the course of the first month there is formed what is called a blastocyst, which is simply a small cyst which is found, a plate of tissue which has a discernible head curve and incurve, which indicates the first beginnings of the notion of the human.

After the fifth week, we develop what we call the embryonic stage, in which the attachment and nourishment supply between the baby and the mother in the early stages are definitely formed. The discus is formed in the stage where a body stalk is also formed, and the sac in which the baby is found is approximately one to three millimeters, which is something in the nature of a 16th of an inch.

At the end of the sixth postmenstrual week the chorionic sac found around the baby and attached to the mother is 20 to 30 millimeters—about an inch in size. The embryo is five millimeters, which is slightly less than a quarter of an inch. The heart is already formed. The arm and leg buds are formed, and the umbilical cord, the cord which is to

attach the baby in a free-floating way to the mother, has already begun to form.

At eight weeks the embryo measures 22 to 24 millimeters. The head is large, as it always is in the embryonic form. Fingers and toes are formed, and the external ears are formed.

At the end of the tenth postmenstrual week, we have what is generally called the determination of the fetal stage, which is now 30 millimeters in size. At this beginning of the fetal stage, all the structures, major structures of the body, have now been formed, in the opinion of the consensus of embryologists.

At the end of the third month, the baby is seven to nine centimeters—2.2 centimeters to the inch. The centers for development of bones are already formed. External genitalia are there. The fetus, if born at this time, will make spontaneous movements if it is still within the sac or if the sac has been ruptured—the bag of waters, as it is commonly referred to—if the baby is put into a warm saline, warm salt solution, it will make spontaneous movements. This is the first attempt of the baby to move spontaneously and independently.

In the fourth or fifth month, it largely grows from the nine centimeters at the end of the third month to approximately 22 centimeters at the end of the fifth month, and weighs 300 grams.

At the end of the sixth month, it weighs approximately 600 grams, and the skin becomes wrinkled and begins to look like a little old man or little old lady that we refer to in a premature baby; and the fetus born at this period attempts to breathe, and generally will live for a day or two. It almost always dies, although occasionally they live at this stage. These are the one-pounders and ten-ounce babies we hear about in the newspapers all the time.

From the point of the sixth month on, it is largely a question of development. We generally state that the baby has better than 50-50 chance, if born at the end of the seventh month, and the chances increase beyond that time. It is largely a question of putting on weight in the last two months, where it doubles in size.

Do you have with you today an accepted medical handbook which pictorially reveals the growth of an infant, along the lines that you have just explained to the Court?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. All right. And would you produce that particular journal?

A. Yes.

Q. Would you read to the stenographer the title of it?

A. It is called, *A Child is Born: The Drama of Life Before Birth*. Photographs by Lennart Nilsson, with the text by Dr. A. Ingelman-Sundberg.

Q. Doctor, are there photographs in there of the fetus at certain stages of development in their mother's womb?

A. Yes, this is the unique flavor of the book, in that the photographs are unprecedented.

Q. Are they authentic photographs?

A. Yes.

Q. Of the fetus?

A. Yes.

Q. And do they fairly represent the growth of the fetus as you have explained it to the Court, at various stages?

A. Yes, it does.

Q. And would you, by virtue of that particular book, point out to the Court the appropriate pictures of the youngster and the fetus at various stages we have enumerated, to the Court, and would you please keep your voice up so the stenographer may record what you are saying, and would you make a note for the benefit of the stenographer as to what page you are referring to when you demonstrate those pictures to the Court?

Q. With reference to your experience, training, education and studies and surveys that you have conducted in this particular field—based upon all of those factors, do you have an opinion as to whether or not this particular embryo or any given embryo is in fact a human being?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. Do you have an opinion on it?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. Will you tell us what your opinion is?

A. Yes. I think at the moment of conception, with the union of a human sperm and a human egg, you have the beginning of new life. This is human. I don't really understand how it could be anything other than human.

Q. Now, Doctor, will you tell us on what factors you base that opinion?

A. The potency for human life, or the potential for human life resides within the sperm and the egg. When these two come together, you have the union of two human reproductive substances which produce the human zygote, which at that moment has everything that develops into a human adult. Everything, the entire genetic package, is found in that zygote. There is nothing that is added to it by any means afterwards. . . . This is human from the very beginning and cannot be otherwise; to have something start off as human and become something different is incongruous. To have something start off as human and become inhuman is equally incongruous.

The babies people try to abort, they do so because they want to prevent the birth of a human being.

Q. Are you familiar with the science of fetology?

A. Yes.

Q. Would you define for us what the science of fetology is?

A. The science of fetology is of rather recent origin. It has to do with the development and functions and diseases of the human fetus while it is *in utero*.

It has developed to the point where 10,000 learned scientific articles have been published in the literature every year for the past five years, and the whole program started with Dr. Liley from Australia, who started with the intrauterine transfusion to protect the human being inside of the mother's womb, or the Rh problem.

#### U.S. VIETNAM INVOLVEMENT CONTINUES

#### HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the continuing U.S. presence in Vietnam and the possibility of renewed U.S. military intervention there constitute a troubling backdrop to the return of our prisoners. The facts of our continuing commitments and involvement in Vietnam, and the likely results of trying to "guarantee the unguaranteeable" there are concisely summarized in a February 1 article in the *Wall Street Journal* by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Albert Schweitzer professor of humanities at the City University of New York.

As the primary sponsor in the House of legislation (H.R. 3349) identical to the Church-Case bill in the Senate to preclude a renewal of U.S. military activity without congressional authorization once all the prisoners are returned,

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

I found Professor Schlesinger's article most interesting, and I am pleased to submit it for the RECORD:

##### ARE WE REALLY OUT OF VIETNAM?

(By Arthur Schlesinger Jr.)

Is it really over at last, this longest, most unpopular, most useless, most mysterious war in the history of the republic? Combined hope and weariness incline us to accept the Paris Accord at face value and suppose that we will never have to worry about Vietnam again. But it is rash to take anything on faith in international affairs. Repellent as the idea may be of thinking about Vietnam any more, it may be worth a moment to take a hard look at the Paris documents.

The principle on which agreement was based—the principle that Henry Kissinger had pressed and Hanoi had resisted so long—was that a military cease-fire must precede a resolution of the political issues. In finally accepting this last October, Hanoi, as Washington has repeatedly told us, made a notable concession. Another Hanoi concession was to drop the demand for the immediate dethronement of General Thieu. However, Washington made its concessions too; and, since it has talked a good deal less about these, it may be well to list some of them here:

1. We have agreed to withdraw all our troops and dismantle all our military bases in South Vietnam within 60 days, while 145,000 North Vietnamese troops (our count; 300,000 according to General Thieu) may remain in South Vietnam so long as the Vietcong want them there. (The agreement provides that this question "shall be settled by the two South Vietnamese parties in a spirit of . . . equality.") "What kind of a peace," General Thieu asks not unreasonably, "is a peace that gives the North Vietnamese the right to keep their troops here? What kind of a treaty is a treaty that legalizes their presence here *de facto*?" Mr. Kissinger said the other day that these North Vietnamese regulars would somehow fade away in time through "the normal attrition of personnel." The prospect of waiting around while they die of old age may not be totally consoling to General Thieu.

2. We have agreed to supply no further arms to South Vietnam except on a one-for-one replacement basis, while Russia and China can continue to send arms to North Vietnam without any limit as to type or quantity.

3. We have obliged the Saigon regime to accept as full and equal partners on a National Council of National Reconciliation and Concord both the neutralists, whom the regime had been sending into prison or exile, and the Communists, whom it had outlawed. And we have confided to this National Council, on which each partner has a veto, the authority to organize elections. Thus we have not only legalized the presence of North Vietnamese troops in South Vietnam; we have also legalized the Vietcong as an equal partner in determining the future of South Vietnam.

4. We have promised to pay reparations to North Vietnam in the form of reconstruction assistance and in the magnitude of \$2.5 billion.

5. We have thrown overboard the whole theory on which our intervention was based and for which 50,000 Americans died—the theory that North and South Vietnam were separate states, one of which had wantonly invaded the other. Mr. Kissinger now casually refers to the conflict as "the civil war." The agreement pledges us to "respect" the "unity and territorial integrity of Vietnam" and endorses reunification as a laudable objective.

##### A GREAT SOCIALIST VICTORY

Such concessions may have been indispensable to a settlement. Some of them may

even have been desirable in themselves. But there is no point in pretending that they were not made. When one considers how much was conceded, it is easy to see why Le Duc Tho, the North Vietnamese negotiator, should call the agreement "a very great victory for the Socialist countries" and why General Thieu should be filled with such alarm and foreboding.

The point of the concessions was to persuade Hanoi to accept the Kissinger principle of a cease-fire in advance of a political settlement. Not everyone experienced in these matters on the American side thought the Kissinger approach a good idea. For the essence of this approach is to leave the substantive political issues, i.e., the causes of the war, unresolved. Those, like Averell Harriman and Clark Clifford, who thought a political settlement should come first, did so in the belief that the contending parties were so diametrically opposed, their differences so bitter and irreconcilable, that, unless these differences were settled in advance, any cease-fire would be certain to break down after a short time.

To this, view the Kissinger reply has been that a cease-fire will set in motion a political evolution that will end by resolving the political differences. We must pray that Mr. Kissinger is right, and we will now see how much merit his argument has. We will see whether General Thieu and the Vietcong, after all the years of hatred, betrayal and killing, are going to get together; whether supervisory personnel can maintain the cease-fire over the crazy-quilt of ill-defined jurisdictions; whether the National Council, required to operate on a basis of unanimity, will be able to agree on a procedure for elections.

Of course in its Article 11 the Paris Accord says incredibly: "Immediately after the cease-fire, the two South Vietnamese parties will: Achieve national reconciliation and concord, end hatred and enmity, prohibit all acts of reprisal and discrimination against individuals or organizations that have collaborated with one side or the other." Only a grammarian can comment adequately on the curious use of "will" in this context. When the agreement adds that Saigon and the Vietcong "will" also "ensure the democratic liberties of the people: personal freedom, freedom of speech, freedom of the press" and so on, up to and including the "right to free enterprise," one can only wonder with what amused tolerance of Western eccentricity the representatives of the Saigon, Hanoi and Vietcong regimes, none of which has shown notable enthusiasm for democratic liberties, watched this attempt to import the concepts of Western individualism into their non-individualistic cultures and with what cynicism they affixed their signatures to the document.

##### MR. ARNETT'S VIEW

No one has followed the Indochina situation longer or more carefully than Peter Arnett of the Associated Press; and he is almost certainly right when he predicts that a "dirty war" will be followed by a "dirty peace." Neither side has the slightest faith in the desire of the other to compromise the political issues. On December 30 General Thieu told Oriana Fallaci that bloodshed would be "inevitable" with a cease-fire. "It is not that we are overly suspicious," he said after the agreement was announced. "It is because we have had plenty of experience with the Communists in this regard and we don't place too much trust in their signature." The Vietcong, we may be sure, are equally suspicious. As Le Duc Tho said in Paris, "According to Marxist-Leninist theories, so long as imperialism persists in the world there will be wars." Each side is undoubtedly right about the other.

General Thieu has already said he will not agree to elections until the North Vietnamese

troops leave South Vietnam. If elections are not held, this will very likely lead the Vietcong, still denied a political role, to become guerrillas again. If the cease-fire gradually disintegrates, what will the United States do? When President Nixon announced the settlement to the country on January 23, he said that all parties must "see to it" that the peace lasts and that "interested nations" must "help ensure that the agreement is carried out." What does these veiled phrases mean? Does or does not the President have in mind a continuing role for the United States as a guarantor of the agreement?

There is a short-run argument for ambiguity on this point. That argument is that, if the United States were to tell the world we were out of Indochina forever, this would tempt Hanoi to violate the agreement. But advocates of this tactic should never forget Theodore Roosevelt's warning: never draw unless you mean to shoot. What really do we intend to do if things go sour? The New York Times had a story from Saigon saying that General Thieu has received "official" assurances from Washington pledging American re-intervention in case of "blatant" Communist violations of the cease-fire. Have in fact such pledges been made? Does Congress know about them? Will we react in the same way in case the blatant violations are made by the Saigon regime?

#### MR. NIXON'S OPTIONS

As long as the Seventh Fleet remains in Indochinese waters, the bombers on our carriers can readily strike again. Exhilarated by what he no doubt regards as the success of the December B52 raids, President Nixon may feel that he can control Hanoi from the air. Or perhaps he thinks that Moscow and Peking can control Hanoi for him, though he would be mistaken if he supposes that their influence over Hanoi is any greater than ours over Saigon. He has, of course, another lever on the situation in reconstruction assistance. If agreements were violated, for example, aid could be cut off to the violator. This could not be done effectively, however, unless aid were distributed by an international organization; for President Nixon, by calling the Thieu regime "the sole legitimate government of South Vietnam," has already committed America to one side in the conflict.

This is the ultimate danger in the formula of a cease-fire in advance of a political settlement—that, as the cease-fire breaks down under the pressure of those deeply-felt and still unresolved political issues, the United States, as a party to the settlement, may be drawn back into the quagmire.

No doubt the administration rejected the other road to a negotiated agreement—a political settlement first—on the ground that no such settlement was possible without abandoning General Thieu, which would be, by the President's definition, dishonorable. Yet, if we were unwilling to do that (and how General Thieu acquired such a hammerlock on the American official conscience is another mystery), then perhaps historians many conclude that, rather than tie the United States into an inherently unstable and almost certainly unworkable agreement, we would have done better to follow the course recommended by such disparate figures as General Maxwell Taylor and Senator George McGovern—the course, in General Taylor's words, "of terminating the American commitment without recourse to a formal agreement involving Hanoi and the Vietcong."

Unilateral withdrawal, for example, would not have legalized North Vietnamese troops in South Vietnam. It would not have conferred new juridical status on the Vietcong. Above all, it would not have entangled the United States—as today we stand merrily entangled—in the position of seeming to guarantee the unguaranteeable. In the end, we will probably be forced to abandon General Thieu after all; or else reenter the war in the effort to save him.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### MORE ON MEDICAID ABUSES IN NEW YORK

#### HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

#### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, again I call the attention of my colleagues to the New York Daily News series on medicaid abuses in New York. The following is the eighth in the series of articles:

[From the New York Daily News, Feb. 2, 1973]

#### MEDICAID LOSES AS DOCS PLAY BEAT THE CLOCK

(By William Sherman)

Playing an expensive version of Beat the Clock, some medicaid psychiatrists routinely dismiss patients after a 10-minute chat, then bill the city for a full hour's psychiatric examination. One doctor charged \$700 for 35 hours of work in one day and sometimes, the Health Department said, bills are paid for patients who were not seen at all.

Psychiatrists are paid \$20 an hour for medicaid clients and last year billed the city for more than \$4 million. Yesterday it was learned that the State Health Department has raised the maximum fee in New York to \$30 an hour. The city has the option to maintain the \$20 fee, or raising it to \$30.

"The only control we have over psychiatrists is that we will not pay an individual for more than 10 hours a day, six days a week," said Stuart Laurence, Health Department attorney.

"Unfortunately, we have no way of knowing whether he's seeing those 60 patients in two hours, and then goes back to his private practice, or if he's really spending the time," Laurence said: "He may not see some of the patients at all," he said.

The continuing News investigation into abuses in the city's \$1.3 billion medical assistance program revealed that some of the psychiatrists work in large medical group centers where patients are referred to them by other specialists.

This reporter, posing as a medicaid patient complaining of a cold at a Queens group center, was ushered in to see a psychiatrist after he had been sent to a podiatrist and an internist.

"Some psychiatrists' offices are literally bridge tables located between a podiatrist's and a chiropractor's examining rooms," said Laurence.

Under city medicaid regulations, psychiatrists have been directed to bill by units, with each \$4 unit representing 15 minutes. They can bill in fractions of units, for instance, 1.5 units represents \$6 or 22 minutes.

"I have never seen any bill less than \$20," said Laurence.

Another psychiatrist who works in a group medicaid center is Dr. Max Packer, who sees patients at the South Jamaica Medical Center, 107-53 New York Blvd., Queens. Health Department records show that on several occasions during 1971 he was billing for up to 30 hours a day.

When he was asked to explain his billing procedures, Packer replied that some of the invoices were clerical errors.

However, an examination of Health Department records revealed that during August 1971, Packer billed the city for 2,590 units, or \$10,360—17 hours a day for each day of that month.

#### WORKED 6-DAY WEEK

He told Health Department officials that he worked 12 hours a day six days a week, and that other practitioners at the center referred patients to him.

On April 26, 1972, Packer agreed to a reduction of his previous billing to 36 hours a week and subsequently has made the re-

March 5, 1973

sulting restitution. He still is in the medicaid program.

The highest billing medicaid psychiatrists, department records show, are those who own private methadone clinics. There is no limit on the volume of patients, and the centers are paid \$4 every time a patient comes in and swallows his dose of methadone. An average dose costs a dime.

However, Dr. Elio Maggio, who runs the Bronx Psychiatric Center, a methadone clinic, 1420 Grand Concourse, Bronx, was billing at the hourly rate during the summer of 1971.

#### THE 35-HOUR DAY

Records show that he regularly billed for about 100 hours a week, but reached a peak when he charged for 35 hours work in one day.

When confronted by the department, Maggio protested that he spent more than one hour with each patient and complained that medicaid didn't pay for the methadone.

After further questioning he said he could not be concerned with (billing) units. The department reduced his payments to 32 hours a week.

On June 15, 1972, Maggio was indicted by a Bronx grand jury for selling dangerous drugs and violating the state health laws. He was charged with selling methadone to private patients for \$50 a week without giving proper follow-up care, including urine analysis tests to detect the presence of heroin, and counseling.

#### GROSSED \$3,000 IN 2 DAYS

During a two-day period, including his medicaid and private patients, he grossed \$3,000. His case has not yet been brought to trial and he has not been suspended from the medicaid program.

"In most of these clinics, the patient never sees the doctor," said senior Health Department medical auditor Dr. Howard Katz.

"He simply walks in, swallows his dose, and leaves," he said.

The biggest methadone operation ever run in the city was owned by Dr. Rafiq Jan, who accepted both private and medicaid patients. From 1969 through 1971, he was grossing \$20,000 a week out of two offices: 35 W. 92d St., and 137 W. 96th St.

#### A \$277,000 YEAR

From May through December 1971, Jan's operation grossed \$277,000 in medicaid funds, in addition to more than 800 private patients who were paying up to \$20 a week for their medicine.

During an investigation, Katz said he found that patients were standing 10 deep in the reception room waiting to hand money or a medicaid card to "an individual behind a cage" who handed out pills.

"The doctors were keeping records in dime store pocket notebooks . . . there were 17 doctors and psychiatrists employed at different times," he said.

Jan was suspended from Methadone maintenance programs, and the Health Department demanded \$15,000 restitution. However, he was not suspended from medicaid and now is operating a group center at 137 W. 96th St., offering services from pediatrics to psychiatry.

#### DIRECTIVE IS ISSUED

Recently, an investigator with a medicaid card had two 13-minute consultations with Jan at his new office. When the bills came in they each were for one-hour visits.

On Oct. 12, in an effort to control psychiatrists billing, the Health Department issued a directive that doctors indicate the specific session time and date on each patient's bill.

#### MEET AT HOSPITAL

However, members of the Bronx Mental Health Center, directed by Dr. Hugo Morales, protested saying it was impossible to keep such records because in the South Bronx, patients come in and leave at odd hours, and

doctors spend at least 30 minutes with each patient doing paperwork and making telephone calls.

A meeting was held at Prospect Hospital and attended by city medicaid officials and Rep. Herman Badillo (D-Bronx) and State Sen. Robert Garcia (D-Bronx).

During the meeting, Morales said, the psychiatrists insisted that they were not paid enough, and that patients, when questioned by department investigators, could not accurately remember what time a doctor saw a patient.

The Health Department insisted it was a valid and simple request. However, Dr. Tibor Fodor, executive medical director of medicaid, said "Badillo and Garcia insisted we rescind the order."

Badillo responded to this by saying he was not advocating cheating but that he thought the directive was unnecessary so long as psychiatrists did not bill for more than 10 hours per day.

At any rate, the directive was suspended by the city and Dr. Fodor said he referred the matter to the State Health Department. No action has been taken.

#### SMALL COMMUNITIES SHOUT "HELP"

#### HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, one of the drawbacks that keep people from establishing residence in the countryside is the lack of health care facilities. There are many towns in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District that had two or three doctors 20 years ago that have none or only one today.

Worst of all, there seems to be no end in sight to this shortage.

Some of our rural communities are trying a unique approach. They seek out talented young people who would like to enter the medical profession, but lack the financial resources. They contract with these young people to finance their education on a loan basis with the provision that the young medics will return to the sponsoring community to practice medicine.

However, as one sponsor ruefully commented:

This contract is not very air tight.

Nor does it guarantee that the student will continue his education to a conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, this shortage of medical practitioners was excellently dealt with by Mrs. Madonna Kellar, editor of the Heron Lake News, a weekly newspaper in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District.

With your permission, and to give my colleagues and all of the other readers the opportunity to make a judgment of this shortage of medical personnel in the countryside, I insert Mrs. Kellar's editorial in the RECORD:

#### SMALL COMMUNITIES SHOUT "HELP"

Every small town has a fight on their hands the fight for survival. They either have the problem of too little housing, no doctor, no dentist, inadequate facilities or other inconveniences.

Shortage of doctors seems to be high on every town's list and the critical situation is

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

not getting any better. The young graduate does not wish to tie himself down to a 24 hour a day job where he will be giving shots, delivering babies and aiding the dying in the wee small hours. Dedication—to a degree—has been diminished as the shortage became more acute. Young doctors are shopping for places where the load is not so heavy, where recreation is close at hand and where the financial remuneration is good. And who can blame them? They can age in a hurry when burdened with so great a responsibility. However, perhaps they are not weighing the great advantages of the small community where they can live in comparative safety among people who really care about them. They can live more economically where the small community is calling them.

Dental care is another need. It is difficult to get appointments when they are needed because the dentists are overworked as well.

It would seem that licensing between states should have a greater degree of reciprocity which would enable us to invite doctors from other states to join the ranks.

It is true that our legislators are working hard to get medical and dental care for the small communities, but the time element is tremendous. In the meantime a severe accident could occur which would cost a life that could have been saved by quick medical attention.

Maybe a deluge of letters to legislators could help speed up the wheels of politics to get something done more quickly. Perhaps it would be more vivid to them that their friends at home are in dire need of help.

In a country where education has been of prime importance it would seem that there would be at least one young doctor who would be dedicated enough to want to heal the ills of the people of our communities. In time, no doubt, there will be a physician and a dentist who will realize the potential of this area and who will come to the rescue. At least Hope springs eternal!!

#### THE ADMINISTRATION'S "BENIGN NEGLECT" HAS CHANGED TO PLAIN "NEGLECT"

#### HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's budget assumes that many of our pressing domestic problems have been solved. On this assumption, President Nixon has asked for an end to or a severe cutback in many of the programs that have been designed to provide improved health care, housing, education, manpower training, and other critical needs of our Nation's people.

To further justify his position, President Nixon's budget states that many of these programs are not working. He has been quick to criticize people-oriented programs, but very slow to offer alternatives to these programs. The problems of poor health care, low income, deteriorating housing, high unemployment, and low quality education have not disappeared. In fact, if some of these programs are not working, the fault would probably lie with the way they are being administered and not with the programs themselves.

The administration once used the phrase "benign neglect" to describe its policies toward these problems. Now the phrase has been changed to "self reliance"; perhaps it would have been

more accurate to shorten the original description to just plain "neglect."

Certainly the Federal Government cannot and should not try to do everything, but the Federal Government has the responsibility to provide leadership in dealing with national problems on a national scale, and this role should not be abandoned.

#### THE CONTAMINATION OF CALIFORNIA LETTUCE BY MONITOR 4

#### HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, a problem of disturbing proportions appears to have developed involving misuse of pesticides and affecting the well-being of farm-workers and consumers. Monitor 4 is a poisonous organophosphate which has been used by California growers as a pesticide for lettuce growing. It is a highly poisonous substance, a poison that in its pure and undiluted form attacks the central nervous system and can cause death. It is, in fact generally a part of the "nerve gas" family.

The established Federal tolerance level of this poison is one part per million, but in recent tests by the Department of Agriculture, lettuce samples showed contamination of up to eight parts per million. Over 10,000 acres of California's Imperial Valley are affected by this contamination. Each acre yields approximately 12,000 heads of lettuce, which means that a total of over 9 million heads of lettuce appear to have been poisoned with this deadly organophosphate. The severity of this widespread contamination is confirmed by the reaction of the chemical companies involved. According to Ralph Lichte, Los Angeles County Agriculture Commissioners—

The entire lettuce crop was so contaminated that the chemical companies offered to buy it all to avoid lawsuits. The growers refused.

Instead, shockingly and almost unbelievably to me, the lettuce was sent to market.

After discovering this contamination, the Department of Agriculture condemned thousands of cartons of lettuce that were to have been sent to retail stores for general consumption, belatedly preventing at least those shipments of contaminated vegetables to the general public. The USDA nevertheless permitted retail stores to "recondition" earlier shipments of contaminated lettuce and sell it to the public. This "reconditioning process" apparently consists of simply removing the outer leaves of lettuce that show the greatest signs of contamination. A shipment of this same contaminated lettuce left Arizona for Canada within the last 2 months, to be sold to the unsuspecting public.

The health and safety of the farm-workers is similarly not taken into consideration in this instance it appears, by anybody, not the Government enforcement agencies, not the growers, and certainly not the chemical pesticide com-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

panies. No effort whatsoever has been made to check the poisoning levels of the lettuce workers, that I have yet determined, even though it has already been proven that exposure to organophosphates such as Monitor 4 can cause physical disabilities. In a 1970 report by a team of doctors—sponsored by the New York Field Foundation—the worst incidents of human illness were proven to be those exposed to both organophosphates and chlorinated carbons. Monitor 4 is an organophosphate. Department of Agriculture tests also showed the presence of Thiodan, the second most toxic chlorinated hydrocarbon. The result of increased exposure to these two substances includes headaches, sleeplessness, loss of coordination, blurred speech, slow reaction time, losses in vitality, high irritability, and poor memories. Nevertheless, the poisons are still used. They continue to infect the workers and contaminate the consumer products.

The most shocking rationale I have yet discovered for this misuse of pesticides was offered by one major lettuce grower in California who frankly admitted that Monitor 4 is more dangerous than DDT. His explanation was—

We could get away with DDT, but it's banned now, so we have to use the stronger stuff, like Monitor 4. It's good for getting rid of the insects and that's what we're interested in.

This sort of attitude regards consumers and the farmworkers of this country as mere insects. They have been regarded as such for too long, and I will do all I can to insure that they will be treated as such no longer.

Even now, this pesticide, possibly more dangerous than DDT, is being used, and apparently abused. On supermarket shelves across the country the contaminated lettuce is being sold to the unsuspecting public. Where was the Federal Government when this pesticide was being indiscriminately abused, and the contaminated lettuce was piling up for commercial sale? Where is the Federal Government now?

I have called for a full and complete three-pronged Federal investigation by the Environmental Protection Agency; the White House Consumer Affairs Adviser; and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration of the Department of Labor. It seems to me, that to insure the safety of the consumers and the workers, this substance should be banned from the market, and its use discontinued until the appropriate Federal agencies have had the opportunity to complete adequate testing. If Monitor 4 is found to be unsafe, as many claim, then it should follow in the footsteps of DDT and be permanently banned from commercial use.

## THE HORSE PROTECTION ACT

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months, members of the

Public Health and Environmental Subcommittee have received an enormous number of inquiries from Americans across the Nation, calling attention to the provisions of Public Law 91-540, an act which prohibits the movement of sored horses in interstate or foreign commerce. The law originated in the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment and we are well aware that it was the intent of Congress in passing it that the brutal practice of soring be abolished. Therefore, we were shocked to learn that despite the Federal statute of 1970, soring continues throughout the country.

As a consequence, I wrote the Secretary of Agriculture, December 5, 1972, asking for detailed information concerning their procedures and methods of enforcement. I received their reply dated February 14, 1973.

I also asked the American Horse Protection Association, Inc., to submit their comments on the Department of Agriculture's reply. Representatives of this nonprofit humane organization, which is dedicated to the welfare and protection of all horses, both wild and domestic, have battled for over 10 years against this vicious maiming of horses. They have attended a large number of walking horse shows, both before and after the act went into effect. It was deeply discouraging to note their charge that "there are just as many sore horses in the show ring today as there were before the law went into effect." As a recent editorial from the Nashville Tennessean stated:

Perhaps by the year 2000 some progress will have been made on the problem of soring horse.

But there is no need to wait until the year 2000 to correct this unhealthy situation. We intend to take whatever action is necessary to eliminate persistent confusion on the part of the Department of Agriculture concerning their powers of enforcement and the will of Congress.

At this time and for the information of my colleagues, I shall insert in the RECORD my questions of the Department of Agriculture, their responses to those questions and the comments of the American Horse Protection Association to USDA's answers. I also insert the entire editorial from the Tennessean.

The material follows:

## QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

Congressman Roger's question—How many horses were inspected by the U.S. Department of Agriculture at the National Celebration, Shelbyville, Tennessee, prior to their entry in the show?

USDA answer—In the Horse Protection program, inspection of a horse involves a visual observation as well as physical examination. Entry in the show means that an entry form has been executed and submitted to the show management along with the required entry fee. These entry forms and fees are requirements of the horse show. In shows such as the Celebration, entry is made several weeks before the horse show actually occurs. At this show, every horse that entered the ring under saddle to be judged was usually observed by at least five different U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) inspectors. A number of horses were observed and examined several times because they were shown in more than one class. Our figures for the National Celebration disclose 1,753 horses entered. Of these, 680 horses were never shown. This could be due to numerous reasons. We know that 115 of the

680 horses were excused by representatives of show management. To the best of our knowledge, none were excused for the stated reason of being sored. Horses numbering 565 were never presented for showing. We believe many of these horses were entered in a class and an entry fee paid so that they could qualify for stall space. This would get the horse in an area where horsemen and potential horse buyers were prevalent. It is also possible that some of these horses were not shown because of the Department's presence and activities.

AHPA's comment—U.S.D.A. admits that out of 1,753 horses entered in the 1972 "Celebration," 1,245 were never examined by U.S.D.A., i.e., "680 horses were never shown" and "565 were never presented for showing." Inasmuch as 1,753 horses were officially entered in this horse show, this leaves a remainder of 508 horses which were shown, but only 314 of that number were examined by U.S.D.A. Thus, the remaining 194 horses were shown in the ring but none of this number was inspected by Federal Veterinarians. Why were these 194 horses exempted from U.S.D.A. inspection?

U.S.D.A. Rules and Regulations state that an "exhibitor," as defined in Section 11.1(s) "means the owner or other person who enters a horse in any horse show or exhibition," and Section 11.5 defines access to premises for inspection of horses. One must take for granted that the owner of any horse listed in the official program of the "Celebration" has paid the required entry fee and his horse is therefore officially entered in the show.

(See Section 11.21 (b)). Therefore, there is no excuse for U.S.D.A. not examining the 1,245 horses which were officially entered, for whatever purpose, in the "Celebration."

U.S.D.A. states that out of this number, they examined only 314 horses, which indicates that over a period of eleven days, eighteen Federal inspectors examined only thirty horses a day. In contrast, the three veterinarians hired by the show management were able to inspect, during the same period, 1,188 horses, "some of them several times."

There is also no excuse for their not having examined the 115 horses which were said to have been excused by the show veterinarians. All press accounts indicate that only "35 horses were excused for alleged violations" during the "Celebration", but whatever the exact number, one would think that these excused horses in particular would have been under immediate suspicion of soring, and that U.S.D.A. would have recognized its duty under the law to inspect them.

The above would clearly indicate malfeasance on the part of U.S.D.A.

Question. How many horses prior to showing were found by U.S.D.A. veterinarians to be sored?

Answer. None. The horses were observed prior to showing; however, the inspection of the horses was not complete until after the showing. No horse was considered sore on visual observation only. The diagnosis of soring is made only when a visual examination and a physical examination are made. Palpation of the allegedly affected limbs is a vital part of the examination and diagnosis.

AHPA—No comment.

Question. How many horses were inspected by the U.S.D.A. veterinarians after showing?

Answer. Approximately 314 horses were examined after being shown. These horses were selected for post-show inspection by virtue of being recipients of ribbons, or by exhibiting a gait which could be indicative of a sored horse, or by random selection.

There is no sufficient time to examine all horses exiting a class in the short time between classes. Any attempt to do so would unduly delay the show. Additionally it would seem impractical under the circumstances to examine horses that appear normal in their gaits. Examination of horses

March 5, 1973

showing symptoms that might be indicative of soring, as well as those receiving ribbons, is the most effective way to utilize the personnel available for assignment to a particular horse show.

AHPA—No comment.

Question. Of this number, how many horses were found to be sored?

Answer. Fifty-nine cases of alleged violations at the Celebration have been submitted from the field for evaluation. There are an estimated 70 additional alleged violation cases being prepared.

AHPA's comment—In answer to the question "Of this number, how many horses were found to be sored?" U.S.D.A. states that "there are an estimated 70 additional alleged violation cases being prepared." Are we to understand that these 70 cases concern violations at the "Celebration", or elsewhere in the United States?

Question—What was the procedure followed upon determination by a USDA veterinarian that a horse was sored?

Answer—Our procedures included provisions for enforcement personnel to assemble information necessary for prosecution for those horses thought by USDA veterinarians to be sored. This included statements to establish the horse was sored for the purpose of affecting its gait and that the soring may reasonably be expected to cause pain, extreme physical distress or inflammation. The responsible persons were identified, often by affidavits, and commerce was established. Each alleged violation also includes, by documentation, that the show was or was not in violation and that the trucker was or was not involved. Many of these items are difficult to obtain. Often meetings had to be arranged with the trainer and his lawyer, at which time the lawyer would advise his client not to comment. Some problems are being encountered in establishing commerce. Most exhibitors are reluctant to swear they brought their horse interstate for the purpose of show or exhibition.

When all the above was obtained, it was sent to the national program staff for review. If it appeared complete and accurate, it was sent to the Department's Office of the General Counsel with the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service's recommended action.

AHPA's comment—concerning U.S.D.A.'s answer to the question, "What was the procedure followed upon determination by a U.S.D.A. veterinarian that a horse was sored?", we do not understand why meetings had to be arranged by U.S.D.A. with trainers and their lawyers. This procedure is not called for in either P.L. 91-540 or the Rules and Regulations. Thus, why was this action taken in the face of a clear violation of the law?

2. Question—To your knowledge, how many horses were inspected by independent veterinarians?

Answer—The private practitioners hired by show management examined every horse brought to the showing for showing under saddle. Halter classes were not examined, as soring is not a factor in these classes. Horses numbering 1,188 were examined, some of them several times.

AHPA—no comment.

Question—Of this number, how many were found to be sored?

Answer—To the best of our knowledge, no such horses were diagnosed by the independent practitioners as sored as defined by the Act.

Show management has committed an unlawful act if they conduct a horse show subject to the Act in which sored horses are shown unless show management complies with the regulations of USDA. Most of the larger shows, and many of the smaller ones, hire a veterinarian to prevent this from happening. The practitioner can accomplish this purpose by excusing any horse for unsoundness or for having a gait not typical of the

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

breed. It has been easier for this type of diagnosis to be made by the show veterinarian and/or the judge than to make a diagnosis of soring as defined by the Act. They fear lawsuits as well as being reluctant to make such a serious charge against a client. The judge, who is almost invariably a trainer and owner, also is reluctant and seldom excuses a horse for being sore. In the most extreme cases, if he must do something, he offers the rider the opportunity to excuse himself. The announcer will then say: "Horse number — has asked to be excused."

AHPA's comment—In reference to U.S.D.A.'s answer to the question, "Of this number (1,188), how many were found to be sored?", U.S.D.A. states that to the best of their knowledge, "no horses were diagnosed by the independent practitioners as sored as defined by the Act". And yet 35 out of 107 horses were excused from the show ring on the second night of the "Celebration" by these same "independent practitioners". Certainly some reason must have been given for their unprecedented action, which caused a riot in the ring and the "Celebration" to be closed temporarily for that evening. Veterinarians paid by the show management are not required to make a diagnosis of soring, and are, of course, hesitant to make such a serious charge against their clients. Conversely, U.S.D.A. veterinarians are bound by law to make this determination. Again, U.S.D.A. admits they did not do their job!

Question—Was there a procedure whereby horses, determined to be sored by the independent veterinarians, were referred to USDA veterinarians for further inspection?

Answer—A USDA veterinarian was working just inside the area where the private practitioners were examining horses. He was advised as to which horses were passed or were excused.

AHPA's comment—It is obvious that U.S.D.A. hedged in answering the question, "Was there a procedure whereby horses, determined to be sored by the independent veterinarians were referred to U.S.D.A. veterinarians for further inspection?" U.S.D.A. did not state that U.S.D.A.'s inspection building was cut off from view of the area used by the show veterinarians to inspect horses. One might also ask what use U.S.D.A. made of whatever information they received from the show veterinarians concerning those horses which were excused.

3. Question—Kindly provide a listing of the number of cases referred to the Department of Justice as a result of a determination by an independent inspector that soring had occurred.

Answer—(With comments regarding commerce and willful violations.) The Act is clear that delivery of a sored horse for showing constitutes a violation of the Act, but it must be shown that such a person had reason to believe the horse was sored when moved and that this movement was in commerce as defined in Section 2 of the Act. The Act is also explicit in that the showing or exhibiting of a sored horse constitutes a violation of the Act with the stipulation that the horse or any other horse was moved to such show or exhibition in commerce. There have been no cases forwarded to the Department of Justice as a result of a determination by an independent inspector that soring had occurred. As mentioned above, the practitioner can perform the duties for which he was hired by pointing out horses to management that are not sound. Sored horses fall in that category. Practically speaking, the purposes of the Act are accomplished by prohibiting this sored horse from showing. If this were to happen routinely, the practice of soring would come to an end.

AHPA's comment—A.H.P.A. takes strong exception to U.S.D.A.'s theory, as stated in their answer to question 3, that "the purposes of the Act are accomplished by prohibiting this sored horse from showing. If this were to happen routinely, the practice of

soring would come to an end." In no instance have we observed U.S.D.A. in the act of prohibiting any sored horse from competition, nor is this the primary function of the show management. Instead, it is the clear responsibility of U.S.D.A. under the law. Inasmuch as U.S.D.A. has charged so very few alleged violators (only four to date after the 1972 season) out of an estimated 110,000 horses they allegedly examined, it is pathetically clear that USDA's presence has not become an effective deterrent to soring. This fact is further illustrated in their reply to the following question in which they admit that they have referred only 8 cases of alleged violations to U.S. Attorneys throughout the U.S. We should also like to question why no cases have been referred to any U.S. Attorney in Tennessee inasmuch as the majority of the horses which we observed at the "Celebration" were in our opinion, and according to our veterinarian, painfully sored.

Question—Kindly provide a listing of the number of cases referred to the Department of Justice with respect to horses determined by the USDA inspectors to be sored.

Answer—There have been eight cases referred to the United States Attorneys as a result of determinations made by USDA inspectors. These are in Texas, South Carolina, Indiana, Illinois, and Alabama. A number of other cases are currently being prepared for referral to various United States Attorneys.

4. Question—Is there a formal arrangement with the Department of Justice governing referral of cases involving willful violations of the Act?

Answer—Cases involving willful violations are referred to the Department of Justice pursuant to Section 7 of the Act. Such referrals are sent directly to the U.S. Attorney in the district where the violation occurred for his consideration and action. This is normal procedure in criminal cases of this nature, and no specific written agreement in this regard exists.

AHPA—No comment.

5. Question—In your judgment, do the provisions of the Horse Protection Act provide your Department with ample authority to prevent the practice of the soring of horses or is further authority necessary? For example, should the law be amended to provide USDA representatives with the authority to confiscate horses or to stop horse shows? Should you be provided with the authority to bring actions in Federal court to enforce provisions of the Act? Is the authorization of \$100,000 annually sufficient to allow you to properly implement the provisions of the Act?

Answer—An evaluation of the effectiveness of the Act cannot fully be made until cases have been tried in a court of law. If convictions are obtained, it can be determined if these convictions will prevent others from continuing the practice of soring.

The authority to confiscate horses may cause more problems than benefits. The responsibility for these extremely high-priced horses would be great, especially when considering the risk involved in transporting them to controlled stabling areas. Even if this were successfully accomplished, damage is done to show horses when taken out of training. We understand that although some humane associations have the authority to confiscate horses, such action has not been taken.

The present legislation provides authority to bring action in Federal courts for willful violations in Section 7. Civil penalties are also provided for in Section 6 when the violation is nonwillful in nature.

With regard to the \$100,000 annual authorization for administration specified in the Act, our experience to date is that this amount provides only limited ability for field surveillance and enforcement. After accounting for national level staff support, training and training aids, travel, and other

costs, less than \$1,000 is available to each field office in each State for enforcement purposes. It is estimated that the average cost per show is approximately \$500, based on attendance at both large and small shows. Should we concentrate on the larger shows only, the average will be much higher. It is estimated that the cost to the Department for our activities at the 11-day Celebration at Shelbyville, Tennessee, was \$27,305.99, without consideration of the costs to the Office of the General Counsel for legal services. During calendar year 1972, USDA inspectors were actively inspecting horse shows that lasted from one evening to 11 days. During this time, we were at over 800 horse shows and inspected over 110,000 horses.

The 1972 horse show season has been an extremely busy and educational one. Department personnel not only had to familiarize themselves with the Tennessee Walking Horse breed and its distinctive gait, but had to become familiar with the deviations to the natural gait which could be attributed to soring as defined by the Act. Since the Act is applicable to all breeds, it also became necessary to be familiar with the training and showing procedures of all other breeds as well. Enforcement cannot be accomplished without a thorough knowledge of show management practices and we could not expect compliance at any significant level without expending a great deal of time contacting and working with all segments of the industry informing them as to what the Act and its regulations required of them.

We believe that the industry is now informed. We further believe that continued opposition will occur until the industry is convinced that they must stop the practice of soring and that equality of competition is necessary for their own good.

AHPA's Comment—In reference to U.S.D.A.'s answer to the final question, we should like to submit that representatives of the A.H.P.A. have attended a great many Walking horse shows during the 1972 show season. It was a most "educational" experience for us too, but more importantly, it taught us that there are just as many sore horses in the show ring today as there were before the law went into effect. It is quite evident to us, if not to the Department of Agriculture, that the Walking horse industry has absolutely no interest in "compliance" with the law, nor are they "convinced that they must stop the practice of soring". For two years they have flagrantly violated the law with enormous success, and they have no reason to believe the Federal government will prosecute their continued violations. This unhealthy situation would certainly indicate a serious problem on the part of U.S.D.A. whose responsibility it is to translate the strength of the law into effective action. They in turn prefer to wait until the industry reforms itself, which will never happen. It is obvious to us that U.S.D.A. is more interested in waiting for "compliance" than in using the full force of the law to end, once and for all, the brutal practice of soring.

#### A THIRD CHARGE OF HORSE SORING

The Agriculture Department has filed charges against a third person accused of soring a Tennessee Walking Horse.

Mr. James Altman of Arnold, Mo., is also accused of transporting a horse across a state line and with covering the area of the lower leg with grease in violation of the 1970 Horse Protection Act. The horse was entered in an Illinois show, but didn't compete. Mr. Altman pleaded innocent.

The previous charges were against a Tennessee horse trainer and a Texan. The astonishing thing is that the Agriculture Department has found only three persons to charge with soring horses since passage of the 1970 act.

One can either conclude that the Walking

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Horse industry has made valuable strides in attacking the problem itself, or that the Agriculture department is astonishingly inept in finding evidence sufficient to bring charges.

If it is the latter case, perhaps by the year 2000, some progress will have been made on the problem of soring horses.

## NEWS BULLETIN OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

### HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

#### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the Record the February 26, 1973, edition of the news bulletin of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission in an effort to help my colleagues be informed of actions being taken across the country in preparation for the coming 200th anniversary of the United States in 1976. The bulletin is compiled and written by the staff of the ARBC Communications Committee:

BICENTENNIAL BULLETIN, FEBRUARY 26, 1973

"Let's Talk Bicentennial" is the theme of the New Jersey statewide conference to be held March 3 at the State Museum Auditorium. Sponsors are the New Jersey Historical Commission and the newly created New Jersey American Revolution Bicentennial Commission and the official County Bicentennial Committees have also been invited to serve as co-sponsors. Governor William T. Cahill issued invitations to all counties and the "Big Six" cities—Camden, Elizabeth, Jersey City, Newark, Paterson and Trenton—to send ten delegates each to the conference. He urged them to make their delegations "as broadly representative as possible of the communities which you serve. Such representation is essential if the Bicentennial is to involve all of the people of New Jersey," the Governor said. This is the second such meeting to be held in the state—the first, held in April 1971, stimulated formation of county and municipal planning committees; the second will emphasize reports of programs and plans of each county and "Big Six" city. A film on "Liberty Park," a major Bicentennial project of the state, and officially recognized by the national ARBC will be shown. Professor Richard P. McCormick of Rutgers, and member of the national organization, will be featured speaker.

"American Idea," the Ford Motor Company's TV presentation will get its first viewing on March 18 (8 p.m. EST on ABC-TV) with a program dedicated to the proposition that land is good; that America was built around the goal of owning property. Henry Fonda, Dick Van Dyke, Cloris Leachman and the late Edward G. Robinson will star in this installment. The second program built around the cowboys and Indians and their natural dependence on the land will be shown sometime in early summer and a third episode based on the waves of immigrants will come to the small screen next fall. The series is expected to continue into 1976.

In Guam the Bicentennial Commission has met and set up task forces and committees to enthusiastically launch activities related to the theme areas. Under task force Heritage, a Calendar of Events of happenings from 1776 to 1976 will be developed and the Horizons Committee will sponsor a contest among high school students to develop a Guam Bicentennial logo and letterhead. Further plans will be discussed at the March 1 meeting.

March 5, 1973

The University of South Alabama in Mobile is developing an Ethnic-American Art Slide Library as a project of the Department of Art. Its holdings now include almost one thousand slides of American Indian artworks and five hundred slides of Mexican-American art. Scheduled to begin later this year is a collection of Oriental-American art. The work is being carried on under the sponsorship of the Samuel H. Kress Foundation of New York who has recognized the importance of developing Ethnic-American art slide collections for use by scholars in the various subject matter areas comprising the Humanities.

Billed as a "sure non-best-seller" at \$100 per copy, "The American Campaigns of Rochambeau's Army, 1780, 1781, 1782, 1783," has been recently published and represents eight years' work by its author, Mrs. Anne S. K. Brown, and is a major event for the Rhode Island Bicentennial Commission's celebration of the nation's 200th birthday who presented Mrs. Brown with a citation. The book details the campaigns of the Comte de Rochambeau, the French general who commanded a French army that helped the Americans defeat the British at Yorktown. The book looks at the campaign through the diaries of three young officers, and not only provides an essential view into the understanding of the Revolution but an entertaining glimpse of colonial America by three sophisticated Frenchmen... who found the custom of "bundling" particularly curious. The two volumes have been printed in an original issue of 2,500, more than half of which have been sold so far, mostly to libraries.

New in the Old Dominion: Along with their new license plates, residents of Virginia are receiving an enclosure which displays the new highway signs being installed throughout the state. The signs are essentially the same as the "international" traffic signs used in most other countries of the world. Most states are providing these easily recognized guides for tourists. There are few efforts which could make travel more pleasant and easier for the influx of visitors from other countries whose numbers are expected to be particularly great during the Bicentennial year.

The National Archives Conference on the "Meaning of the American Revolution" will be held during November 1973. Session topics will explore the implications of the Revolutionary experience in America beyond the Revolutionary War period itself. Among the subjects that will be considered are political and economic implications, law and constitutionalism and cultural and religious implications of the Revolution. A session highlighting the holdings of the National Archives in the area of pre-Federal studies will emphasize certain basic institutional resources available to the scholar both in manuscript form and on microfilm.

The Maine State American Revolution Bicentennial Commission has announced the appointment of chairmen and members of its three key committees—Heritage 1776, Festival U.S.A. and Horizons 1976. Heritage will develop a plan to encourage the preservation of historic documents and sites; a publication program will be established and the participation of museums, historical societies and patriotic organizations will be solicited. Festival will direct its main efforts towards schools, libraries and other educational bodies, encouraging pageants and re-enactments and setting up criteria for grants in aid to groups. The committee will also explore how the fine, applied, performing and visual arts resources in Maine can be related to the Bicentennial celebration. Horizons program goals are to encourage and promote activities both ecologically and of a conservational and restorative nature to leave as a legacy to the state of Maine.

The New York State American Revolution Bicentennial Commission has produced a

useful booklet, "Independence and Statehood," a Framework for Observing the Bicentennial in New York State. The booklet is divided into areas headlined Guiding Principles, The Three Phase Approach (referring to the dates of phases of project implementation), the Endorsement Policy and in addition, lists a great number of suggested Bicentennial programs, among them: Bicentennial history of your community for children, cookbooks, ethnic histories, competitions of diverse sorts and demonstrations of 18th century crafts and "Heritage Workshops." The "New York Master Calendar" of Revolutionary events from 1770 to 1783 is presented in the back of the book. New York recognizes its preeminence in the story of the American Revolution, and has since 1968 been hard at work to fulfill its mandate for a fitting anniversary.

Two state agencies have received commendation from the Nevada American Revolution Bicentennial Commission for initiating the first historical project of the Bicentennial era. The Nevada Department of Education and the Nevada Highway Department have created a multi-media kit, "Trails Across Nevada," which will be used in Nevada junior high schools. The kit consists of a color booklet, a carousel with 74 slides and one audio tape. Vicki Nash, Bicentennial Director commented on the package, "Trails Across Nevada emphasizes the evolution of early trails to modern highways and is a fine example of Nevada's heritage."

**LAWRENCE F. TAYLOR URGES DEMOCRATIC PARTY TO UNITE AND EARN RESPECT OF VOTERS**

**HON. DANTE B. FASCELL**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, recently, Mr. Lawrence F. Taylor was installed for his second term as the president of the Biscayne Democratic Club, Miami Beach, Fla. He was returned to office because he has demonstrated the qualities which he advocates as essential for leadership. His is a dedicated Democrat. He recognizes the need for strong local effort if the Democratic Party is to make its contribution to the strength of this country through the operation of an effective two-party political system.

In his remarks accepting his second term, Larry Taylor called on all members to exert every effort possible to make the Democratic Party stronger, more united, and to redouble support for those principles for which the Democratic Party stands and which made it the party of the people.

He correctly warns that we must continue to earn the respect of our fellow man if we are to be entrusted with the challenge and responsibility of leadership, both local and national. I thoroughly concur with these observations. I am sure all Democrats are as impressed as the many who attended the installation banquet.

In a humble yet potent manner Lawrence F. Taylor, who is giving his best for the Democratic Party at the local level, reminds us all that we must have the will to strengthen the Democratic Party; that we must have everyone's cooperation; that the strength of the Dem-

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

ocratic Party is in local organizations such as the Biscayne Democratic Club of Miami Beach, Fla.; that adversity must unite us; that we must have strong national candidates and that we must be more determined in our effort to be of service to the people of this country if the Democratic Party is to remain the party of the people.

Mr. Speaker, Lawrence Taylor's remarks are timely. I commend his very capable leadership on behalf of the Democratic Party. I know all my distinguished colleagues join me in expressing our appreciation for his fine work, and wishing him continued success.

**SHELL OIL'S REFUSAL TO BARGAIN ON OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH**

**HON. HENRY S. REUSS**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 established a landmark Federal program to guarantee safe and healthy workplaces to all American workers. Often overlooked, however, is the first admonition of the law: That employers and employees act voluntarily "to institute new and to perfect existing programs for providing safe and healthful working conditions."

The oil industry, by and large, has made a magnificent response to this law. In contracts negotiated with the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers—OCAW—nearly all American oil companies agreed to health and safety clauses of far-reaching importance. These companies include American, Atlantic Richfield, Gulf, Texaco, Mobil, Union, Citgo, Exxon, Sohio, Continental, Phillips, Ashland, Marathon, and Skelly.

Shell Oil Co., however, has flouted the spirit of the law by stubbornly insisting that health and safety is not a bargaining issue. One of the richest corporations in the world, it has gone so far as to file an "unfair labor practice" charge against the OCAW with the National Labor Relations Board. Because of this resistance to basic worker rights, the OCAW is striking at Shell refineries and calling for a consumer boycott of Shell products

I wish the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers success. It is the stated policy of this Nation that management and labor should work together to guarantee safe and healthy working conditions. Shell, for some reason, is slow to move in this American style. Is it because Shell is 69 percent owned by two European companies—Royal Dutch Petroleum Co. of the Netherlands and the "Shell" Transport & Trading Co. of Great Britain? Why should Shell behave differently from the U.S. companies?

A copy of the OCAW's standard health and safety clause follows:

**HEALTH AND SAFETY CLAUSE**

1. There shall be established a Joint Labor-Management Health and Safety Committee, consisting of equal Union and Company

Representatives, and not less than two (2) nor more than four (4) each.

2. The Company will, from time to time, retain at its expense qualified independent industrial health consultants, mutually acceptable to the International Union President or his designee, and the Company, to undertake industrial health research surveys as decided upon by the Committee, to determine if any health hazards exist in the work place.

3. Such research surveys shall include such measurements of exposures in the work place, the results of which shall be submitted in writing to the Company, the International Union President, and the Joint Committee by the Research Consultant, and the results will also relate the findings to existing recognized standards.

4. The Company agrees to pay for appropriate physical examinations and medical tests at a frequency and extent necessary in light of findings set forth in the Industrial Consultant's reports as may be determined by the Joint Committee.

5. The Union agrees that each Research Report shall be treated as privileged and confidential and will be screened by the Company to prevent disclosure of proprietary information or any other disclosure not permitted by legal or contractual obligations.

6. At a mutually established time, subsequent to the receipt of such reports, the Joint Committee will meet for the purpose of reviewing such reports and to determine whether corrective measures are necessary in light of the Industrial Consultant's findings, and to determine the means of implementing such corrective measures.

7. Within sixty (60) days following the execution of this agreement and on each successive October 1 thereafter, the Company will furnish to the Union all available information on the morbidity and mortality experience of its employees.

8. The Joint Committee shall meet as often as necessary but not less than once each month at a regular scheduled time and place, for the purpose of jointly considering, inspecting, investigating and reviewing health and safety conditions and practices and investigating accidents, and for the purpose of effectively making constructive recommendations with respect thereto.

9. All matters considered and handled by the Committee shall be reduced to writing, and joint minutes of all meetings of the Committee shall be made and maintained, and copies thereof shall be furnished to the International Union President.

10. Time spent in committee meetings by Union representatives, including walkaround time during joint inspections and investigations shall be considered and compensated for as regularly assigned work.

11. In addition to the foregoing, Company intends to continue its existing Industrial Hygiene Program as administered by Company personnel.

12. Any dispute arising with respect to the interpretation or application of the provisions hereto shall be subject to the grievance and arbitration procedure set forth in the agreement.

**BICENTENNIAL REFLECTIONS**

**HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, the minds of many Americans will soon be turning to our Nation's bicentennial celebration

March 5, 1973

in 1976. It was with this occasion in mind that Mrs. Arita VanRennselaer recently penned her latest poem.

I commend this patriotic piece to you now, because its message represents the very spirit upon which we should celebrate our Nation's bicentennial:

## BICENTENNIAL REFLECTIONS

Across the valley of the years  
Our forbears marched in sweat and tears  
With simple faith and trust in God  
They climbed the hills to the prairie sod.  
Then over the mountains sharp and steep  
They drove their cattle and grazed their  
sheep  
From the bowels of the earth they withdrew  
its gold  
And many a tale of hardship is told.  
Pushing on through the wilderness and  
grassy plain  
They felled the trees and drove a train.  
Now, "We The People" took a stand  
To become a free and sovereign land;  
To elect from our own the people's choice  
With loud acclaim from heart and voice.  
Joy abounded. Political parties grew,  
From Wigs and Federalists to "Nothing they  
Knew";  
Democracy forever; slogans became strong  
The Republic must be saved and right win  
over wrong.  
Cities they built to pierce the sky  
Awe with the grandeur was each passerby.  
Always the belief in the open door  
Welcomed the stranger ever more.  
To the land of the free and the home of the  
brave;  
This the motto to each one they gave.  
Machines replaced laborers more and more  
And cotton became king in every store.  
The iron horse carried the roadway west  
The stage coach with its team came to a rest.  
The Pony Express was the first fast mail  
But now everything went by the new iron  
rail.  
With water and fire they created steam  
And rivers became highways; yes, this dream  
Had over the years besought mankind  
To harness the treasures of creative mind;  
To march, to sing, to dance, to float  
On the "Father of Waters" in a steam pow-  
ered boat.  
While bales of cotton, tons of wheat  
Lay piled in bundles, high and neat  
Even heaped upon each other at the ocean's  
door  
Waiting and waiting to reach the distant  
shore.  
But within this giant of a land  
The parts divided; the treasure grand  
Was torn asunder in mutual strife  
And everyone fought for his home and his  
life.  
The forces that build could now destroy  
Life, liberty and happiness; forgotten their  
joy.  
Homes laid waste, and the widow's cry  
Rent the air with only a whispered sigh.  
Oldest sons with careers but newly made  
Were snatched with vengeance, nothing  
stayed.  
The hand of the giant turned on its self;  
Spent was the happiness, spent was the  
wealth  
Gone were the hearthstones, gone too was  
their health.  
Only the heartache came to stay  
To fill the void for those gone away.  
Only the anguish, for those left alone  
Only the loved ones remembered the un-  
known.  
Only to God could their names be called  
Only in memory would they be installed.  
And then again the nation grew.  
Became as one, where it had been two.  
Divided no more, it reached out in war  
To save the world—and just as before

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The needless slaughter, the fights were large  
And again a son of the pioneers took charge.  
The young nation had become an adult at  
last  
Learning the lessons from civilizations long  
past:  
That Peace is more difficult to wage than  
is war,  
That ever as we strive the world to improve  
There are valleys to cross, and mountains to  
move.  
There are streams of unhappiness and dis-  
content  
There are emotions unleashed, demonstra-  
tions to present  
The course of true justice, the misuse of  
Power  
Become the overwhelming demands of the  
hour.  
The hunger for righteousness, mobs screaming  
for food  
The yearning to know what is best, what is  
good  
For every man, every woman and each child  
And evermore upward, the cry grows more  
wild  
The dream that drove the first settlers to  
seek a new land  
To practice a belief in their God, without de-  
mand  
For a common faith, by government control;  
That dream was lost; freedom of faith no  
longer the goal.  
A freedom has come, but with its the soul  
Has lost its meaning; in diversity to please  
The many; yet so few remember the driving  
force  
That started our Nation on its upward  
course  
To the place of leadership; of holding the  
Light  
Of Liberty and Justice, with truth and right  
Established for each human being on the  
face of the earth.  
Is this dream too large; too costly form its  
worth?  
The challenge is here, now, at long last  
The cry for peace, Peace Now, not of the past.  
"One Nation Under God", is still the loud call  
With Liberty and Justice and Freedom for  
all.

APPRaisal OF CURRENT TRENDS  
IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

## HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, with the recent sharp increases in food prices, the unhappy housewife looks for someone to blame, and naturally so, but the blame unfortunately and unjustifiedly has been falling on the farmer.

One point that should be kept in mind is that the farmer only gets 40 cents of each dollar spent for food. The other 60 cents goes for transportation, processing, distribution, and marketing.

Another is that, notwithstanding recent increases in prices received by farmers, they still are getting only about the same for their crops now as they did 20 years ago. Only their efficiency and improved technology over these years has made it possible for consumers to get food now for only 16 percent of their income after taxes. The average family spent 23 percent of its net income on groceries in 1952. While farm prices are at about the same levels those prevail-

ing 20 years ago, the cost of labor, machinery, fertilizers, and other input items of production have doubled and in some cases tripled.

The real cause of the inflationary spiral is the abundance of hard cash in circulation, even though a great many people individually have not shared in this increased flow of money. How that bears directly on the rise in food prices is lucidly set forth in an article published in today's Wall Street Journal. I recommend its reading. It should help answer complaints of persons who understandably want something done and mistakenly think the farmer is to blame for the situation.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 5, 1973]  
APPRaisal OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS  
AND FINANCE

(By John O'Riley)

Food prices. Not even sex or taxes is getting more attention in conversation and commentary these days. They are "going through the roof" it is said. And indeed their upward march is sharp. They have jumped at retail some 33% since the middle of the last decade. But beyond the fact of the steep climb, the confusion and befuddlement is unlimited. The farmer is blamed. The supermarket is blamed. And all wrongly. The basic forces behind the trend it would seem actually should be pretty obvious.

The prime pusher is something seldom mentioned in relation to food costs. It is simply the huge growth of the number of dollars American families have to spend on food and everything else. If food prices have indeed gone through the roof, the level of personal income is some twenty feet above the roof.

The table below traces the story in the official yardsticks used to measure both food prices and income. The retail food price index (1967 equal 100) is that prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The per capita disposable personal income (after taxes) figures come from the Commerce Department. The 1965 starting point is used because that is about the time the current brisk inflation began. The 1972 figures are December for food and the final quarter for income.

## FOOD PRICES VERSUS INCOME

| Year | Food prices | Per capita<br>disposable<br>income |
|------|-------------|------------------------------------|
| 1965 | 94.4        | \$2,436                            |
| 1966 | 99.1        | 2,604                              |
| 1967 | 100.0       | 2,749                              |
| 1968 | 103.6       | 2,945                              |
| 1969 | 108.9       | 3,130                              |
| 1970 | 114.9       | 3,366                              |
| 1971 | 118.4       | 3,595                              |
| 1972 | 126.0       | 3,954                              |

What the official record since 1965 adds up to is:

Retail Food Prices: Up 33%.

Per Capita Income: Up 62%.

There is more to the big rise in income than individual wage increase—as sharp as these have been. Important, too, is the unprecedented gain in multiple paychecks within individual families. The leap in the number of women and teenagers on payrolls makes this clear. The paychecks of adult women are especially important.

Tabled below are Labor Department figures on employed women (20 years old or older) and teenagers of both sexes. The country's population growth is included for comparison.

## WOMEN AND TEENAGE EMPLOYMENT

[Millions]

|                 | 1965  | 1972  | Up<br>(percent) |
|-----------------|-------|-------|-----------------|
| Women.....      | 22.6  | 28.1  | 24              |
| Teenagers.....  | 5.0   | 6.6   | 32              |
| Population..... | 194.3 | 208.8 | 7               |

With personal income dollars up nearly twice as much as food prices since the mid-1960s, it is surprising that the cost of eating is up as much as it is? Isn't it, rather, surprising that such a flood of buying power hasn't pushed it even higher? Only the gigantic food production capacity of the U.S. has kept this from happening.

The pace at which the well-heeled American public has swung to "better eating" (more meat) in recent years is amazing. From about 88 pounds in 1962, per capita consumption of beef has bounded upward to an estimated 118 pounds this year. That is a jump of some 34%. And the leap is not measured in dollar prices. It is pounds of beef on the plate.

This brings us to another and probably more potent pressure on food costs in the immediate past. People in Europe and Japan have grown more prosperous too. They, too, are "eating better." And they are reaching across the seas to the American garden for more nourishment.

The U.S. exports relatively little meat as such. But the foreigners are growing more animals of their own. And this is where the U.S. enters the picture.

Steers don't get fat on fresh air. Cows don't produce more milk and cheese on psychological contentment alone. Broiler chickens don't grow plump from eating grasshoppers. They need grain—all of them. Grain is really meat-by-the-bushel. And the feed grain flow overseas from the U.S. rises sharply.

Here are some corn export figures spanning the last decade. Not all destination countries are included, of course. So the ones given don't add up to the export total.

## U.S. EXPORTS OF CORN

[Millions of bushels]

| Destination             | 1959  | 1971  |
|-------------------------|-------|-------|
| Belgium-Luxembourg..... | 12.3  | 24.3  |
| France.....             | 0.2   | 2.0   |
| West Germany.....       | 17.7  | 45.5  |
| Italy.....              | 0.4   | 47.3  |
| Japan.....              | 7.3   | 116.1 |
| Netherlands.....        | 34.1  | 89.5  |
| All countries.....      | 210.1 | 500.9 |

Foreign crop conditions cause yearly figures to fluctuate. But the trend is steeply up. The total was some 670 million bushels in one recent year. And the current year is the real whopper. It is projected at a billion bushels or more.

Or take soybeans. Soybean cake and meal is widely used in feed for dairy cattle and chickens. And the rise in exports of U.S. soybeans has been spectacular. Such exports came to 141 million bushels in 1959. This year they are expected to hit 475 million bushels, aided by a Latin American slump in production of fish meal (soybean meal substitutes for it).

Prices on feed grains, pressured by huge home-and-foreign demand, have naturally soared. Corn that brought \$1.20 bushel just a year ago is now around \$1.60. Runaway soybeans have jumped from some \$3.30 a bushel a year ago to the \$6.65-a-bushel neighborhood today. And when feed grain prices rise, it follows as the night the day that prices on beef, pork, chickens, and eggs must do likewise.

The mighty U.S. farm factory can produce more of both grain and meat. The problem heretofore has been to keep it from overproducing. Many unplanted acres are now due to

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

go back into planting. But if the U.S. meat eating binge keeps up, and if foreign demand for U.S. meat-by-the-bushel keeps soaring, the U.S. farmer may have a run for his money to keep the cost-of-eating from going even higher.

## ADA LOOKS AT THE DEFENSE BUDGET

## HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, it is dismaying to see the defense budget rising to record levels at a time when many domestic programs are being drastically cut, sometimes killed outright, and often plundered by unprecedented impoundments of congressionally approved funds.

While the domestic casualties of the President's so-called economy drive seem endless, the President has approved a Pentagon budget asking for a fantastic \$85.2 billion in new budget authority for fiscal 1974, a huge increase of \$5.5 billion over fiscal year 1973. Apparently the Defense Department, where cost-overruns and inefficient management are the status quo, is to be exempted from budgetary restraints while already hard-pressed civilian programs are cut to the bone—or cut out altogether.

This massive military budget is indicative of the ill-conceived priorities of this administration. While "people-oriented" programs are to be sacrificed, the Pentagon is to continue spending far in excess of what is needed to effectively provide for the security of this country. Despite the continuing improvements in relations among the super-powers—including the Vietnam peace accord and the SALT agreements—the defense budget is going up, at a time when logic would indicate that it should be going down.

Unless Congress takes a strong stand and redirects the fiscal priorities of this administration, the Pentagon's budget will have increased by \$26.3 billion in the 6 fiscal years of the Nixon administration.

These budgetary figures and other convincing information are obtained from a carefully researched analysis of the defense budget prepared by Americans for Democratic Action and carried in its March 1, 1973, Legislative Newsletter. Using the Pentagon's own figures as well as General Accounting Office reports, this analysis gives a comprehensive overview of the new Pentagon budget and some of the more controversial defense programs.

Mr. Speaker, I include a copy of this analysis in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I commend this information to my colleagues:

## A LOOK AT THE DEFENSE BUDGET

The defense budget goes up and up at a time when many domestic programs are being cut back. Any peace dividend from the decline in Indochina war expenditures is being consumed by new weapons systems and rising personnel costs. This newsletter, accordingly, is devoted to an analysis of the defense budget and some of its more controversial aspects.

## AN OVERALL VIEW

Fiscal year 1974's defense budget is heading toward a new peacetime high. The Nixon

Administration is requesting \$87.3 billion in new national defense spending authority, a category which includes Pentagon spending, Atomic Energy Commission spending for such items as AEC warhead production, and other defense-related activities.

For immediate national defense outlays—what the Administration expects to spend in FY 1974, with the rest of the authorized spending deferred to future years—the budget calls for \$81.1 billion.

For Pentagon spending alone, with AEC and other defense-related items eliminated, the new budget represents a whopping \$5.5 billion increase in new budget authority (to \$85.2 billion) and a \$4.2 billion increase in new spending (to \$79.0 billion) over the FY 1973 budget.

If however we include, as do some economists, veteran's benefits and war-related costs in the national debt, FY 1974 defense outlays in reality will reach \$111.3 billion.

All this—despite a Pentagon-estimated decrease in Southeast Asia costs from \$21.5 billion in FY 1969 to \$2.9 billion in FY 1974, despite SALT agreements limiting defensive weapons systems, and despite improved relations with China, the Soviet Union and even North Vietnam.

Let us put DOD budget authority requests into a chart comparing defense costs at the height of the Vietnam war to defense costs today:

## DOD BUDGET AUTHORITY

[In billions of dollars]

| Year                        | Non-<br>Indochina<br>forces | Additional<br>South-<br>east<br>Asia<br>costs | Total |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---|-------|
| Fiscal year 1969.....       | 56.0                        | 21.5  | 77.5  |
| Fiscal year 1973.....       | 73.5                        | 6.2   | 79.7  |
| Fiscal year 1974.....       | 82.3                        | 2.9   | 85.2  |
| Plus or minus, 1969-74..... | +26.3                       | -18.6   | +7.7  |

Source: Former Assistant Secretary of Defense Robert Moot's budget briefing of Jan. 27, 1973, plus statistics supplied by the Pentagon at a congressional staff briefing.

In short, the long-anticipated Vietnam "peace" dividend has been swallowed up by new defense costs. The Pentagon claims that the bulk of the increase of \$26.3 billion in non-Indochina defense costs (or baseline, in Pentagonese) between 1969 and 1974 is due to salary hikes, the effort to create a volunteer army, and inflation. But another large part of the increase is due to building vast new weapons systems, long deferred by the war claims the Pentagon, including the Trident nuclear submarine, the B-1 long-range bomber and the CVN-70 nuclear aircraft carrier. The Pentagon insists that it has "needed" these new weapons systems for a long time but had to postpone their realization because it was conducting a war.

## A MODEST PROPOSAL TO SAVE \$10.4 BILLION

ADA proposes a minimum modified defense budget, in light of the domestic budget squeeze and the ceasefire in Indochina, keeping non-Indochina defense expenditures at last year's level. The Pentagon has requested a \$4.2 billion increase in outlays; that increase should be denied. The Pentagon is spending \$6.2 billion on Indochina in FY 1973; a like amount can be excised from the budget because of the peace agreement. This \$10.4 billion saving would merely keep non-Indochina military spending at last year's level. Holding to this line will force the Pentagon to absorb price increases and pay boosts; it also will force the Pentagon to make decisions about programs it sees as immediately necessary and others which it can postpone or even kill.

## DEFENSE SPENDING VERSUS DOMESTIC NEEDS

While the Pentagon pleads poverty due to inflation and rising personnel costs, its ris-

March 5, 1973

ing budget should be examined in light of the Administration's squeeze on domestic programs. In discussing the budget, figures of hundreds of millions and billions of dollars are hard to visualize.

Some of these vast sums can be better understood if measured against domestic programs. For instance, if the Trident submarine were cut back to research and development of its missile system, \$1.5 billion would be saved in FY 1974. That savings more than equals the \$950,000,000 savings that the Nixon Administration is claiming for FY 1974 by not spending water pollution funds.

Another example: by not building two of the trouble-plagued F-14 fighter planes which are reported to cost \$16.8 million each, the Nixon savings of \$27 million for reduced subsidies to Amtrak could easily be matched.

Elimination of \$657 million for the CVN-70 aircraft carrier of such dubious value would match any saving derived from suspension of the housing subsidy program and the heavy destruction of OEO war-on-poverty programs totaling \$633 million as claimed in the Nixon budget.

Each American family will pay about \$200 for the new B-1 bombers if this program is carried out to its estimated eventual cost of \$11.1 billion; about \$20 for each aircraft carrier costing \$1 billion; \$100 for the F-14 jets so stubbornly dogged by cost overruns; and approximately \$400 for the Trident and SSN-688 submarine programs.

And if the entire \$2.9 billion for Southeast Asia war costs were eliminated, perhaps the President would feel less need to impound the \$2 billion of Environmental Protection Agency funds in FY 1973 or the \$529 billion of HUD money.

In short, while fantastic sums are bandied about in the coming defense budget debate, it may be helpful at times to compare the cost of building one airplane or tank to the cost of the new library not built, the hospital renovation postponed or pollution unabated.

#### TRIDENT SUBMARINE

The Trident nuclear ballistic submarine program is the most costly weapons program in FY 1974. The Pentagon is asking for \$1.7 billion this year, with the eventual costs for ten submarines estimated by the Navy to be \$13.5 billion. Last year the Pentagon accelerated the program, advancing the completion date from 1981 to 1978, mainly, as explained by former Secretary Laird, as a "signal" to the Soviets of U.S. "will." At \$13.5 billion, Trident is a pretty expensive signal.

This new submarine will follow hard on the completion of 41 Polaris submarines, the oldest being only 13 years old and the newest six. With a life of 30 years, the present fleet of submarines will be usable until the 1990's, is presently invulnerable, and is currently undergoing conversion (at a cost of \$498.2 million in FY 1974) which is putting 10-14 MIRVs on each of 16 Poseidon missiles on 31 of the submarines. This will give us a total of 6,400 submarine nuclear weapons by 1976. (See The Defense Monitor, June 7, 1972, published by the Center for Defense Information.)

Opponents of the program argue for the development of the Trident ballistic missile which can be placed in the existing sub force, thus providing most of the advantages of the Trident submarine at a much smaller cost. By rushing to build Trident before it is necessary, the program is more likely to lead to waste and cost overruns (complete blueprints were not ready at the time of the request for the acceleration) and the Tridents will be built to an insufficiently-tested design. In addition, it is wise to proceed cautiously on Trident development until the murky nature of anti-submarine warfare clears a bit.

#### B-1 BOMBER

One of the more controversial defense programs calls for spending \$473.5 million in

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FY 1974, part of an ultimately \$11 billion investment, to build 244 B-1 bombers over the next ten years. This new bomber force is designed to replace the present bomber mainstay, the B-52 which proved so vulnerable to Hanoi's air defense during the Christmas 1972 bombings. The B-1 is under especially heavy fire because of the dubious need for bombers in an ICBM and nuclear submarine age; it will require eight hours to travel the 5,000 miles from base to target, arriving long after the 30 minutes of travel time for ICBM's or 15 minutes for sea-based missiles on station.

Even without the B-1's, by 1980 the U.S. will have over 13,000 nuclear weapons, or three times enough weapons to destroy both China and Russia. Moreover, the U.S. has already spent over \$3 billion improving the present B-52 force and is requesting another \$3 billion for further modernization of 300 B-52 jets, designed to extend the life of the B-52 into the late 1980's. Yet the Pentagon wants to move ahead with new bombers while freely spending on the old ones. The main argument in 1973 may be whether the marginal increase in overall U.S. strategic offensive capacity due to a better bomber is worth an \$11 billion price tag. (For further information see The Defense Monitor, January 22, 1973, Center for Defense Information.)

#### SAFEGUARD ABM

As a result of SALT accords signed May 26, 1972, in Moscow, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. agreed not to build nation-wide ABM systems. Each will limit ABM systems to two sites, at most, one in defense of an ICBM field and another around the national capital. After the agreement, the U.S. abandoned three of its four potential sites, concentrating on its most advanced site at Grand Forks, North Dakota. Despite the lack of Administration plans to build a Washington, D.C., ABM and despite the fact that Grand Forks is 90 percent complete, the Administration is requesting an additional \$401.5 million in FY 1974 for Safeguard as well as \$170.1 million for Site Defense, the follow-on to Safeguard and \$100 million for advanced ballistic missile defense research. The Pentagon estimates that it will have spent \$6 billion for one ABM network of 100 interceptors, or a cost of \$60 million per interceptor.

#### F-14 NAVY FIGHTER PLANES

The F-14 is the Navy's multibillion dollar fighter plane program. The Administration is asking for \$615.8 million in FY 1974 for the planes, with a total program cost estimated by the GAO to be \$5.3 billion. The plane is involved in another spiraling cost dispute this one between the Navy and Grumman Aerospace Corporation. The Navy, prodded by Congress, said on December 8, 1972, that it wants the next batch of 48 planes for the existing contract price of \$16.8 million per plane, but Grumman is refusing to build because of a claimed loss of \$2 million per plane, due to rising costs. With only 86 of an anticipated 313 F-14 fighters under contract, Secretary of Defense Richardson has been required by Congress to come forth with new program recommendations by early March, killing it entirely, raising the Government-paid price, or cutting back on the number ordered. Congress will have to choose among the alternatives.

#### DD-963 DESTROYERS

DD-963 is a \$2.8 billion program to build naval destroyers using Litton Industries' new shipbuilding techniques at its Pascagoula, Mississippi, plant. While the original plan called for building 30 of these ships, doubts about Litton's ability to build without major cost overruns and delays are rampant in Congress. Rep. Otis Pike (D-N.Y.) pointed out in a June 27 floor speech last year that Pascagoula's other major pro-

gram, the construction of LHA amphibious assault ships, is two years behind schedule, has risen in cost from \$43 million per ship to an estimated \$183 million and has suffered a 50 percent personnel turnover. House Armed Services Chairman Hébert, in a June 9, 1972, letter to the Pentagon, was speaking for the entire committee when he wrote about "serious doubt as to the contractor's future capability to perform on the DD-963 contract." As a result of committee concern, the fate of the FY 1974 request for \$590.9 million is uncertain. The final decision will be complicated by the elevation of Roy Ash, former head of Litton, as OMB director, plus a proposed \$192 million "bailout" for Litton's LHA contract which Rep. Les Aspin (D-Wisc.) discovered tucked away in the Pentagon's FY 1974 proposals.

#### CVN-70 NUCLEAR AIRCRAFT CARRIER

CVN-70 will be the fourth U.S. nuclear aircraft carrier; the others are the Enterprise, commissioned in 1961; the Nimitz, scheduled for delivery in 1973; and the Eisenhower, scheduled for delivery in 1975. The Administration is asking for \$657 million for this one ship in FY 1974, with fleet use expected in 1980 at a cost of about a billion dollars. The proponents of the carrier stress its superiority over the conventional carrier, its increased length of time in the water, and its greater striking capability. What they fail to point out is the carrier's ineffectiveness except in intervention. The DOD acknowledges that the carrier is not effective otherwise by failing to put it on the strategic weapons list. The Soviet Union seems to agree: it has no aircraft carriers today (while the U.S. has 16). Moreover, the cost of this one ship is pricing it out of the water. While Essex class ships of World War II cost \$1.5 million, the Enterprise about \$200 million, and the Nimitz half a billion, this new carrier again will double carrier cost. That price tag does not include the tremendous support force needed for each carrier plus the jets which fly off the carrier, doubling or tripling the final cost. (See floor speech by Rep. Robert Leggett (D-Calif.), June 27, 1972.)

#### INDOCHINA WAR COSTS

One of the easier amounts to eliminate from the defense budget should be the \$2.9 billion slated for Pentagon use in Southeast Asia. Former Assistant Secretary Moot on Jan. 27, 1973, described this request as pre-peace agreement. \$1.9 billion of this amount was slated for support of "Free World" forces in South Vietnam and Laos. The remaining \$1 billion was scheduled for support of U.S. naval and air forces in Indochina—forces for which the Pentagon has avoided announcing any redeployment plans. Moot was unable to say how much the \$2.9 billion figure would be decreased (or even increased) in light of the ceasefire.

#### VETERAN'S BENEFITS AND RECOMPUTATION

Veteran's benefits will be getting more attention this year. By the end of FY 1973, there will be over 900,000 retirees on the rolls at an annual cost of \$4.4 billion. From 1960 to 1975, it is estimated that the number of retirees on the rolls will have more than quadrupled and the cost will have increased sevenfold. Even if the present system of benefits is not revised upwards, Rep. Stratton's (D-N.Y.) Special House Subcommittee on Retired Pay Revisions estimated that the cost of veteran's benefits, cumulative to the year 2000, will be \$339.3 billion (Committee report H.A.S.C. No. 92-80 of December 29, 1972).

With mushrooming veteran's costs, it is little wonder that even staunch military advocates such as Armed Services Chairmen Stennis (D-Miss.) and Hébert (D-La.) are critical of proposals to increase retirement pay. Yet Nixon has thrown a sleeper into his budget by proposing the recomputations pay with a FY 1974 cost of \$360 million and a probably lifetime cost of over \$17 billion. The armed forces already have an extremely

generous retirement system which allows a soldier to leave the military after only 20 years of service and immediately begin to draw retirement pay, in addition to many other benefits, and protects him against inflation with an escalator clause.

The Nixon recomputation proposal would provide a double jump in retirement pay: the normal cost of living increase and a new one based on increases in active-duty pay scales. Such an expensive proposal in a tight budget would seem an ideal target for budget-cutters; yet it is politically difficult to oppose veteran's benefits on the Senate or House floors. A similar proposal last year was barely defeated by the determined opposition of Hébert.

#### CIVILIAN PERSONNEL COSTS

The Pentagon contends that the main cause of high defense budgets is the huge cost of maintaining a volunteer army, pointing to 57 percent of the FY 1974 budget for manpower. These high costs come despite a decline in military strength from 3.5 million military personnel in 1968 to 2,288,000 by June 1973 and a further reduction of 55,000 by the end of FY 1974. However, it should be stressed that a whopping \$10 billion goes to pay Pentagon civilians, and that the civilian level will rise slightly in FY 1974 to 1,013,000 people. Thus even if the armed forces level remains at about 2.2 million, the one million-plus Pentagon-employed civilians are a prime target for cutbacks.

#### COST OF CONTROVERSIAL FISCAL YEAR 1974 DEFENSE PROGRAMS AT A GLANCE

| Program and kind of weapon  | Fiscal year 1974 request <sup>1</sup> | Estimated total cost of program from R. & D. to finish <sup>2</sup> |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|
| Trident: Nuclear ballistic missile submarine  | \$1,712,000,000                       | \$13,500,000,000  |
| B-1: Long-range bomber  | 473,500,000                           | 11,100,000,000  |
| Safeguard: ABM defense for Grand Forks, N. Dak.   | 401,500,000                           | 6,000,000,000   |
| F-14: Navy fighter  | 615,800,000                           | 5,300,000,000   |
| DD-963: Naval destroyer   | 590,900,000                           | 2,800,000,000   |
| CVN-70: Nuclear aircraft carrier (1)  | 657,000,000                           | 1,000,000,000   |
| AWACS (E-3A): Airborne Warning and Control System                                       | 209,500,000                           | 2,700,000,000   |
| SAM D: Army surface to air missile  | 194,200,000                           | 5,200,000,000   |
| SSN-688: Nuclear attack submarines  | 921,600,000                           | 8,100,000,000   |
| <br>Fiscal year 1974 request  |                                       |   |
| Other DOD programs:   |                                       |   |
| South East Asia war costs   | \$2,900,000,000                       |   |
| Military assistance (grant aid, military credit sales, and security support-assistance) | 1,942,000,000                         |   |
| Recomputation on veteran's benefits   | 360,000,000                           |   |

<sup>1</sup> All figures from DOD-published "Program Acquisition Costs by Weapon System" for fiscal year 1974.

<sup>2</sup> All figures in this column except those noted are from GAO accounting report of Nov. 24, 1972, based on DOD-supplied information.

<sup>3</sup> Navy estimates quoted by Senator Stuart Symington (Democrat Missouri) in floor speech of July 27, 1972.

<sup>4</sup> DOD figure submitted to House Armed Services Committee on June 13, 1972.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. This yearly contest recently drew nearly 500,000 secondary school students from all over the country inviting each participant to write an essay around the theme "My Responsibility to Freedom."

It is my pleasure to congratulate this year's winner of the contest, Miss Stephanie Cheek, a junior from High Point High School in Beltsville, Md. Her essay portrays the spirit of our young citizens and their willingness to insure its continuance.

It is for this reason that I wish to insert Miss Cheek's speech in the RECORD, and I recommend it to the attention of my colleagues.

I include the following material:

#### MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

America is singing. Throughout our nation a song is heard. Sounding clearly at times—straining faintly at times—but ceasing never to tell a story—The story of America—its past, present, and future. Its way of life—its freedom—its democracy.

Although verses are continually being added to this song of freedom, the original composers were our founding fathers. They wrote the first three verses when they created the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. This last verse states vividly the rights and liberties guaranteed to all Americans.

Just as all songs contain important symbols, such as sharps and flats, freedom's song has its symbols. Since adopted, the stars and stripes have stirred the hearts of many. And, although the lyrics were written by just one American, the Star Spangled Banner continues to represent the pride of those who live in "the land of the free." Then, also, there is the Statue of Liberty whose light rekindles hope in those seeking this free life.

Our song also has directions. One direction is *crescendo*, meaning to increase the sound. This indicates that we Americans must strive to broaden our knowledge and make our voices heard. Another signal is *fermata*, meaning hold. We must grasp freedom to insure that it is everlasting.

Although the words, symbols, and directions of freedom's song were composed by others, the manner in which the song is delivered is up to each American. Each individual performs according to the way he hears the song. To some, the song is clear, vibrant, and strong. To others, it is vague, listless, and faint. Some do not hear the song clearly because they do not recognize that inherent in freedom is responsibility. They are vague or ignorant as to the meaning of responsibility, apathetic, or are so accustomed to freedom that they take it for granted.

My responsibility to freedom is never to let the freedom song become faint to me. To deliver the song well, I must have a solid foundation upon which I base my beliefs. Therefore, it is my responsibility to strive always to deepen my understanding of my country and its way of life.

How can I deepen this understanding? First, I must be a selfish student. I must utilize every educational opportunity within my grasp. I must constantly seek out meaningful information that will make me a better person and a better American.

I also must expose myself to those messages disseminated by way of mass media. I must be aware of all sides of important issues—not just of those with which I initially agree. Too, I must carefully examine all that I receive. Not until then can I formulate objective opinions.

Furthermore, my understanding can be improved through listening to others. I must keep my mind open to others' views, so that I can better form my own. Here again, in observing the reactions others take toward freedom, I will be gaining insight that will aid me in understanding freedom's song.

My responsibility, however, does not end with understanding. I must, as a citizen, become involved with freedom. Verse by verse the song is delivered in the actions I take as a performer.

I must act by assuming all duties of a responsible citizen. Among other duties, I must participate in the selection of our leaders and share in the decision of the guilt or innocence of a fellow man. It is not my responsibility, however, to abuse the rights of others. I must respect my fellow men. I must never let fear, self-interest, or prejudice interfere with the equal rights of all men. For, equality is a word found in every verse of freedom's song.

Throughout our heritage, men have seen this nation grow and prosper. Our country has slowly climbed the ladder to greatness, and the freedom song has risen to the top of the charts. I am very proud of this country, and I feel that I have a responsibility to respect and support it—not only when the tone is one of joy but also when it is one of sorrow.

These, then, are my responsibilities to freedom. Through deepening my understanding of my country and through acting responsibly, I can perform the song of which I am so proud.

Most songs fade away and die at the end. But I hope the song of freedom will never die. I have faith that it will flow clearly over the nation and that all Americans will meet their responsibilities. In so doing, we will keep our country and our song alive.

#### "MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM," 26TH ANNUAL VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM, 1972-73

The Voice of Democracy Scholarship Program sponsored by the VFW and its Ladies Auxiliary is conducted annually in our nation's secondary schools during the fall term. It is a national broadcast scriptwriting program which provides an opportunity for 10th, 11th and 12th grade students in our public, private and parochial schools to think, write and speak up for freedom and democracy.

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

Participating students prepare and transcribe on magnetic tape a three to five minute broadcast script addressing their remarks to the theme, "My Responsibility to Freedom." At each level of judging—school, community, District, State and National—winners are selected from the evaluation of the judges using three basic criteria. These criteria and the maximum point value assigned to each are: Content, 45; Originality, 35; and Delivery, 20.

Upwards of 500,000 students from over 7,000 secondary schools participated in this year's 26th annual Voice of Democracy Program.

Each state winner receives an all-expense paid trip to Washington, D.C., March 2-7, 1973, and competes for one of five national scholarship awards provided by the VFW. The first place winner receives a \$10,000 scholarship to the school of his or her choice; 2nd place, \$5,000; 3rd place, \$3,500; 4th place, \$2,500; and 5th place, \$1,500. In addition, the monetary value of scholarships and awards

#### MARYLAND WINNER IN VFW ESSAY CONTEST

**HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the

presented by the VFW and its Ladies Auxiliary to the winners at the Post, County, District and Department levels will be in excess of \$300,000 this year.

During the five days in Washington, D.C., the state winners have an opportunity to meet their United States Senators and Representatives, visit the shrines and monuments in our nation's capital and observe firsthand the workings of our federal government.

The Voice of Democracy Program was originated by the broadcasting industry and the United States Office of Education 26 years ago, and for over a quarter of a century now it has had the continuing support of the National and State Associations of Broadcasters and Secondary School Principals. Broadcasters and Educators alike have been enthusiastic in their endorsement of the Voice of Democracy Program and have contributed generously of their time and expertise in the programs' development.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### TRAVEL BY CONGRESSMAN FRENZEL DURING THE 92D CONGRESS

#### HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

#### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, today I am inserting for the RECORD a list of all of the traveling I have done between Washington and my congressional district, or to other locations on legislative business during the 92d Congress. The list includes trip expenses, reimbursements, and the source of reimbursement.

This list indicates that the number of trips provided by the House of Representatives is not adequate to keep me in close contact with my district as I would

#### TRAVEL BY CONGRESSMAN FRENZEL DURING 92D CONG.

| Dates             | Destination             | Total cost | Reimbursement | By whom—                                 | Dates             | Destination                          | Total cost | Reimbursement | By whom—   |
|-------------------|-------------------------|------------|---------------|--|-------------------|--------------------------------------|------------|---------------|--|
| Jan. 28-30, 1971  | Minneapolis, Minn.      | \$226.55   | \$155.60      | House of Representatives.                | Feb. 3-5, 1972    | Minneapolis, Minn.                   | 249.64     | 249.64        | General Mills, Inc.  |
| Feb. 5-6, 1971    | do                      | 146.90     | 145.20        | Do.                                      | Feb. 10-11, 1972  | do                                   | 168.93     | 149.60        | House of Representatives.  |
| Feb. 11-13, 1971  | do                      | 153.20     | 143.00        | St. Paul Lincoln Republicans.            | Feb. 14-16, 1972  | do                                   | 225.22     | None          | Paid personally.   |
| Mar. 1, 1971      | Boca Raton, Fla.        | 136.40     | 134.00        | American Warehousemen's Association.     | Feb. 24-25, 1972  | do                                   | 182.55     | 146.00        | Western State Bank, St. Louis Park, Minn.                          |
| Mar. 4-6, 1971    | Minneapolis, Minn.      | 146.80     | 145.20        | House of Representatives.                | Mar. 9-13, 1972   | do                                   | 221.01     | 149.60        | House of Representatives.  |
| Mar. 12-13, 1971  | do                      | 165.64     | 138.00        | Frenzel Volunteer Committee.             | Mar. 23-25, 1972  | do                                   | 148.40     | 146.00        | Frenzel Volunteer Committee.                                       |
| Mar. 18-21, 1971  | do                      | 260.62     | 241.52        | Do.                                      | Apr. 13-15, 1972  | do                                   | 150.95     | 149.60        | House of Representatives.  |
| Mar. 26-27        | do                      | 149.75     | 138.00        | Do.                                      | Apr. 28-29, 1972  | New Haven, Conn., Minneapolis, Minn. | 236.64     | 155.10        | Do.  |
| Apr. 5-6, 1971    | Philadelphia, Pa.       | 69.00      | 69.00         | Minneapolis School Board Association.    | May 4-7, 1972     | Minneapolis, Minn.                   | 285.90     | 273.75        | Frenzel Volunteer Committee.                                       |
| Apr. 15-17, 1971  | Minneapolis, Minn.      | 141.60     | 141.60        | House of Representatives.                | May 12-13, 1972   | do                                   | 156.20     | 146.00        | Do.  |
| Apr. 21, 1971     | do                      | 138.00     | 138.00        | Greater Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce. | May 18-19         | Wilmington, Del.                     | 17.00      | None          | Paid personally.   |
| Apr. 29-May 1     | do                      | 144.10     | 138.00        | Frenzel Volunteer Committee.             | May 24-30         | Minneapolis-Duluth, Minn.            | 283.30     | 167.00        | American Metal Stampers, \$146; Frenzel Volunteer Committee, \$21. |
| May 7-8, 1971     | do                      | 151.80     | 149.60        | House of Representatives.                | June 2-3, 1972    | Minneapolis, Minn.                   | 156.65     | 155.60        | House of Representatives.  |
| May 27-31, 1971   | do                      | 288.45     | None          | Paid personally.                         | June 15-18, 1972  | do                                   | 279.30     | 146.00        | Macalester College.  |
| June 5-10, 1971   | do                      | 274.69     | 162.29        | House of Representatives.                | June 22-24, 1972  | do                                   | 159.10     | 146.00        | Protective group.  |
| June 17-20, 1971  | do                      | 259.05     | None          | Paid personally.                         | July 4-14, 1972   | do                                   | 170.20     | 151.55        | House of Representatives.  |
| June 24-27, 1971  | do                      | 158.50     | 146.00        | Frenzel Volunteer Committee.             | July 22, 1972     | do                                   | 146.00     | 146.00        | Frenzel Volunteer Committee.                                       |
| July 23-25, 1971  | do                      | 156.50     | 155.60        | House of Representatives.                | July 28-30, 1972  | do                                   | 154.90     | 146.00        | Do.  |
| July 30-31, 1971  | do                      | 62.25      | None          | Paid personally.                         | Aug. 4-6, 1972    | do                                   | 173.02     | 149.60        | House of Representatives.  |
| Aug. 8-30, 1971   | do                      | 200.45     | 170.00        | House of Representatives.                | Aug. 11-13, 1972  | do                                   | 176.35     | 166.00        | Frenzel Volunteer Committee.                                       |
| Sept. 17-19, 1971 | do                      | 164.00     | 162.60        | Do.                                      | Aug. 18-Sept. 1   | do                                   | 194.60     | 146.00        | Do.  |
| Sept. 23-26, 1971 | do                      | 293.25     | 273.75        | Frenzel Volunteer Committee.             | Sept. 7-10, 1972  | do                                   | 174.10     | 164.40        | House of Representatives.  |
| Sept. 30-Oct. 2   | do                      | 159.90     | 153.20        | House of Representatives.                | Sept. 14-17, 1972 | do                                   | 175.64     | 150.00        | Frenzel Volunteer Committee.                                       |
| Oct. 1, 1971      | Lake of the Ozarks, Mo. | (1)        | (1)           | General Mills, Inc.                      | Sept. 22-27, 1972 | do                                   | 175.20     | 150.00        | Mortgage Bankers Association.                                      |
| Oct. 10-11, 1971  | Minneapolis, Minn.      | 164.70     | 146.00        | League of Women Voters of Minneapolis.   | Sept. 29-Oct. 1   | do                                   | 157.00     | 152.40        | House of Representatives.  |
| Oct. 15-16, 1971  | do                      | 178.08     | 146.00        | Frenzel Volunteer Committee.             | Oct. 6-10, 1972   | do                                   | 159.70     | 150.00        | Frenzel Volunteer Committee.                                       |
| Oct. 23-24, 1971  | do                      | 162.00     | 145.00        | Minnesota Jaycees.                       | Oct. 14-17        | do                                   | 160.85     | 150.00        | Do.  |
| Nov. 2-3, 1971    | do                      | 160.00     | 146.00        | University of Minnesota.                 | Oct. 19-27        | do                                   | 162.00     | 150.00        | Do.  |
| Nov. 12-13        | do                      | 158.00     | 190.00        | Greater Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce. | Oct. 29-Nov. 8    | do                                   | 564.10     | 154.80        | House of Representatives.  |
| Nov. 21-24, 1971  | do                      | 158.60     | 158.00        | House of Representatives.                | Nov. 27-Dec. 2    | do                                   | 181.65     | 162.20        | Do.  |
| Dec. 3-6, 1971    | do                      | 154.40     | 154.40        | Do.                                      | Dec. 13, 1972     | Haddonfield, N.J.                    | 34.15      | 29.50         | Department of Transportation.                                      |
| Jan. 10-15, 1972  | do                      | 162.05     | 186.00        | Minneapolis Builders Exchange.           | Dec. 19, 1972     | Morgantown, W. Va.                   | (1)        | (1)           | Do.  |
| Jan. 21-23, 1972  | do                      | 162.80     | 161.40        | House of Representatives.                |                   |                                      |            |               |  |

<sup>1</sup> Private plane.

#### HONORARIUMS RECEIVED BY CONGRESSMAN BILL FRENZEL DURING 92D CONG.

| Date          | Organization        | Amount |
|---------------|---------------------|--------|
| Oct. 13, 1971 | General Mills, Inc. | \$750  |
| June 6, 1972  | Brookings Institute | 150    |
| July 19, 1972 | Macalester College  | 200    |

#### REKNOWNED EDUCATOR RETIRES AFTER 40 YEARS

#### HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

#### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Robert LaVanture, principal of Jonathan

Dayton Regional High School in Springfield, N.J., for the past 11 years, has retired after 40 years of outstanding service in the field of education. As this dedicated educator retires, I would like to share with my colleagues the highlights of Mr. LaVanture's distinguished career, as they appear in the Springfield Leader:

#### DR. ROBERT LAVANTURE RETIRES AFTER 40 YEARS

A native of Carlisle, Pa. Dr. Robert LaVanture holds a Ph. D. degree from Dickinson College in that city, and an M.A. in social studies from Montclair State College. He continued his studies at New York University, completing all requirements but a seminar for a doctor of education degree.

Before coming to Dayton, LaVanture

like. I do not feel that it is appropriate for such groups as the League of Women Voters, local chambers of commerce, local trade associations, schools and colleges, or my own volunteer committee to have to pay for my return to the district to report on my own activities and to find out what the needs and desires of the people of my district are. I note with pleasure that the number of trips between Washington and each Congressman's district have been increased for calendar year 1973. That is a fine improvement, but I think more is needed.

Following the list of trips is a list of honorariums received by myself during the 92d Congress. From time to time I have published in the RECORD various bits of personal information like this in order that my constituents may be as fully informed as possible about my activities. The two lists follow:

March 5, 1973

served from 1953 as principal of Morristown High School. Prior to that, he was director of guidance at Morristown High from 1952-53; director of the Morristown Community Adult School in the same years; principal of the George Washington elementary school in Morristown from 1949-52, and registrar and chairman of the admissions committee at Rutgers University College in Newark from 1947-49.

From 1936-43 and 1946-47, he was a teacher and coach at Morristown High. From 1944-46 he was attached to the officer selection and classification section of the Bureau of Naval Personnel in Washington.

LaVanture served as field director of military and naval welfare service of the American Red Cross in Bainbridge, Md. from 1943-44. His teaching career began in 1931 at Blair Academy in Blairstown, where he was employed until 1936.

His professional activities included membership and service as president, vice-president and committee chairman with the N.J. Secondary Schools Principals Association. He is past president of the Watchung Conference; past president of the Jersey Hills Conference; a former member of the board of educational directors at Farleigh Dickinson University, and of the board of directors of the N.J. Council on Economic Education.

He was a member of seven Middle States evaluation committees, and a representative at 10 national conventions of the National Association of Secondary School Principals. He is a member of that association, the N.J. Association of Secondary School Principals, the National Education Association, the N.J. Educational Association and Phi Delta Kappa fraternity.

His civil activities include service on the board of directors of the Springfield Rotary Club, membership in the Morristown Juvenile Conference Committee and work on the board of directors of the Morristown Kiwanis Club.

He was on the board of trustees of the Presbyterian Church in Morristown and the board of directors of that community's chapter of the American Red Cross. He is a Mason and is an elder in the Morristown Presbyterian Church.

Mr. Speaker, as you can see, Dr. LaVanture has lived a full and active life.

His contributions to the field of education have made him a respected leader in New Jersey. I join with his many colleagues, friends, and admirers in wishing him well in his retirement and for the people of New Jersey I say, thank you Dr. LaVanture.

#### POTENTIAL PROBLEM IN THE MIDDLE EAST

#### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the potential problems which exist in the Middle East are certainly recognized by objective observers and the need for a columnist's objectivity should be obvious to all. In my judgment, the article in the Chicago Tribune of Thursday, March 1, 1973, was a very sound commentary on the Middle East situation.

The article follows:

#### STILLNESS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

An international incident does not grow into an international crisis unless someone really wants it to do so. No one, fortunately, is trying thus far to turn the shooting down of a Libyan jetliner by Israel into such a crisis.

In the days before the tragedy there had been a feeling that the Middle East was moving toward peace. In the hours immediately after it there was fear that this prospect had been destroyed with the aircraft.

Today, days after the incident, one finds a surprising lack of response by the Arabs to the incident. There has been no act of retaliation. The responsible leaders of the Arab world have been restrained in their rhetoric. Even the leader most directly aggrieved, Libya's mercurial Col. Muammar Kadafi, has remained uncharacteristically quiet.

We don't know what has muted the Arab response. Maybe the Arabs are still considering what to do. Maybe Russia has told them to keep cool.

Whatever the reason, the longer the stillness continues the cooler all heads will become. And for this we are grateful. It gives the United States and other countries time in which to pursue their efforts to bring peace to the troubled area.

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, March 6, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Levi J. Sides, Hebron Church of Christ, Joppa, Ala., offered the following prayer:

Holy Father, God of heaven and of earth, we come to praise Thee and to magnify Thy great name. We rejoice in Thy great love and marvelous goodness unto the children of men.

In times of doubts, when our belief is perplexed by new learning, our faith tried by facts too hard for us to grasp and by riddles too deep for us to read, give us still the humility of disciples and the trust of believers. Grant us patience to master the facts, courage to face the issues, insight to penetrate the mysteries, loyalty to truth already known, and courage to welcome new truth yet to be made known.

It is in the name of the Prince of Peace that we make this petition. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

#### THE LATE HONORABLE FRANKLIN H. LICHTENWALTER

(Mr. BIESTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that I rise to inform the House of the death of a distinguished former Member of Congress, the Honorable Franklin H. Lichtenwalter, of Center Valley, Pa. Mr. Lichtenwalter died this past Sunday in Harrisburg, Pa.

Mr. Lichtenwalter served in the Pennsylvania State Legislature beginning in 1939 and was speaker of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives in 1947. He left that post to fill a vacancy in the 80th Congress, representing the Eighth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, the district which I now have the honor to represent. Mr. Lichtenwalter was re-elected to a full term in 1948 and served in Congress until 1951, when he became vice president of the Pennsylvania Electric Association. He served the Eighth Congressional District well and had a justly deserved reputation as a Congressman who worked for his people. He also had a warmth and a wit which made working with him not only productive but a pleasant experience. He was a fine legislator.

Mr. Speaker, services will be held today in Harrisburg and tomorrow near his home in Center Valley, Pa.

I will later request a special order so that other Members may express themselves with respect to the passing of our former colleague.

#### NATIONAL PROCRASTINATION WEEK

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the start of National Procrastination Week, and for that reason I would like to put off my remarks on the subject until a later time.

#### BOMBING OF NORTH VIETNAM, DECEMBER 17, 1972, THROUGH JANUARY 3, 1973

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Armed Serv-

ices, I call up House Resolution 26 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 26

*Resolved*, That the President and the Secretary of Defense be, and they are hereby, directed to furnish the House of Representatives, within ten days after the adoption of this resolution, with full and complete information on the following—

(1) the number of sorties flown by United States military airplanes, for bombing purposes, over North Vietnam during the period December 17, 1972, through January 3, 1973.

(2) the tonnage of bombs and shells fired or dropped on North Vietnam during the period December 17, 1972, through January 3, 1973.

(3) the number and nomenclature of airplanes lost by the United States over North Vietnam or its territorial waters during the period December 17, 1972, through January 3, 1973.

(4) the number of Americans killed, wounded, captured, and missing in action while participating in flights over North Vietnam during the period December 17, 1972, through January 3, 1973.

(5) the best available estimate of casualties among the North Vietnamese during the period December 17, 1972, through January 3, 1973.

(6) the cost of all bombing and shelling carried on by the United States in or over North Vietnam during the period December 17, 1972, through January 3, 1973, including the costs of bombs and shells, ships, and airplanes employed in the transportation and dropping or firing of such bombs and shells, maintenance of such ships and airplanes, salaries of United States military personnel involved in operating and maintaining such ships and airplanes, cost of equipment destroyed or damaged while participating in missions over North Vietnam, and all other expenses attributable to such bombing and shelling, during the period December 17, 1972, through January 3, 1973.

(7) the extent of damage to any and all facilities struck by bombs, including "after