

## By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Res. 277. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by rule XI(8) and House Resolution 224; to the Committee on House Administration.

## By Mr. MORGAN:

H. Res. 278. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 267, 93d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

## By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. Res. 279. Resolution to create a special committee to investigate campaign expenditures; to the Committee on Rules.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## By Mr. STUDDS:

H. Res. 280. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

## By Mr. BRASCO:

H. R. 5378. A bill for the relief of Domenico Musso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 5379. A bill for the relief of John B. Clayton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## By Mr. GRAY:

H. R. 5380. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Fugaccia and his family: Anna Maria Franchi Fugaccia (wife), Alberto Fugaccia (son), Isabella Fugaccia (daughter); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## By Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland:

H. R. 5381. A bill for the relief of Elijah Stith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## By Mr. REES:

H. R. 5382. A bill for the relief of Gregory Barrett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## SALUTE TO NICOLAUS COPERNICUS AND TO THE PEOPLE OF POLAND

## HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 500th anniversary of the birth of Nicolaus Copernicus, I should like to make the following remarks:

## NICOLAUS COPERNICUS

Nicolaus Copernicus, Polish astronomer, propounded the Copernican theory, which revolutionized planetary astronomy and laid the foundation stone for modern developments. He was born on February 14, 1473, at Torun on the Vistula river where his father was a merchant of some social standing. In 1491 Copernicus went to the University of Cracow. There he came under the influence of the mathematician Wojciech Brudzewski (1445-97), a supporter of the geocentric system of Ptolemy, who is believed to have awakened his genius.

Copernicus became increasingly dissatisfied with the Ptolemaic system of astronomy. He was not alone in this dissatisfaction; indeed he himself said that the many divergent views prevalent in his day gave him cause for profound thought. These difficulties had arisen as the accumulated observations on the position of the sun, moon and planets had made it necessary to elaborate the arrangement of deferents and epicycles which the Ptolemaic system contained. It was therefore an increasingly laborious task to compute the future positions of these bodies and, of course, much of the elegance of the Ptolemaic hypothesis was lost. Ptolemy's system contained not only some original work but also a synthesis of the views of previous Greek philosophers and was based on a purely geocentric basis. By the 16th century this geocentric idea had become not only firmly entrenched in astronomical thought but also had the virtual standing of an article of faith. Although certain Greek philosophers had, as far back as the third century B.C., suggested that the sun and not the Earth was the centre of the universe, their ideas had not been developed. However, Copernicus concluded that, in view of the plethora of epicycles and other complexities needed by the Ptolemaic system so that it might still account for the observed motions of heavenly bodies, it must contain some basic error. In consequence he read many original Greek authors and discovered that heliocentric hypotheses had been suggested. The idea of a moving Earth seemed absurd at first but when Copernicus used this assumption he found that a much sim-

pler and aesthetically superior system resulted even though, as might be expected, he still believed that the planets moved with uniform circular motion. After many years of labour he became convinced of the truth of his new ideas, but made no attempt to publish them. It was only the efforts of his friends and, more particularly, those of his pupil and disciple Georg Joachim Rheticus (1514-76), who studied with him for two years, that finally resulted in the publication in 1543 of the great *De revolutionibus orbium coelestium*. Although not widely accepted at once, the heliocentric views of Copernicus in due course exerted a vital influence on astronomy. (Extracted from the Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., Volume 6.)

It is, therefore, with a great deal of pride, Mr. Speaker, that we salute Nicolaus Copernicus and the people of that ancient and noble nation, Poland, who during the year 1973 will be hosts to the educators and scientists of the world on this forthcoming 500th anniversary of the birth of Nicolaus Copernicus.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY WINNER  
JEFFREY LEE DETROW

## HON. RALPH S. REGULA

OF OHIO

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, young Americans today have a greater role in our society than at any time in our history. This expanded role makes it increasingly more important that they fully understand the value of the freedoms and privileges guaranteed by the Constitution and statutes of the United States. It is in this interest that the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conducts the Voice of Democracy program. It is a national broadcast script-writing program designed to give high school students an opportunity to think, write, and speak up for freedom and democracy. This year over 500,000 students from over 7,000 secondary schools participated in the 26th annual Voice of Democracy program. This week the State finalists in the program are competing here in Washington for scholarships provided by the VFW.

I am pleased that the winner of the Ohio program, Mr. Jeffrey Lee Detrow is a resident of the 16th Congressional District. I would like to recognize Mr.

Detrow's achievement by calling his speech to the attention of the Members of Congress by inserting it into the RECORD:

## VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

The date is November 8th, 1972 . . . the time . . . 4 a.m. . . . and I am now sleepily pulling myself together after an evening which will be recorded in history. I've spent the last 10 hours compiling results in a presidential election . . . and I guess, one never realizes just how great democracy is until it's seen in action at a time such as this! When I hear of people speaking out against the United States . . . I wonder if there is a single citizen left who still feels the deep cry of America . . . but in these early morning hours when the final votes are trickling in . . . it's evident that many still do consider that undefinable word patriotism as more than just old hat!

When asked why one votes a common answer is . . . "It's my constitutional right" . . . and this reply is an excellent one . . . for whether it be a small town farmer in his fields . . . or a corporate magnate in his New York office building . . . all are granted these same basic freedoms . . . or inalienable rights.

When 56 men banded together at Philadelphia's Independence Hall in 1776 to sign our Declaration of Independence . . . and in 1789 when their dreams for this new nation were more clearly defined in the Bill of Rights . . . what they wrote was not only a revolutionary theory of government . . . it came to be a way of life! These documents are a series of rights which these men and the people whom they represented felt were God given to all human beings.

Now that we have established that freedom has certain responsibilities to us . . . let us stop and think for a moment . . . isn't there something which has been omitted? ? ? . . . something which goes far beyond freedom's basic responsibilities to us? ? ? . . . I believe there is! ! ! An idea which is so often forgotten . . . yet is so important . . . so vital . . . that we dare not forget it! . . . for in all this talk of freedom's responsibilities to us . . . we often forget that we have responsibilities to freedom.

It is easy in a time when we have not recently been posed with an immediate threat on our nation . . . to become indifferent . . . to consider the battle for freedom as already won . . . but this is where we must scrape off the outer cover and look deeper into this thing called freedom. It is often suggested that the American of today is programmed by the government to be the type of citizen that they want him to be . . . the so called "American Machine" . . . but may I offer another suggestion for your consideration? ? ? instead of being run through the American machine. . . I believe that we are often caught up in the anti-American machine. How many times have you found yourself speaking out against your country? ? ? . . .

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Don't get me wrong . . . I'm not denouncing criticism . . . for without it no institution can progress . . . but it becomes rather disenchanted to see defamation of the United States every day . . . It's important that you as a responsible citizen . . . do your best to avoid becoming another cog in the anti-American machine.

We the young Americans of today are finding it hard to express our patriotic views . . . we don't have the Eddie Rickenbackers . . . Sergeant Yorks . . . and General Eisenhowers to rally behind . . . so we must wage our own personal crusade to preserve freedom. Countless men have died or suffered insurmountable tortures so that we may live in a society such as ours . . . to those men we owe an unpayable debt.

How can I . . . you may ask . . . one little building block in a tower of millions . . . make any impact on this vast land which we call America? But did you ever stop to think of the power of an individual human voice???

Those voters on November 7th were letting America know how they felt . . . don't be afraid to stand up and say . . . America, you are mine and I am yours . . . for if one by one . . . the blocks in that tower of millions begin to tumble . . . our society will be nothing more than a faded page in a history book titled "The Fall of the American Nation" . . .

I must say that I am an optimist . . . I believe that the people of this nation can and will . . . defend their freedom in the future as they have done so fervently in the past.

A recent song by the Johnny Mann singers was entitled . . . "America . . . There is so Much to Say . . ." This song is trying to reach you . . . young and old . . . and is telling you to stand up . . . speak out . . . and express your opinions . . . you will be heard !!!

Throw a monkey wrench in the mechanism of the anti-American machine. Fight for the ideals of America in your daily life . . . and be willing to die for them. We have got to realize that freedom is our responsibility.

It's 4 a.m. . . . November 8th, 1972. It's time for me to go home and perhaps reflect upon this evening's happenings. It's now my turn to fulfill my responsibilities to freedom. America, there is so much to say . . . let's begin today!

**GHANA IS 16 YEARS OLD: THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE NATIONAL REDEMPTION COUNCIL**

**HON. LOUIS STOKES**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 6, 1973*

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the Nation of Ghana will be 16 years old on March 6, 1973. It is an occasion of great moment, and I hope that all of my colleagues will join with me in expressing their congratulations to this vital and growing country.

In honor of the occasion, I would like to share with this House a statement which the Embassy of Ghana has prepared on the occasion of its Government's 16th birthday.

**GHANA IS 16 YEARS OLD: THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE NATIONAL REDEMPTION COUNCIL**

Ghana, which is 16 years old today, has already experienced many vicissitudes. More than one year ago, Ghana had one of the worst balance of payments crises known to the developing world. We were up to our necks in inflation. Food was scarce and the prices were very prohibitive. Today, Ghana is on the way to achieving her first balance

of payments surplus in many years. The country's visible balance of trade during 1972 showed a moderate surplus as against a deficit in 1971. We have succeeded at the same time in controlling inflation and our food production has shown a remarkable increase. We have done this from our own resources, without borrowing and adding to our external debt burden.

Our policy of self-reliance has paid off very well for not only have we been able to grow enough food for our people but we are also working hard to produce raw materials for our industries. From the results of "Operation Feed Yourself", we are moving forward to involve all the people in development through a new co-operative programme which will lead to the creation of co-operative societies. We are moving the principle of self-reliance to a new plane where the people will not only feed themselves but will work to change their entire living conditions.

We have launched a campaign to provide houses for the people and we are adapting our educational system to suit our development needs.

The students of our three universities without prompting, voluntarily decided on their own to assist in the harvesting of sugar cane and to plough the land to mark a new turning point in our history inspiring a nation-wide determination to conquer the land and feed ourselves from its resources.

We recognise that the type of education imposed by colonialism has been detrimental to our interests. We have been brought up to hold white collar jobs in reverence and to look on manual labour with scorn. The result is that with our fertile land, abundant water and our proverbial sunshine, Ghana has been one of the greatest importers of food.

We are taking steps to correct this situation. The curricula of our educational systems, from primary to university, are being revised to reflect the needs of our society. The Government is taking steps to involve the institutions of higher learning in the practical problems of development.

The Agricultural Faculties of the University of Science and Technology and the University of Ghana have been asked to join the State Farms Corporation and the Agricultural Development Bank in a consortium to plan and implement a programme of oil palm development designed to make Ghana self-sufficient in oil palm production.

A similar consortium is to be promoted again by the two faculties, the Agricultural Development Bank and the Cattle Development Board to plan and execute a project to make Ghana self-sufficient in the production of cattle and meat preparations.

The Physical Planning and Architectural Departments of the University of Science and Technology have been requested to undertake project studies for the replanning and modernisation of our cities and the planning of new townships which will replace some of our villages.

Priority is being given to the training of Ghanaians for the high technical grades of the mining industry and for all the key sectors of our economy. This is to prevent the domination of our economy by powerful foreign interests.

In our world today, it is impossible for any single country to do it alone. The people and nations of the world must depend upon one another, but this process of inter-dependence must be based on the new concept of partnership expressed in the form of joint ventures. Instead of seeking total ownership of major economic enterprises, we are asking foreign businessmen to think of joint ventures with our people so that the profits they earn may be jointly shared, partly for the development of the land and partly to reward the foreign entrepreneurs.

It is on the basis of this that the National Redemption Council has taken steps to acquire majority shareholding in our main ex-

portive industries. Ghana already has such fruitful partnerships with a number of U.S. businesses.

This is a Government which in just over one year has shown practical understanding of our problems to evolve realistic plans to resuscitate our economy.

The National Redemption Council has recently been described by West Africa, a magazine published in Britain, as purposeful, energetic, honest, and worthy of every help from abroad. The magazine, in addition, has admitted that its earlier misgivings about the Council were wrong.

The people of Ghana, through a determined effort of self-reliance and loyalty, are making their country a much happier place to live in. We shall overcome.

*March 7, 1973*

**TRIBUTE TO DENNIS D. O'BRIAN**

**HON. EDWARD YOUNG**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 6, 1973*

Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding community leaders in my hometown of Florence, S.C., died on Monday morning, February 19, 1973. Dennis D. O'Brian had lived an active and productive life even though he was stricken with heart disease a decade ago but he never let this condition dominate his life. He was a business and civic leader in our area of South Carolina and served as president of O'Brian-Mace Co., an industrial supply firm which he founded shortly after World War II. Mr. O'Brian was a native southerner and possessed those traits of character and gentleness that made him known to all as a true southern gentleman.

The crowd which overflowed the sanctuary and churchyard at his funeral at All Saints Episcopal Church in Florence, where he served as junior warden at the time of his death and where he was a longtime member of the vestry of this church, attested to the esteem in which he was held by our community. He also served as a member of the board of trustees of All Saints Episcopal Day School.

This affable community leader was a member and former president of the Florence Rotary Club, a member of the Southern Industrial Distributors Association, and a past member of the board of directors of the South Carolina Chamber of Commerce, as well as the Florence Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. O'Brian had been active in the Pee Wee Area Council of the Boy Scouts of America and his business ability will be missed by this organization, as well as the many others to which he devoted his time during his productive and useful life.

The city of Florence was particularly fortunate in having Mr. O'Brian serve as a member of the Florence City Council from May 16, 1960, until May 1, 1969. First elected as a Democrat, he later joined the Republican Party and led the county and State in support of U.S. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, the then presidential nominee of the Republican Party. He, thereafter, was reelected to the city council as a Republican and be-

came the first member of his party ever elected to Florence City Council. He also served the Republican Party as South Carolina's Sixth Congressional Chairman and introduced Senator GOLDWATER at a statewide rally when he came to Charleston in 1966 following his successful South Carolina campaign.

Mr. O'Brian was a member of the Florence-Darlington Technical Education Commission and served as second chairman of the commission. He was one of the original members of that commission and under his leadership, the physical construction of the large TEC Center near Florence was begun.

A graduate of Georgia Tech in Atlanta, he just recently completed service on the Alumni Council for his alma mater.

He served in the Navy during World War II and was always a staunch defender of his country and the need for it to always be prepared.

Dennis O'Brian was an avid sportsman and particularly enjoyed fishing. He maintained a home on the fabulous Grand Strand of South Carolina as well as on the Santee-Cooper Lakes in my congressional district.

He is survived by his widow; a daughter, Maureen; and a son, Scott, all of Florence. He is also survived by his sister, Coleen, and his brother, Bill. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of personal loss and sympathy for the O'Brian family that I recognize Dennis O'Brian's passing.

#### MORE ABOUT THE TRUE NADER

#### HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, broadside attacks on our Government and its officials, including generalizations concerning Members of Congress—are frequently inaccurate and misleading. These can have only a destructive effect on our Nation and its institutions.

The amateurish and highly inept effort of Ralph Nader in his report on the Congress has now been followed by an already discredited proposal that would punish free American citizens who fail to register and vote. While Soviet oriented societies with their one-party governments have embraced such a view it is to be hoped that little support will be accorded Mr. Nader's latest fling in the area of participatory democracy.

Mr. Speaker, this point is eloquently and forcefully expounded in an editorial which appeared in the Monday, January 22, issue of the Chicago Tribune, and is reproduced below:

#### NADER'S ULTIMATE DEMOCRACY

The ubiquitous Ralph Nader has charged forth on yet another front, this time complaining that not all is right with democracy. The flaw, he asserts, is that too few people are voting in elections. His thoughtful solution is to make voting mandatory. It would be "the ultimate in democracy," he said, and would deal a "decisive blow" to political machines by subverting their control over the voter registration process.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

We have long shared Mr. Nader's unhappiness with voter apathy in this country, and have frequently noted the disparity between voter turnout here and in other western nations. But the answer to voter apathy is to increase voter interest, not to drag millions of uninterested voters to the polls where they will be likely to make an indifferent and ill considered choice.

Far from viewing Mr. Nader's proposal as a "decisive blow" to machine politics, we think most machine politicians would welcome it. In Chicago's inner-city wards, for example, the biggest problem the political bosses have right now is in getting the faithful out to the polls. In many of these areas, it has been unfortunately axiomatic to say that the bigger the turnout, the bigger the vote fraud.

Mr. Nader overlooks yet another important point, and that is that, while Americans have the freedom to vote, they also have the freedom not to vote—just as they have the freedom not to worship and the freedom not to patronize a free press. We may lament the exercise of this freedom, but it is a freedom, none the less.

Mr. Nader's "ultimate in democracy" actually has more in common with such countries as the Soviet Union, where failure to vote is a punishable offense. If democracy is Mr. Nader's goat, he is approaching it by a curious route.

#### ACTION ON PRESS FREEDOM

#### HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, protecting the confidentiality of the sources of information obtained by our news reporters is one of today's critical issues. The accuracy of information provided to us as citizens depends heavily on the reporter's freedom to go about his work without concern that he will jeopardize the relationships on which the quality of his product depends. Most of us have assumed that the Congress is the natural body to provide that necessary protection, and attention has thus focused principally on what Congress can do at the Federal level. Yet the major part of the problem stems from subpoenas issued by State and local authorities in local proceedings. Two of the three cases decided by the Supreme Court last year involved State proceedings. Any legislation that fails to deal with the State and local problem in protecting news sources will fail in its purpose.

We realize, of course, that forced disclosure of confidential information on a State or local level is not purely a State or local problem. In this day of instantaneous communication and rapid mobility, any action which impinges on the ability of news reporters to develop the trust necessary for the development and dissemination of information, no matter where that action may be taken, affects reporting everywhere. Societal groups about which we seriously need accurate information observe that newsmen are vulnerable and therefore less able to be trusted. Members of those groups become more defensive, even though the instances of attempts to force disclosure

of sources may have occurred elsewhere. And the quality of reporting about them deteriorates.

Because Congress may have the constitutional power to enact a law to protect news sources does not mean that a Federal law affecting State or local proceedings is the most desirable alternative. The scope of a privilege given to confidential information may well be regarded as a matter for the State legislature, rather than leaving the issue to a Congress which appears remote from local problems. State legislators know State procedures and the needs of State prosecutors and newsmen better and might well be able to develop a more workable shield law. Already, there are States with effective news shield laws, and there should be more. For that reason, it is encouraging to note that efforts are being made on the State level. It would be good for our national well-being if these efforts are successful, although the need for a Federal law will not be obviated. There will then be an active expression of State policy supporting the free flow of information, and no one can say that our State governments are merely passive observers in establishing important legal principles.

At this point, I am inserting a statement describing action taken by WBZ in Boston in support of State legislation on that subject. Massachusetts State bill 704, referred to in the statement, would create a privilege somewhat more narrowly drawn than does the Whalen bill which I have cosponsored. It may not be the most workable legislation, but it is the beginning of the legislative process. I want to take this opportunity to express my support for efforts to develop such legislation at the State level to deal with the problem.

The statement follows:

#### ACTION ON PRESS FREEDOM

(Delivered by Winthrop P. Baker, General Manager, WBZ-TV; Sy Yanoff, General Manager, WBZ Radio)

Recent events have shown a growing threat to press freedom in America. And we feel there's a serious gap in protection for professional newsmen that should be filled with legislation at both the state and national levels this year.

A special Jerry Williams program from Faneuil Hall Thursday night showed the sharp differences of opinion on this issue within both the press and the government. In our view, qualified newsmen should be given reasonable immunity from having to identify source and disclose confidential information when called before courts, grand juries, government agencies, and legislative committees. There obviously have to be some exceptions to this and some procedure for appeal through the courts. All that's easier said than written into law. But Senate Bill 704 filed by Senator John Quinlan and the New England Press Association comes as close to that goal as possible. Two years ago a similar measure got through the Senate and missed in the House by only four votes. With a real show of support this year, the measure can go all the way. And the process starts with a public hearing before the Judiciary Committee at the State House next Wednesday afternoon.

Some people will claim that this type of shield law creates a special class of citizen. The answer to that argument is that the shield law is really for the benefit of the public, not the reporter. Newsmen are constantly digging into events behind the scenes, and

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

often they have to get a lot of pieces of a story on a confidential basis. Nothing would more effectively destroy the essential trust between a newsman and the people he deals with than the knowledge anything said in confidence would become official property on request. Nineteen other states have laws which grant newsmen the right to protect sources of information. Massachusetts needs such a law, too.

(The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, In the Year One Thousand Nine Hundred and Seventy-Three)

AN ACT PROVIDING PROTECTION FOR SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THOSE ENGAGED IN THE PROFESSION OF JOURNALISM

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:*

SECTION 1. Definitions: In this act the following words and phrases shall have the following meanings:

"Professional Journalist", one who, for gain or livelihood, is engaged in the gathering, preparation, presentation or editing of news for a newspaper, journal, press association, wire service, or radio or television station.

"News", written, oral or pictorial information or communication concerning local, national or worldwide events or other matters of public concern, of public interest or affecting the public welfare.

"Newspaper", a paper that is printed and distributed ordinarily not less frequently than once a week, and has been so printed and distributed for at least one year, and that has at least a twenty five percent yearly average of news-editorial contents such as news, articles of opinion (as editorials), features, advertising or other matter regarded as current interest, and that has a general circulation and that must be formed of printed sheets.

"Journal", a publication containing news which is published and distributed periodically, and has been so (published and distributed) for at least one year and must be formed of printed sheets.

"Press Association", an association of newspapers and/or magazines formed to gather and distribute news and journalistic information to its members.

"News Agency", a commercial organization that collects and supplies news to subscribing newspapers, magazines, periodicals and news broadcasters.

"Wire Service", a news agency that sends out syndicated news copy by wire to subscribing newspapers, magazines, periodicals or news broadcasters.

SEC. 2. "No person engaged in the work of, or connected with or employed by any newspaper or any press association or any journal or any radio broadcasting station, or any television station for the purpose of gathering, procuring, compiling, editing, disseminating, publishing, broadcasting or televising news shall be required to disclose the source of any information procured or obtained by such person in the course of his employment, in any legal proceeding, trial or investigation before any court, grand jury or petit jury, or any officer thereof, before the presiding officer of any tribunal, or his agent or agents, or before any commission, department, division or bureau of the state, or before any county or municipal body, officer or committee thereof."

SEC. 3. "In any case where a person claims a privilege conferred by this statute, the person seeking the information or the source of the information may apply to the superior court for an order divesting the privilege. If the court after hearing the parties, shall find that there is substantial evidence that disclosure of the information or of the source

of the information is necessary to permit a criminal prosecution for the commission of a specific felony, or to prevent a threat to human life, and that such information or the source of such information is not available from other prospective witnesses, the court may make such order as may be proper under the circumstance. Any such order shall be appealable under section ninety-six of chapter two hundred thirty-one of the General Laws."

HENRY HATHAWAY

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, pioneer film director Henry Hathaway celebrates his 75th birthday on March 13 of this year and 67 of those years have been devoted to making motion pictures. His contributions to the film industry and to Hollywood itself are vast and immeasurable.

Born in Sacramento, Calif. in 1898, Hathaway, a child star at the age of eight made a picture a day, 5 days a week, along the Mexican border and picked up the first smatterings of the Western lore that was to become one of his greatest assets in later years. Hathaway has directed every manner of motion picture in his brilliant career although his first loves are perhaps those with the boots and saddles of the old west. Property boy at 14, to eventual assistant director were giant steps Hathaway took on his way to full directorship at the helm of his first seven pictures, all westerns and every one a hit. He went on to direct the first color film "The Trail of the Lonesome Pine." Among his other memorable films are "How the West Was Won," "The House on 92nd Street," "Brigham Young," 13 Rue Madeleine," "The Desert Fox," "Lives of a Bengal Lancer," and "True Grit," for which John Wayne won an Academy Award.

In reality Henry Hathaway is the Marquis Leopold de Fiennes, although few of his closest friends know it. He is a humble man whose meticulous direction has left and continues to leave a permanent mark on the screen. His current effort, Brut Productions' "Hang-up," a black/white, police/suspense drama adds another dimension to the Hathaway list of credits. "It is, after all, for both audiences," he says, "It's about people, not color or creed."

The Hathaway films will live as long as the entertainment industry endures as will the careers he has fostered, bringing "new" faces to the screen. Gary Cooper, Jeanne Crain, Julie London, Karl Malden, E. G. Marshall, Lee Marvin, Shirley Temple, Jack Warden, Richard Widmark.

Henry Hathaway's career is a tribute to the democracy which is the American way of life. He started on the lowest rungs and has reached heights that are known throughout the world.

March 7, 1973

ILLEGALITY INCREASINGLY BECOMES A PATTERN IN THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, although Howard Phillips, Acting Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, has decided to bring his wild attack on programs for poor people under some slight but insidious control, the blatant illegality of his actions in this matter still stand as an insult to the Congress and the Constitution.

Mr. Phillips, with bloody hatchet still in hand, has now seen fit to circulate memoranda stipulating that most OEO delegate agencies have some hope of being funded for another year, while community action agencies must work their last, based on a potential refunding period of 6 months.

This appointee of President Nixon, who has still not been put before the Senate for confirmation, repeatedly ignores the specific legal mandates contained in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 as amended and continued.

Hundreds of thousands of jobs and hundreds of extremely worthwhile programs have hung in the balance as this man has acted out his reactionary vendetta against the poor of America.

Certainly, the war on poverty needs strengthening from top to bottom, but Mr. Phillips appears to see strength only in the capability to destroy. In this instance, it is the lives of millions of disadvantaged Americans that will be destroyed; Americans who had come to view community action programs as a chance for a new beginning through self-help.

With all the talk of transferring programs to old-line Federal agencies, it is incredible to me that the memory of this administration is so short that it cannot remember the days before the war on poverty. During those years, each Federal agency totally buried any effective service to the poor in its own brand of bureaucratic quagmire.

The cold fact is that the number of poor people in America has decreased since the beginning of the war on poverty and OEO at a faster rate than at any time in recent decades, according to Bureau of the Census figures. Only since Richard M. Nixon became President of the United States in 1969 has this decrease become an increase.

For these reasons, I introduced the "Economic Opportunity Compliance Act of 1973" last month along with 24 of my colleagues. This bill, now in two introductions, would clearly direct that the kind of callous illegal actions carried out by Mr. Phillips be stopped at once. It also clearly reasserts the authority of Congress and Congress alone to carry out extensive overhauls of the philosophy of programs funded under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The OEO Director's authority to in-

sure sound management would not be limited, but his arrogant insensitivity to the will of Congress, which he demonstrated before the Equal Opportunities Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee recently, would be unmistakably challenged and curtailed.

The strengths and weaknesses of the war on poverty are not the issue in this bill. The only issue is whether or not Congress will allow itself to be bullied and have its clear legislative and legal mandates ignored on the whim of one bureaucrat and the forces that support him.

Columnist David Broder, in a column in the Washington Post recently, described the scope of the threat to our Constitution and law that Mr. Phillips is attempting to pose. I hope my colleagues will join me in stopping this misguided effort.

The column follows:

**SACRIFICING LEGALITY FOR EFFICIENCY**

(By David S. Broder)

The man of the week in Washington is Howard Phillips, the 32-year-old acting director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Phillips is obliterating OEO and the federal antipoverty program even faster than his fellow Harvard man, Henry Kissinger, is ending the Cold War—but to much less general applause.

Because he is going about his work with such enthusiasm that he seems likely to have demolished OEO even before his June 30 target date, Phillips is being attacked as a White House hatchet man. It's a bum rap. He is a 100 per cent true believer in what he's doing, and would take on the job for free if they didn't want to pay him.

His philosophy was summed up in an interview the other evening with Martin Agronsky, in which he said: "One of the things that has disturbed me is the view of many of the organizations that we have funded out of OEO, that poverty is a political and cultural fact of life, rather than an economic fact of life. I don't think poverty is a political question. I don't think it's proper for the government to be in a position of trying to solve the poverty problem through political means."

With that view, it was inevitable that the efficient Nixon personnel computer would identify Phillips as the ideal person to administer the poverty program. But it discredits young Mr. Phillips to think he is just an antipoverty program fanatic. He is a libertarian conservative, suspicious of all connections between government and the public. One of the 11 "general principles" he handed me when I went to see him last week says, "My political liberty is diminished when the government subsidizes political activities."

This suspicion of government and its works is no new thing to him. Years ago, when he was a junior staffer at the Republican National Committee, we used to lean against the wall and argue about the evils of the welfare state.

Little did either of us dream then that he would be chosen to preside over the death of OEO. Indeed, Phillips expressed his own astonishment during our visit last week at discovering what power an acting director has to put his own agency out of business.

"My first reaction when they outlined it to me was that it couldn't be done," he said. The President, you see, had signed into law last fall legislation extending the life of OEO through mid-1974 and providing funds for its operations—not its abolition—this year.

But by the time the White House lawyers had finished interpreting that legislation,

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Phillips began to savor the possibilities of striking a blow for libertarianism.

The lawyers' reasoning is a marvelous example of Orwellian Newspeak. When Sen. Abraham A. Ribicoff (D-Conn.) wrote Phillips asking him to identify his authority to abolish OEO and "terminate" or "transfer" its functions, it all turned out to be a phantom. "While the 1974 budget requests no funding for them," the letter of reply said, "the statutory basis for these activities will remain intact." Some programs may be "delegated" to other agencies, but none, Ribicoff was told, is being "transferred."

To translate those legalisms into the sports metaphor that Mr. Nixon likes, that's equivalent to saying that while the Washington Senators have "delegated" their players to the Texas Rangers, their franchise remains "intact." That's a comfort to know, but it doesn't mean you'll find any baseball in Washington this summer. Or any antipoverty program either.

One of the "general principles" Phillips had given me as a guide to his philosophy read, "The elitist notion that our traditional institutions and democratic processes must be bypassed to achieve 'socially desirable' objectives poses a fundamental threat to our system of government."

In light of that statement, I asked him what he thought of Mr. Nixon's end-run around Congress on the abolition of OEO. "That decision," he said, not batting an eye, "was made on the grounds of effectiveness."

For the same reason, it turns out, Mr. Nixon has decided not to submit Phillips' name to the Senate, despite a recent pointed reminder from Sen. Harrison A. Williams Jr. (D-N.J.), the chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, that the position of OEO director requires Senate confirmation.

"If my name went up," Phillips said with unassailable logic, "I'd have to spend all my time up there getting confirmed and I'd never get the place dismantled."

So there you have it. Having picked as the poverty program administrator a man who believes that poverty is not "a political question," Mr. Nixon has now authorized him to dismantle the agency, rapidly and totally, despite the fact that its life, under law, is supposed to extend at least until mid-1974. And he is doing it right now without the Senate even having a chance to exercise its statutory and constitutional right to give or withhold its "advice and consent" to the nomination.

All this, mind you, in 1973. It makes you wonder what our government will be like by 1984.

## A RESOLUTION OF GRATITUDE TO CONGRESS

### HON. PAUL W. CRONIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. CRONIN. Mr. Speaker, as one of my first public duties, I was invited to attend the installation of new officers of the Merrimack Valley Branch of the Retired Armed Forces Association. I was deeply impressed with the character and dedication of these people who have devoted so much of their lives to their country. At that time I assured them that I would be only too pleased to publish their resolution of gratitude in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

### SPECIAL RESOLUTION

To: The Congress of the United States

Whereas, the newly revamped Retired Servicemen's Family Protection plan (the Survivors Benefit Plan) is now law, and is designed to provide lifetime incomes to our widows, and

Whereas, this new plan is so much more attractive and so much less expensive and will allow a much greater number of retired veterans to take advantage of it, and

Whereas, this newly revamped plan was sponsored and supported by the late Armed Services Committee Chairman, Congressman Mendel Rivers; and the present Armed Services Committee Chairman, Congressman Edward Hébert and by such other distinguished U.S. Representatives as Otis G. Pike, Olin E. Teague and a host of others . . .

Be it resolved that we, the members of the Merrimack Valley Branch (of the Massachusetts Chapter) Retired Armed Forces Association, ask our new Congressman, the Honorable Paul Cronin of Andover, Massachusetts, and the Fifth Congressional District to express our deep gratitude to those who sponsored and supported this legislation, and

Be it further resolved, that he, Congressman Paul Cronin, be requested to ask the Congress of the United States that such expression of gratitude from the retired members of the Armed Forces of the United States be entered in the Congressional Record.

## 55TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

### HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues, and our many friends of Lithuanian origin here in the United States, in commemorating the 722d anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian State and the 55th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

After a long period of foreign occupation, Lithuania regained its freedom in 1918 and subsequently adopted a constitution which guaranteed its citizens freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of communication, with the power of legislation vested in a parliament. The United States recognized that independent Republic of Lithuania on July 27, 1922.

Unfortunately, Lithuania was occupied during the Second World War by the Red Army and on August 3, 1940 was declared a "constituent republic" of the Soviet Union—a status which the United States has never formally recognized.

Ever since, the people of Lithuania have sought to regain their freedom and independence. This struggle for freedom has been manifested in many ways.

All of us remember, for example, the attempted flight to freedom from a Soviet ship of the Lithuanian sailor, Simas Kudirka, off the coast of the United States. In his final statement during his trial, he very poignantly said:

I have nothing to add to what I have already said, only one wish, more specifically a request to the supreme court and the Government of the Soviet Union: I ask that you

grant my homeland, Lithuania, independence.

Still another expression of Lithuania's desire for freedom was a petition recently signed by 17,000 Lithuanian Catholics, asking the Secretary General of the United Nations to help bring an end to religious persecution in their country.

On this occasion, I want to express my sympathy for the Lithuanian people's wish to be free, and to let them know that they are not forgotten.

**MARTIN AGRONSKY—HOWARD PHILLIPS INTERVIEW**

**HON. MARVIN L. ESCH**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that Mr. Howard Phillips, the Acting Director of OEO, was interviewed by Mr. Martin Agronsky on his program, "Evening Edition."

Each Member of Congress will of course come to his own independent decision with regard to this subject, however, since we are all keenly interested I recommend this interview to my colleagues.

The interview follows:

Mr. HOWARD PHILLIPS, ACTING DIRECTOR, OEO, ON "EVENING EDITION."

Moderator. Mr. Phillips, I think we should begin with you.

You are in charge of liquidating the OEO, and both the President and you are coming in for a lot of heat and criticism as a result of it. Criticism came from five Democratic Senators: Gaylord Nelson; Harrison Williams; Edward Kennedy; Walter Mondale, and Alan Cranston. And they said that to eliminate the OEO saved only one-tenth of one per cent of the federal budget. And that it raised budget cutting—as they put it—above elemental common sense on national priorities.

That's not a bad place to begin. How would you respond?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Well, Mr. Agronsky, I think that one has to look at the decision which is reflected in the President's budget in a broad, philosophical context.

In the 1971 State of the Union Message of President Nixon, which was characterized as his "New American Revolution Message," he began to broadly articulate his social philosophy that to the extent possible, decision-making should be dispersed throughout the nation. The control over the decisions should be in diverse places; should be decentralized. The idea that all knowledge and all wisdom does not repose in Washington, and that there are intelligent people in Peoria, in Chicago, in Boston, and Los Angeles, and that it is a mistake—it's a disservice to them to concentrate control over the decisions that affect their lives, in Washington. OEO, and other similar federal programs, have in many respects had the effect of having unaccountable people within the federal bureaucracy subsidizing private non-profit organizations to approach social problems in their own way. And it's one thing to delegate the function of policy executing, for government to do that. I believe that's a proper function. I do not believe it is a proper function to delegate—it's proper to delegate policy-setting. I think that must be done

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

in a manner which is accountable to elected officials. And that therefore it is wrong to have an organization which can expend funds in a political way, in a policy-setting way, unaccountable to the electorate.

Moderator. You talk about this as if it were philosophy. It strikes me what you're talking about is an administrative approach. This is an emphasis on the local—or the regional, if you like—as opposed to the federal.

Now, I wouldn't describe that as a philosophy—as a philosophy. I'm asking you what the President thinks about the federal commitment to bettering the lot of the poor, really. I think perhaps that's a more specific way of—

Mr. PHILLIPS. Let's look at the decision which has been made.

If you examine the decision closely—and it is a complex one; it's a decision which, to some extent, has been overshadowed by other budget decisions—

Moderator. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS.—You will find that what has happened is that the budgets as henceforth, between now and June 30th, community action agencies, which—whose funding will expire during that period, may be extended for a period of up to an additional six months. After June 30th of this year—

Moderator. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS.—no additional federal obligations of funds to community action agencies will be made.

Moderator. Right.

Mr. PHILLIPS. After that point the continuation of community action will be a local option.

In regard to other programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity, their functions are being transferred to other departments and agencies which have the legal authority to continue them. An additional provision for funding has been—

Moderator. As I understand, you are telling me that what is actually happening here is that there's the same commitment to bettering the lot of the poor but it's going to be done in a different way.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes. As a matter of fact, I—

Moderator. Is that it?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I believe the effect of the President's decision is not merely justifiable as good social philosophy, or good political philosophy—

Moderator. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS.—but it has the effect of helping the poor.

Let me give you one example of what I mean—

Moderator. Okay, you may indeed.

Mr. PHILLIPS. All right.

For example, OEO has been doing some experiments in the area of tuition vouchers, which I believe in very deeply. They are based on the premise that poor people should have the same kinds of choices over their lives and the lives of their children that other people have.

Moderator. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. And for this reason, poor people are given vouchers, which they may expand to send children to the schools of their choice.

Now, decisions about the nature of those tuition voucher experiments, and about what you do with the results of those experiments, should really be made by people who impact on the dollars of major institutions. So for that reason, control of those experiments have gone to the National Institute of Education at HEW.

Similarly, child development experiments will go to the Office of Child Development in HEW, and so on.

Moderator. In effect, we are being told, I think, that there is a more efficient way of doing it.

Voice. Yes. I think there's a couple of points that you make which I'd like to dis-

March 7, 1973

cuss. One is this point you just made about the voucher. Now, there are many people who thought that OEO was getting too big. A lot of Democrats have told me that, and there were a lot of people who wanted to spin off these programs. It seems to me that if you—you told me in that interview the other day that you thought that OEO had done some very good work in research and development. This is one of the areas. Why, then, wouldn't it have made sense to have spun off all these programs to other agencies, done all of these things that the President wanted to do, and still kept this office in the Executive Office of the President, which is kind of, some people think, like a beacon to the poor.

And then the other question that relates to that, that you are talking about, these community action agencies, the ironic thing about it, it seems to me, is that we're closing down the community action agencies—I mean the government is—or throwing them back on the locals at the very time that an evaluation made by your office—but I understand withheld by you—says that the total emerging picture of community action clearly shows that they are becoming very positive forces in their communities that can play significant roles in helping communities rise to the challenges of revenue sharing and other forms of government decentralization.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Let me speak to the second part of your question first, if I may.

You indicated—and there was a report in the New York Times—that a study done by the Office of Economic Opportunity had, in effect, argued against the budget decision, and that this study had been suppressed.

What in fact happened was that a survey was taken, largely anecdotal, which said, "Tell us about some of the successes of community action in your area," and some people in the Office of Economic Opportunity published the survey. The publication of that survey has not been suppressed. As a matter of fact, today we made it available to various committees on Capitol Hill.

We did suggest to people within OEO that they would be wise to delay publication of it pending the revelation of budget decisions.

Moderator. Well, you know, it was a pretty substantial study. It was called the "Utilization Test Survey." Your own personnel did it in the Office of Operations and Regional Offices, and it covered 591 of the 907 local agencies.

Mr. PHILLIPS. First of all, what you have to understand is that many of the people who work at OEO, although they bear the label "Civil Service," are, in effect, people who came in under the Johnson Administration with Sargent Shriver, who have been active in the Democratic Party, active in the work that—

Moderator. Are you saying—

Mr. PHILLIPS. —the Great Society—

Moderator. —that that evaluation was partisan and political? Is that—

Mr. PHILLIPS. I'm—I'm saying that research and evaluation, to a large extent, arises from a person's social values. And—

Moderator. Do you permit that to affect your evaluations, too?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Well, sir, I had no control over that evaluation. I would hope that any official evaluation of OEO would be more methodologically sound than I am told that one was. I received an analysis on it—

Moderator. Okay.

Mr. PHILLIPS. —and I was told it was largely an effort to go out and encourage state OEOs, and other offices—

Moderator. Yeah.

Mr. PHILLIPS. —to tell people good things about community action.

One of the interesting things about the study is that it said that community action is so good that it's been getting more local support. If that's true, then the President's decision is right on with that, because the

President's decision is that community action is a local option.

Voice. Well, I would like to stop you on that one.

Mr. PHILLIPS. You didn't give me a chance at your first question.

Voice. I really hope you'll go back to it, because I think that's—I must say I know that community action people watching us won't agree with me. I think that's a more important question: the question you haven't answered.

But this question of—

Mr. PHILLIPS. If you give me a chance, I will.

Voice. Okay, I know you will.

On revenue sharing, when revenue sharing was being discussed and the local people were being told, "You can do this and that with the money," and the general revenue sharing was being passed, nobody that I know of in the debate—and I covered a part of it—had any idea that out of these general revenue sharing funds that they were going to suddenly be picking up the cost of operating the community action agencies.

It seems to me that there is one question involved if you say that beforehand: "These are some of the things that you are going to do with the money." It seems to me if you say, "You are going to do something else with the money," and some of this money is already, you know, pledged for tax relief and all kinds of things, and then say, "We're dumping this back on you," we don't really know whether—what those local communities would do if they had a different kind of option.

Wouldn't have been squarer to have told them a year ago, "We're going to close this, and if you really like these things, why—"

Mr. PHILLIPS. Well, OEO has been saying for a long time that community action agencies are local institutions. And they should be. It's wrong for people in Washington to say, "This is how you should spend your money here. You should set up this service system which is in competition with the other instruments of the local government and seek to solve your social problems this way."

And I keep hearing very disturbing examples of what can happen. These aren't really, in many cases, representative organizations.

A congressman called me the other day to express concern about the fact that the local people in his community action agency had determined to remove, by proper vote and due process, the official of one of the—of their community action agency. And then had been told, apparently by an official of one of our regional offices, that if they did that their funding would be cut off.

Well, those facts may or may not be precisely correct. We are having them checked out now. But the fact of the matter is—and it certainly can't be denied—it is unfortunate when people who happen to exist in the Washington bureaucracy, or in a regional office, can impose their views on the view of people in the local community. And it makes much more sense, from my standpoint, to have these decisions made by local officials who can be blamed for their failures and praised for their successes when people go to the polls on election day.

The essence of what Richard Nixon is saying is that there should be self-determination at the local level. And when you look at the way that community action money has been spent, roughly 75 to 80 per cent of it doesn't really go directly to help the poor, it goes to pay salaries, in many cases. We have been supporting an agency system, the effect of which in alleviating poverty is, in many cases at least, somewhat questionable. And I would argue that the tremendous increase that the President has made in human resources spending across the board has had a tremendously positive increase—impact on

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

poverty. And that more has been achieved in this Administration than in any previous Administration in dealing with the problems of poverty in this country.

But beyond that, it's not just a question of whether money is well spent, whether it achieves positive results, money can also have a negative impact.

One of the things that has disturbed me is the view of many of the organizations that we have funded out of OEO, that poverty is a political and a cultural fact of life rather than an economic fact of life. I don't think poverty is a political question. I don't think it's proper for the government to be in a position of trying to solve the poverty problem through political means.

I think that which distinguishes poor people from the rest of the population is the fact that their economic resources are less abundant. And what we have to do is deal with those economic resources.

It's my view that there is a social contract in our society, and that government does have responsibility to see to it that the minimum needs of people are met. And—

(Simultaneous voices.)

Voice. Why not keep that office in the Executive Office of the President, then? And do this research and development which wouldn't, by any means—

Mr. PHILLIPS. Of course, HEW is in the Executive Branch—

Voice. But it's not in the President's Executive Office.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Well, one of the—

Voice. And it's a big agency.

Mr. PHILLIPS.—complaints that have been made is that the Executive Office of the President has grown too large, like the rest of the bureaucracy has.

Voice. Who has been making that complaint?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Oh, I've seen it in the press, and I think the President has been consistent in cutting back not just the various departments and agencies, but has been cutting back the Executive Office of the President.

Let me get to your first substantive question.

If you are going to be effective in dealing with the problems of poverty, you've got to impact on the major institutions of society.

You could have multiplied the budget of OEO by 10, by 20, by 30, and it still wouldn't have eradicated poverty in America. The fact of the matter is that you have got to impact on those systems, on those ways of doing things that really do affect poverty.

If OEO—if HEW is working in the area of health services, it makes sense to have health experimentation, to have comprehensive health programs, operating out of HEW. It doesn't make very much sense to have a separate OEO bureaucracy dealing with those problems.

Voice. Didn't you once argue with the agency that there ought to be all these spin-offs, and that there should be a sep—that OEO should be an experimental kind of office? Didn't you take that point of view yourself?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Oh, I believe that the programs that we've been engaged in should be generative in nature. And I think that's an extremely important thing to do.

Voice. Well, how will you generate it if you kill the office?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Well, because I don't think that our loyalty should be to institutions as much as it should be to results. I think the fact of the matter is that the results we will achieve will be greater under the plan which has gone forward.

Moderator. You say you are committed to a program to deal more efficiently with the problems of the poor and those of social welfare. Let's take some numbers; maybe that's a better way to deal with this thing.

In the President's budget—in the 1974 budget proposed by Mr. Nixon, there has been a reduction in the Hill-Burton program, which is to construct public or other non-profit hospital or clinical facilities of \$90 millions; is that correct?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I'm not certain whether it's correct or not. I don't have a copy of his budget in front of me.

Moderator. Well, it is.

The regional medical program has been cut by \$60 million.

Voice. By the way, on Hill-Burton it has been well argued by many that the number of beds needed—

Moderator.—that we have an excess now. Granted.

On community mental health clinics, \$50 million cut.

On training grants and fellowships, \$58 million cut.

On education, including all educations in HEW, the largest component of cutback is reduction of library construction, but the total is \$208 million cut.

On public assistance, including all federal welfare assistance programs in HEW, 1,237,000,000.

Office of Economic Development, which is the agency to research and reduce incidence of poverty—

Mr. PHILLIPS. That's OEO.

Moderator.—and that's your outfit—\$390 million.

Water pollution control, \$3 billion cut.

Manpower programs, to encourage on-the-job and classroom training, summer jobs for youth, \$499 million cut.

Housing subsidies to help fulfill the 1949 Housing Act pledge, \$305 million cut.

Housing projects—that is projects approved for urban renewal, Model Cities, et cetera—\$745 million saving projected by the 1975 budget.

Now, I would regard those as very considerable—

Mr. PHILLIPS. In effect, I would regard what you are saying as an argument in favor of what we are doing in this sense—

Moderator. Oh?

Mr. PHILLIPS.—that for the last 10 years the federal government has proliferated dozens of categorical programs, a number of which you just cited. And what we have done is send layer after layer of programs to be dealt with by state and local officials. And listen to the Governors; listen to the Mayors. They may not agree with particular decisions which have been made. They have constituencies which are urging them to protest this decision and that decision, but one thing on which they will agree—and I think you'd agree with this, Lou—is that they've had an abundance of categorical programs, the programs have been overlapping, one program has gotten in the way of another, and that federal funds have been expended largely on the ability of the kind of grantsmanship a state or local government can develop, rather than on the real need which may exist.

The President's whole philosophy is that you can't decide this kind of question in Washington. You can't send out these dozens and scores of grants and have them make any sense in dealing with the public problem.

It makes far more sense through the revenue sharing approach to put this money in the hands of state and local officials and let them, in a manner accountable to people at the local level, determine what the priorities in that state or that city are.

Reasonable men can disagree over that, but that's the rationale behind the President's decision.

Voice. Can we talk about legal services for a minute?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I'd be happy to.

Voice. It seems the one point upon, if you just take the budget and the statements made by you and by the Senators, is that the Nixon Administration and the Democratic

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

opposition agree is that there should be a legal services corporation of some kind.

Now, again, I have two questions for you. One is:

If the Nixon Administration really wants this legal services corporation, considering it's February, and we all know that Congress is a very deliberative body—why don't they have the bill up there? Which is a technical question and maybe you don't even know the answer to.

The other is your contention that these lawyers are engaging mostly in—or many—many of them are engaging in political action and not representing their clients; that they are doing things that benefit the lawyers.

After we talked last week I dug out that thing from the American Bar Association, the Chairman of their Committee on Legal Aid and Indigents wrote that the professional record of legal service lawyers has been exemplary. This record, far from showing these lawyers have been irresponsible, or unresponsive to their clients' needs, show that they have vigorously in the preponderance of cases, successfully represented their indigent clients.

Are you saying that that's not true? And if it is true, why are you so critical of legal services?

Mr. PHILLIPS. We just have one or two minutes left to respond.

Let me simply say that the corporation issue—whether or not there should be a corporation—is not the real issue. I am committed to seeing enacted the kind of corporation which the President will propose. And I hope that we'll be able to send the bill to the Congress in the very near future.

The real issue in legal services is whether the program will be one which seeks to achieve equal access to justice for the poor—a concept which I strongly favor—on the one hand; or, on the other hand, it will be a program which seeks to achieve law reform in a manner defined not necessarily by the clients but by the legal services' attorney.

The way legal services have been delivered, by and large, in a system of noncompetition, has produced a result where the client doesn't have as much power as he should have over the kind of case which is brought. Some of the regulations in the program have encouraged legal services' attorneys to organize groups, to get involved in lobbying activities, to reach the conclusion that it's inefficient to represent individual clients, but that the real need to help poor people is to change the law, to change society.

It's my contention that changes in the law should be within the purview of the legislative branch of government, the executive branch, and in some cases of the courts through properly litigated cases.

It's not appropriate, in my opinion, for federally funded people to use the subsidy which they receive as a jumping-off point for organizing rent strikes.

Voice. How many of them have done this, though?

Mr. PHILLIPS. A great many, sir.

Voice. Do you think that *Crouse*(?) is wrong in what he's writing, then?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Well, I haven't studied Mr. Crouse's statement.

I know for a fact that legal services' attorneys have been politicizing institutions like prisons, like schools, like nursing homes, which in my opinion shouldn't be politicized.

Voice. Your own legal services division says that that represents less than one-half of one per cent of the cases, Mr. Phillips.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Well, I would point to you the rules and regulations governing the program, and hope that we can work closely with people in the area and develop a program which has as its main goal equal access to justice for poor people. That's a goal to which I am committed.

MODERATOR. Well, unfortunately, we can't carry this any further.

I would think everyone would certainly hope that the President's shift in emphasis and philosophy will work in the end to the benefit of the poor. And I suppose that we are going to have to sit and watch now for a while and see if indeed it does work.

## IS THIS REALLY WELFARE REFORM?

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1973, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare announced proposed regulations that would cut back and perhaps undermine the social services programs for the aged, blind, poor families with dependent children, and the disabled. I am very concerned by this action on the part of the administration, for it continues an obvious callous, indifferent attitude held toward the needy people of America. This attitude was demonstrated in President Nixon's recent nationwide radio address and message to Congress on human resources by a constant distortion of the social priorities of America.

The HEW regulations would cut back on social services in various ways. Perhaps the one regulation which will hurt the most is that private funds will no longer be figured in State shares to achieve Federal matching grants. This would be truly tragic, Mr. Speaker. Community organizations such as the United Fund and the United Way of America have long participated in aiding the disabled, poor, and unfortunate of our country. Last October I addressed the House and warned against this very proposal saying it was not Congress' intent to eliminate the public-private partnership. Mr. Elliot Richardson, then Secretary of HEW, wrote a letter in support of the public-private partnership, which I am including in the RECORD, in which he said: I am convinced that this kind of partnership between private donations and public agencies should be encouraged rather than discouraged.

To what do we owe the total, sudden reversal of this policy?

A new leadership at HEW under Secretary Caspar Weinberger has decided to eliminate abuse of the social service contracting provision. Certainly it is acknowledged that there are abuses within the operation of this program but that is no cause for blanket prohibition. Regulations can be proposed, examined, and tightened up, but to completely discontinue this program would not only be utterly disastrous to the needy involved, it would maim what is left of private charity and public philanthropy in this country today. Private funds are widely used in some States to support day-care programs. Thousands of children will be deprived of the guidance and attention they need in their formative years. The welfare rolls will swell in response to this proposed regulation. Mothers currently

working to support their families will be unable to continue in the work force without day care for their children and subsequently will file for public assistance.

The new proposals will also reduce the number of required services a State must provide. Child care, and counsel to those with alcoholic and drug addiction problems are clearly needed in today's society, yet it is likely they will go down the drain. Eligibility to receive social services will also be affected. Currently, former welfare recipients are entitled to receive social service help for 2 years after losing eligibility and potential welfare recipients within 5 years also are eligible for social services. This had the effect of keeping people off the welfare rolls and providing services their incomes could not afford. The HEW proposals cut back the periods to 3 months after and 6 months before eligibility. Mr. Speaker, the harsh realities of these arbitrary proposals is that thousands of people, especially children, will be denied the opportunities for good care, education, health services, and improved nutrition that are so crucial to their development.

Part of the proposals includes elimination of group eligibility which allows services to low income neighborhoods. This particular program has been especially beneficial for senior citizens under title XVI. I have long been a protector of our Nation's elderly. They are a resource which our Nation should be proud of. This ruinous proposal would resume the indifference with which our elderly were once treated. Wonderful programs such as meals on wheels and service centers for the elderly stimulate their lives to a degree only they can fully appreciate. But, once again, when priorities are formed, our senior citizens take a back seat.

These are only the highlights of the proposals—changes that are certainly reprehensible and inhumane. This is a further crippling of the welfare system, not reform. It appears that we in the United States continue to opt for stop-gap measures to clean up the welfare mess. Social services is in need of regulation, no one will deny this fact. But now the opposite extreme has been reached.

Last session, in the hasty drive to adjourn, a ceiling of \$2.5 billion was placed on social services contracting. This was a ceiling, however, and not a mandate to emasculate the program as the Department of HEW seems to think. This worthy program is being made one of many scapegoats for the austerity the President so staunchly desires. Mr. Speaker, it is time the double standard of welfare criticism was ended. The administration feels quite comfortable in chastizing the individual welfare seeker, severely punishing his incompetence while they lavishly subsidize large enterprises and special interest groups whose inefficiency boggles the imagination.

Millions of dollars are given away because of mismanagement. But when day-care centers, drug addiction and alcoholism counseling, mental retardation assistance, coordinated job training, and the elderly are mentioned, the cold, sharp

March 7, 1973

steel of the meat ax falls because of inefficiency. The situation is truly deplorable. All the emotion that the word welfare stirs up is being exploited by our supposed responsible leaders. The administration appears to be tiring of subsidizing the poor person who is living on the poverty line income or no income at all. Well, Mr. Speaker, many, many more people are tired of subsidizing inefficient conglomerates. Certainly it is time to stop deluding ourselves. Jean Jacques Rousseau warned:

Nature never deceives us, it is we who deceive ourselves.

We have learned, too late indeed, that the answer to curing society's ills did not lie in throwing money at them. Are we now to make the mistake of believing the answer is cutting, cutting and more cutting? I would hope not.

The welfare mess will never be solved by stopgap proposals. History has taught us that difficult lesson, although some have not learned it well. It is past time we realized wholesale reform is required. Federal assumption of all welfare costs is the most basic need and should be our ultimate goal. The provisions of H.R. 1 last session were a big step in this direction but after a conference committee was through, the bill emerged as a mere shadow of its former self. The Congress has been continually reluctant to take the initiative in reforming our welfare system. We have been the object of much criticism, deservedly so, for this practice. It is time we stopped dragging our proverbial heels. It is time we took a good, long, hard, responsible look at the welfare mess. We should not fall prey to the emotionalism that the word welfare brings with it and which the administration seeks to exploit. America has made great social progress in the last 40 years. Are we to turn this around by overreacting to the problems and adopting oppressive, shortsighted regulations such as those presented on February 16 by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare? I would hope not, Mr. Speaker. I urge all of my colleagues to examine the welfare issue in their States, the thousands of children, aged, handicapped, and disabled who will suffer tremendously if these HEW proposals are adopted. I also urge my colleagues to contact Secretary Weinberger concerning the tragic impact these changes will have. We must stop the tide from turning against social progress in America. Reform is timely, but austerity at the expense of human suffering never is.

I include the following letter:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mar. 6, 1973]

OCTOBER 13, 1972.

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,  
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As we have discussed, I am most concerned about the legislative history which has been made regarding use of donated private funds for social services matching under Title IV A of the Social Security Act. In its report on H.R. 1, the Senate Finance Committee directed HEW to issue regulations prohibiting the use of such funds for this purpose.

Having served as United Fund chairman in the past, I am convinced that this kind of partnership between private donations and

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

public agencies should be encouraged rather than discouraged, and I would strongly urge that the legislative history so far created on this point be modified.

United Fund representatives have indicated that their contributions to state social service agencies now amount to approximately \$17 million dollars per year, some 60% of which is being used for child care. They acknowledge that in a few cases, the social service agencies have in turn contracted with United Fund agencies to provide services which may be more directed toward United Fund priorities than the state social service plan priorities. They would be very much willing to accept the limitation that donated funds may be used for matching purposes only if the funds are spent for services in accordance with the state plans and not merely to provide for United Fund priorities.

I thank you for your key role in obtaining Congressional acceptance of the ceiling on social services spending as part of the general revenue sharing bill. With this provision, I am sure that we can now begin to obtain the necessary control over this important program. However, I believe a prohibition public-private partnership in this field would be a great mistake, and your assistance in correcting this point in the legislative history on H.R. 1 would be very much appreciated.

With best wishes,  
Sincerely,

ELLIOU L. RICHARDSON.

## AMNESTY

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the more emotional subjects resulting from the Vietnam period is the issue of amnesty. There is an obvious controversy inherent in this subject.

In my judgment, we must maintain necessary objectivity which in turn must be based on an appreciation of precedents in this field. A very objective, timely, and thoughtful commentary on this subject was a WBBM (CBS) radio, Chicago, Ill., editorial of February 13, 1973, with which I concur. I insert it into the RECORD since I believe it deserves thoughtful reading by my colleagues in the House:

## AMNESTY

Insofar as there have been relatively few cases of amnesty in all of American history, we find it easy to agree with President Nixon in his interpretation of the historical precedents for amnesty. Some critics of Mr. Nixon contend that President Lincoln was far more compassionate on the subject of amnesty. However, careful reading of the history of the Civil War era argues to the contrary—as does consideration of such facts concerning alleged draft dodgers in wars intervening years. Pardons and amnesties have been granted—true—but such actions have been taken after sentences had been completed.

We do not wish to prejudge anyone who has acted to avoid Viet Nam service. However, as our prisoners-of-war return home from their ordeal, we find it easier to turn our attention to them and to those who are returning from active military service. We think that Illinois Secretary of State Howlett hit the right note when he remarked in an address over the weekend that we should

turn our attention first to those who have served their country—to insure that they have jobs and return to normal civilian life. When that is accomplished, then, as Secretary Howlett suggested, we can turn our attention to those who—in the view of many—fled to avoid military service.

Without debating the agonizing question of Viet Nam *per se*, we think that the proper course for those who fled is to come back and face the music. In a nation and world which has difficulty defining honor, we think that such a course is truly the honorable one.

## GEOTHERMAL ENERGY

### HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is facing an energy crisis.

Early this year, we stood by helplessly as areas of this country became subservient to their dwindling fuel supplies. Schools shut down; homeowners could not hook up to gas lines; gas companies called in emergency supplies—all due to the energy crisis now at hand.

Scientists have testified that within 25 years, our energy needs will multiply by 600 percent. Yet, we have only a 10-year supply of oil and natural gas at the present rate of use.

The warnings of an impending energy disaster are now being displayed. But most of us promptly regard the problem as being beyond solution in contemporary America. Clearly we need to develop every possible source of energy to meet the crisis. One important possible answer to the energy crisis is the development of our geothermal resources.

John Chancellor, on his NBC nightly news program of February 19, 1973, presented a report partially filmed in the 43d District's Imperial Valley and partially in northern California's Geysers area, by California correspondent Don Oliver which examines the present state of geothermal development in the valley.

I have presented Mr. Oliver's report for the RECORD in hopes that others may realize the value of geothermal energy as one method of solving this crisis while continuing to preserve the environment.

The material follows:

#### CALIFORNIA'S GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES—I

Hot steam from deep in the earth . . . forced out of cracks in the ground under great pressure.

Geysers of boiling water . . . shooting into the air.

Interesting, unusual, even spectacular, but until lately, hardly thought to be useful.

This is the only place in the United States where underground steam is being used to produce electricity. It's north of San Francisco at a spot called the geysers. For ten years, they've been tapping the steam here—piping it out of deep wells—and into power plants.

The steam forces turbines to go around and creates electricity.

Some think that by 1975 the steam here will produce enough power for the whole city of San Francisco. Engineers say there are many other areas of geothermal energy that could produce as much or more power.

It's argued geothermal energy could produce 20 percent of the nation's power by the

year 2000—thus helping relieve the energy crisis.

There are obstacles.

**CALIFORNIA'S GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES—II**

Drilling for steam or boiling water is expensive and difficult.

Geothermal resources have been found mainly in scenic areas. The pipes and power plants are unsightly. There is noise associated with power production and some noxious gases released in the air.

Engineers say they can solve these problems. Environmentalists haven't been too worried so far because they don't see geothermal energy as much of a threat.

Oil companies, power companies and others are going right ahead—exploring—drilling—looking for geothermal energy.

They are being secretive about what they are finding. Within a couple of months the Federal government will release millions of acres for exploration and leasing. The competition for geothermal energy under this land is expected to be fierce.

Don Oliver, NBC News, in California's Imperial Valley.

Mr. Speaker, we must commit ourselves now to the goal of utilizing our geothermal resources to their fullest extent. The Federal land soon to be open for geothermal exploration must be thoroughly searched in hopes of discovering and implementing this method of relieving the energy crisis.

Some estimate that with the geothermal resources now mapped in southern California, the area could be supplied with energy for the next 50 years and beyond.

That figure alone should be encouragement to more seriously appraise geothermal resources as an alternative to halt the energy crisis.

Geothermal energy holds the promise of being environmentally the most acceptable source of energy, and also being lower in cost than any other sources. It behoves us to move for its early development.

**TERROR IN KHARTOUM**

**HON. JOHN E. HUNT**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 6, 1973*

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, another 60 hours of terror and death was blatantly exposed to the whole world last week in Khartoum by the so-called Black September movement.

The calculated, cold-blooded murders of U.S. Ambassador to the Sudan Cleo A. Noel and the outgoing Chargé, George G. Moore, along with Belgium Chargé Guy Eid, shocked the entire world.

I speak out now to offer my prayers and condolences to the families of the victims. Ambassador Noel had served his country before in Sudan. He knew the country and the people intimately. Moore was being recalled from the country he had served since 1969. He did not want to leave. It was at a party in his honor that the tragedy took place.

My words at this time are spoken from the heart. But they are words which are spoken needlessly. It is time for the world community to take firm steps to

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

see that terrorism, no matter what form it may take, is eliminated once and for all. Until action is taken the world community can only share some of the guilt.

Our words of sorrow and shock must be replaced with swift and firm action.

**HOWARD PHILLIPS, IN AN ABC-NEWS INTERVIEW, ANSWERS SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT THE WAR ON POVERTY**

**HON. LAMAR BAKER**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 6, 1973*

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, ABC-News recently interviewed Howard Phillips, Acting Director of OEO. Because of all of the misconceptions and misinformation about what is supposed to happen to the war on poverty, I feel that Mr. Phillips' statements and his answers to questions in this interview will be of interest to all of us.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert this interview transcript at this point in the RECORD. The interview follows:

**ABC-NEWS INTERVIEW OF HOWARD PHILLIPS**

Mr. PHILLIPS. The primary factor is that government should operate by consent of the governed. Unfortunately, in OEO and in some other agencies, money has been expended in a manner which is unaccountable to the control of the people through their elected representatives; people in Washington who haven't been able to be held to account have been dispensing large sums of money, often in an arbitrary fashion to people in cities and towns throughout the nation. And what the President is saying: that it's the elected official at the state and local level, the official who can be blamed for his failures and cheered for his successes, who should determine how federal funds should be expended.

He is also saying that it's not a wise policy to establish a separate bureaucracy for one element of the population. One of the underlying conceptual flaws on the "war on poverty" was the notion that poor people should be treated as a class apart with interests and aspirations separate from those of society as a whole. That's a denial of the tradition of individual liberty and individuality, which has characterized our main political thought since the beginning of this country. I believe that it's wrong to judge people on the basis of their collective identity rather than their individual identity. Yes, people who have less income than other people have special problems, and those problems should be addressed—and I would submit to you that the policies of the President are doing more for them than the policies of any other President—but it's wrong to say that poor people should be sustained in their poverty; that all poor people are the same. They're not. Poor people are as different as non-poor people. They have different aspirations, different abilities, different backgrounds, and the policies of the United States Government should be shaped to take into account those differences.

The policies of the government should be shaped to reinforce the kinds of values, the kinds of policies which will help people move out of poverty rather than stay in. I would submit that some of the activities that this agency has subsidized—the idea that you have to politicize the poor, the idea that you

*March 7, 1973*

have to politicize institutions in order to overcome poverty—are a faulty notion; that it does a disservice to the poor to claim that boycotts and disorders and demonstrations, and what-have-you, are a way of overcoming poverty. I don't believe that's the case.

If people want to demonstrate on their own time with their own funds, that's their privilege. But it's a violation of my civil liberties when government funds are used to subsidize private political activity in a manner which is unaccountable to the public.

QUESTION. All right. Let's get into the area of to what extent the war on poverty is continued in better-directed ways that you are talking about. And let me ask the question: Is it hearts and flowers, do you think, to say that war on poverty has ended, or the thrust of the national—you know, the thrust of this Administration is away from it? And I'm looking specifically for saying, "What is the ongoing thing?"

Mr. PHILLIPS. Essentially what is happening is that community action becomes a local option. Community action ceases to be a creature of the federal government. It is entirely up to local officials and state officials to determine whether community action is an effective way to overcome the problem of poverty.

The fact of the matter is that roughly 80 percent of the money that has been spent by the federal government in that way has been used not to help people get out of poverty, but to support a group of professionals in a poverty-industrial complex. It hasn't really been shown to be very effective in helping people overcome poverty.

In terms of the other programs that have been carried on by OEO, in the research and development area, for example, are experiments in the area of tuition vouchers and education are being transferred to the National Institute of Education at HEW. It is our feeling that this is a logical and a wise step. It makes very little sense to have people in a small agency, apart from the major institutions of society, deciding that which is to be researched and what shall be done with the results of research. It makes far more sense for the decision-makers who control large dollar figures in major bureaucracies to be able to direct the research in a manner that it becomes relevant to the decision-making process.

The same could be said of the decision to switch our child development experiments to the Office of Child Development at HEW. To switch our health projects to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The decision to transfer community economic development activities to the Office of Minority Business Enterprise at Commerce. I think these decisions make eminent good sense, not just for the public as a whole, not just governmentality, but in terms of making these programs more effective for the people that they are intended to serve.

QUESTION. You talk about the authority and the expenditure of funds to be on a local level to the extent that that is possible. I'm wondering if that isn't the reason it all gravitated to the federal level in the first place, because the locals weren't doing the job?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Well, I would deny the view held by some people that the people in Washington, because they happen to live in the D.C. area, happen to be wiser or smarter than the people who live in Peoria, in Chicago, or Los Angeles.

QUESTION. Was the job getting done?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I suggest to you that the job hasn't been done very well here; that there is a difference between policy executing and policy setting. And if we truly believe in the democratic process, then it's important to have policies set by elected officials. In the social program area, unlike, say the General Services Administration, where you're building buildings or carrying out policies, the

role of people in the Civil Service is not policy-executing, but policy-setting. Policy-setting should be done by people accountable to elective authority. Richard Nixon won a substantial mandate in the election in 1972. He stood for certain values in that election: the work ethic rather than the welfare ethic, for example. Yet there have been programs subsidized by this agency which have worked against the values in which Richard Nixon campaigned and was elected. And I think it's very sound, very proper, and very correct that decisions about values and policies should be in the hands of people at the local level.

In his 1971 State of the Union address, called "The New American Revolution," the President articulated his desire that we try to take advantage of the genius of the American people, the talent which exists in every section of this country, and that we develop new centers of power, not just in Washington but all over America so that the important decisions aren't just made in OEO or HEW, or even the Defense Department—although it's a little bit different there—but that the decisions are made to the greatest extent possible in the city halls and statehouses and the town halls.

QUESTION. So isn't the war on poverty continuing?

MR. PHILLIPS. The work of dealing with the problems of poverty in America has been substantially accelerated and rendered more effective under the presidency of Richard Nixon. The idea that the way to overcome poverty—the ideas to radicalize and politicize the poor—that idea has not been furthered in this Administration. We think that does a disservice to the poor and does a disservice to the nation as a whole.

#### CORNWALLIS FRUSTRATED AT DAN 192 YEARS AGO, FEBRUARY 15, 1781

#### HON. DAN DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

MR. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, in preparation for the American Bicentennial in 1976, a good deal of historical study and development is now being carried on in many quarters. This renewed emphasis on the historic beginnings of our Nation will be of immeasurable value to historians and students for many years to come.

Our people are gaining new interest in and indeed new insights into the significant contributions which were made by many in gaining our national freedom.

In the course of this reemphasis on the Revolutionary period, many interesting stories are gaining popular attention. All of this is very graphically told in a splendid article by Mr. Spurgeon Compton, editor of the South Boston News, South Boston, Va. The article entitled "Cornwallis Frustrated at Dan 192 Years Ago, February 15, 1781," calls attention to one of the lesser known but vitally important confrontations in the period before the American victory.

Mr. Compton is a student of American history and is in his own right a most outstanding citizen and leader in his community. In this article he has captured the significant facts of this engage-

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ment and I commend this to the reading of the Members of the House.

The article follows:

##### CORNWALLIS FRUSTRATED AT DAN 192 YEARS

Ago, FEB. 15, 1781

(By Spurgeon Compton)

While Virginia and the nation prepare to celebrate the Bicentennial of America's Independence in 1976, an anniversary of one event that assured independence for the United States passed this week with scant notice here in Halifax County, where it occurred.

Exactly 192 years ago today, February 15, 1781, Lord Cornwallis, at the head of the British army, rode up to the banks of the Dan River at Boyd's Ferry, now Riverdale, and stared across the swollen, impassable stream at the Continental Army of the South behind the breastworks on the north bank of the river and camped up the hill where South Boston's Ferry Street now runs.

What Lord Cornwallis actually saw, whether or not he knew it at the time, was the frustration of his last chance to win the Battle of the South in the Revolutionary War and the road that would henceforth lead to Yorktown and surrender by the British.

That chance had eluded Cornwallis in the darkening hours of the preceding day, when General Light Horse Harry Lee ended his rear-guard skirmishing with the British, swam his horses across the river, took his men across in boats, and then pulled the boats ashore.

The main body of the Continentals and militia, under the command of General Nathaniel Greene, had crossed safety in the boats at Boyd's Ferry and at Irwin's Ferry, three miles upstream.

Thus ended the famous "Retreat to the Dan," credited by most historian's as the turning point of the Revolutionary War in the South, with Greene's masterful maneuvering saving the South from complete domination by the Redcoats.

For things had been going badly for the American patriots in the South since 1779, when Georgia fell to Cornwallis. In the following May, Charleston surrendered, and Cornwallis soundly defeated the Continental Army at Camden, S.C., where Gen. Horatio Gates, then in command, fled the field in disgrace.

It was then that General Washington placed Greene in command of the shattered remnants of the Army of the South, and sent Light Horse Harry Lee's Legion to reinforce what was left of the Continentals and militia.

Two victories for the American cause, at Cowpens and Kings Mountain, were insignificant, for by this time, Cornwallis had been able to regroup his Army, swelling it with recruits, and was ready to move against Greene for a final, decisive battle. There is no doubt that such a battle would have resulted in victory for the British, giving them control of all of the Carolinas and Georgia, and possibly paving the way for the defeat of Washington's army.

At Salisbury, N.C., Greene was convinced that his ragged Army had no chance against the superbly-trained and equipped Redcoats. It was then that Greene's superior military genius was seen.

Sending a small force into South Carolina to hang upon Cornwallis' rear, cut off supplies and pick up stragglers, Greene began his retreat. Col. Edward Carrington, a native of Halifax County, was sent to Irwin's and Boyd's Ferry to collect boats for the crossing, and the Polish patriot, Kosciusko to construct fortifications on the north bank of the Dan and at Halifax.

A picked infantry unit and Lee's Legion were ordered to stay in front of Cornwallis and delay his march as much as possible without actually engaging in battle.

It was Cornwallis' conclusion that Greene

would swing his army to the west, crossing the Dan at its shallow fords there rather than attempt a crossing of the swollen river downstream. Lee gave credence to this belief by maneuvering his Legion westward, screening Greene's movement by continued sniping and skirmishing.

Meantime, Greene was marching his army as straight as the crow flies, along the old stage route from Guilford Courthouse to Boyd's Ferry. The eighty-odd miles was covered in three days of marching by a ragged, barefoot army that often left bloody footprints in the February mud.

Greene's Army successfully crossed the rising Dan on February 14 at Irwin's and Boyd's Ferry and at dusk on the same day, Lee broke off his skirmishing with the British in the vicinity of Turbeville, skirted Irwin's Ferry to determine that the main army had crossed there, and trotted on to Boyd's Ferry, to cross the river in the gathering darkness.

Cornwallis camped at Boyd's Ferry on February 15 and 16, and on February 17, turned his exhausted army back toward Guilford Courthouse. In pursuing Greene, he had burned his baggage and destroyed the run ration in an attempt to gain speed and overtake Greene for the final battle.

Greene, on the other hand, had been able to move his supplies safely across the river in the boats provided by Col. Carrington. While Greene rested briefly, picked up supplies and recruits, Lee's Legion immediately recrossed the Dan and continued to harass Cornwallis.

When the battle between Greene's strengthened forces and Cornwallis was finally enjoined at Guilford Courthouse, the British claimed victory. It was a victory that cost so much in men, especially British officers, and so exhausted Cornwallis' supplies that he was never again able to mount an effective offense.

From there on, Cornwallis moved toward his inevitable date with destiny at Yorktown on October 19, 1781.

Today, 192 years later, only a highway marker on Route 58 recalls this turning point of the Revolution. There is no battlefield park, no monument to mark the famous river crossing. But it will receive the attention of historians as the Bicentennial approaches.

#### RESTRICTIVE REGISTRATION LAWS: THREAT TO THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS, THE POOR, AND MINORITIES

#### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

MR. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, I introduced the "National Voter Registration Rights Act of 1973." Joining me in launching this proposal were a bipartisan coalition of over 30 other Members of Congress from across the country, a number of States attorneys general, civic and social organizations, and other concerned individuals.

It represents the most comprehensive overhaul of registration and voting for Federal elections ever offered in the House of Representatives.

My decision to place this proposal before my colleagues, the people of New York and the Nation was based on careful research aimed at discovering causes and solutions to the grim trend toward nonparticipation and voter disenfranchisement in America.

The conversations and correspondence my staff and I have had in every State in the Union with concerned citizens, election officials, lawmakers and legal minds such as former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark, States attorneys general, authors and educators, such as Prof. Penn Kimball, led me to a clear conclusion. This conclusion was that, although the general political climate of the Nation played a significant role in this nonparticipation, the administrative and legal obstacles to registration and voting also played a tremendous role in this dangerous trend.

In New York City alone, there were estimates that as many as 130,000 registered voters were disenfranchised by these kinds of obstacles, with thousands more unable to register.

Dave Dinkins, as president of the New York City Board of Elections, has waged a courageous battle to reform these procedures. But in New York, as in almost every other State in the Union, laws have not changed to meet the demand of an America in the 1970's.

#### THE REGISTRATION RIGHTS ACT

This is why I have introduced the "National Voter Registration Rights Act of 1973." This bill will create a system of national registration for Federal elections.

The system would be coordinated by a new registration agency in the Bureau of the Census. It would enable eligible individuals to be registered in their precinct by this agency through information the individual sends the agency by mail on a postcard.

Under this bill the role of the Federal voter registration agency would be to constructively augment local registration systems. Grants would be available to reimburse State expenses for the basic part of the program, as well as grants to encourage States and local jurisdictions to modernize and bolster their own systems.

All local governments would be required to open registration for most of the year, and generally make greater efforts to insure that all of their citizens have freer access to registration and voting. One of the ways included in the bill is the requirement that handicapped, but otherwise eligible, voters be assisted in registering and voting.

If this plan is implemented, I believe that approximately 90 percent of potentially eligible American voters will be registered by the next presidential election, with a minimum of 75 percent registration in any one State. When this minimum is achieved and sustained for at least 4 years, the national agency can devote itself to the overall improvement of our electoral process.

#### TIME FOR CHANGE

Action by Congress is long overdue to abolish the "survival of the fittest" registration procedures being practiced all across the Nation. The political parties, candidates, and civic organizations that expend so much time, money, and effort attempting to register individuals should be dedicating themselves to voter education drives and raising the standard of political dialog. By enacting the program that I have set forth, Congress can see to it that this will be possible.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### THE NATIONAL PICTURE

Nationally in 1960, 64 percent of those eligible to vote in that exciting presidential election actually voted. In 1968, another election that was closely contested, the figure dropped to 60.6 percent.

In last November's presidential election, the figure dropped to less than a dismal 55 percent.

Local elections across the country are far worse. Recently, 4.4 percent of the eligible voters turned out for local elections in Oklahoma City, Okla. In Dallas, Tex., there was a 9.1-percent turnout.

This rapidly developing phenomena of political nonparticipation is threatening to destroy our society as we now know it, even faster than pollution or inflation.

However, this problem as an area of concern is far from new. In 1963, President Kennedy's Commission on Registration and Voter Participation reported:

Restrictive legal and administrative procedures for registration and voting are a major reason for low participation.

The Commission described these procedures as, "unreasonable, unfair and outmoded" and said they, "disenfranchised millions." Since 1963, the situation has gotten worse—not better.

#### RESEARCH TELLS THE STORY

In 1960, Stanley Kelley, Jr., and associates analyzed the rates of registration in 104 of the Nation's largest cities. Prof. Penn Kimball, in his book, "The Disconnected," reports on their findings:

They (Kelley and associates) discovered in statistical tests of twelve variables possibly affecting registration in the one hundred four cities under study that the most significant relationship of all was between the percentage of the population of voting age that is registered and the date which the registration rolls are closed.

Idaho, which keeps its rolls open until the Saturday night before the election, had approximately 90 percent of its eligible citizens registered to vote in the last election. This is extremely significant when we consider that 80 percent of persons who register—do vote.

Professor Kimball of Columbia University, the League of Women Voters, the National Urban League, Frontlash, Richard Scammon, director of the Elections Research Center, and many other organizations and individuals who have made registration studies and reports also cite the effect of registration on voting statistics.

#### PROGRESS CAN BE MADE

The past decade saw the passage of laws that began to liberalize registration procedures. The Voting Rights Act of 1965, applying mainly to Southern States, abolished literacy tests and assigned Federal examiners to areas with low registration and voting turnout. This had an astounding effect on registration, especially among minority peoples.

In Mississippi, black registration jumped from 6.7 percent of blacks potentially eligible in 1965 to 59.8 percent in 1967. In Alabama, the increase was from 19.3 to 51.6 percent. Progressive advancements in registration laws and procedures can clearly bring nonvoters into our participatory process.

For most Americans, the primary contact with government and politics is registration and voting. We must en-

March 7, 1973

deavor in every way to make this contact as trouble-free as possible. Only then can we begin to develop a progressive and participating electorate; a goal and hope in which I believe we all should share.

## LITHUANIAN FREEDOM

### HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, Friday, the 18th of February 1973, marked the 55th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania. On that day the Lithuanian Council of Miami assembled and unanimously adopted and passed a resolution requesting the U.S. Government to continue in its stance of non-recognition of the incorporation of Lithuania and the other Baltic States into the Soviet Union. I support these efforts. I also commend the courage of 17,000 Lithuanian Catholics in Lithuania who recently petitioned the Secretary General of the United Nations, Kurt Waldheim, charging the Soviets with religious persecution.

The plight of the Lithuanian people and of all those trapped behind the Iron Curtain deserves considerable attention at the upcoming European Security Conference. I would urge that our delegates to the conference initiate talks on this matter.

I would like to affirm my support for the cause of the Lithuanians and for any and all persons striving for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that at this point the text of the resolution adopted by the Lithuanian Council be included in the RECORD:

#### RESOLUTION

We, Lithuanian Americans of Miami, Florida, assembled this 18th day of February, 1973, at the Lithuanian American Citizens Club, 3655 N.W. 34th St., Miami, to commemorate the 55th anniversary of the restoration of independence to the more than 700 year old Lithuanian state, have hereby unanimously adopted and passed the following resolution:

Whereas, on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian nation proclaimed the restoration of its independence as a free democratic republic which was won and secured by the bloody sacrifice of the Lithuanian people during 1919-20, and which was subsequently recognized by the international community; and

Whereas, on June 15, 1940, the Russians forcibly occupied and illegally annexed the independent Republic of Lithuania and maintain illegal and overlordship in Lithuania to this very day; and

Whereas, the Russian invaders are unable to suppress the aspirations of the Lithuanian people for freedom and the exercise of their right of self-determination, as most strikingly demonstrated by riots in Kaunas on May 18, 1972, following the funeral of a Lithuanian youth, Romas Kalanta, who had immolated himself in a public square in Kaunas in a dramatic protest against the Russian enslavement of Lithuania and by a petition to the Secretary General of the United Nations, Kurt Waldheim, signed by 17,000 Lithuanian Catholics in the occupied country charging the Soviets with religious persecution; now, therefore be it resolved

That we express our sincerest gratitude to the Administration and Congress of the

United States of America for the continued nonrecognition of the incorporation of Lithuania and the other Baltic States into the Soviet Union;

That we again demand that the Soviet Union withdraw its military forces and administrative apparatus from Lithuania, thus permitting the Lithuanian people to freely exercise their sovereign rights;

That we request the President of the United States of America to instruct his delegation at the European Security Conference in Helsinki to demand the restoration to the Lithuanian people of independence and self-government in their own land; and

That copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the U.S. Senators and Congressmen from our State, and to the press.

#### DRUG ABUSE

### HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, the military has for some time expressed great concern about drug abuse and addiction among members of the Armed Forces. Efforts to bring the dangers of drugs to the attention of its personnel have been accelerated in recent years.

An outstanding example of the drug-abuse campaign was recently brought to my attention; an article published in the Fall 1972 edition of *Fathom*, a journal of surface ship and submarine safety. The article was written by R. T. Forbush, of the Norfolk Naval Safety Center. I insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

#### CHAINED

(By R. T. Forbush)

(NOTE.—During the past 8 months, the author has had numerous meetings with Detective Lieutenant Lewis W. Hurst, Head, Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs Squad, Norfolk, Va. Police Department. What follows is a true account of how the lives of two young men were tragically affected by drug addiction. The main locale of this story is the Tidewater area of Virginia. However, the events could just as easily have taken place anywhere. If you are presently on drugs, thinking about experimenting with them, or are a parent, then read this article—it's meant for you.)

A few months ago, a young man entered a men's lavatory in an establishment located in Norfolk, Va. Once inside, he walked to the washbasin and went through the ritual of preparing a hit. When it was ready, he drew the contents into a syringe and injected the needle into his arm. As he was working the heroin into his bloodstream, he fell to the floor dead. His drug-laden body could take no more, and his heart just stopped beating. He was no longer chained to narcotics.

Lieutenant Hurst estimates there are 4,000 drug addicts residing in the Tidewater area. His squad has personally interviewed and identified nearly 1,300 of them by visually inspecting addiction wounds of their arms, hands and legs.

Last year in Norfolk 12 people, most of them young, died following an overdose of heroin. Another 92 were hospitalized for the same reason and 121 addicts attempted suicide. Of the 771 arrests made by the Norfolk Narcotics Squad in 1971, 290 involved the sale of illegal drugs, 475 the possession of illegal drugs, and six, the forgery of doctors' prescriptions. There were 153 more drug arrests in 1971 than in 1970.

It would be great to report that no navy-

### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

men or women, or their dependents, were among those arrested for the sale or possession of drugs but, unfortunately, this isn't the case. Drug abuse is as much a problem in the Navy as it is in the civilian community.

I'd like to tell you about another young man, who, prior to enlisting in the military, was a Navy dependent. He became addicted to heroin. What happened to him is typical of what happens to a good many drug addicts.

I have known this young man, whom I'll call Don, since he was born. During his early years he was like most other boys his age—active in Boy Scouts, little league baseball, and the like. He was intelligent, personable, and well-liked by those who knew him.

However, things began to change as Don neared his 15th birthday. He made it known to his parents that he resented their discipline. In fact, it was soon evident that he resented authority of any kind. His grades in high school began to deteriorate; he barely managed to pass. At 16, Don was involved in a couple of minor altercations with the local police whom he disliked intensely because of, in his own words, "their browbeating tactics."

It's hard to believe that this teenager's parents couldn't see he was headed for serious trouble. Had they sought help for him at that time, it's unlikely he'd be where he is today. However, they didn't. The following year his father was transferred to the Tidewater area for duty, and the family took up residence there.

Things settled down for a while and it looked like Don, now 17, was going to overcome his problems. It didn't last. Within 6 months he took to drinking, and on several occasions became intoxicated. His parents had to bail him out of jail twice for being drunk in public.

On his 18th birthday, Don announced he was leaving home. His parents tried to talk him out of it, but it was to no avail. He took to the open road to "do his own thing" and led a hippie existence for several months. Surprisingly, the following summer he returned home and told his parents he would like to return to high school and get his diploma—which he did.

After graduation Don enlisted in the military and headed for recruit training. He received excellent grades on the tests administered by the training center and as a result, was assigned to the schools command of his choice. Don told me later that this is where his drug addiction problem began.

He stated that marijuana and hard narcotics were easy to purchase at his base. Starting with marijuana, he rapidly progressed to heroin. In a matter of 6 weeks he was a graduate junkie.

Twice Don went AWOL from his unit, but each time he voluntarily returned. On the second occasion he was sent before a disciplinary board which recommended that he be given a less than honorable discharge. This was approved by higher authority, and Don was discharged. His parents were unaware that he had been discharged under less than honorable conditions because of drug addiction.

Back home again, he was a changed young man. The brashness and disrespect for authority were replaced by a complete serenity. He talked to his parents of the wrongs done by mankind to mankind. There seemed to be an aura of religion about him. He had stopped smoking and drinking.

Don got a job, and his parents were convinced he was leading a normal life. How wrong they were. Don was as much a junkie now as he was before. He was careful not to alert his parents, however. He took his fixes away from home.

In the summer of 1971, Don came down with a serious case of hepatitis. His father took him to a veteran's hospital for treatment. Several days later he was released because his less than honorable discharge

didn't entitle him to veteran's benefits. Unfortunately, the medical authorities didn't tell his parents that hepatitis can be a definite clue to narcotics addiction.

Don didn't know it, but he was now under surveillance by an undercover agent of the Norfolk Narcotics Squad. He was to be arrested on two counts of selling and possessing drugs. However, before the arrest could be made, Don decided to visit a friend who was going to college in the western part of the state.

The two friends did the drug bit together for a few weeks. In their midst was an undercover agent attached to the state police. As soon as he had sufficient evidence, both were arrested and charged with three counts of selling and possessing narcotics. Don was tried, convicted, and sentenced to 10 years in prison. For him the world of fantasy had ended.

After the conclusion of these first trials, Lt. Hurst picked Don up and returned him to Norfolk to stand trial on similar charges pending against him here. Because of mitigating circumstances, which I won't go into, the Commonwealth's attorney decided not to prosecute. Don was sent to Richmond and is now in prison serving his sentence.

Why did this young man end up in prison? Was it his fault alone? How about the vermin who make drugs available and profit from their sale? Knowing how widespread drug abuse is, why didn't Don's family take the time to learn the signs of drug addiction? Is our society uniting to help the police and others who are trying to stamp out the sale and use of illegal drugs? Is enough being done to promote drug education? Are our rehabilitation facilities adequate? I'll let you answer each of these questions for yourself.

No segment of our society is free from the evils of narcotics and dangerous drugs. Drug addicts can be counted among the rich and the poor. We have them in our Navy. In larger cities throughout the United States, drug addicts account for more than 50 percent of the crimes committed. Every taxpayer in the country pays his share of the drug abuse cost.

But, in the final analysis, the one who pays the greatest penalty is the drug addict himself. Besides his freedom, Don has lost the right to vote; the right to run for public office; the chance to be a licensed doctor, dentist, C.P.A., engineer, lawyer, architect, osteopath, pharmacist, schoolteacher, and/or stockbroker. He can never get a job where he has to be licensed or bonded. He can't work for the city, county or Federal Government. Anyone convicted of a felony has to live with it all of his life unless he receives a pardon from the governor of the state. And, believe me, these aren't being handled out in large batches.

Don is somewhat luckier than the young man discussed at the beginning of this article. Someday, he will have a second chance to make something of himself. Only time will tell what it will be. I can assure you that his parents will be standing by to give him all the love and understanding he will need to start his life anew. How can I be sure of that? Don is my son.

(Our thanks to Lt. Lewis Hurst for allowing his name to be used in the article, and for providing photos and statistical data concerning drug abuse in Norfolk, Va.—Ed.)

### FREEDOM OF EMIGRATION

### HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, recently the Communications Workers of America issued a hard-hitting, thoughtful state-

ment expressing their strong opposition to the Soviet education head tax.

This statement includes much information of interest to the 270 cosponsors of H.R. 3910 which Chairman MILLS and I introduced.

#### HEAD TAX ON SOVIET JEWS

(Statement by Executive Board of Communications Workers of America)

The Soviet Union, since August 3, 1972, has been imposing a head tax on Russian Jews who seek to emigrate to Israel.

The amount of the tax ranges from \$5,000 to \$37,000, depending on the amount of education completed, on each Jew granted a visa to leave the country. The schedule of fees is carefully calculated with \$5,000 per visa for those who have not finished high school, \$6,600 for those with a high school diploma, and ranging up to \$37,000 for holders of the equivalent of an American Ph.D. It would take most Soviet citizens at least 10 years to save the necessary funds for even the lower head taxes, based on an average Russian worker's income of 140 rubles a month.

There is no doubt that this oppressive new Communist edict is specifically directed against Soviet Jews and particularly against educated ones. Jews make up the largest and most vocal minority group who have expressed a desire to leave Communist Russia. In addition, they are the most highly educated of the ethnic minorities in the USSR. Eighty-five percent of the adult Jews in the USSR have received at least a high school education. Current official figures show also that only 3.15 percent of the Jewish population are university students, when it is well known that Jewish cultural emphasis is on higher education.

Ironically, the head tax levied on the Russian Jewish community violates the Soviet Constitution, which specifically grants Russian citizens the right of emigration.

Also, this tax is in conflict with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights passed in December, 1948 by the U.N. General Assembly with the affirmative vote of the USSR. The Declaration expresses in Article 13 the right of everyone "to leave any country including his own, and to return to his country." The Declaration also expresses in Article 14 the right of everyone "to seek and enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution." Article 15 affirms the universal right to change one's nationality.

The Soviet government's bigotry strikes out at Jews in jobs, housing, education and activities of every kind. Synagogues have been arbitrarily closed down in community after community for the past 30 years. Fifteen years ago, in 1957, there were 450 synagogues; in April of 1963, almost 10 years ago, 100; and today the figure has dwindled to less than 60 synagogues which remain to serve a population of 3 million. This total compares with 120 synagogues in Chicago, which serve a Jewish population of only 200,000. Moreover, those who do attend synagogues in the Soviet Union are intimidated by agents of the KGB, the dreaded communist secret police.

The study of Hebrew is systematically and forcefully discouraged in the USSR. Although the 3 million Soviet Jews represent one of the two largest Jewish communities in the world, the last Hebrew-language book published in the Soviet Union was published in 1928. Recently, Moscow's only Hebrew teacher was imprisoned on vague charges of "hooliganism."

Judaism is not even permitted any central or coordinated structure, unlike the other 10 recognized religions in the USSR. The publication of religious literature and the manufacture of religious articles for Jews are prohibited.

It is indeed a tragic irony that the Soviet government will not let its Jewish citizens

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

live in peace, as productive citizens of their country, yet at the same time refuses to permit them to find peace in other countries which have indicated a willingness to accept them as emigrants.

The United States itself is a nation founded and populated by the refugees of an earlier era. We or our forefathers were all emigrants from somewhere. Our commitment to the cause of aiding those who flee repression and persecution is inscribed on the base of the Statue of Liberty.

The Communications Workers of America has always held that it is unconscionable to place price tags on human freedom. We condemn this reprehensible form of extortion practiced by the Russian government.

We urge the Soviet Union to allow all members of its Jewish community and other members of minority groups and all other citizens who desire to leave to emigrate to the land of their choice, in accordance with national and international law.

## ANNIVERSARY OF ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE PROCLAMATION

### HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 5, 1973

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, February 24, 1973, marked the 55th anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of Estonia. The Estonian-American organization deserves our support in commemorating this anniversary.

Although Estonia has been a captive nation behind the Iron Curtain for many years, the light of freedom still burns in that country. This light is demonstrated in the following resolution adopted by the Lakewood, N.J., Estonian Association, Inc., and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The text of the resolution follows:

#### RESOLUTION

We, Americans of Estonian ancestry, gathered on the 24th day of February 1973 at the Estonian House in Jackson, New Jersey to observe the 55th anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of Estonia, and mindful of the fact that the homeland of our forefathers is still oppressed and suffering under the totalitarian rule of Soviet Russia, declare the following:

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the peoples of Estonia and the other Baltic countries of Latvia and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Soviet Russia; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of the Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence:

Now, therefore be it

Resolved, that we Americans of Estonian descent reaffirm our adherence to the principles for which the United States stands and pledge our support to the President and the Congress to achieve lasting peace, freedom, and justice in the world; also be it

Resolved, that we urge the President of the United States, in fulfillment of the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 416 unanimously adopted by the Eighty-Ninth Congress, to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums to the de-

March 7, 1973

nial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; also be it

Resolved, that the United States delegation to the proposed Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe seek the inclusion on the agenda of the Conference the question of freer movement of people, ideas, and information and the application of the principle of self-determination in the Soviet controlled territories in East-Central Europe; also be it

Resolved, that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty seek ways to initiate broadcasts on a regular basis, in the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian languages; also be it

Resolved, that the President request that all maps published by the United States governmental agencies delineate the Baltic States in their original boundaries, with a footnote explaining that their military occupation and forced incorporation into the Soviet Union has never been recognized by the United States; also be it

Resolved, that the Secretary of State produce "Background Notes" on the Baltic States as a source of information for federal agencies, educators, schools, librarians and general public, and that all U.S. Government publications and lists of the nations of the world include the names of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania as separate entities; also be it

Resolved, that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, the U.S. Senators of New Jersey, the Representatives of the Third and Sixth Congressional Districts of New Jersey, and the area press.

## WHAT IS RIGHT ABOUT AMERICA?

### HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, at the dedication of the New York Monument at Andersonville, Ga., the statement was made by Commissioner McKenzie, of New York City, as I remember reading the narrative, that that occasion marked the happiest day of his life. For, he related:

When I was released from Andersonville Prison, caught a train at Millen to Savannah and a ship from Savannah to New York, I thought surely "this was the best hour of my life."

But he went on to say that the dedication day of that year, in 1916, surpassed that earlier day so many years before, because in his words, in a land of free speech, free religion and one country—

We are all now comrades and friends and live in the finest country upon which the sun has ever shone.

It still is—as illustrated by Terri Kay Finley, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Alex V. Finley, Jr., of Columbus, Ga. A lovely finalist in the Miss Georgia teenage pageant this year, Terri wrote an essay entitled, "What Is Right About America?" and I would like to share that essay with my colleagues.

#### WHAT IS RIGHT ABOUT AMERICA?

We are indeed fortunate to live in America where the rights of a free people was established when our forefathers wrote "The Bill of Rights," long ago. This assured every American equality and justice. It is the same

democratic government in our country today that upholds the rights of every American. Citizens in our society may live securely knowing that "the laws of the land" are written for the protection of all. Americans are able to speak freely on any legislation introduced by our government and have the right to support any representative in public office. Our country's foundation, a true democratic form of government is what is right about America.

Blackstone, in differentiating "natural liberty" from "civil liberty", wrote that an orderly society is introductory of liberty rather than being derogation thereof. I am glad many of our fine young people today are accentuating the positive as is so ably illustrated by my youthful constituent.

MR. ANTHONY PERSICO

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 10, I will be privileged to join with the Sons of Italy in New Hyde Park, N.Y., to honor one of its past venerables, Mr. Anthony Persico.

Tony Persico moved to New Hyde Park in 1953 and still lives there with his wife Fannie and his daughter Arlene. As a New Hyde Park resident he immediately became involved in community activities. He became a member of the New Hyde Park Council No. 2852 of the Knights of Columbus and served as its advocate from 1960 to 1967. He also served as a director and associate counsel of the Columbus Club of New Hyde Park, Inc. from 1964 to 1972.

In 1968 he became a charter member and assisted in the organization of Cellini Lodge No. 2206, Order of Sons of Italy in America and was elected orator on the first officers' council of that organization. After serving as assistant venerable in 1969, he was elected as venerable of the Cellini Lodge in 1970.

Anthony Persico belongs to the Notre Dame parish in New Hyde Park and has been a member of the Holy Name Society since he took up residency in our community. He is a member of the Sperandeo Brothers Post 1472, Kings County American Legion; New Hyde Park Council No. 2852 of the Knights of Columbus; Cellini Lodge No. 2206, Order Sons of Italy in America; Columbian Lawyers Association of Queens County, and the Queens County Bar Association.

During World War II he served in the Armed Forces of the United States with the infantry and military intelligence service. Upon his discharge from the Armed Forces in January 1946 he organized and obtained a charter for the Sperandeo Brothers Post 1472 American Legion, Department of New York, which organization he served as its first commander. Nine years thereafter, in 1955, he was elected as county commander of the Kings County American Legion, Department of New York.

For the past 18 years, in spite of being a resident of Nassau County, he has

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

served as vice chairman and ceremonial chairman for the Cypress Hills National Cemetery Pilgrimage Committee of the Kings County American Legion.

I am looking forward to joining with Tony's many friends in honoring him for his loyal and dedicated service to his community over the years and I am privileged to be able to bring his distinguished record to the attention of my colleagues in the House.

## VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. From across the Nation our young people—tomorrow's homemakers, businessmen, public officials, and community leaders—make some remarkable contributions to the country's store of patriotic thought and literature.

I was particularly impressed this year with the words of a young lady from my own congressional district—Miss Shawna Marie MacGregor of Grangeville, Idaho. I would like to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point for the benefit of my colleagues:

### MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

"The meaning of America flows from one pure source. Within the soul of America is the freedom of mind and spirit in man. Here alone are the open windows through which pours the sunlight of all the human spirit. Here alone human dignity is not a dream but a major accomplishment."

These words, of former President Herbert Hoover, made me realize that the spirit of freedom in America can be thought of as "sunlight."

For sunlight is the prime source of energy for plants and animals. Without sunlight all living things on our planet would starve.

Is not freedom a source of energy for every American? Without our cherished liberty would we not hunger for the privileges and happiness that we once had? Are we not just as dependent upon our rights, such as freedom of religion and freedom of speech, as plants and other animals are on sunlight?

My answer is "yes."

When a beam of pure light passes through a prism it is broken up into a rainbow band of colors called a spectrum. By using a prism we learn that white light is a mixture of many colors.

Our one pure source of light in America is freedom. We the people make up the United States, and each one of us is uniquely different. We form a wide "spectrum" of ideas, opinions, and racial colors. All of us together produce that one pure source of light "freedom."

When the sun's rays are reflected from raindrops, a rainbow appears. In a rainbow various colors are shown.

It takes both sunshine and a rainstorm to produce a rainbow.

In America the sun shines through in a variety of ways, free enterprise, democratic elections, community service organizations, and most of all our Bill of Rights and Constitution. However, we do have several "rainstorms" . . . The Vietnam War, racial prejudices, and economic and social difficulties.

A rainbow of opinions appears on how these problems should be solved.

But no matter how terrible a storm may be, it passes. The sun does shine, and finally, all the colors in the rainbow become one, once again.

So it is in America. For only in our country do we have the right to voice our opinions, no matter with whom they coincide or with whom they disagree. That is why our rainbow of opinions is so precious and vital to our way of life.

Former president Hoover stated that within the soul of America "are the open windows through which pours the sunlight of all the human spirit."

If the light of freedom is to warm us with its rays we must keep our windows open, clean, and bright.

Today many people have let their windows become dirty, covered with smoke. Because of this smoke everything appears to be soiled. These people cannot be warmed by the light of freedom.

Others have rose-tinted window glass. Because they do not face up to the realities of life they cannot reap its benefits.

Still others have put locks and bolts and boarded up their windows. They have become fed up with life and refuse to accept any new ideas. They want nothing to reach them.

The light of freedom shines equally from the minds of both men and women. It is this light that illuminates their interests and opinions without prejudice. The light of freedom is composed of love, support, and a willingness to defend one's countrymen from their enemies.

This light can be kept alive by "realizing" that with every right there is a responsibility, by "respecting" the rights of others, and by "responding" to the challenge of freedom.

My responsibility is to keep my window open, and clean, even in stormy weather, so that I can appreciate the brilliant colors of the rainbow and watch them once again merge into the unified light of freedom.

## POST OFFICE-FEDERAL BUILDING WORTH ITS PRICE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in a day when we quite often question justifiably where our Federal tax dollar is being spent and whether we are getting any value for our money, it is heartening to be able to pass along a note of optimism.

In Mansfield, Ohio, an \$8 million post office and Federal building complex was recently completed. The new facility is a welcome addition to the Mansfield area and an editorial which appeared in the Mansfield News-Journal points out the benefits of this project.

Like many of my colleagues, I have been receiving complaints relative to the operation of the Postal Service and it is good to know that improvements are being made. I would like to insert at this point the editorial which appeared in the News-Journal:

### POST OFFICE-FEDERAL BUILDING WORTH ITS PRICE

If you want to know what \$8 million looks like, drive past the new Mansfield Post Office and Federal Building at 200 North Diamond St. Then go through the building as some 500 persons did on Thursday afternoon and

as others will have an opportunity to do some evening or Sunday afternoon in the near future.

The site, covering 11 level acres, was selected by the former Post Office Department (now the U.S. Postal Service) with the assistance of General Services Administration. It has been the butt of some controversy. However, local residents were invited to submit site proposals before this one was chosen. Nobody could come up with at least nine level acres in the downtown area, which was the basic requirement, in any other spot.

And now that the structure is up, it surely does stand out as a major improvement in an area that had been slowly declining for years. New growth around the site can be expected as the postal facility swings into operation.

The postal facility will be headquarters for 67 associate post-offices with a total employment of more than 1,000 persons and an annual payroll of \$12 million.

Three hundred thirty-four postal employees will work in the Mansfield building; the payroll there will total \$3,500,000. About 200 million letters will be handled annually and local receipts will top \$3 million.

What these statistics and the functional design of the building add up to is an example of the efficiency which the U.S. Postal Service is seeking to build into its operations.

Automatic sorting machines next August will replace the present hand sorting of mail.

Customers can buy stamps and even determine the amount of postage needed for parcel post packages in a newly automated area in the long foyer.

The low clean-lined building is really two structures. Its southern wing will house federal offices with a separate parking area provided for employees and customers.

Already in the federal office wing are Selective Service, Internal Revenue Service, Labor Department, and Federal Bureau of Investigation. Scheduled to join them are the Agriculture Department and several others. Room for expansion of these departments is available.

To bring this project to fruition has required almost a decade. Long before a site could be chosen or a plan drawn it was necessary to make the proper political contacts in Washington. There was nothing irregular about this; it is an integral part of government operations whether people like to admit it or not. These alignments were completed first under the Johnson administration. Then, with Johnson's retirement, the whole process had to be done again, working with Republican officials. It was even necessary at one point to quash political efforts from outside this area which would have diverted the project to another site merely as a political and business favor.

Once the federal commitment was made, design and construction moved ahead with remarkable smoothness.

At the very center of all this was Mansfield's genial and modest Postmaster Ralph M. Hardy. Because of his position, Hardy resolutely refrained from any part in the political goings-on but he kept a conscientious eye on every detail of planning and progress.

It was with justifiable pride that he noted Thursday that local postal operations now will expand from their former cramped 34,000 square feet of space to 156,000 square feet of floor. Actually the building has three acres under roof and is expected to prove as Hardy said, "one of the best postal facilities in the country."

If you haven't taken a look at the facility since its completion, do so. Eight million dollars is a lot of money. Mansfield and the 67 communities to be served from the new postal building appear to have received every dollar's full worth.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### HOMESTEAD SPORTSMEN OBSERVE MILESTONE

#### HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

#### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, on February 17 the Homestead District Sportsmen's Association Inc., the first organized hunting and fishing oriented organization in America, observed a historic milestone. It celebrated the 50th anniversary of its founding as an active, aggressive group of people dedicated to solving the problems of conservation and ecology as well as to provide fraternity and recreation for its members.

The Homestead Association was formed in December 1923, through the efforts of Mr. Charles Hobson of Homestead, who along with Ross L. Leffler of McKeesport, Pa. and Colin Reed of Washington, Pa., recognized the need for a united organization to protect the interests of sportsmen in western Pennsylvania. This trio, meeting in Mr. Hobson's office, laid the foundation for the present county, State, and national sportsmen's organizations.

Mr. Hobson, unselfishly contributing his time, ability, and personal funds, selected the first locations throughout Allegheny County where local groups could be formed, then knitted together to form a countywide association. The first branch chapter was established in Homestead but within a few months representatives from 21 districts in the county met and put together the Allegheny County Sportsmen's League. Over the years, other communities and counties joined the league and finally in February 1932, the Pennsylvania Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs came into existence with Mr. Hobson as the vice president. In 1936 Mr. Hobson, Mr. Leffler and Mr. Reed saw the realization of their dreams with the creation of a national sportsmen's organization.

Although illness restricted the participation of Mr. Hobson in later years, he still retained a keen interest in the activities of sportsmen's groups. Mr. Leffler, however, went on to become president of the Pennsylvania Game Commission, and Mr. Reed the president of the Pennsylvania Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs.

The Homestead Association, the heart of the sprawling national organization, still is active today. Its members continue to instruct young Americans in the sport of hunting, the joys of the outdoors, the importance of conservation, and the vital need for effective ecological programs. Over the past 25 years the Homestead Association has been led by its current president, Mr. Andrew Schultz.

I take great pride in representing the birthplace of our sportsmen's organizations and bringing the accomplishments of the Homestead Association to the attention of my colleagues. I commend the efforts of its members and the men who led them: Mr. Schultz, president; Andrew Kovacs, vice president; Edward Cuttler, treasurer; Stanley S. Rakoski, secretary;

March 7, 1973

William Kovacs, delegate and the board of directors; Carlton Elrick, Charles Sidlauskas, Carl Cappasso, Lloyd L. Passmore, and Richard Allison.

Mr. Speaker, I extend to the Homestead District Sportsmen's Association, Inc., my congratulations upon its 50th anniversary and I wish the members many years of continued health, happiness, and good hunting.

#### JOHN BORLING DAY

#### HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

#### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, March 4, 1973, was "John Borling Day" in Riverdale, Ill., which is part of the Third Congressional District.

Capt. John Borling is a returning prisoner-of-war. He arrived back in Riverdale after 6 years of imprisonment in North Vietnam.

Mayor Selvig of Riverdale signed a proclamation in honor of the POW which reads as follows:

#### PROCLAMATION

Selvig's proclamation reads as follows:

"Whereas, Captain John Borling is a resident of the village of Riverdale and has recently been released as prisoner of war of the Viet Nam war; and

"Whereas, the president and board of trustees of the village of Riverdale, and the entire community, are deeply proud and honored to have Captain John Borling as a resident of said village; and

"Whereas, the entire community has a deep debt of gratitude to Captain Borling,

"Now, therefore, I, Robert C. Selvig, mayor of the village of Riverdale, on behalf of the board of trustees and the entire community, do hereby proclaim Sunday, March 4, 1973, as "John Borling Day" in the village of Riverdale and do hereby ask the entire village to honor him accordingly by flying their American flags on said date.

"The village clerk be and she is hereby authorized and directed to deliver a copy of this proclamation to Captain John Borling."

Captain Borling was honored in a parade at which over 4,000 area residents turned out to pay tribute to a great American.

During the official ceremonies I read a letter to Borling expressing the feeling of his fellow citizens for such courageous men who served their country so well.

The letter is as follows:

Capt. JOHN BORLING,  
Riverdale, Ill.

DEAR CAPTAIN BORLING: Our nation has been both proud and moved by the great sacrifices you and your fellow POW's have made for the benefit of this country during your captivity in Vietnam. We know that no words of praise nor honor bestowed upon you can adequately replace the years of your life spent in a foreign prison or give back the time away from home and family. But as your Congressman I want to express to you the deep feeling of gratitude the American people have felt by your courage.

While our country was in mourning over the deaths of two former Presidents, the return of our POW's became a cause for celebration. It was perhaps one of the greatest moments of joy the citizens of this nation have felt in many years.

On behalf of the State of Illinois and of the United States of America, I wish you both happiness and prosperity for the life you have yet to live. Welcome home.

With warmest regards,

ROBERT P. HANRAHAN,  
U.S. Congressman.

## HARNESSING THE TECHNOLOGY OF SPACE

### HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, this Nation's pressing domestic problems must be at the heart of our concern. Housing and pollution, crime, education and transportation are areas that require a firm national commitment on the part of all.

Richard F. Gamble is division president of United Aircraft Corp.'s Hamilton Standard Division, which is located in my hometown of Windsor Locks, Conn. On January 17, 1973, he spoke to the southern New England section of the Society of Automotive Engineers. His remarks suggest that the systems approach—with its long-range strategy, well-defined priorities and goal—which was most effective in sending man to the moon, would provide the best method of coping with our multifaceted domestic needs.

Mr. Gamble points out that this Nation can redirect its technological thrust. By harnessing the technology of space, he says, the efforts of the scientific and engineering communities could again be fully utilized with great benefit to the Nation as a whole.

Mr. Gamble's speech is an important one, and I am pleased to insert it in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY RICHARD F. GAMBLE, DIVISION PRESIDENT, HAMILTON STANDARD DIVISION OF UNITED AIRCRAFT CORP., BEFORE THE SOUTHERN NEW ENGLAND SECTION, THE SOCIETY OF AUTOMOTIVE ENGINEERS, JANUARY 17, 1973

On a Sunday night in the fall of '64, just a little over eight years ago, a crew-cut young Navy pilot arrived on a commercial flight at Bradley Field to take part in an event called Connecticut Aviation Week. Even though he was billed as guest of honor and was a new member of America's then-small corps of astronauts, his arrival couldn't have been heralded less. Only one man was on hand to bid him welcome and drive him to his hotel.

The outlook for the young astronaut's appearance at a luncheon the next day was rather grim. At the very hour he was to give his talk on the budding Apollo program at the Hartford Club, the campaigning Lyndon B. Johnson had scheduled an appearance in the portico of the Hartford Times building half-a-block down the street. Here was an unknown filer competing against the President of the United States. In fact, the astronaut said he wouldn't mind going down the street to see the President himself. All turned out well, however, every seat at the luncheon was filled, and he was roundly applauded when he spoke of the hopes and promises represented in the Apollo program's drive to put men on the moon.

The astronaut rounded out his day in Connecticut with visits to plants develop-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ing hardware that would be used on Apollo. He stopped at Pratt & Whitney Aircraft to look in on progress of the fuel cell powerplants, and at Hamilton Standard to see how it was going with the LM's environmental control system, the life-support backpacks for the moon walks, and the abort sensor assembly for lunar module's backup guidance system. At each stop he was photographed with people working on Apollo, and later he personally autographed each picture.

Those photos are something of a treasure today to the people who own them. The astronaut who signed them is Gene Cernan, no longer an unknown, and the recipient of a somewhat more rousing reception when he returned from the moon last month than when he landed at Bradley eight years ago. In those eight short years, Gene Cernan traversed the distance from promise to finale. As the last American to walk on the moon for the foreseeable future, Cernan ironically symbolizes how things have gone in this country in a very short time as regards science and technology, research and development.

As members of the engineering profession we are all too aware of the souring of America's love affair with technology. When Gene Cernan visited Connecticut in '74, technology was riding a wave of popularity. When he returned from America's last planned moon flight, technology, in the eyes of far too many people, and their legislators, had become a debt that needed to be exorcised.

Repeatedly the critics say it's wrong to spend money on the moon and space. They are apt to ask, "If we can send a man to the moon, why can't we . . .," leaving a blank which each and every critic fills in according to his own whims.

For our own good we should at least set straight such wobbly thinking in our own minds. The money that financed Apollo and our other space efforts was not, repeat not, spent on the moon. It was spent right here on earth, and, at one point in the build up—in 1966—Apollo provided employment for 400,000 persons working for prime and subcontractors, as well as NASA.

By the time Apollo 17 was launched last month, employment attributable to the program had plunged to 130,000—with more cuts in the offing.

Secondly, we can solve earth-bound problems, just as we solved the myriad problems of lofting men to our satellite, keeping them alive there, and bringing them home safely. But the scatter-shot approach now so much in evidence is the wrong path to follow. Apollo must set the example in this arena—it succeeded because it was a concerted, focused effort with a national commitment and adequate funding behind it. Although 20,000 contractors were involved, each had a well-mapped, detailed goal, all brought together in the ultimate application of the systems approach to a knotty problem.

In recent years there has been a general uproar nationwide over protecting the environment and solving the problems of air and water pollution, waste disposal, urban decay, and mass transportation. Unfortunately more passion than productive energy has been generated in this sphere. True, individual programs have been launched at national and state levels, and money is being spent. But the money is fragmented, not focused on a recognized, well-outlined goal. The search for solutions to domestic ills has not been pulled together, has not been precisely defined—everything is too nebulous, too general. A clearcut objective has not been laid down, and a systematic approach planned.

For too long the aerospace industry has been belabored with demands by the activists that it redirect itself, that it put its energies and talents to use on the social scene.

All too often, however, attempts by the

industry to redirect its technological thrust toward the pressing problems of the nation have run headlong into a harsh economic fact—there just isn't a market for this redirected effort. The industry is ready, but there are few buyers, and available money is being spread rather thin in the absence of a definitive national commitment.

If the verbiage written or spoke about the need for high-speed ground transportation in short-haul intercity markets were compiled, the volumes would probably stretch the length of the Northeast Corridor. Yet orders for Sikorsky Aircraft's proven Turbo-Train have been few and slow in coming. The Turbo-Train represents a commitment by Sikorsky's parent, United Aircraft, in one of the domestic problem areas we hear so much about. The corporation invested heavily in the new generation train, yet a respectable production order has yet to be made. This is just one close-to-home example. There are many others where companies found only fragile or nonexistent markets when they responded to urgencies that they do something to make things better in this country.

It's easy for activists to say to our industry, "change your ways," but without customers, it's pretty tough for a company to meet a payroll. Too much of our scientific and engineering talent has been dissipated already. Total aerospace employment is down about 40 percent since 1968, a startling drop in so short a time span. Closer to home, the Aerospace Industries Association projected last month that employment of scientists and engineers would continue to decline, hitting a level of about 157,000, compared to peak employment of 235,000 in 1967.

The sad fact is, that once a highly skilled engineer has departed a job in aerospace, it is unlikely he would be eager to return, if the opportunity presented itself. Ironically, so soon after the breakup of many of the advanced technology teams that gave us Apollo and world dominance in commercial air transports, the threat of a shortage of engineers—due to the drop in engineering enrollments in college—is appearing on the horizon. And who can blame a fresh-out-of-high school teenager for shunning training in a profession that has had more downs than ups in just a few years.

The amazing technological advances of the late 1950s and the '60s in transportation, both within and outside the atmosphere, in communications, medicine, materials, and even Space Age foods were the fruits of research and development. Today, unfortunately, that miracle producer known as R&D has been downgraded to the point where technological advance in the years ahead is threatened. Since 1966, the annual growth rate in government-supported R&D has slumped from nine percent to one percent. At the same time, non-federal R&D has held steady with a growth rate of nine to ten percent a year. Hardest hit by the fall off in R&D are basic research and highly advanced projects that traditionally were financed by the federal government. It seems to me we are sacrificing tomorrow's progress by today's shortsightedness.

This loss of momentum in digging out and developing technology for tomorrow endangers the nation's ability to meet the growing needs of the people here at home, as well as the competitive threats of technologically oriented countries in Europe and the Far East. Our once lush trade balances now glow with red ink. Aerospace exports, long a contributor of billions of dollars toward a positive trade balance, are threatened by competition from abroad. In 1972, for example, aerospace exports earned \$3.4 billion more than we spent on similar imports from overseas. As impressive as that sounds, it represents a drop of nearly seven percent from 1971.

Further threats to this plus in foreign trade already are airborne in the shape of the

Concorde SST and the A-300B airbus. Both projects are moving ahead under the thrust of financial support of the various European governments involved, particularly Britain, France, and Germany.

This country, on the other hand, responded to the scare tacticians, turned its back on the inevitable, and buried a supersonic transport that assuredly would have been a better competitor for airline equipment dollars than the Concorde. If the U.S. continues to abuse, rather than encourage, technical advance, we're doomed to see more and more instances where lost trade dollars are reflected in fewer jobs for our people.

The scientific and engineering communities and the aerospace industry, flush from years of high employment, good sales, and adulation by the public, were appalled by the shift in the public and Congressional mood that began in the late '60s. Venomous criticism replaced praise. Instead of being lauded for contributions to transportation, communications, and the exploration and utilization of space, our community was damned. The militants said technology either was responsible for fouling the world, or was guilty of gobbling up money that could be better used in other, more socially oriented, endeavors. They are demonstrably wrong, considering the great imbalance in spending for social welfare as opposed to advanced technology, but the public, the Congress, and state legislatures bought their message.

In truth, those who live by and for technology smugly felt the love affair would never end, and failed to communicate to the public all of the positive aspects of technology. The public didn't get the message that such down-to-earth benefits as patient monitoring devices, instant global TV, new power sources, better materials, to name a few, came to them courtesy of technical advance. The public took them for granted, at the same time building an antagonism toward technology.

Hopefully, we are beginning to turn the tide, at least as far as attitudes are concerned. We in industry, science, and engineering are speaking up, and not just in a defensive tone. Critics still abound, many of them in powerful and influential places, so we must continue to present our case in emphatic and positive terms.

On the national scene, there is coming into being a new arm of Congress that, also hopefully, will be a major instrument for weeding fact from fuzzy thinking as far as technology is concerned. That is the Office of Technology Assessment. As envisioned, the office will serve Congress by assessing the impact of new technology, weighing all sides of a question, much like a court, and then present its findings. It's job isn't to make recommendations one way or another, but to serve as an impartial source of information. If such an office had existed when continuation of the SST was battled in Congress, perhaps the supersonic transport wouldn't have been shot down amid a cloud of passionate, but often faulty, scientific and economic testimony.

Too much misinformation has been spread under the mantle of improving the quality of life. This is particularly true in that area I mentioned earlier, redirecting our technological thrust. The first thrust, however, must come at the executive and legislative levels of government. They must put it together in the form of a unified national commitment to attack, in an Apollo-like way, these domestic problems of housing, pollution, crime, education, transportation and waste disposal. A hard-nose, no-nonsense systems approach must be adopted. Unless this happens, the problems are bound to worsen. Long-range strategy, a well-defined goal, and priorities are essential.

Those who call for overnight solutions must be ignored. After all, Apollo, the most complex technological problem ever tackled,

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

took the better part of a decade to bear fruits. The domestic ills facing the U.S. are at least as complex, if not more so. Instant solutions are out of the question. And so are any solutions unless there is a unity of purpose and commitment—as well as adequate funding to create markets where few now exist.

I'm not advocating handouts. Competition in skill and cost at all contracting levels was the hallmark of Apollo. In that same way, the search for solutions to domestic problems must be carried out entirely within the framework of the free enterprise system.

Obviously not every national ill is open to technological solution, but many, such as pollution control, waste management, housing, and transportation are. First we must identify those areas showing promise or potential for solution through technology. Then we must adopt an R&D approach to explore promising concepts and develop the best systems to meet the national goal. Sociologists likely would disdain this idea. But since sociological approaches haven't been all that successful—as we can see in the continuing burgeoning problems—I think it's time the technologist is given a chance.

Beneficial fallout is inevitable. Serendipity abounded in the space program, why not on the domestic scene. One happy result could be returning technology itself from the outer reaches back to the ranks of the good guys. And if that happens, we're bound to see a resurgence in engineering school enrollment. With a clearly outlined national program to confront our problems on the frontiers of technology, young blood and new ideas will be drawn to science and engineering. The threatened shortage of such talent, happily, would be headed off—much to the benefit of this country.

What I have said may seem idealistic. But didn't Apollo have more than an aura of idealism when first proposed? In the end, it proved to be man's greatest technical conquest. Eight years ago when Gene Cernan visited Connecticut, he was asked why he wanted to go to the moon. He replied: "We have to begin somewhere. It gives us the crutch to go into space. It also will be used to prove out the systems and problems in the space program before we go deeper into space."

Man's personal stride into that space beyond the moon has been ruled out, at least for a while, assuredly not forever. If we must redirect, as Gene Cernan said, "We have to begin somewhere." That somewhere is a genuine national commitment to use technology to cure domestic problems that have defied solutions by other means.

## NIXON'S PRESIDENCY, EXPANSION OF POWER

### HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a series of articles appearing in the New York Times, beginning March 4, entitled "Nixon's Presidency, Expansion of Power." As we are all aware, the President seems to be pursuing a policy which will make the Executive office the strongest it has yet been—at the expense of the powers of Congress. This series of articles, written by John Herbers, puts this problem into a scholarly and historical context. Herbers quotes Thomas E. Cronin, a presidential scholar at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, as saying:

March 7, 1973

He (President Nixon) has systematically gone about trying to strengthen the Presidency in a great number of ways, frequently by circumventing the Constitution or expanding on past practices that were ambiguous or questionable.

Mr. Herbers takes the situation and conducts an excellent analysis, approaching it from angles that are very thought provoking.

Herbers first points out ideological shifts. Conservatives who have traditionally favored a strong Congress with a weakened Presidency and liberals who have looked to the Presidency as a means of achieving reforms in governmental policy at home and abroad are now, according to Herbers, advocating the reverse. Another irony that Herbers points out is that Mr. Nixon seems to be expanding the powers of his office to attain a more conservative period in which the Presidency and the National Government would play a lesser role.

Mr. Nixon promised a strong, active Presidency and he is achieving his goal. Herbers quotes Nixon's 1968 Radio Address as saying:

The days of a passive President belong to a simpler past . . . the next president must take an active view of his office. He must articulate the nation's values, define its goals and marshal its will. Under a Nixon Administration, the Presidency will be deeply involved in the entire sweep of the American public concern. The first responsibility of leadership is to gain mastery over events and to shape the future in the image of our hopes.

This is the kind of Presidency that liberal Democrats have been advocating for years but with more checks.

Much of his new power is accumulative, with trends that began during or after World War II. Herbers gives the example of the shift from treaties to executive agreements.

The President has usurped power in many areas. Herbers points out two of these areas which we will all agree are two of the most important. First, in foreign affairs, the President no longer follows the practice of advising and consulting Congress as in the past. The war powers are now viewed as so institutionalized in the executive branch that the American President is free to take military action on his own. This new practice has its roots in the precedents set by Mr. Johnson when he ordered the bombing of North Vietnam.

The second is in domestic affairs where Mr. Nixon is using his office to reverse some aspects of the growth of the national Government as the chief instrument for public policy and services.

Herbers also points out that Mr. Nixon is attempting to stop this trend by public persuasion—

By impounding funds that exceed his budget, by deciding which programs will be reduced or eliminated and by threatening to eliminate others if Congress does not turn back more authority to state and local governments.

Herbers goes on to say that in this regard—

He is going farther than any other President not involved in total war.

Herbers quotes Dr. Commager, author and historian, as saying:

He (Mr. Nixon) has usurped or aggrandized authority in almost every field. . . . Even in wartime the only thing comparable is the Civil War, which was a very special kind of war and therefore the kind of instantaneous action that Lincoln took was domestically required . . . there was no such broad-gauged and wide-fronted assault on the integrity of the constitutional system as we now have.

Apparently we cannot look to the Supreme Court for help in solving this Constitutional dilemma between the Executive office and Congress. Herbers points out that the Supreme Court traditionally stayed away from fights between the other two branches. Furthermore, there is a long tradition of Presidents making their own powers. Woodrow Wilson said:

The President is at liberty both in law and conscience to be as big a man as he can. His capacity will set the limits.

Mr. Nixon seems to take President Wilson at his word. The presidential assistants and supporters seem surprised that anyone is questioning his use of power. They insist that he is reacting to the mandate issued last November by the electorate.

This series of articles can give us a thoughtful perspective on this deep-rooted conflict between this branch of Government and the executive. If we are to hold the ground the President is bent on taking we must have a thorough understanding of the problem we face. I, therefore, commend this series which was too lengthy to include without cost in the Record, to my colleagues.

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

#### HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

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

A child asks: "Where is Daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?"

A wife wonders: "Is my husband alive or dead?" How long?

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

We must make every effort to alleviate their anguish by redoubling our search for the missing servicemen. Of the incalculable debt owed to them and

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

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?"

#### NEWSMEN'S PRIVILEGE

#### HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would insure the freedom of the mass media.

Thomas Jefferson, in 1787, stated:

The basis of our government being the opinion of the people, the very first object should be to keep that right; and were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter.

It is difficult to improve upon that statement, but I am going to explain why I believe Mr. Jefferson to be correct.

A free, unbridled press is essential to our society, and to our democracy.

Why? Because the people are the "rulers" in this Nation.

Ultimately, the people tell the Government what, when, how, and where to act. Some seem to have forgotten that we are a nation of, by, and for the people; but until we reject the principles on which this great country was founded, the people are the "kings" and those of us in elected office are the "servants."

And for the people to be fully informed on the activities of their Government, the press serves as a conduit for a free flow of information.

Our Nation's Founding Fathers knew what they were doing when they wrote the first amendment to include protection of the press. They had learned through bitter experience that no government official can be entrusted with censorship of the news media.

Any power to censor the media destroys all the freedom of speech to which they are entitled. Those who are only partially safeguarded are not safeguarded at all.

If the people of our Nation truly want freedom, they must be willing to insure the freedom of the press—the people's most easily accessible way of auditing the conduct of their elected officials.

The press and those who serve in the news media are human, and as humans they are prone to error. They have biases—like all of us. They make mistakes—like all of us. And, I dare say, that all of us in public office feel that we have been maligned, or ill-treated by the press at one time or another.

In their effort to uncover the truth, the press steps on sensitive and often powerful toes. The resulting story can lead to an embarrassed official and the end of an otherwise promising career.

On rarer occasions, the press has been wrong.

Yet, that is the price we must pay if the public—the ultimate judges in our

democracy—are to be kept fully informed.

The press is not the judge and the jury—that function rests with the people.

The people can accept or reject a news item; they can accept or reject an editorial opinion.

It is not the right of any branch of government to restrain the press. It is the public who must decide, and in their collective wisdom, they have kept our Nation free.

I have no illusions of perfection of the press. But none of its faults is so grave as to justify abridgment of freedom.

There is no persuasive evidence that a free press will cause the collapse of our Nation. Rather, it is more likely that government management to keep news away from the people could contribute to the downfall of the American system of government.

Yet, there are elements in our society who would restrain the free press and thus deny the people the information needed to make decisions.

Today, the freedom assured under the first amendment is in jeopardy. The Supreme Court decision in the 1972 *Caldwell* case, dramatically shows that the freedom of the press has been gradually sifting away—yielding to a policy that threatens to eliminate the newsmen's sources of information and the public's right to know.

The history of the battle for newsmen's privilege to inform the public goes back to President George Washington's jailing of a correspondent for refusing to tell the Senate his source for the publication of a proposed treaty between the United States and Mexico.

But newsmen have long fought to protect their rights. In the first 190 years of our Nation, in only 4 out of 80 cases have newsmen yielded to judicial pressure and revealed their sources.

Since 1934, the American Newspaper Guild's newsmen's code of ethics has read:

Newspapermen shall refuse to reveal confidences or disclose sources of confidential information in court or before other judicial or investigating bodies . . .

Today, the issue of newsmen's privilege has gone beyond merely protecting a confidential source.

Incidents which have occurred since September 1972, have made it especially necessary to devise legislation which would protect newsmen from subpoena and contempt citations, and thus assure the public a free, uncensored press.

John Lawrence and William Farr—two newsmen—have been jailed for protecting their sources of information. In effect, they were jailed for seeking the truth; they were jailed for assuring the peoples' right to a free flow of information.

The objective of the press—to inform—cannot be met unless sources of information are willing to give assistance on the highest level of confidentiality.

Every time one newsmen covering sensitive sources is pressed to violate a confidence, all other reporters covering similar sources must pay the penalty.

Which means that in the long run, it is society which loses.

If the press is bridled and fails to expose injustices and scandals, then our democratic society will diminish, and we will be even closer to the Orwellian 1984—when, the news is controlled and serves only to mold the people to the government's wishes.

"Freedom of the press" not only protects the newsman from governmental interference, it protects the people from an autocratic, dictatorial government.

Ultimately, the people are the judges and the jury, and no bureaucrat, no legislator, no judge, and no governmental official should stand in the way of their free and uninhibited collection of information.

It is the job of Congress to guarantee the people a free press. The Supreme Court's language in last year's *Branzburg* decision clearly invites Congress to enact legislation "as narrow or as broad" as deemed necessary to "to refashion those rules as experience—may dictate."

I believe the legislation we enact must be as unqualified as possible to insure the survival of the first amendment.

A prominent newsman, A. M. Rosenthal, managing editor of the *New York Times*, explained his belief in unqualified protection as only a newsman can.

Testifying before subcommittee No. 3 of the House Judiciary Committee yesterday, Rosenthal said:

In 1959, after a year and a half in Poland, I was expelled on the charge of probing too deeply into the internal affairs of the government, the party and the leadership. Believe me, every bit of information I received came from Poles who trusted my word that I would protect them. I was lucky. The Polish Communists did not put me on trial; they just threw me out. If I had been called into a Polish court and asked to reveal who told me what, I believe that every member of Congress would have supported my refusal to testify had I had the strength to do so.

And I was by no means the only foreign correspondent who found himself in this kind of situation. It happens all the time. Henry Raymond, a former foreign correspondent for *The New York Times*, was arrested in Cuba and grilled as to the sources of some of his information having to do with the Bay of Pigs. Mr. Raymond was even threatened with execution but he did not reveal his sources.

And now, fourteen years later, we have a debate in our country on whether an American newsman has the right to do and act in our own society as I did in a Communist society—to inquire, to write, to protect his sources and information and thus his existence as a conveyor of information to the public.

I never dreamed in Warsaw that the day would come when I would be arguing this point in Washington.

Unfortunately, the battle for newsman's rights has come to Washington. Now that the responsibility is ours we must accept it quickly.

This Congress has shown a great concern over the limitation of the free flow of information.

Only one out of five of the approximately 30 bills introduced in the second session of the 92d Congress offered an absolute protection to newsmen. Half, of the over 38 newsmen's privilege bills

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

introduced in this Congress, offer absolute protection.

None of the old bills offered protection to newsmen in State, as well as, Federal proceedings. Many of the new bills do.

Many journalistic organizations have come out in strong support for unqualified protection. The American Newspaper Publishers Association and the American Society of Newspaper Editors' Boards of Directors have both voted support for legislation to grant newsmen unqualified privilege from subpoena.

The public generally supports newsmen's privilege, according to a Gallup poll taken last November. The Gallup researchers found 57 percent of the persons polled supported the right of newsmen to protect sources.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must join with these citizens to protect newsmen's first amendment rights.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the Congress must:

First, enact a strong Federal law, such as the bill I introduced today, to lay to rest any possible doubt of the ability and right of newsmen to protect confidences obtained in their gathering of news;

Second, protect the news media from being utilized as agents of the Government;

Third, reaffirm the first amendment guarantees of freedom of the press.

For nearly 200 years, we rarely challenged the right of the press to investigate and report to the American people. Today, that is no longer true. Thus, it falls to us—the Members of Congress—to assure a press which is not shackled by the bonds and restraints of those who would turn our news agencies into propagandists for the Government or any of its representatives.

## THE VIEW OF COPERNICUS

### HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, Americans of Polish descent in the city of Chicago and the 11th Congressional District of Illinois, which I am proud to represent, and all over the Nation this year are celebrating the 500th anniversary of the birth of Nicolaus Copernicus, a man who changed the world's view of the universe.

It is most fitting that the Postal Service has authorized the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Copernicus. As part of this continuing national celebration, the Smithsonian Institution and the National Academy of Sciences will sponsor an international symposium next month.

An editorial from the March 6 Washington Post highlights one of Copernicus' contributions to man's view of himself. The editorial follows:

#### THE VIEW OF COPERNICUS

Revolutionary has become a cheapened word lately, claimed by all varieties of sophomores who think they know how things should be run. Occasionally a true revolutionary does appear, and recently the world

March 7, 1973

has marked the 500th anniversary of one, Nicolaus Copernicus. Fittingly, the Copernican revolution involved exactly that—the question of whether the earth was in revolution around the sun or the sun around the earth. A large vision was needed for that, to raise assertions that man did not live at the center of the created universe, but dwelled instead on a small rotating planet that lumbered through the skies around a stationary sun. A formal tribute to Copernicus' birth will occur in late April when an international symposium will be held in Washington, co-sponsored by the Smithsonian and the National Academy of Sciences.

The applause of history did not begin for this Polish astronomer until long after his death in 1543. His study, "On the Revolution of the Heavenly Bodies," was, as they say, 17 years in the making. Even then, caught between publishing and perishing, Copernicus needed 13 more years to find a printer. The book reviewers of the day, as nasty as ever to wild thinkers, provided no blurbs for the jacket. "This fool," said Martin Luther, "will turn the art of astronomy upside down, but the Scripture shows and tells another lesson, where Joshua commanded the sun to stand still, and not the earth." John Calvin asked: "Who will venture to place the authority of Copernicus above that of the Holy Spirit?" The Vatican damned Copernican theory as "philosophically false and formally heretical."

Rather than seeing Copernican theory as insulting to the importance of man in God's universe, the theologians should have seen it as the enlargement of a mystery, one whose totality we will never know. As Copernicus understood—and as modern men like Whitehead, de Chardin and others understand in our times—science and religion are not opposed; they are complementary. Copernicus himself experienced no loss of faith as a result of his findings, and there was no reason any of his contemporaries should have either.

## BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, this March 25 marks the 55th anniversary of the establishment of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. The history of this small Eastern European nation dates back almost 1,000 years, and those years have been filled with a remarkable number of accomplishments.

Perhaps what is most noteworthy about the Byelorussian people is their longstanding belief in democratic principles. During the 16th century, Byelorussia established a tolerance for diverse ideas, both religious and political, that was unequaled anywhere else in Europe.

Other achievements of the Byelorussian people are literally too numerous to mention. But it is clear that Americans of Byelorussian descent can be extremely proud of their native land.

Unfortunately, only 2 years after the founding of the republic, Byelorussia was occupied by the Soviet Union. Although their independence was short-lived, the Byelorussian people have never lost their desire for national freedom.

On March 25, Americans of Byelorussian descent will commemorate the crea-

tion of the Byelorussian Republic. On that day, it should be the sincere wish of every American that the Byelorussian people will someday be free of foreign domination.

#### NEW OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN IN POLICE WORK

#### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

**Mr. FRASER.** Mr. Speaker, the winter 1972 Occupational Outlook Quarterly features an article surveying the "New Opportunities for Women in Police Work." Written by Gloria Stevenson, a staff member of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, this essay records the leadership role taken by the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department in the employment of women as police officers.

No longer are female employees of American law enforcement agencies automatically assigned to typewriters and filing cabinets. While "only 6,000 of the Nation's 400,000 municipal police officers were women" in early 1972, we have reached the point where the Secret Service suggests the possibility of growing opportunities for women in law enforcement, saying:

A girl in high school, preparing for college, may find wider opportunities by the time she graduates.

We invest billions of dollars of Federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administration funds in local and State law enforcement agencies. But the best investment we can make today in police work is to open up law enforcement jobs to women, taking advantage of a vast pool of almost untouched talent. The following article is a useful guide to those counseling young women concerning their vocational futures. The counselors must become aware, if they are not already aware, of the changes chronicled by Ms. Stevenson's article if we are to make progress in women's rights and improved law enforcement.

The article follows:

#### THE FORCE OF CHANGE—NEW OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN IN POLICE WORK

(By Gloria Stevenson)

On a typical workday, Officer Joyce Hicks of the Washington, D.C. Metropolitan Department dons her blue uniform, straps on her .38 service revolver, and patrols a relatively high crime neighborhood in a marked scout car. Her 8-hour shift is usually busy and varied. She might ticket an illegally parked car, investigate a complaint about a disorderly person, try to settle a husband-wife squabble, and speed to a site where a crime is in progress. In between, she fills out report forms covering each activity.

Like her male counterparts, Officer Hicks, 25, spends most of her time in nonviolent social service activities and seldom needs to resort to physical force or to use her gun in the course of duty. However, she is prepared to do so if necessary. Late one night, for example, Officer Hicks was in one of several scout cars dispatched to break up an unruly crowd of 200 people that was harassing a policeman who had attempted to break up a street fight between two women. Officer

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Hicks waded into the crowd, was thrown to the ground several times, and used physical tactics to help disperse the group. She came out of the melee with several bruises, a gashed ear, and high praise from her male colleagues.

Officer Hicks is one of the relatively few women now performing law enforcement functions traditionally reserved for men. The movement of women into such areas—patrol work, traffic control, investigative and detective work, and guard duty, for example—is now in its infancy. Should this movement continue, however, women interested in careers in law enforcement may find an increasing number and range of job opportunities available to them in the years ahead.

#### WOMEN'S PLACE

The range of law enforcement jobs open to American women traditionally has been very limited. In 1911, Los Angeles became the first U.S. city to appoint women to its police force, hiring them to protect young girls and to prevent or minimize social evils such as the sale of liquor to minors. Fifty-six years later, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice reported that the role of women on local police forces "is today what it has always been. Female officers serve in juvenile divisions, where they perform investigative and social service oriented activities for women, teenage females, preteen youngsters (both male and female), and infants."

Moreover, according to "Women in Policing," a report by Catherine Milton of the Police Foundation,<sup>1</sup> "It is not unusual for trained policewomen to be permanently assigned to typewriters or file cabinets." Mrs. Milton concludes that the vast majority of the nation's policewomen "have been hired to do jobs that women are thought to perform better than men, such as working with juveniles, female prisoners, or typewriters."

The number of police jobs open to women also has been small. Mrs. Milton reports that in early 1972, only 6,000 of the Nation's 400,000 municipal police officers were women, and that only a third of 1,330 law enforcement agencies surveyed in 1969 by the International Association of Chiefs of Police had any full-time sworn women officers. In departments that did, women made up less than 2 percent of the total force.

Although opportunities for women have been very limited in local police departments, they have been virtually nonexistent in many areas of State and Federal law enforcement. Until very recently, for example, no State trained women for all-around duty on a State police force, and Federal investigative and protective positions requiring the use of firearms were open only to men.

During the past several years, law enforcement agencies have felt mounting pressure to examine the validity of the limits on women's role in police work. Women's liberation advocates, for example, maintain that women are perfectly able to perform police jobs traditionally believed to be too dangerous or difficult for them, and that barring women from such assignments is discriminatory. At the same time, Federal efforts to assure equal job opportunity for women are spurring law enforcement agencies to take a hard look at their employment and staffing patterns for women.

The increasing need for police officers also is prompting some agencies to seek better ways of utilizing woman power. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that employment of local police officers will grow moderately through 1980, and that State police employ-

<sup>1</sup> The Police Foundation, a nonprofit agency funded by the Ford Foundation, finances local police department projects designed to improve police services. Copies of the report "Women in Policing" are available for \$3 each from the Police Foundation, 1015 18th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

ment is expected to rise very rapidly. About 17,000 openings a year are expected for local police officers and 2,900 are projected for State police officers.

Examining the difficulties police departments often have in recruiting top-quality personnel under traditional employment policies, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice in 1967 said, "Policewomen can be an invaluable asset to modern law enforcement, and their present role should be broadened... Their value should not be considered as limited to staff functions or police work with juveniles; women should also serve regularly in patrol, vice, and investigative divisions."

#### ON THE BEAT

In "Women in Policing," Catherine Milton reports that Indianapolis, Indiana, was the first American city to place women on regular patrol duty; two women were assigned to "Car 47" in September 1968. Various other cities, including New York and Miami, have followed suit, as have some smaller communities. Morro Beach, California, for example, a small beach town, recently assigned three policewomen to its three patrol cars.

In the late summer of 1972, Washington, D.C., which assigns policewomen to a wider range of duties than any other city, had about 95 women on regular patrol duty in cars, on motor scooters, and on foot. Several of these women have advanced from the rank of officer to that of sergeant, and supervise both male and female patrol officers. Like Officer Joyce Hicks, women on patrol assignments perform duties identical to those of Washington's patrolmen.

Other Washington policewomen direct traffic, conduct criminal investigations, and work as radio dispatchers. Several are assigned to specialized patrol work in high-crime areas and at demonstrations and other mass gatherings. Working in civilian clothes, others pose as decoys in areas where purse snatchings and rapes are frequent.

About a dozen policewomen are assigned to the Washington, D.C. police department's Administrative Services Bureau, where they work in community relations, public affairs, and personnel. Women instructors train both male and female recruits.

"Women in Policing" reports other innovative assignments:

The Indianapolis police force has women working as radio dispatchers and plain-clothes narcotics investigators. One woman serves as an "Officer Friendly" in the community relations department. She frequently visits local elementary schools to tell children about the work of police officers.

In early 1972, all but two of the 37 police-women in Miami were in the field operations unit, where they were assigned to patrol, traffic direction, automobile accident investigations, and criminal investigations, including homicides.

Several Philadelphia policewomen serve on the city's Civil Disobedience Unit. During demonstrations, picketing, or other protests, these women, who work in plain clothes, try to keep the lines of communications open between opposing factions.

#### STATE POLICE JOBS

The main duty of State police officers—sometimes called highway patrol officers or State troopers—is to enforce laws governing the use of highways. They patrol highways to make sure drivers obey traffic laws, help at the scene of traffic accidents, and perform other road duties. They also investigate crimes and apprehend lawbreakers.

For several years, the State police departments of Massachusetts and Connecticut have employed women officers for work with women and youth, and several other State police departments have hired women without police training for uniformed duty in clerical and other support areas. In mid-1972, however, Pennsylvania was the only

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

State to hire women for State police duties identical to those performed by men.

Women became eligible for the Pennsylvania State police department in late 1971, and the first 14 women to become troopers were graduated from the department's training academy in July 1972. As this article was being written, the new graduates had been assigned to stations throughout the State, and were completing a 30-day period of on-the-job training. A department spokesman said the women will be appointed to highway patrols, criminal investigations, desk duty, and other jobs as the need arises.

Like women performing nontraditional jobs in some local police forces, Pennsylvania's female troopers wear uniforms which include both skirts and slacks; the nature of the trooper's assignment and the weather dictate which should be worn.

## AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

Several Federal law enforcement and protective agencies recently opened their ranks to women. For example, the first two women selected for training as FBI Special Agents were sworn in during July 1972, and the first five women to become Special Agents in the U.S. Secret Service were appointed in December 1971. The Executive Protective Service—a uniformed security unit formerly known as the White House Police—also recently began employing women, after 48 years as an all-male force.

The new women Special Agents for the Federal Bureau of Investigation are Jeanne E. Pierce, who had previously worked for the FBI in a clerical capacity, and Susan Lynn Roley, formerly a first lieutenant in the U.S. Marine Corps. They joined a highly-trained corps of 8,500 male Special Agents who investigate violations of Federal law, including bank robberies, kidnapings, frauds against the Government, thefts of Government property, espionage, and sabotage.

The women's first mission was the rugged 14-week training program required of all FBI Special Agents. This program includes a comprehensive physical fitness program as well as training in defensive tactics, regulations, and procedures.

After passing the required tests, including a demonstration of proficiency with a revolver, shotgun, and rifle, these two women, like all new agents, will be assigned to FBI field offices where they will work closely with experienced agents for about 2 weeks before handling assignments independently. The Acting Director of the FBI has declared that the women will be assigned the same types of duties given men, and will not be exempted from dangerous duty.

Seven women are now working as Special Agents for the U.S. Secret Service. This 107-year-old agency suppresses counterfeiting, detects forged Government checks and bonds, and protects the President and his immediate family, the Vice President, the President-elect, the Vice President-elect, major Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidates, former Presidents and their families, visiting heads of foreign states or foreign governments, and official representatives of the United States performing special missions abroad.

The 1,200 Special Agents of the Secret Service also may perform other protective duties on a temporary basis. For example, several years ago, agents protected Leonardo da Vinci's painting "Mona Lisa" while it was on exhibit in the United States.

For security reasons, the Secret Service will not reveal the assignments of female Special Agents. It does say, however, that male and female Special Agents perform the same kinds of duties.

Secret Service Special Agents who protect the President wear civilian clothes, but the Secret Service also supervises the Executive Protective Service which guards the White

House, the President and his immediate family, buildings which house Presidential offices, and foreign diplomatic missions located in and around Washington, D.C. Officers on this force, known as the Executive Protective Service, protect their stations through a network of car patrols, foot patrols, and fixed posts.

Since 1970, this agency has been recruiting women for work at the White House. Duties of female Executive Protective Service officers include supervising the questioning and, when necessary the custody of juveniles and women whose activities arouse the attention of Executive Protective Service officers and Secret Service Special Agents.

## TRAINING

As law enforcement agencies open nontraditional areas to women, they are more likely to offer men and women recruits similar training than to continue the old practice of preparing men for general assignments and training women for specialized work with youth or women.

In Washington, D.C., for example, men and women recruits train together, and the only aspect of their training which differs is the physical fitness regime; different programs of situps, pushups, and other physical activities have been tailored for men and women. Both men and women receive 63 hours of self-defense training, including instruction in use of a night stick, use of firearms, and judo and karate holds. Both also study constitutional law, local ordinances, and procedures to be followed in accident investigation, patrol, traffic control, and other police work. All new recruits learn how to make arrests, administer first aid, and deal with various types of emergencies.

Men and women preparing to become Pennsylvania State troopers must complete a rigorous 6-month resident training program, which includes a daily 3-mile run before breakfast. Trainees learn karate and use of firearms. They also learn how to ride and care for horses, which troopers occasionally use in crowd control and parades. Classroom training includes the study of criminal law and the motor vehicle codes of Pennsylvania.

Like FBI Special Agents, male and female Secret Service Special Agents receive identical training as do male and female Executive Protective Service officers. In all three cases, recruits learn use of firearms, self-defense techniques, and the specialized law enforcement and protective techniques used in each agency.

## QUALIFICATIONS

Like their male counterparts, women who do police work generally must be U.S. citizens who can meet physical and educational standards, which vary from agency to agency. Departing from past policies, agencies which assign women to nontraditional roles increasingly set identical entrance qualifications for men and women, except that height and weight requirements may be lower for women. The minimum height for women is often 5 feet 2 inches or 5 feet 4 inches. (In Washington, D.C., it is 5 feet 7 inches.) Weight must be in proportion to height.

Both male and female applicants generally must be at least 21 years old and have very good eyesight. They must be in very good health and may have to undergo background investigations to determine if their character is suitable for police work. Usually, they must do well on competitive civil service examinations.

Traditionally, according to Catherine Milton, some police agencies have set higher educational standards for women than for men; women needed a college degree—on the assumption that higher education would help them perform social work duties—while men needed only a high school diploma. Now a high school diploma or its equivalent is the minimum educational requirement for both men and women in many agencies, including

police departments in Dallas, Indianapolis, New York City, Miami, Washington, D.C., and Peoria, Illinois, as well as in the Pennsylvania State police department, and the Federal Executive Protective Service.

At the same time, however, law enforcement agencies, like many other employers, are eager to hire workers with post high-school training. A spokesman from the International Association of Chiefs of Police recommends that both men and women interested in police work get at least junior college training in law enforcement.

The same authority strongly recommends that women interested in police work make sure they can meet the physical requirements of the police forces they are interested in joining before investing time and money in college-level preparation.

Applicants for the positions of FBI and Secret Service Special Agent must meet standards more stringent than those of other law enforcement agencies. Both men and women who wish to become FBI Special Agents must be U.S. citizens between 23 and 40 who are willing and available to serve in any part of the United States or Puerto Rico. They must have graduated from a State-approved resident law school or a 4-year resident college with a major in accounting. The law school training must have been preceded by at least 2 years of resident undergraduate college work. Accounting graduates also must have had at least 1 year of accounting or auditing experience.

Applicants for FBI Special Agent jobs must be at least 5 feet 7 inches tall and able to perform strenuous physical activity; they must have excellent hearing and vision, normal color perception, and no physical defects which would interfere with their use of firearms or their participation in raids or other dangerous assignments. A valid driver's license also is required, and a thorough background investigation is made of all potential appointees.

Secret Service Special Agents must be U.S. citizens, at least 21, and graduates of a 4-year college. No specific major is required, but courses in law enforcement and criminology are desirable. Applicants must be in excellent health and have good eyesight—20/20 vision in one eye and at least 20/30 in the other. There are no specific height or weight requirements, but weight must be in proportion to height.

Starting salaries in law enforcement are the same for men and women doing the same work. The Washington, D.C. police department, for example, pays \$10,000 annually, as does the Executive Protective Service. After completing training, Pennsylvania State troopers earn \$10,400 a year, Secret Service Special Agents are paid either \$7,319 or \$9,053, and FBI Special Agents earn \$12,151.

## SOME PROBLEMS

Women interested in nontraditional police work may anticipate various difficulties, including both police and public skepticism about their ability to perform such duties. Women in nontraditional police roles also must accept the disadvantages of their assignments as well as the challenges. They must risk injury, work outdoors in all kinds of weather, and be available for shift work.

Getting into nontraditional police work is likely to remain rather difficult for women for some time. The total number of police-women on duty in most local police forces is still very small. In mid-1972, for example, Washington, D.C., had only 175 policewomen on its 5,000-member force, and was recruiting another 35. Inasmuch as many law enforcement agencies which now assign women to nontraditional duties also continue to hire women for specialized activities involving youth and women, the number of openings for nontraditional work is even smaller than the number of policewomen hired.

March 7, 1973

Moreover, competition for some available jobs—those with the better paying and more prestigious agencies—is acute. About 3,100 persons recently took the qualifying examination for appointment to the Pennsylvania State police department, and only 150 men and women will be selected for the next training class. Explaining that applicants with college training stand a better chance of being appointed when competition is keen, a representative of the department noted that 11 of the 14 women who became troopers in 1972 held degrees.

A spokesman from the International Association of Chiefs of Police says that if police departments are satisfied with women's performance in nontraditional areas, increasing opportunities will probably become available during the next several years. He reports that the Association is receiving inquiries from many police departments interested in opening new areas to women.

The Secret Service also suggests the possibility of growing opportunities for women. This agency says that although vacancies for women Special Agents and Executive Protective Officers are currently filled, "a girl in high school, preparing for college, may find wider opportunities by the time she graduates."

Catherine Milton of the Police Foundation recommends that women interested in law enforcement jobs be "aggressive and determined." She warns that women must often fight "an uphill battle to get the opportunity to take the examination."

#### FOR MORE INFORMATION

Women who wish to learn more about police work should contact their local police department, State police department, or local or State civil service commission. More information about the job of FBI Special Agents is available from the Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20535. Details about the positions of Secret Service Special Agent and Executive Protective Service officer may be obtained from the United States Secret Service, Personnel Division, Room 912, 1800 G Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20226.

Under Federal law, it is illegal to deny a woman solely on the basis of her sex the opportunity to compete with men for any police position in local or State government. Further details about equal job opportunity law are available from local offices of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, listed in the white pages of the telephone directory under U.S. Government.

#### GUN CONTROL

#### HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the subject of gun control is one that has produced a vast amount of debate in this body. If the need for strict controls on the possession of handguns has not been clear up to now, the shooting of a senior Member of the Congress, Senator JOHN STENNIS, should make it clear.

A copy of an editorial on WEEI radio in Boston has come to my attention. I believe it speaks eloquently to the need for gun control and the tragic shooting of Senator STENNIS. I recommend this editorial to each Member's attention:

#### GUN CONTROL AND THE STENNIS SHOOTING

John Stennis wasn't shot because of his position of power as a United States Senator.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

John Stennis was shot because he was at the wrong place at the wrong time.

The wrong place just happened to have been outside his Washington home. The wrong time was in the early evening hours. The point WEEI is making is that any time or any place can be the *wrong* one, and any one of us can be the next victim of a crime committed with a gun. And this is why we once again call upon our lawmakers in Washington to tighten up gun control.

If past is prologue, the attack on Senator Stennis will lead to increased calls for stronger firearms control laws. Indeed, it already has. However, past evidence also suggests that this pressure will fade before a strong law gets on the books.

After Governor Wallace was shot and permanently disabled last year, the Senate passed a bill outlawing those domestically produced cheap handguns known as "Saturday night specials." However, the House failed to act because gun control legislation never came out of committee. Police officials say one of those inexpensive weapons was used in the assault on Senator Stennis. Now President Nixon is calling for a ban on "Saturday night specials."

WEEI hopes Congress will heed Mr. Nixon's call and then go another step. We feel that the registration of firearms and the licensing of their owners is the only answer to the problem. Join us in this effort. Contact your representative on Capitol Hill and tell him your feelings on gun control. Then make a carbon of the letter and send it to him again in a couple of months.

#### A BILL TO PLACE METHAQUALONE ON SCHEDULE II OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES

#### HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which will place the substance methaqualone on schedule II of controlled substances. It is imperative that swift action be taken on this bill.

Over a month ago I wrote and formally requested the Attorney General and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to place methaqualone on this schedule through administrative regulations, but to date, this has not been done. Yet every day which we delay in restricting this dangerous substance, the situation gets worse.

Methaqualone is a prescription drug, readily obtainable at local pharmacies. When it entered the pharmaceutical market, it was touted as a safe barbiturate. It has proven far from being safe. Currently, it is the most abused drug of the "pill culture" among young drug abusers. It is also one of the most dangerous. The substance has proven to be addictive, with terrible physical and psychological dependency occurring. It may cause fetal deformities in women who become pregnant, and, contrary to certain myths, can be deadly when taken with alcohol.

Recently, there have been a number of methaqualone related deaths. I have information of a suicide in Monroe County, N.Y., attributed to the drug, a young university coed on Long Island, N.Y., allegedly overdosed from taking methaqualone, and in Arizona, a medical

examiner has attributed another death to "an overdose of methaqualone and other depressant drugs." All these deaths have occurred since I made my initial request for restriction on January 29.

This is a clear indication that we have delayed too long in taking action. New York State has moved to restrict the drug. It is certainly about time that the Congress took this action.

#### THE WINNING SPEECH OF MR. MERRILL NELSON

#### HON. DOUGLAS W. OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting for the benefit of my colleagues, the speech with which Mr. Merrill Nelson of my district won the Utah State Veterans of Foreign Wars 26th Annual Voice of Democracy Contest.

Merrill is truly an outstanding young American. That he has a tremendous love for this country can be seen from his speech. He is also a leader in student government, a 4-year letterman in sports, and has won several scholastic honors. On top of all this, he is an active member in his church, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

I am very proud to have Merrill as one of my constituents. I believe he is a fine example of the kind of young Americans to whom we can safely entrust the future of this country.

The speech follows:

#### MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

There are over 200 million people living in the United States today. I consider myself one of the luckiest people in the world, because I am one of those 200 million. This is a great country, and as it continues to become greater, likewise do our responsibilities to her become greater. I may be just one of 200 million, but this does not lessen my obligations to my country, nor does it decrease the impact for good which I may cause.

Each of us, like it or not, has a responsibility to freedom. Some accept it, others accept it but don't fulfill it, and yet others actually reject it and even go as far as to disregard and abuse the freedom which we now have.

As young Americans we're very blessed. We haven't, as yet, had to fight for our freedoms. They've been won and established by those before us—by men and women who met their responsibilities. Theirs was to gain freedom—ours is to preserve it. The least we can do to show our appreciation to them, is to be happy with what we have, and forget about rioting and making big scenes, that's not our part. We've got to realize what we have and try to capitalize on it. This country, no matter how good it is, can always become better. Other people got us where we are, now it's our job to keep ourselves going, and get future Americans where they should be.

It's our responsibility to exercise our freedoms. Our freedoms could be likened unto talents. If you have a certain talent and don't make use of it, it will become lost to you forever. So it is with our freedoms. If we don't make use of them, the need and desire for them will be lost, and they'll be taken from us. We must realize that they were gained by men, they can also be taken by men.

It's our responsibility to take advantage of what we have. To take an active interest in learning—get all that we possibly can out of school. This is preparing us for future challenges, for future responsibilities.

The very most important requirement we have is to care. Apathy and indifference are our biggest enemies. If this nation falls, it will be caused by weakness from within, not pressure from without. We can't leave it up to the "other guy" to carry our load and bare our burdens. There's a purpose and place for each of us, that each must discover. The strength of a nation lies in its youth, and there's no limit to how strong this nation can become.

We must get behind our leaders and support them, trust in their wisdom, but we must also peacefully voice disapproval if they work against our best needs. Standing behind each other and supporting our leaders will help to unify our country.

America is a nation which has become as great as any other in the history of time. That greatness was achieved by overcoming problems. Adversity is a deterrent only to those who regard it as such. To the true American, it's an opportunity for progress. We have problems now but those problems are merely potential strength, let us think of them in that way.

As a nation, whatever our shortcomings, we have strength and abundance, as a people, much compassion, as a symbol and as a world power, much to offer everyone on earth who loves liberty. Here, we have more opportunities for self-realization. Here, each man has his own voice in his own destiny. In a world where freedom is often at bay, we thrive on it. We can't take these freedoms for granted, let's not wait to lose them before we realize their value. Let's act now, let's care now, let's do our part now, for that is our responsibility to freedom.

#### CANADIAN PIPELINE FEASIBLE

#### HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, recently the Mackenzie Valley Pipe Line Research Ltd. produced a final report on the feasibility of a Canadian alternative route to the trans-Alaskan pipeline. At various times, several companies that are involved in the Aleyska consortium plan have also participated in the Mackenzie Valley Pipe Line Research Ltd.

The Mackenzie Valley group concludes as a result of its research over the past 4 years that construction and operation of a 48-inch diameter crude oil pipeline from the Arctic coasts of Alaska to Edmonton, Alberta, is technically feasible. "It can be designed, built and in operation within a period of 4 years after a final decision to proceed, providing final Government approval is granted within the first year."

The 1,738 mile pipeline with pump stations and terminal facilities can be built for about \$3.4 billion. A volume of approximately 1.8 million barrels a day of crude oil can be transported from Prudhoe Bay to Edmonton on a 7-percent flowthrough net income basis at a 30-year average tariff of \$1.15 per barrel. The average tariff of delivery from Prudhoe Bay to Chicago would be approximately \$1.55 per barrel, and to Puget Sound about \$1.40 per barrel.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Mackenzie Valley Pipe Line Research Ltd. also gives a Canadian pipeline a clean bill of environmental health. They conclude:

Such a pipeline can be built without major or irreparable damage to the Arctic environment.

I am pleased by the interest shown by the participating companies in the Mackenzie Valley Pipe Line Research Ltd. However, I believe that further environmental studies are needed. I have asked the Interior Department to conduct them, and hope the Canadian Government will cooperate.

There are two basic conclusions which emerge from this report. First, that such a pipeline through Canada is undoubtedly feasible—although all the environmental impact has probably not been evaluated—and second, that several large, major oil companies have indicated an interest in the Canadian pipeline by joining the Mackenzie Valley Pipe Line Research Ltd.

A list of the companies follows:

Amoco Canada Petroleum Company Ltd.  
Ashland Oil Canada Limited.  
BP Oil Limited.  
Cities Service Company.  
Elf Oil Exploration and Production Canada Limited.  
Gulf Oil Canada Limited.  
Hudson's Bay Oil & Gas Company Limited.  
Imperial Oil Limited.  
Interprovincial Pipe Line Company.  
Mobil Oil Canada Ltd.  
Shell Canada Limited.  
Standard Oil Company of British Columbia Limited.  
Texaco Inc.  
Trans Mountain Pipe Line Company Limited.  
TransCanada Pipe Lines Limited.

#### POW HOMECOMING

#### HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in recent days there has been joy in our Fourth District area in Kentucky. It is the kind of joy which has been witnessed elsewhere in America lately—a happy and jubilant homecoming as our POW's returned from their long captivity in Communist jails.

Kentucky's first returning POW was Lt. Col. Bob Purcell of Louisville. He received a heartwarming greeting on his return and I want to add my voice to those who have shown their enthusiasm for him and their happiness for his family. Colonel Purcell was imprisoned for almost 8 years, and we share with him and his loved ones more than simply joy and enthusiasm—we share gratitude that our prayers were answered and that he and his brave compatriots have come back home.

Another real reason for gratitude is that our returning POW's provide an example to all Americans of the power of faith and patriotism to carry a man through the severest trials. As these men landed on American soil after all those years, and as they made their first

March 7, 1973

comments about being back, it was a source of great personal inspiration to me to hear them talk of love of country and love of God as the two things that motivated them and encouraged them in even the darkest days of their captivity. Unfortunately, their words sounded almost out of place after all the words of vituperation we constantly witnessed over the news media. These brave POW's represent the best about America—and throw into high relief the dishonor of those who attack, vilify, and abandon their country in time of need. For this example, we owe these men a great debt.

I know I join all my colleagues here in Congress and Americans everywhere in saying to all of our brave POW's welcome home.

#### ABDNOR WONDERS—WILL FARM PRICES DROP THROUGH THE FLOOR?

#### HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Christian Science Monitor came out with an excellent article which forecast the very real possibility that farm prices could drop through the floor next year if no provisions were made for buying surplus crops if the markets dried up. I would like to share this article with my colleagues in the House, and all those who are interested in giving the farmer a fair break in the American marketplace.

The article follows:

WHILE FOOD PRICES HIT THE CEILING—WILL FARM PRICES DROP THROUGH FLOOR?

(By David Mutch)

CHICAGO.—While housewives fret about food prices going through the roof, American farmers worry about crop prices going through the floor.

How can it be, the consumer asks, knowing that in 1972 farmers had the best year in 20 years, with net farm income up \$3.1 billion over 1971's \$16.1 billion.

Here is how farmer Vere Vollmers of Wheaton, Minn., explains it: "President Nixon's farm policies are a gamble that Russia will have another crop failure. He's put about 40 million acres of idle land back into production and wants to end subsidy payments on wheat, feed grain, and cotton, and other crops.

"Basically the idea of the farmer earning his money from the marketplace is good, but Nixon's plans allow no provision for the government to step in if there is a crop surplus. And so prices could drop faster than they went up this year."

The President says his policies are aimed at cutting the food-price rise, expected to be 6 percent in 1973.

#### NO SOVIET COMMITMENT

Mr. Vollmers sees the same problem farmers in the U.S. have seen for more than 40 years: Food production is so vigorous in America that overproduction and consequent deflated prices hang constantly over their heads like the sword of Damocles. They see their economic happiness hanging by a hair whenever the government threatens to withdraw its pervasive support in favor of a free market.

The actual volume of farm marketings last

year was barely larger than in 1971—it was higher prices and government payments that raised farm income. Therefore, a larger crop in 1973 is easily achievable.

Last year the billion dollar wheat sale to the Soviet Union mopped up a grain surplus, with the Russians getting a bargain price. Already there are reports from Moscow that the weather looks better this year and that Soviet officials will not commit themselves early to large purchases of American wheat. Hence planning in this country to avoid supply fluctuations is not yet possible.

#### LARGE SURPLUS LIKELY?

At the same time, acreage goes up in this country and government payments to farmers are expected to drop by \$1 billion, a record, from \$4 billion last year. These factors, plus the high prices farmers in general received last year for their crops, could combine to produce a dangerously large surplus, many experts are beginning to say.

This point was made in a recent study by C. Edward Harshbarger for the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, Mo. In that study he warned that the "wheel of fortune in agriculture is a capricious device that is capable of producing sudden changes with little or no warning."

Farmers interviewed by this newspaper agree with another conclusion drawn by Dr. Harshbarger: Production costs, for fertilizer, fuel, equipment, and credit, have risen much faster than farm income for years, and if farmers push up the crop supply this year, production costs will rise even faster.

Balancing the concern of oversupply is the growing population and improved eating habits in this country as well as demands by consumers elsewhere, such as in Russia, Japan, and Europe, for better diets. China, too, may become a large importer of U.S. agricultural goods. All of this bodes well for keeping demand for U.S. agricultural products strong. Exports are over \$11 billion in this sector, a figure few would have believed possible only three or four years ago. Certainly the U.S. balance of trade needs this help.

Farmers are as upset about the President's cuts in farm supports as are big city mayors about cuts in the poverty programs. Mr. Vollmeres had a bad year due to spring floods and then found a loan program dropped just before he applied. Some of his neighbors got in just under the wire. He is also very concerned that if the soil-conservation program is dropped, it will hurt the next generation of farmers worse than this one.

\*\*\* farmers in the U.S. "will be put out of business."

Here is how he explains it: "The Department of Agriculture estimates that it costs a minimum of 32 cents a pound to produce cotton. Last year I got 20½ cents a pound on the market and the subsidy brought it up to 35 cents, with a profit of only 3 cents a pound."

Mr. Grueben and Mr. Vollmeres, along with other farmers, were in Washington last week to testify before Sen. Herman E. Talmadge's Senate Agriculture Committee. Senator Talmadge (D) of Georgia is highly critical of President Nixon's farm proposals. Mr. Grueben says he talked to a farmer from South Dakota who had thought "the subsidy for cotton was making us rich in Texas. So you see, even other farmers don't understand the subsidy program."

Consumers should, but don't, understand the economic position of farmers. In 20 years the prices farmers get for crop have gone up only 11 percent, while retail food prices have gone up 46 percent. Sixty percent of the family food dollar goes to transportation, processing, and distributing food, and these sectors have risen fastest; in the same period salaries of industrial workers went up 129 percent, food-marketing employees 148 percent. Farm costs in 20 years went up 108 percent, while taxes went up 297 percent.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### WORLD FREEDOM DAY

#### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I inserted into the RECORD addresses by several dignitaries on World Freedom Day held this past January in the Republic of China at which our colleague DAN DANIELS was a featured speaker.

I insert into the RECORD at this point addresses by Mr. Geoffrey Stewart-Smith, British Member of Parliament; the Honorable John Mothepe, Minister of State of Lesotho; and a message from the World Freedom Day rally in Taipei to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon.

The material follows:

SPEECH BY GEOFFREY STEWART-SMITH,  
BRITISH MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT

It is a very great privilege for me, a British Parliamentarian, to be invited to address so distinguished a gathering. It is right that you should know that by no means all British Members of Parliament have supported the policies of the British Government with regard to your country in recent years. On the contrary, we have deplored publicly your expulsion from the United Nations.

There are those, like myself, who believe that the Republic of China alone is the true custodian of your unique and priceless culture. It is only from the realisation of the ideals of Free China that the great united Chinese people can make their just contribution to Mankind.

Those politicians in the West who believe that Communist China is a trustworthy and reliable member of the comity of nations deceive themselves, and worse still, deceive their people. What they do is merely manifest their ignorance of Maoism and Marxist-Leninism.

Today's appeasers build illusions on sand for they put their trust in unelected Communist Party leaders and their illegal regimes, and they ruthlessly betray the people.

Now there are those in the United Nations who wrongly believe that liberty and tyranny are compatible; that democracy and one party rule can be merged; that legality and lawlessness can be reconciled; that religion and atheism can be harmonised and that nations, and indeed the world, half-free and half-slave can live for ever in peace.

I maintain that such contentions are false.

We in the Free World have our principles and they are not negotiable. We believe in liberty, the inviolability of the individual, self-determination, democracy, the rule of law and our precious civil liberties of religion, speech, association and movement. We will never agree to their denial to any nation or peoples.

Western political leaders should be working for the establishment of these principles on Mainland China not expelling from the United Nations that part of China, the Republic of China, which cherishes them.

There will never be lasting peace in China until the whole Chinese people enjoy these inalienable liberties. To believe otherwise is to live in a world of dangerous fantasy.

It is not natural for any man or woman to live in an inhuman, cruel and degrading manner, and to be subjected to the arbitrary whims of the leaders of irrational regimes based on mass terror, fears and lies. But this is exactly what the people on the mainland endure. It is a condition of life which is the exact opposite of what the United Nations should be standing for and the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights demands.

The great Chinese people on the mainland will work out their destiny in their own way and strive to seek these liberties, no matter how much certain non-Chinese political leaders may betray them and aid their oppressors.

The aspirations of the people on the mainland for liberty are self-generating, and they are immensely heartened and encouraged by your own support and self-sacrifice.

Now there are times in the history of nations when small countries have to stand alone against what appears at the time to be insuperable odds. Britain stood alone against Nazi occupied Europe in the dark days of 1940, and eventually after great sacrifices liberty was victorious. It was our finest hour.

When the history of China comes to be written, I am certain that your endeavors and your courage now, will be described as your nation's finest era.

When all your enemies appeared so powerful and your friends betrayed you, you stood alone—true to your ideals, true to your Chineseness and worthy guardians of your nation's destiny.

I believe that you have a unique contribution to make to the cause of human liberty in the 20th century. In the eternal fight for Man's freedom, you are the conscience of the world. I beseech you to be true to yourselves. Never waiver from doing what you believe to be right for free China. Never ever, ever give up. Fight on and on, for we are engaged in the most terrible protracted struggle in the history of the world. Be unsparing in your energy and self-sacrifice.

But as you see so clearly here today, you are not alone. You have true friends who will stand by you in your darkest hour.

I believe that acting together we will never conquer fear with a greater fear but with love.

We will never defeat irrationality with the denial of reason but with reason.

We will never supplant inhumanity with a greater inhumanity but with humanitarians.

We will never defeat lies with greater lies but with the truth.

Our cause will be without hope unless we have faith.

We can only defeat daily terror by daily courage.

We will never achieve the brotherhood of man with hatred and fear but with tolerance and understanding.

We will never attain liberty except with the consent of the liberated.

We will never build a world at peace spiritually if all we offer is more matter than the materialists.

We will never restore human dignity until we restore the sanctity of marriage and the family.

We will never attract men of goodwill if we preach hatred either of nation, religion or race.

We will deserve to lose unless all our efforts are devoted to serving the people from whom comes all true and legal power.

Search after truth; find it and proclaim it. The Republic of China has a great case to make. I hope that in future you will make greater efforts to proclaim your magnificent achievements to the world.

With your renown Chinese patience and stoicism, you must wait for history, but in the meantime build your industries; improve the standard and quality of life of your peoples; carry through your social reforms and preserve your faith and culture.

For my part, I can say that your friends in Britain will play an increasingly energetic part in helping you in your noble struggle.

Of one thing I am certain that with God, human nature and the millions of your fellow citizens on the mainland on your side, your final victory is certain.

## ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN MOTHEPU, MINISTER OF STATE, LESOTHO

May I, on behalf of my Government, my party and my people give my very sincere thanks to the organizers of this august assembly for having invited me to participate in its deliberations. May I take the opportunity to congratulate them for their excellent arrangements.

May I also thank the President and the people of the Republic of China for their heart-warming hospitality.

To me, this is a very welcome opportunity to put across to the delegates here and to the world at large my people's stand on the menace of Communism. You may wish to note that in 1965 the people of Lesotho gave my party, the Lesotho National Party a mandate to form Lesotho's first points. Our election platform was a relentless fight against Communism. We said in our election manifesto:—

"Our stand against materialistic and atheistic Communism is uncompromising. We believe that, whereas economic underdevelopment and disease are the greatest internal problems of the African Countries, Communism is the greatest external danger."

In the event of the 1969 General Elections my party's Government did not hesitate to suspend the constitution and to declare the election null and void when we realized that our opposition colleagues were making no secret of their associations with the forces of international Communism. We had been fore-warned, and we knew of the intricate methods of Communist expansionism.

We know of the Russian approach that relies heavily on indoctrination and brainwashing of the ignorant. We know of the Communist Chinese teaching of violence as a method of introducing political change.

We know of the dangerous overtones contained in their appeals to the young people in our countries. Hence, our bold and fearless stand to stamp out this philosophizing, all its forms and manifestations. As long as we live, there is no room for Communism in Lesotho and indeed, we are laying the foundations of economic and political stability to deny it the soil of instability on which it so much thrives.

We fought for and won our National independence from the British; how then can we without contradicting ourselves, allow the new Russian and Communist Chinese Imperialists to steal away from us our hard won independence? How can we abandon our future and that of our children to the whims of the anarchists, the political murderers and the shameless advocates of war and violence?

Mr. Chairman, I will not conclude my talk before appealing to all here present, to visit Lesotho, to organize seminars there and to talk to our people, young and old, both formally and informally, in order to carry across to them the great fight against the greatest enemy of humanity—Communism.

## MESSAGE TO PRESIDENT NIXON OF THE UNITED STATES FROM THE WORLD FREEDOM DAY RALLY IN TAIPEI, JANUARY 23, 1973

YOUR EXCELLENCY: On this World Freedom Day, on the third day of your second term as President of the United States, we representatives from various circles of the Republic of China, are gathered in Taipei together with anti-Communist leaders from all of the five continents of the world for an expanded mass rally to bring a new climax to this great movement to win victory for man's freedom. We feel all the more excited and encouraged today because of your inaugural address on the 20th about the need of American endeavor for peace and freedom if both are to be perfect.

Peace and freedom are inseparably related. Peace must have freedom as its pre-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

requisite, and efforts toward peace must have realization of freedom as their simultaneous goal. More than 22,000 Chinese and Korean ex-Communists POWs of the Korean conflict sought freedom at the risk of their lives and under the principle of voluntary repatriation supported fully by the United States. Their action was to fight for freedom for the realization of peace.

As have stated, "we stand on the threshold of a new era of peace in the world" but the major question we face is how to make use of that peace. This statement has prompted us to raise the following four-point suggestion as we express to you our heartiest felicitations on your inauguration for another term.

Firstly, the United States should manifest its founding spirit, firmly abide by the principles of justice, help the other free nations oppose armed Communist aggression, and through truly powerful actions implement your statement about America's adherence to treaty commitments toward allies as well as uncompromising stand against Communist aggression.

Secondly, the bitter experience of Paris talks for peace in Vietnam should serve as a convincing testimony that in any attempt to replace confrontation with negotiation, we must, instead of being tolerant toward the Communists, unflinchingly insist that freedom be the goal of peace talks, or lengthened negotiation can only benefit Communist aggressors.

Thirdly, the center of world turmoil is in Asia and the source of Asian troubles is the Chinese Communists who, in addition to enslaving and oppressing the 700 million people on the Chinese mainland, have been supporting and directing the Communist war of aggression in Indochina and therefore should be branded as true culprits for the killing of Vietnamese and Americans in Vietnam. This being the case, we of the Republic of China pledge to strengthen our unity and, together with all the anti-Communist forces on the Chinese mainland as well as all the other freedom-loving people of the world, fight to the very end to erase Communist tyranny and bring about a final victory for freedom.

Fourthly, in view of the close alliance of the United States and the Republic of China, we earnestly hope that Your Excellency will during the second term of your office continue to strengthen the cooperation between the two nations toward preservation of freedom and peace and against Communist attempts at division and destruction.

With our most sincere wishes for your continued well-being and for the growing prosperity of the United States,

Sincerely yours,

KU CHENG-KANG,  
Chairman, World Freedom Day Rally of  
the Republic of China.

## MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

## HON. JOHN MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention the accomplishments of two constituents representing the Kennedy Memorial Post No. 5880 in the Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy program.

Mr. James Fuccillo, West Roxbury, Mass., speaking on "My Responsibility To Freedom" won the Suffolk District II Competition.

Mr. Arnold Kunian, West Roxbury, was the finalist in the Kennedy Post Com-

March 7, 1973

petition. Both young men are seniors at Boston Latin School and are deserving of praise for their fine efforts.

The Kennedy Memorial Post, named to Honor Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., John Kennedy, and Robert Kennedy, must be highly commended along with the national V.F.W. for the rewarding program it has established for the young people of our Nation.

I am pleased to insert at this time an article from the West Roxbury Parkway News which documents the accomplishments of these fine young men.

The article follows:

## BOSTON LATIN SENIOR WINNER OF VFW CONTEST

Kennedy Memorial Post 5880 Commander John D. Drummond and Post Voice of Democracy Chairman Edmund J. Rainsford have announced that James E. Fuccillo, representing Post 5880, won the District 2 contest.

Theme of this year's scriptwriting scholarship program is "My Responsibility to Freedom." Jim, who lives at 43 Atwill road, West Roxbury, is a Boston Latin School senior. His father, Pasquale A. Fuccillo, is an alumnus of the school.

The Joseph P., Jr., John F. & Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Post 5880 which sponsored the Boston Latin School has rewarded the winner with a U.S. Savings Bond. Founded in 1946, the post originally named for Navy Lt. Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., had as its first commander, the late President John F. Kennedy. An early member of the post was the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy. Currently the senior Senator from Mass., Edward M. Kennedy is a member.

For his accomplishment as the district winner, Jim received a certificate and plaque from the Suffolk District 2 Commander William Cassell and District 2 VOD Chairman Philip D'Alessandro.

At the Post level, Arnold M. Kunian, 177 Perham street, West Roxbury, was the runnerup. The son of Mrs. Bernice T. Kunian, he is a senior at Boston Latin School.

The VFW National Broadcast Scriptwriting Program is designed to give all 10th, 11th and 12th grade students the opportunity to voice their opinions on a patriotic theme and to convey their thoughts via the broadcasting media to all America. At the Department of Massachusetts level the district winners are eligible to compete for prizes totaling \$1,550.00. State winners are provided with a five day all expense trip to Washington, D.C., and the opportunity to compete for national scholarships totaling \$22,500.

The Kennedy Memorial Post meets on the third Tuesday of the month at 8 p.m. at the Parker House, 60 School street, Boston. John D. Drummond served as commander; and William J. Walsh, past post commander and quartermaster, resides at 131 Sanborn avenue, West Roxbury.

## MORE ON MEDICAID ABUSES IN NEW YORK

## HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, it is high time Congress and the present administration took a hard look at the problems in our medical care systems. The people of this country are angry because of the high cost of medical care—care which in the case of medicaid in New York is

wholly inadequate or even incompetent. In the year between 1970 and 1971 medicaid costs have doubled from \$666.3 million to \$1.12 billion. In the following article and in the eight previous articles in the New York Daily News series, William Sherman describes how, in instance after instance, extravagant fees are charged for negligent services.

I will be introducing legislation early next week which will help put an end to unscrupulous medicaid profits. My legislation, an amendment to title 19 of the Social Security Act, would give municipalities such as the city of New York the option of using its municipal hospitals and community based medical divisions to treat all medicaid patients. It would not required all localities to treat its medicaid patients in community sponsored clinics; it would simply give those cities that have suffered escalating medicaid costs at the hands of unscrupulous physicians the alternative of creating a network of neighborhood health clinics to be staffed by salaried doctors to treat medicaid patients.

As presently written, title 19 is supposed to give medicaid patients freedom of choice as to which doctor he or she chooses to see. Some may argue that my bill will curtail freedom of choice, but as the following article illustrates so well, freedom of choice does not exist in practice anyway:

[From the New York Daily News, Feb. 5, 1973]

#### IN RACE FOR MEDIBUCKS, THE CITY'S POOR LOSE

(By William Sherman)

Medicaid was launched in 1966 with two major goals: quality care for the poor, and freedom for the patient to choose his own doctor. Both ideals, so proudly hailed at the beginning, have been buried in the grab for the medicaid dollar.

In New York City this year, about \$1.8 billion will be spent on medical assistance for the poor—as much as all other welfare costs combined. Of that sum, about \$180 million will go to physicians, dentists, and other individual providers while the rest will be paid out to hospitals, nursing homes and other institutions.

Most doctors refuse medicaid patients, and city records show that only 3,000 of about 23,000 doctors here have ever taken a medicaid case.

#### 4 PERCENT GET LION'S SHARE

Only a small proportion of doctors see medicaid patients on a regular basis. Only 4% of those licensed to practice here are receiving 80% of the medicaid payments to doctors.

The major reason: Few doctors are situated in poor neighborhoods where those eligible for medicaid live.

"Doctors simply do not want to practice in black or Puerto Rican neighborhoods," says Rep. Herman Badillo (D-Bronx).

Another reason most physicians shun medicaid is that the system pays general practitioners only \$5.20 for a patient's first visit and \$4.16 for subsequent visits. Doctors interviewed say those fees are not worth their time.

Yesterday's disclosure in THE NEWS that some medicaid fees will be raised 25% to 50% was not expected to greatly increase the number of health care providers participating in medicaid.

Last year, 1,457,168 people here were eligible for medicaid. Most of them, records show, live in depressed areas.

So, some doctors and entrepreneurs set up group medicaid centers in those neighbor-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

hoods, including multiservice conglomerates of physicians, dentists, podiatrists, chiropractors, psychiatrists, optometrists and pharmacists.

Working together in a large center with no competition from other practitioners, those professionals found not only that they could survive on medicaid payments, but in many cases could realize huge profits. THE NEWS MEDICAL PROBE found.

One radiologist got \$310,420 in medicaid payments during the first six months of last year; a laboratory processing medicaid patients' tests made \$616,052 in the same period, and a doctor working in Harlem earned \$98,862 at the same time.

In some of the centers, patients were rammed through examining rooms at the rate of one every five minutes. One doctor saw patients at the rate of one every two minutes. The result was low-quality or improper care.

Health Department records show that in some cases, patients were not treated for diseases found in lab tests, records were sloppy and insufficient, and patients were passed from specialist to specialist, regardless of their specific complaints. Meanwhile, there were people in waiting rooms with serious illnesses.

The alternative for the medicaid patient, says Seymour Budoff, director of the city's medicaid program, "is to wait until he gets sick enough to be admitted to a hospital."

"Or he can travel to a clinic and be treated, but there the city must reimburse the clinic at upward of \$30 a visit. A private physician would see that same patient, if he paid cash, for \$15."

"The result was that even for minor ailments like colds, medicaid patients chose the clinics and the hospitals," said Budoff.

Eligibility restrictions were tightened, the number of medicaid recipients is less than it was six years ago, and physicians' medicaid rates were cut by the state Legislature in 1969, but medicaid costs have soared.

In fact, between 1970 and 1971 costs nearly doubled from \$666.3 million to \$1.12 billion. The total cost is now \$1.3 billion. It will increase at an estimated 10% a year and by 1983 will have reached \$2.4 billion, city officials say.

What happened to the patients' freedom of choice?

"The doctor is the man who has the freedom of choice, the right to accept or reject a patient, and not the welfare client. Freedom of choice does not exist for the medicaid recipient," Budoff said.

#### WOULD CREATE CENTERS

"And the quality of care is lousy because many practitioners use the system for personal gain instead of for providing good health care," he said.

One solution, Budoff says, is to create lower cost neighborhood health centers for medicaid patients.

His proposals for medicaid are:

End freedom of choice—it doesn't exist in practice anyway—and create a network of neighborhood health centers where medicaid patients would go for care.

Pay doctors a flat salary of \$35,000 or \$40,000 a year to work in the centers instead of paying them on a per-patient basis.

Pay pharmacists, optometrists, dentists and all other professionals on a salary basis to work in the centers.

Have the city buy eyeglasses, hearing aids, drugs, and other medical supplies on a wholesale basis and let professionals prescribe them for patients at the centers instead of paying professionals for resale and profit.

Begin a program of preventive medicine, including immunizations and annual checkups.

Use city and volunteer hospitals as a back-up system instead of as a repository for people who can't find care anywhere else.

Pay physicians a salary for house visits.

"It's certainly cheaper than the \$120-a-day average medicaid rate we're paying hospitals now for people who could be cared for at home," Budoff said.

Hospitalization would be authorized by a doctor at a health center. Emergency cases would be handled immediately.

"All of this could be paid for with medicaid money and we could save \$100 million per year and give people high-quality care," said Budoff.

He said the health centers would be managed by the city, and the city would directly audit doctors and other professionals.

"Now we have very little auditing power over physicians and the group medicaid centers. This system would save the taxpayers money and give the poor the quality of care that was promised seven years ago," he said.

## CONGRESSMAN CRAIG HOSMER'S WASHINGTON NEWS NOTES

### HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

MR. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, each month, I send an informal newsletter to various interested individuals and organizations in my district. I am pleased to include the March issue in the RECORD at this point:

#### CONGRESSMAN CRAIG HOSMER'S WASHINGTON NEWS NOTES, MARCH 1973

##### AMNESTY, NO; PARDONS, YES

Should the U.S. grant amnesty to the thousands of young men who fled the country rather than serve in Viet Nam? Should the same apply to those who otherwise violated our draft laws during the war? Yes, said KNXT (Channel 2) in a TV editorial recently. No, said Congressman Craig Hosmer in a rebuttal.

Rather than amnesty (which is a general pardon to all members of a group, regardless of individual circumstances), Hosmer argued for a case-by-case review of all expatriates who choose to return to the U.S. Compassionate pardons could then be granted where the ends of justice would be served, he said.

"But to grant wholesale amnesty today would dishonor those who served their country, willingly or unwillingly. To let people easily get away with breaking laws they don't like—to pick and choose what laws they will obey—is the essence of anarchy," he concluded.

##### THE FEDERAL BUDGETING MESS

Suppose your spouse and five children all had check books on your account. And suppose they went on a spending spree with no consideration of your bank balance. Eventually, you'd have to stop payment on some of their checks and bring discipline to the family budget.

That's basically what the current flap over Presidential impounding of funds is all about. The antiquated Congressional appropriation process puts President Nixon in the position of "stopping payment" on some Congressional "checks." Various Congressional committees authorize expenditures and the Appropriations Committees, in effect, write checks. But only the President keeps track of the total expenditures and income.

The answer to this problem lies not in legislation to prevent the President from impounding Congressionally appropriated funds, but in having the Congress reform its machinery to permit consideration of spending priorities within a realistic budget ceiling.

##### HELP COMING FOR VETERANS

Several veterans organizations recently urged Congress to permit veterans to receive

Social Security benefit increases without corresponding cuts in their military pensions. Congressman Hosmer has had such a bill under consideration since 1966. However, with a new chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, Rep. William Jennings Bryan Dorn (D-S.C.), Hosmer is hopeful that the bill may receive more favorable consideration this year.

FOR THE RECORD

"The American bombs falling on North Vietnam have dimmed prospects not only for peace in Indochina but for the wider detente for which all mankind has prayed." —New York Times, December 30, 1972.

"He (Nixon) has conducted a bombing policy so ruthless and so difficult to fathom politically as to cause millions of Americans to cringe in shame and wonder at their President's very sanity." —Washington Post, January 7, 1973.

WASTING ENERGY

In light of the acknowledged U.S. energy crisis, Congressman Craig Hosmer notes that automobiles blow 87% of their energy intake out the tailpipe, and the pilot light on a gas range consumes one-third of all the fuel used in the used in average kitchen. Overall, experts estimate we waste 50% of all the energy sources we use.

A CHANCE TO SPEAK YOUR PIECE

The Environmental Protection Agency has scheduled a series of public hearings on its controversial proposals to ration gasoline and otherwise clear the air in Southern California. Two of the hearings will be held at Wilson High in Long Beach (March 10) and the Anaheim Convention Center (March 22). If you'd like to testify, you should notify EPA's Air and Water Division, 100 California Street, San Francisco 94111 at least seven days in advance.

THE ULTIMATE VOTING MACHINE

Congress recently installed an expensive new electronic voting system, but Congressman Hosmer received his own automatic voting machine from a group of Midshipmen at the Naval Academy. When Hosmer went to Annapolis for a speech earlier this month, the Middies presented him with a unique Ship's Order Telegraph, which ordinarily is used to communicate orders between the bridge and engine room. However, on Hosmer's model, the conventional orders (All-Ahead Full, etc.) were replaced with Congressional voting options: Yea, Nay, Present, Paired For, Paired Against (and two originals from the Midshipmen: "Aye, Aye, Sir" and "Hell No.")

NEW 32ND C.D. OFFICE TO OPEN

Early this month, Congressman Hosmer will open a new District office at 17612 Beach Blvd., Suite 14, Huntington Beach. This new office will help serve the needs of Orange County residents in the 32nd District areas of Huntington Beach, Fountain Valley, Seal Beach and Los Alamitos. Carlos Galindo, the Congressman's Field Representative, will be available to provide assistance on a full-time basis.

WELCOME HOME

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, after spending nearly 6 years in a North Vietnamese prison camp, Navy Lt. Comdr. Read B. Mccleary is finally coming home.

He was among the gallant men released last weekend, some of them suf-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ferring from broken bones and limping, but none of them broken in spirit.

Commander Mccleary must have thought about a lot of things while he was in that prison camp. He must have wondered why America was involved in this conflict, so far from his old Greenwich, Conn., home.

We in America also wondered, but we were not the ones in the prison, we were not the ones who daily had to view the North Vietnamese as keepers.

Commander Mccleary must have wondered about his parents, whom he last saw Christmas Day, 1965. No doubt he knew that he was not forgotten by the American people, and that his Government was doing all it could to free him.

I cannot express adequately my admiration for Commander Mccleary, and others like him, who have endured so much in the fight for their country. He has sacrificed, his family has suffered, but he now knows it was not in vain.

I know I speak for everyone in Connecticut's Fourth Congressional District, and all Americans, in thanking Commander Mccleary and in saying, welcome home.

THE 55TH ANNIVERSARY OF  
ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. CHARLES W. SANDMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1918, Estonia proclaimed itself a free and independent democratic republic. This year marked the 55th anniversary of that historic event.

In the town of Seabrook, N.J., which is in my congressional district, reside about 300 Estonians, most of whom are employed by the great Seabrook Farms—one of the largest vegetable producing companies in the country.

I am most impressed by the sincerity of the Estonian people, almost all of whom today in the town of Seabrook are American citizens. Through years of hard work, they have raised their families and have contributed substantially in the development of the community. We can learn a great deal from these people. Their love of country and their respect for law and order is outstanding.

I have found in my travels that people who are born on foreign shores and have endured the hardships of life, as have the Estonian people, are today among the best of Americans. It would be a wonderful thing if all of the native born population of our country had the same amount of respect for our Government as the Estonian people. We would have no difficulty from within and communism would be stopped in its tracks.

It must be remembered that the Estonian people over centuries have been the victims of invasion by the larger countries that surround them. Thousands of their people have given their lives in an effort to have Estonia recognized as a free and independent nation. Although we have made some progress along this line since 1918, on June 17, 1940, the

March 7, 1973

country was again overrun by the Soviet Army as was Latvia and Lithuania. Whole families have been enslaved by the Communists, and in some cases, whole families have been annihilated.

The hope and prayer of all the Estonian people is that one day Estonia will be recognized by all of the world as a free and independent nation.

May I emphasize again that we who are Americans mainly because we were fortunate enough to be born in this country can learn a great deal from the Estonian people. Their love of country and their loyalty to the United States can never be forgotten. I, therefore, urge the Congress of the United States to command the Estonian-American population on the 55th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Estonia, and also to commend them for their great contribution to the growth of our country.

TIMBER YIELDS IN NORTH IDAHO

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a copy of a resolution of the North Idaho Hoo-Hoo Club concerning the effects of reduced timber yields in our national forests. I am quoting the resolution in my comments because of the facts it contains. All too few national leaders realize how much standing timber is dying every year which could be made into homes.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF NORTH IDAHO HOO-HOO CLUB

Whereas, The members of the North Idaho Hoo-Hoo Club in a meeting on February 15, 1973, at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, discussed with deep concern the alarming downward trend of timber being offered for sale on the National Forests of North Idaho as compared with the allowable annual timber cuts announced by these National Forest Timber Management Plans under sustained yield management; and

Whereas, The lack of making available for sale the announced allowable timber cuts and the reduction in sales volume of 40% or more during the past three years is having an adverse effect on the forest products economy of North Idaho and contributed to the shutdown of several small mills; and

Whereas, over 500 million board feet of merchantable timber is dying each year of overmaturity, insects and disease on the five National Forests of North Idaho including heavy concentrated losses of valuable white pine in roaded areas and in unroaded areas designated as non-wilderness; and

Whereas, most of this dying timber is not being harvested resulting in economic losses of millions of dollars annually to the people, U.S. Treasury and in dollar returns to county governments; and

Whereas, considerable amounts of appropriated timber sale funds and people are diverted to multiple-use and environmental studies leaving a shortage of funds at the ground level to prepare sales; and

Whereas, we recognize the need for balanced multiple-use environmental studies and the growing impact of environmental pressures on the use of land for timber production;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the

North Idaho Hoo-Hoo Club, goes on record, on February 20, 1973, requesting that immediate action be taken to increase the sale of National Forest Timber in North Idaho to the full allowable cut as announced by National Forest Timber Management Plans under sustained yield management; and

Be it further resolved, that a more aggressive program be undertaken on all North Idaho forests to harvest the catastrophic losses of dying timber; and

Be it further resolved, that additional funds and personnel be provided to perform the complicated and time consuming jobs associated with environmental studies before timber can be sold.

And be it further resolved, that copies of this resolution be sent to all members of the Idaho Congressional Delegation, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Chief of the U.S. Forest Service.

GILBERT MITCHELL,  
Vice President.

#### MEETING THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE REPUBLIC

#### HON. FRANK E. DENHOLM

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, the recent policy decisions of the Nixon administration to reduce the level of Federal spending are arbitrary, inconsistent, and unfairly imposed against the people of this country and in particular the people of rural communities.

President Nixon has requested the Congress to increase the national debt ceiling limit a total of nine times in less than 4 years. The public debt of our country is now \$465 billion. It has taken almost 200 years—all of the depressions, all of the hard times, and all of the wars of two centuries to accumulate a national debt of \$465 billion—but the fact is, more than one-fourth of the total national debt has been created in the last 3 years. In years of no drought, no depression, no hard times, and no declared war. The current fiscal problems have been compounded by international trade deficits unprecedented in history, plus two decisions in the last year to devalue the American dollar in the International Monetary Exchange money market.

These are the facts—these are some of the reasons for the recent radical policy decisions of the Nixon administration to "tighten the belt" and to "hold the line" on the level of Federal spending.

The consequences may or may not be the result of error—but they are real. The President has been forced to do inconsistent things contrary to his previous public statements on domestic and foreign policy issues. He imposed wage and price controls after he had said for months that he would not do so. He imposed foreign import duties contrary to stated policies of expanded international trade. He terminated domestic programs he previously endorsed. He has criticized the Congress and pirated our people without notice of cause or reason.

The President has hit hardest at his

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

own people. The people that have given the most in sacrifices and understanding of patriotic duty. He has cut back and terminated public programs for the people of rural America—those most decentralized, those most disorganized and those people most unable to resist adverse policy decisions of Government.

The actions of the President are similar to those of a father in financial difficulty—he has denied American families and the people of this land—to save face in public affairs and among the nations of the world. He continues to take from our people and proposes more to the people of foreign lands.

I do not agree with those that shout we are confronted with a constitutional crisis" or that suddenly this democracy has fallen to the depths of a dictatorship.

The circumstances of our times demand the best of us all.

I disagree with the policies of the President that "hatchet" categorical programs for the aged, for conservation, for education, for farmers, for hospitalization, for those in need and for the veterans of wars that have fought for freedom and offered their lives for liberty.

I have urged the administration to reduce the Federal budget "across the board" that all Americans may share equally the burden of reduced Federal spending.

Now, the Congress has an obligation and responsibility to cooperate in the public interest.

I have introduced legislation as a possible solution to the control of the Federal budget and the level of Federal spending in the future. The legislation that I have introduced is a proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States. The purpose of the legislation that I have introduced is to provide a limitation on annual appropriations to achieve national fiscal responsibility.

The amendment will change article I, section 9, clause 7 of the Constitution to read as follows, to wit:

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law and any sum appropriated to satisfy the annual need of the Federal Government shall not exceed a computed average of the total appropriations for the three consecutive fiscal years immediately preceding the current fiscal year plus the multiple product of the annual per centum rate of interest paid by the federal government, unless Congress shall first declare a national emergency in justification of any appropriation in addition thereto; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

An amendment to the Constitution requires a two-thirds majority of the Congress and the sister States of this Union. I have suggested a continuing method and procedure to control the level of Federal spending. It is a principle of expressed self-discipline of the Congress. It provides for reasonable limitations equal to changing needs with optional controls reserved to the Congress for incidents of national emergency.

#### HIGH COST OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CHARITY

#### HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to recently review a paper prepared by Dr. F. A. Harper which was presented to the Center for Constructive Alternatives at Hillsdale College.

Dr. Harper's article, "Your Brother's Keeper: From Genesis to Galbraith," addresses itself directly to a question we, in the House of Representatives, will have to face in the near future: The role of Government in charity.

Dr. Harper points out that charity given through the Federal Government costs approximately three times as much as charity directly given to the need. And all Members of Congress should take particular note of this fact.

I include Dr. Harper's article in my remarks at this time.

[From *Imprimis*, January 1973]

YOUR BROTHER'S KEEPER: FROM GENESIS TO GALBRAITH

(By F. A. Harper)

The theme of the week's program is, in a word, *charity*. We shall be scanning the span of human affairs from Genesis to Galbraith, hoping to find in the recorded history of man some help on that eternal question of the extent and form of one's obligations to his fellow men.

Helping one's fellow men in matters outside those we usually consider economic ones—such as things of the mind and spirit—is doubtless most important of all. But I shall restrict this discussion to economic matters, as implicit in our topic.

At the outset, I should confess to being a sinner of sorts. I have never found that light by which the words in the Bible all shine forth with complete certainty as to what went on and what was meant, devoid of seeming contradictions.

Let me illustrate. We are told in the book of Genesis that Cain was unhappy with the unfavorable balance of trade between the meat farmers (Abel) and the crop farmers (himself). He proceeded to solve the problem by doing away with all meat farmers (Abel). When questioned about it he responded, "Am I my brother's keeper?" Subsequently, we are told, the Lord renounced the death penalty for Cain. What are we to conclude from that about one's charitable responsibilities?

Then, later, we are told that Ephron offered to give Abraham a plot of land for the burial of his deceased wife, Sarah. Abraham refused, insisting on paying for it with—all things—silver. Does this event help answer our question?

Still later there is an interesting story which goes like this, idiomatically. It seems that there was a lad named Joe who was subject to nightmares. Joe was the favorite son of his father who, one day, gave him a psychedelic coat. His older brothers, who had always been jealous of Joe, were given no such coats. And besides, they probably thought Joe was going "hippie." So they broke off diplomatic relations with him completely and decreed the death penalty. But due to a faulty switch, or something, Joe survived and soon fell into slavery. Now it so happened that Pharaoh also had nightmares about which Joe became the official interpreter. On one occasion Joe interpreted

Pharaoh's dream as forecasting a weather cycle whereby seven years of plenty would be followed by seven of scarcity. Joe, the leading political expert of his time, saw a chance to set up a social security scheme which, though disguised as protection of the people, would eventually enslave them. The scheme appealed to Pharaoh and he appointed Joe as a Cabinet member to carry it out. During the seven good years a twenty percent tax in wheat was collected and put in government warehouses. When the seven years of drought came, Joe sold—sold—the wheat back to the starving taxpayers year by year until finally the only property they had left was their land. Joe then said to them, in effect, "Give me the titles to your land, or I'll let you starve." When they signed the deeds to their land over to the government, Joe observed, "Behold, I have bought you this day . . ." Pharaoh was so delighted at now owning not only all the wealth but also the people as slaves that he gave Joe many gifts—gorgeous robes, a chain of solid gold, a priest's daughter, and other loot.

We could go on and on, such as to consider why the illies of the field get along so well, how the Good Samaritan event worked out, what it means to love thy neighbor as thyself, and other biblical events.

I shall now go on with an analysis of the problem in a manner somewhat in harmony with the view that God helps those who help themselves, as Ben Franklin expressed it. As a preview, I offer my favorite quote on this theme, from Maimonides, the Talmudic philosopher:

"The noblest charity is to perverse a man from accepting charity, and the best alms are to show and enable a man to dispense with alms."

#### PRODUCTION: THE SOURCE OF GIVING

We might start with the simple fact that giving can come only from what has first been produced. I cannot give bread to the needy from wheat that has not yet been produced. We are speaking, of course, about economic matters because things that are plentiful and free pose no problem.

This brings us face to face with the primacy of production as being unavoidably back of each and every form of helping one's brother.

The producer, then, is the basic benefactor of mankind. The conspicuous dispenser of alms which others have produced is merely a vehicle and not the real source of benevolence. In fact, the dispenser may even be a parasitic factor if his work ignores the discipline of necessity and competitive efficiency. H. L. Wells, as Vice President of Northwestern University, once gave illustrative figures for doing a dollar's worth of charitable work:<sup>2</sup>

	Cost
Give it direct	\$1.00
Through a charitable society	1.08
Through local government	1.25
By local bond issue	1.75
Through state government	2.00
Through federal government	3.00

#### WHAT IS CHARITY?

It seems necessary at the outset to dislodge our thinking from the customary rut about what is charity and what is not. On the surface, superficially, it seems simple enough; it is giving a crust of bread to a starving child, for instance. But that is a myopic view of a matter which extends far into time, form, and space, becoming more and more complex as it goes.

Horace Gray, the distinguished Massachusetts Justice who later became a Supreme Court Justice, once had this to say:

"A charity, in the legal sense, may be more fully defined as a gift, to be applied con-

sistently with existing laws, for the benefit of an indefinite number of persons, whether by bringing their minds and hearts under the influence of education or religion, by relieving their bodies of disease, suffering, or constraint, by assisting them to establish themselves in life, or by erecting or maintaining public buildings or works, or by otherwise lessening the burdens of government."<sup>3</sup>

If there were time, we might dwell at length on this interesting concept of charity as being anything which lessen the burden of government; but with this being the first Tuesday after the first Monday of November and the air so full of dust about such possibilities, we should postpone that until some other time. Suffice to say, the concept probably stands higher in logic than in what passes as "law" in our time.

I would plead that we consider the meaning of "helping our brother" in terms above and beyond any political plan or mechanism. The government, at most, is only one of innumerable organizations that may be presuming to be an agency involved in the process.

If it is an act of charity to give a crust of bread to a starving child, how about giving him a second crust? A third? At some point of rising affluence from added giving does it suddenly become non-charity? If so, precisely where?

Or is some other criterion the one to use? If so, what?

We shall discuss this question after considering other aspects of the problem, and now return to the point that anything to be given as charity must first have been produced.

#### ALTERNATIVE USES OF WHAT IS PRODUCED

Not only must the loaf of bread for charity first be produced, but it can serve a charitable use only once—it can't be eaten twice, in other words. This being true, alternative uses must be considered in terms of the same charitable objective. Let me illustrate.

Assume that you deem it proper to give blood to the Red Cross. You may not, however, decide to give all your blood to that cause at any one time. As an alternative, at least, you might well consider keeping some of it for yourself, even in the face of being accused of selfishness.

Or let us say that some wheat is under consideration. You might give all of it to persons who are at the point of starvation; or you might use it for seed with the view of having more later to give to more who are starving; or you might sell it and use the proceeds to pay the costs of trying to develop a higher yielding strain of wheat which, even later, will prevent even more persons from starving.

Viewed in terms of real and practical alternatives, in other words, the objective of charitable uses of what has been produced becomes complicated and calls for great wisdom and foresight if benevolence is to be maximized over time.

But in any event, everything produced will help somebody. Once produced, who is to decide among all these alternative possible uses?

#### WHO SHALL DECIDE?

The one who shall decide the usage of any item produced is, *ipso facto*, the person who owns it.

We do not have time to probe this issue of ownership to the depths it warrants, so I shall merely state my position boldly and clearly.

It seems to me reasonably self-evident that ownership of anything produced belongs to the one who produced it—to the one who bore the costs of necessary inputs of his time and other ingredients. If we were to hold otherwise, we would be denying him the ownership of his own time and body—i.e., we would be prescribing slavery as the

proper status of a man. A slave of whom, and by what right on his part?

Having thus identified the placement of ownership of anything produced, we have thus renounced the right of anyone else to do it. To deny anyone else to it is, *ipso facto*, to deny to any aggregate of other persons—be it political, private organizations, gangs, or whatnot—the right to take that thing from the producer, against his will, and assume the rights as owner which have just been denied to him who has produced it. St. Matthew wrapped up this concept neatly when he said, "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?"<sup>4</sup>

The just province of the producer as owner—or subsequent owners through valid transfer of ownership—is, then, to decide on matters of usage of what has been produced. It is his right, and his alone, to decide whether to "eat" it, sell it, invest it, give it away. . . . On what basis might he make the choice?

#### CHOICES AMONG USES OF PRODUCTION

Among possible uses of anything produced, the top priority would seem to be to "eat" it. To illustrate, let us assume, for the sake of clearness and simplicity, that you produce wheat and nothing else; that you have no other property. It would seem foolish for you to either plant all of this year's crop or give it all away, and then starve. So assuming you eat some of the crop and survive, for that part left over you have the choice of either using it as seed or giving it away. (This ignores other possibilities which are only diversionary forms.) What shall it be?

In terms of Austrian economic theory, what you do with your wheat is strictly your problem, not mine.<sup>5</sup> Fortunately, I do not have to decide for you and have enough of a problem deciding for my own. Yet we may all use some general guides for a decision.

Since the initial reaction of most persons is that the charitable thing to do is to give it to the needy, some sticky problems immediately raise their ugly heads: "How do we define 'needy'? Precisely which persons are needy and which are not? Are the 'needy' only persons, or should we include cattle, dogs, field mice . . . ?"

#### WHO ARE THE NEEDY?

The more one thinks about it the more elusive becomes the word "need."

The son of a friend in New Hampshire, then in second grade, was pressed by his teacher as to what he meant by "necessity." To appreciate his response, it is relevant to note that he was one of a family whose gross income for the two decades from 1927 to 1947 had averaged about \$200 a year, with taxes taking about \$50 of that. The lad replied, "A necessity is something you have to have, or you die." That definition is probably not the one being used by H.E.W., but let us follow through with it a little.

I recall how a famous national philanthropic foundation poured great sums of money, over a long period early in this century, into prevention of yellow fever in India. That seemed clearly to be a "necessity," because without it they would die. The effort was notably successful. Untold millions of Indians were saved from dying of yellow fever—lived to propagate offsprings in great numbers who in turn, lived to face death by starvation. Contemplating this in retrospect, one wonders why those foundation officials at the outset had not asked, "Is it more humane, more charitable, to use our resources to prevent one person from dying of yellow fever or to do something to prevent a larger number of persons—two, three, four . . . —from dying of starvation?"

What I wish to suggest by this illustration is the profound wisdom reflected in the quotation from Maimonides, given at the outset. If human resources are used in such a way as to cure one need but thereby creating an-

Footnotes at end of article.

other equal need, is it being charitable? Or if in so doing, another and greater need is created, is that being charitable—no matter how well intentioned may be the motives behind it?

What I am suggesting is that perhaps "need," with respect to Maimonides' concept, is to be measured in terms of the effects on *production* of needed things, rather than in terms of the persons who lack these things, per se.

#### "YE HAVE THE POOR ALWAYS"

A sobering observation is that of St. Matthew, "For ye have the poor always with you . . ."<sup>6</sup> That is a pretty gloomy outlook. Should we just shed a tear, adjourn, and go home to our dry crust of bread? I think not, and I'll tell you why.

Another possible meaning of the St. Matthew observation is one in harmony with everything else in the Bible including certain key points such as the Golden Rule, the Decalogue, and the Sermon on the Mount. It is also affirmed by the interesting interpretations of the Bible by a Mexican scholar, Alberto Salceda, who has said, ". . . only one system can be derived, the one which goes hand in hand with a rational and free human nature, mainly capitalism."<sup>7</sup> In this sense, we might paraphrase St. Matthew as follows, "Mind ye, there will always be some among you who are poorer than others." Let us now explore this alternate meaning and test it with some seemingly valid evidence.

#### INCOME DIFFERENCES

Wide differences in income are of common knowledge.

In an age saturated with concepts of egalitarianism, justice tends to be equated with the degree of likeness in incomes and wealth. To this is added the human weakness of envy as a powerful catalyst for the egalitarian view.<sup>8</sup>

Many years ago while a graduate student, I began to ponder and study this problem. The fact of wide differences was beyond doubt. But why do they exist?

It seemed clear that if you have more wealth than I do, there are three possible explanations: (1) you earned more, (2) you inherited it, or (3) you stole it. I ruled out "3" as a major cause of these differences because most thieves seem to be poor rather than wealthy. I ruled out "2" because if your rich uncle earned it honestly, it then becomes a "1" problem one generation back. That leaves only "1" as the explanation to be investigated.

In pursuing that line of inquiry, I came across the work of Pareto. He was a man of great genius, curiosity, and persistent devotion to collecting evidence on income differences for every time and clime he could find. When all his evidence was distilled, he found a persistent pattern of variation known to statisticians as a harmonic series.<sup>9</sup> This pattern, incidentally, appears elsewhere in seemingly foreign phenomena such as the distribution of energy among molecules,<sup>10</sup> the populations of cities and towns in a (maturing) nation;<sup>11</sup> and others.

The issue now shifts to the question of whether these income differences are basically just or unjust. Can it be that everyone produces about equal amounts in terms of market worth, meaning that inequality of incomes is to be equated with injustice? I found this far from an adequate explanation for reasons we cannot treat fully here. But as a clue, it seemed to me that if all persons produced equally but were paid widely different amounts, employers who paid the top figures would go broke and those who paid the bottom figures would lose their employees to those paying more. In short, the search must go further.

Footnotes at end of article.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

#### THE LAW OF VARIATION

A good place to start is a bit of biographical reference to the work of Francis Galton, a nineteenth-century scientific genius. Skipping the earlier part of his remarkable life—for instance, learning to read at the age of two and a half years—we find his attention shifting to anthropometry and note his obsession with counting and measuring almost anything observable. ". . . he measured heads, noses, arms, legs, color of eyes and hair, breathing power, . . . reaction time . . . the number of 'fidgets' per minute among persons attending lectures . . . test the dog population with a high-pitched whistle . . ."<sup>12</sup>

Our present interest centers on his arranging each type of data he had collected so as to reveal the persistence pattern, throughout nature, of what has come to be known as the "normal curve." This is the bell shaped curve of frequency, perhaps best recognized as that used by teachers as a pattern for distributing grades among pupils in a class; for instance, in a class of twenty, there would be one A, four B's, ten C's, four D's, and one F.

When Galton discovered this pattern, his exultation is reflected in what he said about it in *Natural Inheritance* (1889):<sup>13</sup>

"I know of scarcely anything so apt to impress the imagination as the wonderful form of cosmic order expressed by the 'Law of Frequency of Error.' The law would have been personified by the Greeks and deified, if they had known of it. It reigns with serenity and in complete self-effacement amidst the wildest confusion. The huger the mob, and the greater the apparent anarchy, the more perfect is its sway . . . Whenever a large sample of chaotic elements are taken in hand and marshalled in the order of their magnitudes, an unsuspected and most beautiful form of regularity proves to have been latent all along."

Perhaps we can excuse Galton for the excesses of his description. But without going overboard completely for his view, one can at least agree that there appears to be something about the occurrences of variations among different units of things in nature that reminds us of the universality of certain laws of physics and chemistry. In other words, it seems to be true that variation can be predicted with surprising accuracy as to both the fact and the form.

The person who has probably done the finest scientific work on the forms of human variations is Professor Roger Williams, the famous biochemist at the University of Texas. He notes with dismay that almost every textbook of physiology portrays the human parts as though all persons were alike. Yet, for instance, there is quite a variation in the size and shape of human stomachs.<sup>14</sup>

#### COMPOUNDED VARIATION

The human organism is not a simple, single variant such as height. Mankind is apparently the most complex form of life. Each human is a package of innumerable separate characteristics, each of which may be assumed to vary from person to person by something like the normal curve, with all these characteristics varying independently of one another. Professor J. P. Guilford has, I believe, identified over sixty independent aspects of the mind alone (and suspects there are at least a hundred), each of which varies independently of the others from person to person.

Note the effect this complexity has on the degree to which any person, as a functional unit, varies from other persons. To indicate the magnitude of variation, let us take a simple illustration by considering variations within each characteristic according to the normal curve. Let us say that I am seeking to employ someone who is capable of "A" performance (among seven gradations) for one relevant characteristic only. You tell me, quite correctly, that I might expect to find

one such person from among 26 persons picked at random off the street, so to speak.

Let us say that I come to you again for help in finding a person who is not only "A" grade in the first characteristic but also "A" grade in a second one wherein our first selectee fails to measure up. You now inform me that I might expect to find one such person from among 676 picked at random. We go on in the same way until finally I tell you that I need someone who is "A" grade in each of seven different characteristics, at which point you report to me, "I wish you luck, because it would require more than double the population of the earth to expect to find one such person among them."

Seen in this light, one can understand why, despite the plethora of self-esteem and freely-advising baseball enthusiasts in the stands, there is only one Willie Mays who can deliver such performance out there on the field. Many other persons can run as fast, perhaps, but they can't also do all the other things as well as Willie. That is why all those people—many with low incomes—pay high prices to see Willie play ball, yet will not come to watch me play, even for free; why Willie Mays, Marilyn Monroe, and many others in different walks of life earn higher incomes than most of the rest of us. It is because consumers vote that way in the market place for what each of us produces. To put it another way, if your mother buys a loaf of bread because she prefers it to the 25 cents which it costs, she cares not whether the one who produced it earns \$5,000 a year or \$50,000 a year. As far as she is concerned, this is the best bread available for her 25 cents.<sup>15</sup> For if the market is free, we know that the relative incomes of the two producers reflects worth of their services to your mother and others like her.

We can also see why high incomes are fewer than low incomes and why "ye have the poor always with you." It is because, when complex units with variable independent component parts perform, individual weak points nullify strong points like links in a chain so that the chains that will hold the heaviest weight are few. This seems to be in the nature of things and is something we should work with rather than against, as one would with the tides or the winds.

#### THE BEST WAY TO HELP THE POOR

My basic theme, then, is that the best way to help the poor is to do everything possible to produce more rather than to waste time, energy, and costs trying to forcefully take from the rich the fruits of their labor and place it where they, as producers, consider to be not its best use. Judging best usage takes foresight and courage, in the face of one's inclinations to help the poor who are close at hand and in view of the climate of opinion of most on-lookers. To take an extreme case, it is not easy to refrain from giving a starving person wheat today rather than to use it for seed and grow much more wheat which might be enough to prevent forty persons from starving later. The same principle, likewise, applies at all levels above starvation.<sup>16</sup>

Karl Marx's objective of helping the needy working man has, in fact, been accomplished in the United States to an amazing degree by a method quite the opposite of his "surplus value" approach.

Greater production, in brief, is almost entirely a matter of permitting producers and savers to accumulate wealth for use in developing tools which, with the aid of harnessed energy, provide powerful leverage to human efforts devoted to production.<sup>17</sup>

#### SUMMARY

How best to be "charitable," in an economic sense, has been a perplexing issue from the time of Genesis to the time of Galbraith. I have suggested places in the Bible where the answer seems a bit confusing so I'll let you read and judge that for yourself. The same goes for Galbraith. What I have at-

tempted to do is to outline an analysis by which to judge both.

We have noted how giving can come only from production, which puts a ceiling on giving irrespective of our hopes and intentions otherwise.

We have noted how production can serve either immediate needs or be saved and used to greatly enhance the serving of needs later.

We have noted that the best route—the just one—along this road of choices and decisions is through private ownership of what is produced and saved.

We have noted that there will always be some who are poorer than others, and that their numbers will be great. This appears to be in the nature of things, because humans are highly complex and variable. As a consequence, production rates are highly variable in amounts and forms so that, under justice, incomes will be highly variable.

The conclusion, then, in a few words is this: attempts to improve the welfare of the poor by forcing redistribution of incomes is likely to reduce the welfare of all. For instance, assume an isolated population of three producers whose production levels are as 1, 2, and 3. If we try to help the first of these by forcing incomes to be equal in spite of production—to divide the total production of 6, in other words, into incomes of 2, 2, and 2—the likely outcome will be reduction of total production to perhaps 3 and incomes of  $\frac{1}{2}$ , 1, and  $1\frac{1}{2}$ . If, instead, they accept differences as in the nature of things and allow each to work through the processes of freedom and private property, the total production is likely to rise to perhaps 12 and incomes of 2, 4, and 6; in this event, the poor are still present but at twice the level of welfare as before. This, as I interpret it, is what both St. Matthew and Maimonides were trying to tell us.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Moses Maimonides, *Code of Jewish Law*, chp. X, par. 7. As paraphrased by Mary Baker Eddy.

<sup>2</sup> H. L. Wells, *That Awful Word "Charity"*. Northwestern University Associates, December 4, 1952.

<sup>3</sup> Op. cit. Wells, p. 2

<sup>4</sup> Matthew 20:15. Also, F. A. Harper, *Morals and Liberty*. Institute for Humane Studies, Inc., 1971 reprint.

<sup>5</sup> F. A. Harper, "Austrian School" *Economics: A Résumé*. Institute for Humane Studies, Inc., 1966.

<sup>6</sup> Matthew 26:11

<sup>7</sup> Alberto G. Salceda, "Jesus and the Question of Wealth" in *Toward Liberty*, pp. 334-352. Institute for Humane Studies, Inc., 1971.

<sup>8</sup> Helmut Schoeck, *Envy*. Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1970.

<sup>9</sup> Carl Snyder, *Capitalism The Creator*, pp. 239-244 and 416-418. The Macmillan Company, 1940.

<sup>10</sup> Frank W. Preston, "Gas Laws and Wealth Laws", *The Scientific Monthly*, vol. LXXI, No. 5.

<sup>11</sup> George Kingsley Zipf, *Human Behavior and the Principle of Least Effort*, chps. 9 and 10. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Press, Inc. 1949.

<sup>12</sup> James R. Newman, "Francis Galton", *Scientific American*, January 1954.

<sup>13</sup> Alan Treloar, *Elements of Statistical Reasoning*, chap. 2. John Wiley & Sons, 1939.

<sup>14</sup> Roger J. Williams, *You Are Extraordinary*. Random House, 1967.

<sup>15</sup> F. A. Hayek, *The Use of Knowledge in Society*. Institute for Humane Studies, Inc., 1972 reprint.

<sup>16</sup> F. A. Harper, *The Greatest Economic Charity*. Institute for Humane Studies, Inc., 1972 reprint.

<sup>17</sup> F. A. Harper, *Why Wages Rise*. Institute for Humane Studies, Inc. Fourth reprint, 1972.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### AUTO EMISSION CONTROL STANDARDS

#### HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, to help clean up the Nation's environment, Congress passed the Clean Air Amendments of 1970, which set tough auto emission control standards.

Within the last 2 weeks, both the Committee on Motor Vehicle Emissions of the National Academy of Sciences and the Environmental Protection Agency have reported that the clean air standards mandated for cars in this law can be met on schedule for model year 1975. Yet the Wall Street Journal last week reported that one of President Nixon's assistants has suggested that the implementation of this law be delayed.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly concerned about attempts to postpone the advent of cleaner air. Urban dwellers are exposed to particulate lead in the atmosphere, to carbon monoxide and to that combination of sunlight, unburned hydrocarbon and oxides of nitrogen that unite photochemically to form smog.

Mr. Speaker, because I think this issue is of interest to all Members of Congress, urban and rural alike, I include in the RECORD a copy of this article from the Wall Street Journal of February 27, 1973:

AIDE TO NIXON HINTS SUPPORT FOR CAR FIRMS IN THEIR BID TO EASE 1975-76 EXHAUST RULES

DETROIT.—A top Nixon aide gave the strongest hint to date that the White House might side with auto companies in their bid to modify the 1970 clean air amendments that set strict standards for control of auto emissions in 1975 and 1976 models.

Presidential assistant John Ehrlichman, in response to a question on whether the administration would ask Congress to delay the 1975-1976 auto emission standards, said, "There are a lot of things about the law that we just don't think (are) common sense."

However, Mr. Ehrlichman wouldn't say whether President Nixon will seek a delay of the standards from Congress and declined to specify the White House's reservations about the current laws. Mr. Ehrlichman said he had already said "300%" more than he should have.

The presidential assistant noted that the Environmental Protection Agency is still considering auto companies' requests for a delay of the 1975 standards. "The ball is in EPA's court," he said.

Thus his remarks, made at a news conference prior to a speech here, left unclear what action the White House will take, if any.

Two weeks ago, a federal appeals court ruled the EPA should hold further hearings on its deadline for installing certain auto pollution devices. The EPA had already turned down one bid by the industry for a delay in implementing the 1975 standards. The new hearings are scheduled to start in March.

EPA officials have indicated that they think the 1970 clean air amendments are basically good legislation but that they would prefer a little more flexibility on deadlines.

The auto companies have criticized existing emissions law in the past. They com-

plain, among other things, that the law includes specific levels to which auto pollution must be reduced and doesn't give the EPA authority to change those levels administratively. The auto companies want the EPA to have such authority. As things stand, relaxation of the levels to which pollution must be reduced requires congressional action.

March 7, 1973

## THE VIETNAM VETERANS

#### HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the releasing of American prisoners of war held for so long by the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong is most welcome news. However, the undue attention focused on these several hundred POW's, to the exclusion of those millions of veterans who served in Indochina, a number of whom were killed and wounded, seems difficult to explain.

Many of those who place this peculiar emphasis on the returning POW's are among the most silent when it comes to demonstrating concern and compassion for the more than 56,000 Americans who died needlessly in the Indochina conflict, for the several hundred thousand men who were wounded, many of whom will bear those scars for the rest of their lives, or for many of the more than 2 million men who served in Indochina and face unemployment and other readjustment problems here at home. The Vietnam veterans, apparently, have been singled out for neglect by the administration, and this is the subject of a Nicholas Von Hoffman article which appeared in the Madison, Wis. Capital Times on March 2, 1973.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

POW'S GET PARADES, VETS ARE FORGOTTEN  
(By Nicholas Von Hoffman)

WASHINGTON.—Contrary to what has generally been reported, we seem to have about 2,500,000 men missing in action. These MIA's are the men who fought in Vietnam and the action they were lost in is the political action coming out of the White House.

The Vietnam vet has disappeared, and if you'd believe what the Nixon Administration wants you to, the war was fought alone by the 600 prisoners of war now coming out of the internment camps. They are the only guys who are getting a victory parade. The other veterans are getting their benefits cut.

The political uses to which this small group of American POW's can be put is next to limitless. For years Nixon offered them as the last excuse for carrying on the war, and now they serve as the focus of a patriotic uproar which distracts people from entertaining the thought that in the end the President bugged out of the war just as he said he'd never do.

All the saluting, gulps and God-bless-America's fill the air with so much random noise it's hard to consider the possibility that Dr. Henry Kissinger and Nixon may also have signed a secret agreement or come to a secret understanding with North Vietnam. Perhaps that much-talked-about two-and-a-half-billion dollars in reparations or goodwill payments is actually the price to ransom those guys out of there.

They're worth the money, to be sure, but this clangorous, red, white and blue fuss almost seems designed to make us think that by taking care of them we've discharged our obligations to the 2,500,000 who are missing in the Washington action. It's fine for these fellows to have their \$100,000 in tax-free back pay—make it \$200,000—and it's nice they were offered free cars and trips, and even that they play along with the embarrassing tattoo of adulation for "the Commander-in-Chief," but the Commander-in-Chief, in his other, more important capacity of President, is trying to cut the pension benefits to Vietnamese War amputees.

He's doing his level best to keep the GI Bill educational benefits so low as to be next to useless. In terms of the dollar's purchasing power, the Vietnam vet is receiving something like a quarter of the school assistance that his father got when he came back from the Second World War and Korea.

Not only that, but the Vietnam vet is having trouble actually getting what little is owed him. A recent article in the UCLA campus newspaper estimates that 15 per cent of the vets on campus are finding their payments blocked or delayed for weeks and months.

Clearly, the Commander-in-Chief likes some of his soldiers better than others, and best of all, he likes the POW's. The POW's bristle at the remark that, while the North Vietnamese couldn't brainwash them in years of captivity, their superiors were able to do it in a matter of minutes at Clark Air Force Base in the Philippines. Even so they do display an admirable unity of enthusiasm for peace with honor and other such slogans.

The POW's are suited to the Commander-in-Chief's tastes, being overwhelmingly white, obedient, professional officers. In contrast, most of the 2,500,000 missing vets were a racially polyglot horde of conscripted grunts.

Many didn't have the money to buy their way out of the war into college or the clout to get into the National Guard and sit it out. They aren't Nixon's kind of people, and they made it worse on themselves when a few thousands of them marched past the Capitol and tore their medals off their chests and flung them into the street. Even the generals who had phony citations written up for themselves kept the decorations they didn't deserve until they were forcibly removed from their heroic bosoms.

The Vietnam vets are ideal for punishment. They're unorganized, and so have no power either to protect themselves or lobby for their own interests. When they filtered back from the Nam, the idea of joining the old-line veterans organizations like the Legion and VFW was repellent. They are a diffuse mass whom, you might think, remnants of the peace movement would try to help. But the old peacenik crowd is too taken up with rescuing their POW's by getting amnesty for them.

The Vietnam vets are a good group to kick around. They lost the war, didn't they? Peace with honor has to be blamed on somebody, and it can't be Nixon or the diplomats or the generals of the North Vietnamese, so who's left? Those guys went over there and smoked dope when they should have been fighting.

Forget them, and cheer the 600 real Americans who won this war. Believe them when they say peaceniks prolonged it with complaints, and Nixon shortened it with his bombing, but when they're all back and throats are hoarse, let's scout around and try to find our missing in action.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### THE KOREAN AMERICAN: FROM LABORER TO LEADER IN 70 YEARS IN HAWAII

#### HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

#### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, America is known as the land of opportunity and indeed has proven so for many people. The Horatio Alger ideal of working one's way from rags to riches has been accomplished time and time again by immigrants and native Americans.

In Hawaii we have had many immigrants come to our shores in search of a better life, including my own parents. One of the most prominent of the immigrant groups are the Koreans, who, since coming to Hawaii 70 years ago as plantation workers, have become leaders in the Hawaiian community. And despite Americanization, they maintained much of their own identity and unique culture.

In commemoration of the 70th anniversary, this year, of Korean immigration to Hawaii, I am submitting for the RECORD the following account by John G. Anderson of the Honolulu Advertiser of the fascinating struggle and success by Americans of Korean ancestry to realize the American dream:

#### FROM LABORER TO LEADER IN 70 YEARS IN HAWAII

(By John G. Anderson)

It has been 70 years since the first Korean plantation worker stepped off the boat in Honolulu Harbor.

Not many of the approximately 8,000 Koreans in Hawaii today are working on plantations. Some are businessmen, doctors, lawyers, professors, engineers and government workers.

They constitute less than one per cent of the State's total population, but the number of Koreans in influential positions may belie that figure.

A list of prominent persons of Korean descent in Hawaii would have to include State Comptroller KeNam Kim, Federal Judge Herbert Choy, physician and police commissioner Dr. Robert Chung, State Attorney General George Pai and engineer K. D. Park, among others.

A large number of local Koreans will be honored next week when the Korean Consulate General and State of Hawaii co-sponsor a series of events to commemorate the 70th anniversary of Korean immigration to Hawaii.

Through the years, despite intermarriage, the Koreans have maintained their own identity.

The history of their immigration here—which was largely accomplished in a 2½-year period between 1903 and 1905—is striking.

A few small groups of Korean merchants were admitted to the Hawaiian Islands as early as 1899, but not until Jan. 13, 1903, did a major influx begin.

That was the day the S.S. Gaelic docked in Honolulu after a 22-day voyage from Inchon, Korea. On board were 101 passengers—55 men, 21 women and 25 children.

The way to Hawaii had been paved for them on Nov. 15, 1902, when the emperor of Korea lifted a tight restriction on Korean emigration. A severe drought throughout Korea induced the emperor to lift the law.

at about the same time Hawaii plantation owners were looking at Korea as a possible source of plantation labor.

A United States law excluded Chinese from entering Hawaii and Japanese workers in Hawaii were creating strike rumblings. So plantation owners were anxious to find a new source of labor.

The first shipload of Korean recruits left their country on the Gaelic on Dec. 22, 1902. Each passenger was given free ocean passage to Hawaii and was provided with \$100 by the Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association to clear Customs.

A Hawaii newspaper article which appeared the day the Gaelic arrived said the immigration was "experimental."

"If they (the Koreans) are found to be good laborers on the plantations and take kindly to the country," said the article, "there is no question whatever that each steamer from the Orient will see a large company of these people."

During the next 2½ years, 65 boatloads of Korean laborers arrived in Honolulu Harbor, carrying a total of 7,843 Koreans. Of these, 6,701 were men, the remainder women and children. Some 5,500 of the men were single.

Koreans were still coming to Hawaii in April 1905, when the Korea emperor decreed a stop to emigration from his country.

University of Hawaii historian Arthur L. Gardner said the reason for the decree was "not because the demand for laborers slackened, but because of official Korean concern over rumored distresses suffered by a large band of Koreans who had emigrated to Mexico in the spring of 1905.

"The rumors threw a cloud of suspicion over all labor emigration," Gardner said.

"Also, there was the increased influence in Korea of the Japanese Government, in whose interest it was to block the continued exodus of Korean manpower."

Korean immigrants were scattered to various Oahu and Big Island sugar and pineapple plantations upon their arrival. The first group went to Waialua, the others to a variety of locations.

But the work demanded by plantation managers was extremely difficult, and the pay was barely enough to live on. As a result, there was a steady out-migration of Koreans to the Mainland, where railroad workers were in great demand.

An executive order from the president in 1907 banned the movement of Koreans and Japanese to the Mainland from Hawaii.

The Korean bachelors who had remained in Hawaii saved their pennies, and between 1911 and 1924, many of them sent back to their homeland for "picture brides." The entry of some 800 Korean women, and the subsequent increase of families, stabilized the Korean population in Hawaii and balanced the departure of Koreans to the Mainland and elsewhere.

With the arrival of the women, a new chapter began in the life of the Korean in Hawaii.

The Korean women largely had no desire to live on plantations. And most of the men, who had spent most of their hard-earned money bringing their new mates to Hawaii, had no desire to remain on the plantations.

Some started a new type of business—boarding houses. The Korean couples took in single Korean men as roomers, and the women cooked for the tenants.

As time progressed, these boarding houses grew into apartment houses. During World War II, with the great influx of military personnel and others, the apartments were nearly always full. As a result, many Koreans prospered.

Other Koreans, leaving the plantations, became successful in food manufacturing, tal-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 7, 1973

loring, carpentry, laundry and other trades. Their offsprings carried on this tradition to a greater extent, and the third generation of Koreans advanced high in the professions to where they are today.

Outside of their working lives, the Koreans were influenced in Hawaii by their social, political and religious organizations.

Sunday worship became an almost universal feature of plantation life for the Koreans. Non-Christian Koreans were drawn to the church by its social offerings. Soon virtually all Koreans in Hawaii became Christians.

This over-all Christian identity was a major factor in hastening the Americanization of the Koreans. But a significant number struggled to sustain their culture.

For example, a large number of the people broke from the controlling Methodist and Episcopal churches in 1918 and formed the Korean Christian Church.

This local nationalism extended to the world level. The cohesive force in the lives of most of the Koreans was the goal of liberating their native country from Japanese control.

As Gardner said, "The Koreans in Hawaii generated a national sentiment out of all proportion to their numbers in their new land. Apart from immediate economic needs, Koreans independence was the one critical and dominant issue for the whole community."

This was spurred by the emergence of two strong local leaders, Syngman Rhee and Pak Yong-man.

Pak insisted that military action was the fastest way to achieve Korean independence. He organized a military training school among Korean laborers in the Windward plantations in preparation for a triumphant return to Korea.

Rhee stressed working within the system, through educational and diplomatic means, to attain the same goal Pak sought.

Rhee, who many years later became the first president of independent Korea, won control of the local chapter of Kook Min Hur, the Korean National Association, in 1915. He proceeded to lay the groundwork for an independent Korean school and church in Honolulu.

Kook Min Hur was almost a government within a government in Hawaii. Every year delegates were sent from every plantation or settlement of Korean residents to the general meeting in Honolulu.

As Gardner recalled, "The delegates would discuss and legislate on matters having to do with their own communities in the Territory. They voted on a budget, raised through individual dues, to provide for the special educational needs of their children, for welfare work among their number, for nationalistic activities in Hawaii and abroad and for their own organizational and publishing activities."

Kook Min Hur exists to the present day, as does an offshoot formed by some of Rhee's disciples, the Dong Ji Hoi.

Neither organization is, of course, as influential as it once was. The end of World War II and the departure of many of the alien nationalists for their newly liberated country took much of the basic motivation from the local nationalist movements.

Their primary interests now involve preservation of the Korean cultural identity and various service projects for the Korean community.

Gardner, who has spent much of his time studying Hawaii's Koreans, believes continuing Americanization appears to be the future of the Koreans here.

"The chances of a Korean ethnic group are slim," he said. "The majority of Koreans here want to be known as Americans of Korean descent, not as Koreans."

Five churches in Hawaii still cater primarily to Korean interests. Three of them are in Honolulu—Christ United Methodist

Church on Keeaumoku Street, the Korean Christian Church on Liliha Street and Saint Luke's Episcopal Church on North Judd Street.

There are also Korean Christian Churches in Wahiawa and Hilo.

Other important clubs influencing the Korean Chamber of Commerce, the Korean Community Council, the Taeguk Club and several women's clubs. In addition, the Korean University Club offers University of Hawaii scholarships to students of Korean ancestry.

The University's new Center for Korean Studies hopes to make its presence felt as the most unifying body for the local Korean community.

"We want to get more involved with the community in cultural affairs," said Dr. Dae-Sook Suh, director of the center. "We have a community affairs program here, but it is not in full operation yet."

When the program is complete, he said, it will bring cultural events to the Korean community through a series of art, dancing and music presentations, plus history and culture lectures by various professors.

Also projected for the future, with a target date of early 1975, is a new Korean Study Center on the University campus, built in classic Korean architectural style.

"We're trying to relate ourselves academically and culturally to the community," Suh said.

Along those lines, the center is launching a comprehensive study of Korean immigration abroad.

Suh estimated there are 50,000 to 60,000 Koreans or persons of Korean descent living in the United States, with large numbers in Los Angeles, Chicago, New York and Washington, D.C.

But only in Los Angeles have the Koreans reached a status in society close to that they have attained in Hawaii, he said.

"That's because in Hawaii, the Koreans aren't settlers," Suh said. "They're second and third generation, and they were born and raised here. Consequently, they have a much higher position in society."

## F-111 AS AIR DEFENSE JAMMER

## HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD an interesting and important newsstory written by Orr Kelly in the Washington Star-News of February 27, 1973.

The whole story is of interest to all Members of the Congress but I would like to point out one particular section of it for special attention.

Orr Kelly points out that:

When ordered into action in September, the planes left their home base in Nevada, crossed the Pacific on their own power, landed at Tak Lhi Royal Thai Air Base and began immediately to fly combat missions.

With their terrain-following radar, which permits them to fly only 200 feet off the ground at high speed through darkness and bad weather, they normally flew alone and at night against some of the most highly defended targets in North Vietnam.

The newsstory points out further that:

In the final week of the bombing campaign against the Hanoi-Haiphong area, the F-111's went in ahead of the slower high-flying B-52's to attack fighter bases, anti-

aircraft sites and communication facilities in a successful effort to reduce losses of the B-52's. It is this ability to move anywhere in the world and to operate with—or even ahead of—other planes in intensely defended areas that the Air Force is counting on to make the EF-111 one of its most useful planes.

I will point out that the first strike of the F-111's in North Vietnam was only 33 hours after the F-111's left Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada. We have no other aircraft in our inventory even remotely capable of this kind of operation.

I insert the article in the appendix as a portion of my remarks:

WASHINGTON CLOSE-UP—F-111 AS AIR DEFENSE JAMMER  
(By Orr Kelly)

The Air Force has begun moving somewhat belatedly, to fill in one of the major gaps in its arsenal exposed by the Vietnam war—the need for a modern, specially designed plane to suppress hostile radar and radio transmissions.

The decision has been made to try to go ahead with the development in the current fiscal year of the EF111. Some of the earlier models of the F111 fighter-bomber will be worked over and fitted out with special equipment that can, in effect, "turn off" the enemy's radar, long enough for the attack planes to get in and out of the target area.

In some ways, the EF111 will represent a not entirely satisfactory compromise solution to the problem.

The Air Force was faced with three possibilities. It could design and build an entirely new plane at a very high—probably prohibitive—cost. It could order some of the very effective EA6B radar suppression planes built for the Navy by Grumman. Or it could adapt its own General Dynamics F111 to carry the computer and electronic equipment needed to do the job.

Cost pretty clearly ruled out the first alternative. But the choice between the other two was a tough one.

The EA6B Prowler went into action in July after nine years of development. Operating off carriers in the Tonkin Gulf it sharply reduced the number of surface-to-air missiles fired at attacking Navy planes and cut the number of attack planes lost.

But the Prowler is a relatively slow plane, unable to fight its way in and out of hostile areas. In attacks against North Vietnam, where the Navy planes came in from the sea, the Prowler was able to operate effectively while avoiding the most heavily defended areas.

The F111, on the other hand, was built as a fighter-bomber, specifically designed to survive in the most hostile enemy areas.

Despite the controversy that long surrounded the plane, it now appears to have vindicated itself in operations in Southeast Asia since 48 of the planes were sent to Thailand in September.

The major drawback to the F111 in its new role as a radar suppression plane is that it probably is not big enough.

When Grumman designed the EA6B as an outgrowth of the A6 attack plane, it decided the plane really needed a crew of four men to do the job right. One man flies the plane. Two others operate the equipment that finds and blinds the enemy's radar. The fourth man concentrates on finding and jamming the enemy's voice communications so fighter planes can't be told where to find the attacking planes.

In the EF111, however, there will be room for only two men. With one of them concentrating on flying the plane, that means his partner will have to do the work done on the Prowler by three men.

Balanced against this, however, are some of the advantages demonstrated in the last

four months of the fighting in Southeast Asia. When ordered into action in September, the planes left their home base in Nevada, crossed the Pacific on their own power, landed at Tak Lhi Royal Thai Air Base and began immediately to fly combat missions.

With their terrain-following radar, which permits them to fly only 200 feet off the ground at high speed through darkness and bad weather, they normally flew alone and at night against some of the most highly defended targets in North Vietnam.

In the final week of the bombing campaign against the Hanoi-Haiphong area, the F111s went in ahead of the slower high-flying B52s to attack fighter bases, antiaircraft sites and communications facilities in a successful effort to reduce losses of the B52s.

It is this ability to move anywhere in the world and to operate with—or even ahead of—other planes in intensely defended areas that the Air Force is counting on to make the EF111 one of its most useful planes.

#### CALIFORNIA CHILD CARE PROGRAMS THREATENED

**Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly concerned about the proposed Federal regulations issued on February 16, 1973, relating to social and rehabilitation services for children, families, the aged, blind, and disabled. These proposed regulations, if allowed to be implemented, would have a serious impact on the lives of thousands of children and parents of low-income families in California and throughout the country. An incredible two-thirds of all children presently in various child care programs in California would be disqualified and over 5,000 jobs for day care workers would be lost. Here are the unpleasant but realistic facts as reported by the California State Department of Education:

It is estimated that 30,000 out of 45,000 federally eligible children now in California child care programs would be disqualified.

Persons who would lose jobs as a result of the proposed regulations:

California preschool program, administered by the State department of education	2,600
Children's center program, administered by the State department of Education	1,800
Other day care programs, including campus child care, migrant, and child care centers contracted by county welfare department	600
 Total jobs	 5,000

The proposed regulations would completely undermine California's attempts at developing innovative programs designed at breaking the poverty cycle. They would force many mothers back onto welfare rolls and would eliminate the opportunity of many to become self dependent and productive, working citizens. Most important, they would prevent many children from receiving

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

health, nutrition, education, and social services.

Specifically, these regulations would preclude donated private funds from such sources as the United Fund and church groups from being considered as the State's share in claiming Federal reimbursement. Further, the scope of eligible recipients would be restricted, particularly as they effect past or potential welfare recipients.

Dr. Wilson Riles estimates that California's pre-school programs currently serve about 19,000 children between the ages of 3 and 5. Nearly 3,000 professional and paraprofessional employees of this program, many of whom would otherwise be dependent on welfare, would lose their jobs. The loss of Federal matching funds in the amount of \$3,288,000 for the present fiscal year for pre-school activities, would throw this program into chaos and deny health, nutrition, and social services to thousands of these children and deny many mothers the opportunity to become more effective parents. With the loss of over \$13 million in Federal funds in 1973-74 for pre-school programs, at least 15,600 children currently in the program would have to be dropped.

Under the new definitions of former and potential welfare recipients, over 11,000 children in California in the children's centers programs would no longer be eligible for Federal funds, forcing many of these children's mothers to give up their jobs and return to welfare. Many employees of these centers would also lose their jobs and would likely be forced onto the welfare rolls.

The impact of the new definitions of former and potential welfare recipients would completely eliminate nearly all children of migrants from receiving day care benefits. Because of the reported accidents and injuries caused to these children in the fields when they are not in day care centers, all efforts should be made to expand, not contract, the Federal participation. In California, this would translate into a loss of \$1½ million for fiscal years 1973 and 1974.

Campus child care centers in California and child care contracted out by county welfare departments will feel the ax most heavily as a result of the loss of private funds as an eligible source in claiming Federal reimbursement.

All 25 campus child care centers in California rely on private funds to qualify for Federal funding and would be forced to close immediately if these regulations went into effect. At one California campus, for example, this would mean that 200 mothers per quarter would not have the use of such facilities. Thirty percent of these mothers are currently on welfare and have stated that the only reason they are able to further their education is the availability of campus child care facilities. Moreover, 80 percent of all student-parents in this program report that they would be forced to drop out of school if the centers closed.

Further, I have received reports from county public welfare departments indicating that they will not be able to handle the day care load for even present

welfare recipients who would qualify under the new regulations.

In Santa Clara County, for example, this would mean that nearly 55 percent or 300 present welfare families, although entitled, would not be able to receive child care benefits. The other 45 percent or 250 families of former and potential welfare recipients, because of inability to pay the high price of private day care, would be forced onto the current welfare rolls and thus overcrowd already inadequate county facilities.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the subject regulations are issued pursuant to Public Law 92-512—H.R. 14370—which authorizes State welfare agencies to contract for services which they cannot directly provide economically or effectively. The law says that such contracting is to be "under conditions which shall be prescribed by the Secretary of HEW." However, there is no reference in this law or any other relevant law which authorizes the elimination of private funds or in-kind contributions as a State's share in claiming Federal reimbursement.

Indeed, in a letter from former Secretary of HEW, Elliot Richardson, to the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, concerning day care contributions, the Secretary said:

I am convinced that this kind of partnership between private funds and public agencies should be encouraged rather than discouraged.

He continued:

I believe a prohibition on public-private partnership in this field would be a great mistake.

In California we have seen that the use of private funds to qualify for Federal reimbursement has eased the strain on the already overworked social services budget and lifted the burden on State and local tax resources. It has helped encourage cooperation between the public and private sectors in meeting the demanding needs of low-income families.

I believe the proposed regulations would take us back, not ahead, and cause many potentially productive people from escaping the poverty cycle and from becoming productive working citizens. The opportunities that many of these programs provide for meaningful vocational plans and self-support would be lost. And the start that many potential and former welfare recipients have gotten at beating welfare dependency would be undercut.

#### THE CASE FOR FEDERAL CHARTERS

**HON. LESTER L. WOLFF**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I should like to include the text of a recent article by Ralph Nader and Mark Green which appeared in the Nation magazine. I believe that the proposal of a Federal corporations agency to

issue Federal charters is one that may be of interest to my colleagues in the House.

The article follows:

THE CASE FOR FEDERAL CHARTERS  
(By Ralph Nader and Mark Green)

Concern over corporate activities is rising. Economic concentration and monopolistic practices, environmental pollution, product safety, occupational health, advertising and deception, corporate secrecy, corporate crime, corporate responsibility—the list of inquiry is long. But while focusing on these behavioral effects, it is important also to consider the structural causes of corporate depredations. Where did the corporate form come from? From whom does the corporation get its legitimacy today? Who should bestow that legitimacy?

A corporation may "have no soul," as Edward Coke intoned in 1612, but legally it must have a body. In order to exist it must obtain a charter. A corporate charter is in effect an agreement whereby a government gives the corporate entity existence and that entity, in return, agrees to serve the public interest. Up to the late 1870s, states granted charters to corporations under carefully circumscribed conditions. For example, corporations could not own the stock or assets of other corporations, were granted existence only for a specified period of years, and could not do business or own property outside the state in which they were chartered. These limitations, according to a recent commentator, reflected a prevailing fear "that a corporation was only an artificial personality and therefore did not have a soul or conscience. Lacking a conscience, it had no morals and was *prima facie* dangerous." So long as corporations remained local, contained by the charter's restrictions, states still maintained the control they considered necessary for the public interest to be served.

But corporations did not stay local. What these restrictions aimed to avoid is precisely what occurred. In order to attract resident corporations, states made their incorporation laws increasingly permissive. The winner of the race for corporate citizens went to the state of least restriction, and the early victor was undoubtedly New Jersey. In 1866 it allowed its corporations to hold property and do business outside the state; by 1875 it had dispensed with its ceiling on the amount of authorized capital. During the 1880s, in a critical move, it allowed corporations to hold and dispose of the stock of other corporations. The result: between 1888 and 1904, 192 of the 345 American companies with capitalization in excess of \$1 million took out New Jersey charters. New Jersey became the home of the infamous Standard Oil Trust, and holding companies declared illegal in other states simply transferred their property to corporations organized under the law of New Jersey.

But New Jersey's dominance was only temporary; Delaware was not to be denied. As an 1899 law review article notes:

"[The citizens of Delaware] had their cupidity excited by the spectacle of their northern neighbor, New Jersey, becoming rich and bloated through the granting of franchises to trusts which are to do business everywhere except in New Jersey. In other words, little Delaware . . . is determined to get her little tiny, sweet, round, baby hand into the grab-bag of sweet things before it is too late."

Delaware's business code of 1899, drafted by a financial reporter and three corporate lawyers, enacted most of New Jersey's liberal code and then some. In a version of Graham's law, Delaware thus took over the lead in the incorporation game, an advantage it has not to this day relinquished.

In a sense Delaware succeeded too well, since imitative states began to take some of its business away. Although by 1960 one-third of the top 600 industrial corporations

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

were headquartered in Delaware, the state decided to loosen its business code still more. A revision commission, formed in 1964, attempted, in its words, "To ascertain what other states have to attract corporations that we do not have." The basic redrafting was done by three private corporate lawyers working on Saturdays in their private offices. The full commission always assumed that the state legislature—which had to approve the new code—would be a rubber stamp. One member of the commission called the legislature "just a bunch of farmers." No hearings were held on the final statute, and it passed the Delaware legislature unanimously on July 3, 1967.

The new code contained many liberalizations for corporate managers; only directors, not shareholders, could propose amendments to the charter; annual meeting need not be held; officers and directors could be indemnified for court costs and the settlement of criminal and civil cases without shareholder approval. These "reforms" achieved their purpose. Delaware had been chartering corporations at the rate of 300 a month before the new code's enactment; the figure jumped to 800 registrations a month directly afterward. Today, 73,000 corporations have their birth certificates on file in Dover, Del., a number including one-third of all the companies on the New York Stock Exchange and fifty of the top 100 industrial corporations.

"The sovereign state of Delaware is in the business of selling its corporation law. . . ." said the *Pennsylvania Law Review* recently. "In fact, those who buy the product are not only consulted about their preferences, but are also allowed to design the product and even the factory."

The idea that the federal government should charter corporations is quite old. During the Constitutional Convention in 1787, James Madison twice proposed, unsuccessfully, that the Constitution expressly empower Congress to do so. By 1791 the nation was debating whether to incorporate a U.S. bank. Jefferson argued that such a bank would overawe the states and permit vast consolidations of economic power to dominate our economic life. Jefferson won this battle, but lost the war, since great economic consolidations did come to dominate our economy, though via state and not federal incorporation.

In the 1880s citizen protest built up against the economic and political power of the huge trusts. Some called for a form of federal licensing of corporations in order to control their excesses. Instead, by passing the 1890 Sherman Antitrust Act, Congress relied on competition rather than regulation. Disillusionment soon set in, as courts handed down a series of restrictive rulings that robbed the Sherman Act of its potential strength. William Jennings Bryan in 1899 went on record as favoring a federal license whenever a corporation wanted to conduct interstate business. Between 1903 and 1914, Presidents Roosevelt, Taft and Wilson all voiced support for a federal incorporation or licensing scheme in their annual messages to Congress. The idea was endorsed by the 1904 Democratic and Republican platforms and the 1912 Democratic platform. Twenty different bills were introduced in Congress between 1903 and 1914.

Despite this array of approval, the Clayton and Federal Trade Commission Acts of 1914 became law instead of federal chartering, support for the latter never having coalesced at any one time. Taft had changed his mind about it by 1912, and the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, after holding hearings on federal incorporation in 1913, concluded in the final committee report that it was "neither necessary nor desirable at this time."

The depression brought new demands for overhauling the industrial sector. In certain respects, Franklin Roosevelt saw his National

March 7, 1973

Recovery Act (NRA) as a form of federalizing corporations, since it provided "a rigorous licensing power in order to meet rare cases of non-cooperation and abuse." There was brief talk during this time of going further, of replacing the NRA codes by the federal chartering of large companies and trade associations. But the Securities Acts of 1933 and 1934—requiring full and accurate disclosure of material facts in a public offering and regulating the practices of the national exchanges—and New Deal regulatory schemes satisfied many who had looked to the federal government to reform corporations.

Nevertheless, the most sustained drive to date for federal licensing occurred in the late 1930s. Sen. Joseph O'Mahoney, a Populist from Wyoming, energetically and repeatedly promoted the idea of "National Charters for National Business." By emphasizing that "a corporation had no rights; it has only privileges," he sought to return to the days when charters policed, as well as permitted. He chaired the famous Temporary National Economic Committee hearings (TNEC) of the late 1930s, reiterating throughout his belief in federal licensing. But the war checked any momentum Mahoney had generated.

Thus, at nearly every point in our history when federal chartering was considered, an alternate remedy was prescribed. During all these periods, federal chartering was prominent, topical and finally ignored. Clearly, it is an idea whose time has come—and come and come. Our present spectacle of corporate power abused makes it topical again.

The federal chartering of giant corporations is necessary because state incorporation has failed. Even if state business codes and authorities did not so overwhelmingly reflect management power interests, they are no match for the resources of the great corporation. (General Motors, with ninety times Delaware's general revenues, could buy Delaware—if DuPont were willing to sell it.) "The century and a half of state failure," one observer has written, "has been the story of a battle between corporate giants and legal pygmies." To control national power requires, at the least, national authority.

At a time when the federal government becomes increasingly prominent in salvaging our unstable economy, it is an anachronism for the states to create corporations which operate in national and international markets. Quite simply, state borders are not relevant boundaries for corporate commerce, and state incorporation makes as much sense as state currencies or state units of measurement. In other federal systems—German, Mexican, Brazilian—firms that do business between the states or provinces must be formed under federal law.

There are procedural benefits to a system of federal chartering. At present, a charter is an IOU which the corporation signs and then files and forgets. States do not review the firms they have created for violation of their birthright, nor do they impose sanctions for charter violations. In Indiana, AT&T, Penn Central and De Paul University all recently lost their corporate licenses to do intrastate business because they had failed to file annual reports. But no hearings were held and no fines assessed. Until the firms filed their forms, it was business as usual, although they had legally ceased to exist in Indiana. It is quixotic to expect state boards to have either the resources or the will to impose adequate sanctions. A federal chartering authority would be far more likely to do so or would be more accessible to citizens demanding that it do so.

A federal chartering agency could help to equalize the differences of burdens and benefits now experienced by corporations because of differences in state provisions. Incorporation fees, regulatory laws, charter stipulations—powerful corporations can threaten to run away to a different state if these items are not to their satisfaction. And it is easy

to see why Textron in Rhode Island or DuPont in Delaware could make its host state anxious. A single federal authority could end this corporate pitting of one state against another.

One can anticipate some of the criticisms to this scheme. Should the government manipulate the rights of private property? Not even the venerable "freedom of contract" is absolute, as the legal qualifiers of duress, coercion and unconscionability, and minimum wage, maximum hour and equal employment legislation have long made clear. It must be realized that private property is not a gift of the gods but a bundle of rights created by our government; it hardly seems valid to condemn the government for legally rearranging this bundle of rights when it created them in the first place. "[T]he corporation, insofar as it is a legal entity, is a creation of the state," the Supreme Court has said. "It is presumed to be incorporated for the benefit of the public. . . . Its rights to act as a corporation are only preserved to it as long as it obeys the laws of its creation."

Would federal chartering merely increase the power of big government; would it be socialist? Since the guiding purpose of federal chartering is to encourage corporate democracy and competition, it is the precise opposite of a centralized planned economy. To the extent that it attempts to make private firms more accountable to their shareholders and more responsive to competitors, it is a radically conservation idea. Right now we do have a type of corporate socialism, in which cooperating monopolies have freed themselves from the constraints of the competitive market and much law enforcement.

The bureaucracy created would be as trim and nondiscretionary as possible. The top 1,000 firms or so—measured by a combination of sales, asset size, market percentage and number of employees—would be chartered, not the hundreds of thousands of small concerns which account for a small fraction of interstate trade; *intra-state* firms would not be affected. Manpower would thus be marshaled to confront the real problem area. The kind of charter provisions to be enforced would also be as objective as possible. Does the firm's percentage of the market exceed permissible limits or doesn't it; has the corporation provided profits and cost data per plant and division or has it not; did management triple its bonus without notifying the shareholders? There is no such thing as government without any discretion; if there were, we would have computers as Cabinet officials. Yet, excessive discretion must be avoided or else the corporate regulatees would successfully shape their supposed regulators—the situation which now obtains.

What if, because of a federal chartering law, many American firms simply left to incorporate in Bermuda or France? What if they treated us as they treat Canada: a place to do business but not to owe allegiance? Or could companies have no country at all? Carl A. Gerstacker, chairman of the Dow Chemical Company, told a White House conference in February 1972, that he looked forward to the day of the "a national corporation," one without any national ties which could, therefore, operate freely and flexibly around the world. Gerstacker revealed that Dow had for a decade been studying the possibility of locating on an island in the Caribbean. Any of these business runaways could claim that restrictions imposed on them were not required by, say, France, and would create legal conflicts with their charters there. To that, there is only one effective reply: the corporation and foreign government in question either complies with the conditions of the federal chartering law or it cannot trade here. Since the American market is such a large percentage of the world market, we would have the leverage,

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

if we had the will, to make this demand of expatriate firms and foreign authorities.

Assuming that the state incorporation laws are the problem and that existing antitrust mechanisms, regulatory agencies and securities laws are inadequately checking corporate power, a federal chartering law seems the most plausible mechanism for achieving corporate accountability. What is needed is a new agency—call it the Federal Corporations Agency—to issue federal charters for firms engaged in interstate business. What is needed is not a Corporate Bill of Rights but a Corporate Bill of Obligations. Herewith a sketch of possible provisions:

(1) *Corporate democracy* would reduce the dominance of the oligarchies commanding most corporations. The potential areas of coverage are all those which, unchallenged, have permitted management to rule without regard to the wishes of its electorate. Such areas include: corporate loans to officers and directors and other "interested" dealings; access to corporate records and easier use of the proxy machinery; cumulative voting, indemnification and compensation schemes; shareholder rights to amend the bylaws and charter; shareholder rights to nominate candidates for directors and the creation of public interest and community directors.

(2) Strict *antitrust* standards must be a condition of the charter. No corporation (unless it clearly proved itself a "natural oligopoly") would be permitted to retain more than 12 per cent of an oligopolistic industry (a percentage recommended by President Johnson's antitrust task force). Large conglomerates should be permitted to acquire only toe-hold positions in concentrated industries and should be made to spin off assets equal in value to any they acquire.

(3) *Corporate disclosure* must replace secrecy. What are the earnings of hidden subsidiaries and consolidated divisions; who are the real beneficial owners of the corporations; what is the racial composition of employees and new staff; what product and safety testing has been conducted; what plans exist to meet pollution standards? Since the public is so intimately affected, answers to all these must be made public. Shareholders, investors and government officials need adequate information to act intelligently. If done extensively enough, a corporate information center could be developed, with data by firm, plant and product available on computer tapes to respond to significant topical questions.

(4) The corporate charter should "constitutionalize" the corporation, in Prof. Arthur S. Miller's phrase, applying constitutional obligations to this private aggregation of power. The logic for this proposal underpins federal chartering: corporations are effectively like states or private governments, with vast economic, political and social impact. A democratic society, even if it encourages such groups for private economic purposes, should not endure such public power without public accountability. Our large corporations represent just the kind of concentrated power which the Constitution and its succeeding amendments aimed to diffuse. If the Constitutional Convention were held today, it would surely encompass *America, Inc.* It makes no public sense to apply the Constitution to Wyoming and West Tisbury (Mass.), but not to General Motors and Standard Oil (N.J.).

Unions, too, are private groups which have been legislated public power, but on condition that they behave democratically, with safeguards of due process (that they sometimes violate such safeguards is a problem of implementation, not construction). The same principle holds true for private corporations legislated public power. When a huge corporation deals with its employees, shareholders and outlets, "state action" principles require that it do so fairly. For example,

the First Amendment right to free speech means that an employee can publish material critical of the firm in a magazine or underground corporate newspaper; Fourteenth Amendment safeguards mean that if he refuses to perform an illegal task or if he blows the whistle on a corporate crime, he cannot be fired without a due process hearing, complete with charges and evidence; the Fourth Amendment would forbid the firm from searching his private belongings in the shop without a warrant. It is inadequate to depend merely on unions to guarantee these rights; they have enrolled less than a quarter of all employees: the other 75 per cent deserve these protections.

Hovering over all these provisions would be graduated penalties for violation of the charter. Depending on the nature and frequency of the violations, penalties could run from small absolute fines to fines as a percentage of sales; from management reorganization to executive suspensions; from public trusteeship to the dissolution of the charter. A scale of sanctions must be developed to guarantee compliance with the charter.

In formulating a Federal Corporations Agency (FCA), care must be taken that it does not become as unresponsive and inefficient as some of the present regulatory and enforcement agencies. Lessons should be learned from the past; at the same time, it would be defeatist and irresponsible to urge no more federal reform measures because some have failed. Many corporations go bankrupt, yet the corporation is still a viable legal structure for the production and sale of goods and services.

It is important to stress once more the objective nature of the FCA's standards. It would not involve itself in the imbroglios of rate determinations which naturally invite industry lobbying and a dependence on self-serving corporate data. However, the FCA should contain liberal provisions for shareholder and citizen suits—as now institutionalized in the Michigan pollution law—so that agency lethargy or inefficiency could be checked by interested citizens equipped with adequate tools. More liberal rights of intervention into government processes could similarly permit public interest lawyers to monitor any misfeasance or nonfeasance. Mechanisms will have to be provided to help insure that that a "commissioner" of the FCA be vigorous, nonpartisan and independent. Furthermore, whatever, the chances that an FCA could still become as inefficient as an ICC, it would have a great distance to drop before it became as supine and irrelevant as the present state chartering bodies.

While Delaware cannot dictate terms to G.M., an FCA could, but it is not inevitable that it would. Thus, a new federal agency is a necessary but not a sufficient remedy. If it is badly organized with weak powers and no citizen access and participation, it will be ineffective. The form is crucial, and so are the powers. But most crucial of all is the effort—one required by the current state of corporate unaccountability.

## ASPIN RELEASES GAO REPORT ON LITTON

**HON. LES ASPIN**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I am publicly releasing today a General Accounting Office report detailing low productivity and high labor turnover at Litton Industries' new shipbuilding facility in Pascagoula, Miss., and predicting new

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

cost overruns and schedule delays on the 30-ship DD-963 destroyer program.

I believe that this latest GAO report is yet another sign that more and serious trouble lies ahead in Pascagoula. The only question now is how bad will the situation get?

Litton openly admits that last July its new West Bank shipyard was only 42 percent as productive as the older East Bank facility in Pascagoula. In addition, Litton's annual labor turnover rate is an incredible 57 percent. While Litton does claim productivity is improving, according to the GAO, the labor turnover problem is still continuing at a very high rate.

The GAO also predicts cost overruns and the schedule delays on the DD-963:

We believe, looking ahead, that some indeterminate cost growth and schedule slippage can be expected.

But the GAO seems encouraged over developments in Pascagoula in recent months. The GAO reports:

During the past year, Litton has undertaken very aggressive action to bring in shipbuilding expertise and has stabilized top management. Within the next year the government should have clear indications as to whether this stabilization has been achieved.

With an annual labor turnover of 57 percent and predictions from GAO that cost overruns and schedule delays will occur, we now have the first indications that there will be serious problems on the 30-ship destroyer program.

I also believe that unless production methods improve, an incredible backlog in both the LHA and the DD-963 will occur, causing massive cost overruns and significant delays. As many of my colleagues know, originally Litton planned to use a modular construction. This method involves the building of the ship in large sections and fitting them together. But, according to GAO, Litton has given up this method of construction of the first LHA and the first two DD-963 ships.

The GAO warns that—

Unless full modular construction is undertaken, congestion can be expected which will affect schedules . . . the increased overlap in production of LHA's and destroyers may generate problems not previously anticipated.

Overall, there is no doubt that Litton's Pascagoula shipbuilding program has been a mess and the chances are extremely good that the same cost overruns, delays, and mismanagement that have characterized the yard in the past will continue indefinitely.

---

YOUTH COUNCIL TO BEGIN  
IN NEWARK

---

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, a few short weeks ago in my hometown of Newark, N.J., the first organizational meeting of a citywide youth council took place. Four hundred young people between the ages of 14 and 25 attended.

Activities are scheduled to begin this month and judging by the enthusiasm, the determination, the devotion and encouragement of all participants, I have great confidence in the plans and goals of all who are involved in the creation of this most important body.

The task of establishing a governing council is filled with strong challenges and with cherished hopes. Precedents must be set. The fabric of tradition must be threaded and the first stitches woven. The council, sponsored by the United Community Corporation's youth development program is designed to give Newark's young men and women an opportunity to speak out with a united voice and to become involved in the decisionmaking process, in the total operation of city affairs. The program charter reads as follows:

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM  
PURPOSE OF PROGRAM

1. The Youth Development Program attempts to provide poor youth with a formal voice in planning and implementing programs in which youth increase their ability to deal with problems affecting their lives.

2. Through collective social action, especially on behalf of their own community, YDP attempts to bring about positive changes in their values, aspirations, and behaviors.

3. Finally, YDP attempts to prepare youth to deal more effectively with the institutions designed to serve them, and by speaking together, to become instrumental in not only expressing their needs to those institutions, but also in being able to orderly change them in order to improve the quality of life in their communities.

The basic purposes of all YDP's are to involve the youth and develop a cadre of youth. Experience has shown that the most successful programs, and the ones in which youth demonstrated the highest degree of responsibility and interest, were those where they were directly involved in the activity. Youth involvement both increases the relevance and effectiveness of the program and offers a means of providing leadership training and youth development through participation in the process of planning, operating, and evaluating. The process in this case becomes the product, since their involvement produces constructive attitude changes which are as important as the accomplishment of other specific objectives.

PROJECTS OF YDP FOR 1972

To achieve these ends YDP offers experiences in the following areas:

1. Project Upgrade (a clerical training program)
2. Economic Development (entrepreneurship)
3. Year Round Recreation (sports)
4. Fund Raising (dances, bus rides, talent shows, fashion)
5. After School Program (tutoring and remedial instruction)
6. Youth Councils (leadership development)
7. Cultural Programs (concerts, plays, dramas, canteens)
8. Communications Projects (electronics training)

It is through all of these experiences the problems of today's youth are dealt with.

I was given the honor of addressing the opening council session and I would like to take this opportunity to share my words with you at this time:

I am pleased to be here with you today, for this very important and impressive gathering of young people.

March 7, 1973

I have always welcomed the opportunity to be with our younger citizens . . . to listen to their opinions of current issues . . . to hear their ideas on current problems . . . to learn how they would handle current social and economic challenges.

As a private citizen and as a member of the House of Representatives, I have found that time spent with our younger people has been time well spent. I was the first congressman to establish a Youth Forum, and found it most helpful. This was an organization made up of delegates from the high schools of the 10th District. They met periodically to discuss vital issues and passed their views along to me in the form of resolutions and reports. And I was a sponsor and a leader in the long and finally successful fight to lower the voting age to 18, so that the NOW Generation could come of age.

There is more to youth than fun and games. You are aware of the world in which you live, and I know you are dedicated to making it a better, safer, cleaner, healthier, fairer place for everyone.

You know right from wrong, and good from bad. No one is going to kid you about it, or mislead you. And you are not satisfied with the way things are, so you take the time to rap among yourselves in the search for solutions.

This conference today is another step in that important direction.

It affords an opportunity to discuss our problems, to create a structure to consider solutions, and to begin sound planning for their implementation.

This is participatory democracy in action. I am proud of you. And I am confident that you will come up with many helpful recommendations, suggestions in our joint effort to find solutions to the vexing problems of today.

Following my remarks, participants broke into workshops, conducted by representatives from educational, governmental and industrial groups. This unity between society's leaders, between a community's builders and the future designers of that community is invaluable. So much is to be learned, to be shared, to be discovered by all involved. Among those attending included: Dr. George Jackson, dean of student affairs at Essex County College; Harold Gibson, director of Newark's Youth Services Administration; Municipal Court Judge Irvin B. Booker; Thomas Mann of the Urban League; Dr. Ralph Ford, a faculty member at Seton Hall University; Jules Lozowick, community relations manager of Western Electric; Mrs. Florence Gaynor, chief administrative officer at Martland Hospital; Mrs. Louis Epperson, coordinator of patient relations at Martland Hospital, and Cornelius Burke, an assistant administrator of this hospital.

Workshops covered such vital areas as community health, human sexuality and venereal disease, drug and alcohol abuse, training and employment, law enforcement, municipal government, recreation, school counseling and college preparation. Theodore H. James, coordinator of the citywide Youth Conference is to be highly commended for his leadership, and insight in bringing together the men and women of our Newark community, individuals from all walks of life, individuals from every generation to grow together, to learn, and to build a better future for themselves for our community, and for this entire Nation.

DOUGLAS MENDEL, JR., DISCUSSES  
U.S. RELATIONS WITH JAPAN

## HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the February 25, 1973, Milwaukee Journal contains an analysis of our relations with Japan written by Douglas Mendel, Jr. Dr. Mendel, a professor of political science at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, has been a scholar of American-Japanese relations for 30 years. His article is timely and of great interest:

TOKYO AND WASHINGTON SPAR, BUT MUCH GOODWILL PERSISTS

(By Douglas H. Mendel, Jr.)

The Vietnam peace agreement was welcomed around the world, but especially in Japan where our actions in Vietnam had caused as much bitterness toward us as the surplus of Japanese exports to the United States over our exports to them, the weakening of the dollar and other economic disputes had embittered American views on Japan. But can the U.S. expect any nation to be wholly a partner, giving 100% loyalty to whatever we ask them to do, or a complete rival—hostile toward all our policies? The world today is too polycentric and flexible to permit such simple description of our relations with past enemies or allies.

The Nixon administration has made major concessions toward Peking and Moscow, and perplexed all observers by its support of Pakistan in the Bangladesh dispute. Japan was our national friend from 1854 when Commodore Perry opened her doors to the West until 1918, when the China issue provoked us to regard her as a "yellow peril." The Pacific phase of World War II was the height of American-Japanese hostility, but gave way to a postwar relationship unparalleled for warmth of interpersonal contact, strong economic ties, and security treaties pledging the two nations to work together.

It has seemed obvious to me in my 30 years of intensive study of Japanese-American relations that the average Japanese never hated the US even during WWII, while the typical American GI (over 3 million since 1945 in Japan) liked the Japanese better than he did other Asian peoples.

Today, some Americans claim that Japan is remilitarized, or should be. Others see Japan as a threat to their jobs as more American firms export capital to Asia, while more Americans choose to enjoy Japanese products as "better buys" than their American counterparts in price or quality.

Never since 1945 have Japan and the United States faced such a dilemma of mutual misunderstanding and conflicting expectations. "Look to trade as the big explosive issue," advised the US State Department Japan desk officer in 1969. By January, 1973, he had become a defender of Japan against extreme charges of American protectionists:

"What do they mean by 'Japan Inc.'?" he asked me last month. "Such a charge ignores the realities of domestic Japanese business, labor, and government." Maybe misunderstanding underlies the whole problem, so let's discuss it before going into the security and trade topics.

Japanese mass media give far more coverage to American news than our media give to Japan, so one should expect the average Japanese to be far better informed about us than we are about them. About twice as many Japanese visit the U.S. annually as Americans visit Japan, and few heard Japanese complain about their large trade deficit with the US—a deficit which prevailed until the mid-1960s.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

But few Japanese really know the facts about American costs of living, union power to push protectionist legislation, or the widespread feeling in this country that Japan is not giving enough attention to defense, foreign aid, and import liberalization.

## LIKE MANY US GOODS

A national poll has asked Japanese every month since 1957 about their favorite and most disliked foreign nations: until about 1968, the US was named by three times as many Japanese as their favorite nation as the nearest rival, and only about 3% disliked us the most. Today we rank behind Switzerland as "best-liked," close to Britain, France, and Germany, and 12% name us as "least-liked" far fewer than the 35% who name Russia, but more than those who dislike any other nation: (only 3% now name China).

However, the United States still enjoys a large reservoir of goodwill and admiration as a materialistic example, however tarnished by our military adventures and notorious pollution record—which, by the way, the Japanese are emulating.

Japanese are invariably polite and helpful to visiting foreigners, especially Americans, who are the most numerous. US products from films to hamburgers, golf clubs to magazines, remain very popular in Japan.

Japanese have proven their taste for many American products and the public generally favors open trade, whatever their government may feel about the need for restricting imports. There are far more foreign products in Japanese supermarkets than in our own and imports have much appeal to Japanese. Americans, whose views of Japan were surveyed by the Gallup organization for a leading Japanese newspaper recently, reveal far greater ambiguity about Japanese goods and politics. For example, when asked to pick which words came to mind when they hear the phrase "Made in Japan," 59% said cheap; 35% said poor quality; and 33% said imitation, far more than cited high quality, good performance, or other favorable features. But Gallup also used a 1,000 sample of well informed Americans, drawn from "Who's Who in America," 75% of whom spoke favorably of Japanese products.

The Gallup polls in November also showed far greater fear of a revival of Japanese militarism than most U.S. specialists would ever express: the general sample divided 74% yes to 10% no on whether Japan is or may in future go militaristic again. The elite sample divided 76% to 16% on that issue, but 69% said Japan was "the most trustworthy in Asia."

The Japanese polled generally approved Japan's normalization of relations with China as either "serving US interests" (26%) or "contributing to world peace" (23%), but 25% said the abandonment of Taiwan was intolerable while another 8% said the action was a "menace to the world."

It was President Nixon who opened the floodgates to world recognition of Peking as the only real Chinese government; most Japanese long ago favored relations with Peking, but also continued relations (and much trade) with Taiwan.

Finally, when asked whether US-Japan relations would improve, worsen, or remain the same in the months ahead, the Japanese polled were optimistic (45% "improve" compared with 20% for each of the other alternatives).

## DISLIKE U.S. BASES

We can conclude that average or even elite Americans have a mixed image of Japan, just as the Japanese do of our country, but are inclined to be friendly and hopeful.

What American officials tend to ignore, at least publicly, is the effect of the Vietnam War and strong-arm economic pressures on all levels of Japanese opinion. I have interviewed thousands at public and elite levels since 1952, and can assure my American friends that no more than 20% of Japanese

really approved our military bases in Japan or Okinawa (now belatedly returned to Japan but with US bases retained), or of our role in Vietnam.

Even at the height of the Korean War, most Japanese wanted the war to end. Japan benefitted economically to the extent of billions of dollars in sales as the result of US spending in Korea and Vietnam, but these "war profits" never counterbalanced the sincere pacifism of the Japanese public.

We must remember that the American occupation under the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur, that still controversial son of a notable Wisconsin family, promoted Japanese pacifism in every possible way, including a constitution that forbids any war potential. Vice President Nixon called that a "mistake" in 1953, but there have never been more than 25% of Japanese who wish to amend it or acquire strategic weapons. The allergy of all but perhaps 10% of the Japanese to nuclear arms or any overseas use of the 260,000 man Japanese military force is proven by many surveys and by government actions.

Those who claim that Japan is being "remilitarized" cannot cite any credible evidence, basing statements mainly on insignificant events magnified by their fears of the future. Actually, the Japanese military budget is only 1% of Japan's Gross National Product (GNP), compared with 8% here or in most other nations.

## WANT BASES REDUCED

Moreover, Japan has no draftees, overseas bases, strategic weapons, or even a Defense Ministry.

As the world's third biggest industrial nation, Japan of course could acquire nuclear arms, missiles, or anything else it decided to attain. But the political deterrents are too numerous. They include the powerful Finance Ministry bureaucrats who decide the Japanese budget, and a fully operating democratic political system, rare in any part of Asia today, as witness events in South Korea and The Philippines. There is also the strong opposition of mainland China and every other Asian neighbor toward Japanese military expansion beyond the present minimal self-defense level.

Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird criticized the obsolete equipment of the Japanese Defense Forces in mid-1969 (to get Japan to buy more weapons from us) and suggested last year that the Japanese should patrol the Indian Ocean to counteract the Soviet Navy, but 90% of the Japanese reject such ideas.

Japan's vice minister of foreign affairs expressed to me last fall what all polls confirm: (1) Japan's willingness to retain the U.S. Security Treaty, but with vastly reduced bases, especially in Okinawa, where there have been ugly incidents with the local population; (2) no Japanese military role in Asia, as Japan rejects the idea that any nation should dominate the region; and (3) Japan will continue gradually to liberalize import rules and expand foreign aid to reduce its trade surplus.

It is indeed ironic that the two biggest anti-Japanese influences in our country today appear to be conservatives on the economic front and leftists who parrot Peking's (now stilled) charges of "Japanese remilitarization."

The economic conflict seems paramount from the Washington side, and Premier Kakuei Tanaka tells his nation that a solution of the \$4 billion annual gap in U.S.-Japanese trade is top priority. Both our nations believe in free enterprise, separation of economics from politics whenever possible, and maximum free trade. Yet Japanese exports to the U.S. have grown fantastically while our exports to Japan have not kept pace.

Withdrawal of the 30,000 remaining U.S. forces from Japan would save some money, but the major cause of this imbalance is the U.S. desire to buy Japanese electronics, steel,

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

and other products. Why can't Nixon curtail U.S. imports rather than ask Japan to curtail its exports? There is no simple solution to the trade problem because the 18% currency revaluation in 1971 did not solve it, nor the 10% dollar devaluation this month, nor the fact that Japan has fewer import rules (tariffs or quotas) than the U.S.

## BIGGEST OIL IMPORTER

Japan's exports are only 8% of her GNP, while ours are about 6% compared with an average of 23% in West European countries.

Japan imports more oil than any other country in the world and will double her imports by the 1980's. Much of the American problem is not Japanese import restrictions, but the need to understand the Japanese market. The Japanese import more from the U.S. per capita than we import from Japan, but there is still room for liberalization on both sides. What we should recognize is the protectionist tendency of many workers and companies in both nations.

Neither government can fully control the actions of its businessmen: the Japanese deputy foreign minister tried to tell me recently that "government and big business are separate, so we can't tell them what to do in China or Taiwan." That is misleading because business and government are closer in Japan than here, while labor is far less influential in Japan. "When a Japanese builds a better mouse-trap (color TV, rotary auto-engine, camera) the world will beat a path to his door."

But the Japanese worker pays a price for the export boom. Most foods in Tokyo and other major Japanese cities cost twice as much as they do here, and housing costs triple or more its equivalent in the U.S.

Americans should consider Japan an equal to be dealt with as we deal with our major European partners, and not demand that Japan do what Washington won't do. Mutual understanding of common problems and the inevitable disputes is the greatest need or, as the old Indian saying put it: "May I not criticize my neighbor until I have walked a mile in his moccasins."

## THE BROWNSVILLE INCIDENT

## HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the response of the American public has been overwhelmingly in sympathy with righting the injustices done to the 167 black soldiers of the 25th Infantry Regiment by their summary dismissal from the Army by President Theodore Roosevelt in November 1906. As you recall, this action was taken without benefit of due process of law and the President simply presumed that the men were guilty of the charged offense of shooting up the town of Brownsville, Tex., the night of August 13, 1906.

In changing the summary dismissals of these men from dishonorable to honorable, the Secretary of the Army, Honorable Robert F. Froehlke, last September 28, 1972, termed their removals a "gross injustice."

The support for righting this wrong done these black soldiers is reflected in part in many newspaper articles.

(See attachment 1.)

At this point, I include in the RECORD a list of the soldiers, their birthdates and addresses.

(See attachment 2.)

Also, I present to you some of the correspondence that my office has received in regard to Brownsville.

(See attachment 3.)

In addition, I want the public to be aware of my recent correspondence with the Secretary of the Army in regard to benefits for the families of these men.

(See attachment 4.)

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I feel that this is of great importance that the public see some of this material. On February 20, 1973, I introduced legislation to remedy some of the injustices done the black soldiers of the Brownsville incident.

The attachments follow:

(Attachment 1)

[From the New York Times, Dec. 31, 1972]  
How BROWNSVILLE RAID CHANGED LIFE OF BLACK GI

(By Andrew H. Malcolm)

MINNEAPOLIS, December 27.—"Nowadays," said Dorsie W. Willis, "I just sit and eat and think."

And what he thinks about most often is the night in 1906 when a gang on horseback rode through Brownsville, Tex., shooting at lighted windows and killing one man.

Mr. Willis remembers how the townspeople blamed the black soldiers at Fort Brown for the shooting, and how the furor reached Washington, and how President Theodore Roosevelt sent an investigator, and how without any trial the President ordered 167 black soldiers "discharged without honor" when they volunteered no information on the culprits.

Mr. Willis also remembers that on Sept. 28, 1972, Secretary of the Army Robert F. Froehlke called the incident a gross injustice and changed all the discharges to honorable.

Mr. Froehlke simply wanted to right a wrong, an Army spokesman said. No official effort was made to find the soldiers, and it did not seem likely that any of them were still alive.

## A PRIVATE IN D COMPANY

But one still is.

He is Dorsie William Willis. Once he was a private in what was called D Company, First Battalion, 25th Infantry (Colored). Now he is 86 years old, arthritic and resentful that an administrative order might have ruined much of his working life.

After his dishonorable discharge, the best job that Mr. Willis ever had was as a porter and shoeshine man in the Northwestern Bank Building Barber Shop here.

For 59 years he opened the barbershop every morning, swept hair off the floor, brushed lint off coats, rubbed dirt off shoes and closed the shop at night.

When he started in September, 1913, a shoeshine cost 10 cents plus tip. When he quit last September, it cost 50 cents and maybe a tip.

With income from that job and a little earned on the side, he supported his wife, reared his son, who is now 65, and at the age of 50 went \$2,850 into debt to buy his own home.

"Some people feel the world owes them a living," Mr. Willis said as he sat in that same home on this city's southeast side. "I never thought that. And I never took a dime in welfare."

"I did figure the world owed me an opportunity to earn a living myself. But they took that away from me. That dishonorable discharge kept me from improving my station. Only God knows what it did to the others."

The Brownsville Raid was a 10-minute shooting spree by 16 to 20 men on the night of Aug. 23, 1906, in that dusty southern Texas border town. It began 24 hours after a white woman had charged that a Negro had tried to rape her.

March 7, 1973

After the shooting, one man was dead, another injured and some Army cartridges were found in the street.

Under Presidential orders, the War Department, assuming that the men from the all-black unit were guilty, took them to Oklahoma for questioning. When not one soldier admitted anything, they were all cashiered for their "complicity of silence."

"None of us said anything, cause we didn't have anything to say," said Mr. Willis. "It was a frame-up straight through. They checked our rifles, and they hadn't been fired. Those cartridges were empties we was sending back to the maker. And we was infantry. We never had any horses to ride."

After a lengthy investigation, an author, John D. Weaver, concluded in "The Brownsville Raid: The Story of America's Black Dreyfus Affair" that some local vigilantes, angered by the black soldiers' presence, staged the shootout, and two people got in the way of the bullets.

## DISCHARGE PAPER LOST

Mr. Willis remembers his discharge paper, although he said that it was lost years ago. He squinted his eyes and recited, "Dorsie Willis is hereby discharged from the Army of the United States without honor and forever debarred from enlisting in the Army or Navy of the United States or holding any civilian employment under the Government."

A check of Mr. Willis' military folder in the National Archives in Washington showed that his memory was sharp.

It also showed a 1972 amendment by the Department of the Army changing the discharge to honorable and noting, "No back pay, allowances, benefits or privileges shall accrue by reason of the issuance of this order to any heirs or descendants."

But, apparently because all involved were believed dead, there was no mention of what benefits were due those still living. So Mr. Willis' status is confused.

In an effort to clear that up and to help the descendants of the 167 soldiers, Representative Augustus F. Hawkins, Democrat of California, said today that he planned to introduce legislation soon to make available such benefits as payments to widows and medical care at veterans hospitals and perhaps to award some monetary compensation to survivors and heirs.

"The entire case is a real disgrace," Mr. Hawkins said. "The Army must have felt there was some wrong committed when it amended the discharges. But to do so without considering the human tragedies and factors is cold-blooded. The Army owes these men something. Ironically, they were the ones who guarded Teddy Roosevelt's flank at San Juan Hill."

Mr. Willis is somewhat baffled, and apparently he is not alone. A Veterans Administration spokesman asserted that Mr. Willis lived in St. Louis. Mr. Willis said that someone called from Washington recently to say that he was eligible now for veterans hospital treatment, which might have saved him many insurance payments and recent hospital bills.

But when he called the local veterans hospital, he was told that he might still not be eligible.

He said that someone telephoned from Washington last fall and said that his honorable discharge papers were in the mail. However, they have not arrived.

But now a spokesman says that the Army will help Mr. Willis to prove that he is the Dorsie Willis who served at Brownsville, a necessary step before an honorable discharge certificate is issued.

Meanwhile, finances are a bit tight for Mr. Willis and his wife. They have stopped exchanging Christmas presents with relatives. And soon it will be time for \$31 worth of medicine for Mr. Willis. He has arthritis, which keeps him indoors. He uses a worn

wooden cane that members of the Zion Baptist Church gave him.

Mrs. Olive Willis, who is 55, earns \$3.79 an hour boxing hamburgers for a restaurant chain. Then there's Mr. Willis' \$180 Social Security check. "We get by barely," Mrs. Willis said.

Mr. Willis' eyesight and hearing are deteriorating, and he moves very slowly, to protect their tiny home at 3724 Minnehaha Avenue, he bought Subrina, an energetic, menacing doberman pinscher.

Long ago, Mr. Willis, who completed sixth grade in an Oklahoma Territory schoolhouse, considered many jobs other than shining shoes. But, he said, no one would post an insurance bond for him, he feared what would happen if employers discovered his discharge and employment at the post office, popular work for many blacks here, was barred by his discharge.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 29, 1972]

**ARMY CLEARS BLACK SOLDIERS IN 1906  
BROWNSVILLE INCIDENT**

(By Robert A. Dobkin)

After 66 years, the Army yesterday cleared the records of 167 black soldiers dishonorably discharged for a frontier shooting in Brownsville, Tex., that resulted in what the Army says is the only documented case of mass punishment in its history.

Declaring it a gross injustice, Secretary of the Army Robert F. Froehlke ordered the discharges changed to honorable for the 167 members of the 1st Battalion 25th Infantry, an all-Negro unit.

President Theodore Roosevelt ordered the men punished in 1906 for their "conspiracy of silence" in refusing to testify against their fellow soldiers during investigation of the shooting that history has come to record as "The Brownsville Affray."

Officials said no attempt will be made to determine if any of the men are still alive and noted that the action rules out any back pay and allowances for their descendants.

A Pentagon spokesman said that while Froehlke's action won't do the men any good now, the "Secretary felt the record should be cleared and did so."

An Army spokesman said the case was brought to Froehlke's attention during a review of administrative and judicial policies invoked under extreme circumstances during frontier times. Froehlke said, "the concept of mass punishment has for decades been contrary to Army policy and is considered gross injustice."

The spokesman said this is believed to be the only documented case of its kind, in which an entire company was punished.

According to the history books, at about midnight, Aug. 13, 1906, some 16 to 20 armed men rode on horse-back through the streets of Brownsville, firing wildly into the homes of whites. One resident was killed and several others injured.

The shooting followed a fight between a black soldier of the 1st Battalion and a white merchant, which resulted in the town being placed off-limits for the battalion quartered in nearby Ft. Brown. The incident drew national attention and President Roosevelt ordered an investigation.

The townspeople claimed the riders were Negro troops from Ft. Brown, but a series of military inquiries failed to establish the identity of any of the men involved. No soldier would give evidence against his comrades.

Finally, all members of Companies B, C and D of the 1st Battalion were assembled on the parade ground at Ft. Brown. The guilty were told to step forward and identify themselves or all would be discharged without honor.

No one moved. And on Nov. 5, 1906, Roosevelt ordered 167 privates and noncommis-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

sioned officers "discharged without honor from re-enlisting in the Army or Navy" because of the "conspiracy of silence."

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, Feb. 6, 1973]

**1906 SOLDIERS' SURVIVORS SOUGHT**

(By Nellie Dixon)

Lyda W. Hamilton of Greenville, S.C., remembers her uncle, a former member of the all-black 25th Infantry in Texas, talking about his exploits in the Spanish-American War but she can't recall that he ever mentioned the night of Aug. 13, 1906, in Brownsville, Tex.

That was the night, the government charged 66 years ago, that her uncle, James Wadsworth Newton, and 166 other soldiers in Companies B, C and D allegedly shot up the town of Brownsville the day after a white woman claimed she had been attacked by a black soldier.

President Theodore Roosevelt summarily removed all 167 soldiers including 26 Carolinians, from the Army, denying them back pay, allowances, benefits and privileges. Last September, however, the Department of the Army cleared the soldiers' records and granted them honorable discharges.

What the Army didn't do according to United States Rep. Augustus F. Hawkins, D-Calif., was reinstate the benefits denied to the soldiers. Hawkins has asked the Army to correct its oversight and, at the same time, has started a nationwide search for any survivors of the Companies B, C and D of the 25th Infantry, or their descendants.

So far, Hawkins said, the only known living veteran of the Brownsville incident is 85-year-old Dorsey Willis of Minneapolis.

Mrs. Hamilton, a semiretired school teacher in Greenville, said her uncle died on June 5, 1932, when she was 18 years old. The family Bible, which is more than 100 years old, lists Newton's birthdate as Nov. 20, 1880.

Mrs. Hamilton said Newton had told her about "the rough way they had to fight in the Philippines," about the "jungle" in the Spanish-American War and about the time "they got lost and had to eat dog meat." She said she doesn't remember his mentioning what happened in Brownsville, although she believes it must have been uppermost in his memory.

When he returned home to Greenville, he worked as a house painter. He was also active in the Masons, often marching in their brigade on Armistice Day. He belonged to the Allen Temple A.M.E. Church, and on Christmas caroled with a quartet.

Hawkins, in a letter to Secretary of the Army Robert F. Froehlke, said that ". . . entitlement to full benefits . . . would be the very least that the United States Army could do after what is obviously in large measure irremediable harm to these men of the 25th Infantry and their families."

Hawkins is also considering holding hearings on the incident, he said.

"If there are hearings, it will be clear what did happen. There will be a lot of concern to people of good will throughout the country," he said.

According to the accounts of the Brownsville incident, on the night of Aug. 12, a white woman claimed she had been assaulted by a black soldier. The following night shots rang out around the town. The townspeople thought black soldiers were attacking them; the soldiers thought townspeople were seeking revenge. When the firing ceased, one white man lay dead and another injured.

The soldiers swore their innocence. Sixty-six years later, the Department of the Army reviewed the incident and changed the men's records from dishonorable to honorable discharges on Sept. 28, 1972.

Here are the names of the North Caro-

lina and South Carolina members of Companies B, C and D of the 25th Infantry and their last known addresses, for whom Hawkins' office is searching.

North Carolina: Joseph Shanks, Charlotte. Alexander Wilson, Glen Alpine. John Cook, Greensboro. Wade H. Watlington, Lassonville. William McGuire Jr., Lexington. George W. Harris, Littleton. Edward Johnson, Littleton. James E. Armstrong, Lowell. Erasmus T. Dabbs, Oxford. Isaiah Raynor, Raleigh. Charley Hairston, Spray. Shepherd Glenn, Washington, D.C. Edward Lee, Washington, D.C. James Johnson, Williamston.

South Carolina: Henry Barelay, Charleston. James Sinkler, Charleston. William Harden, Chester. Carolina DeSaussure, Eastover. Mingo Sanders, Ft. Niobrara, Neb. James Duncan, Greenville. James W. Newton, Greenville. Calvin Smith, Omaha, Neb. Brister Williams, Savannah, Ga. Julius Wilkins, Spartanburg. Solomon Johnson, Wilkins.

[From Community Informer, Oct. 26, 1972]

**HAWKINS PUSHES FOR FULL RELIEF FOR SURVIVORS OF BROWNSVILLE INCIDENT**

Today U.S. Representative Augustus F. Hawkins (D-Calif.) announced that he was in the process of finding out the full details as to the surviving members and descendants of the 167 Black soldiers unfairly removed without benefit of hearings from the U.S. Army as a result of an incident in Brownsville, Texas, on August 13, 1906. The removal came by order of President Theodore Roosevelt and was based upon an incident in which it was alleged that from 5 to 20 of the soldiers had shot up the town around midnight. Much proof was introduced at the time to the contrary, but Roosevelt acted without benefit of any formal proceedings. The entire companies (the B, C, and D companies of the 1st Battalion of the 25th Infantry) were separated "without honor" on the ground that the other men had a duty to inform on their comrades who were presumed guilty. Just three weeks ago, Sept. 28, 1972, the Department of the Army cleared the soldiers' record and changed their separations to honorable discharges.

"From a number of letters received in my office" the Congressman stated, "it is quite clear that these men and their families suffered immeasurably from this unfounded and unjust action." The Congressman added, "Even the words of President Roosevelt in his message to the Senate on Dec. 6, 1906, alone, eloquently attest to the context in which these faithful men and their families were placed:

"A blacker (crime (the shooting up the town)) never stained the annals of our Army. It has been supplemented by another, only less black, in the shape of a successful conspiracy of silence for the purpose of shielding those who took part in the original conspiracy of murder." (at page VII of Reply of the President of the United States to Senate Resolution dated Dec. 6, 1906 concerning the discharge of the three companies of the Twenty-fifth Infantry, U.S. Army)

"At present, I have under consideration introducing legislation to fully compensate the families and descendants of these soldiers and calling for hearings at which the families of these men can testify and give the public a full and complete picture of the agony through which these men and their loved ones went, as well as to give us some idea of what they contributed to the defense of our nation. I understand that U.S. Senator Vance Hartke, Chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee favors appropriate relief in these cases."

"I am also pleased to announce that we are having considerable success in locating the families and descendants of these men," concluded the Congressman.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

[From the Los Angeles Times, Jan. 21, 1973]

A 66-YEAR-OLD INJUSTICE BY ARMY STILL RANKLES

(By Dial Torgerson)

Edward Warfield was there during the Brownsville raid.

He recalls the sound of gunfire, the trumpeter blowing the call to arms, and of groping in the dark for his Springfield rifle.

Because of what happened the night of Aug. 13, 1906, Warfield and 166 other soldiers—all Negroes—were given discharges without honor from the United States Army.

The Secretary of the Army last September changed the discharges to honorable, and declared the 1906 action a gross injustice.

No one knew, then, if any of the 167 men were still alive.

In December, Rep. Augustus F. Hawkins (D-Calif.) identified a Minneapolis man as the only known survivor of the incident.

But this weekend Hawkins' office disclosed that a second had been found: Edward Warfield, a retired security guard who lives in South Los Angeles.

The so-called raid, as Warfield recalls it, was the sound of gunfire in the night.

The history books long described it as an incident in which Negro soldiers shot up the border town of Brownsville, Tex., killing one man and maiming a second.

Then, in 1969, Los Angeles writer John D. Weaver, in a book called "The Brownsville Raid," described how the perpetrators of the incident may have been townspeople seeking a pretext for driving black troops from their assignment at Brownsville.

It was Weaver's book which inspired Hawkins' search for the survivors. It was Hawkins' pressure on the Pentagon which resulted in honorable discharges being issued to the 167 men.

Warfield, now 89, spread his old Army papers out on a table at his apartment on Avalon Blvd. Friday to compare notes with author Weaver. Warfield's memory hopped among the incidents from which Weaver's history was written.

"There was just a mean bunch of people in Brownsville," he said. "They didn't want Negro soldiers there. They had a sign at the park. It said, 'No niggers and no dogs allowed.'

"One of our men was down by the Rio Grande, and some people there threw him into the river."

Brownsville was a small town across the Rio Grande from Mexico. Companies B, C and D of the 1st Battalion of the 25th Infantry had moved into quarters in old Ft. Brown two weeks before.

Brownsville, whose people were Anglo or Mexican-American, did not like the men of the 1st Battalion. On Aug. 12 a white woman reported she had fought off a black soldier who had tried to rape her. Feelings ran high.

Warfield recalled the night of the raid:

"We had been on a march that day and came in late and tired and locked up our rifles without cleaning them. I was in bed in company quarters, asleep, when I heard the shooting. I couldn't tell from the sound what kind of guns they were using."

"The second section gun rack was at the foot of my bed. I got untangled from my mosquito netting, and the man in charge of quarters, Sgt. Jackson, was trying to open the rack. I could hear the call to arms."

CONFUSED RESPONSE

"A soldier named Jamison, he was a mean scoundrel, he yelled, 'Cut that light out, somebody gonna get killed.' The sergeant had a hard time opening the rack. I ran down and fell in. I was the first one, No. 1, and the others fell in around me."

"I heard somebody yell, 'They're shooting the quarters up!' Our squad got all fallen in, but the sergeant told us to fall out and fall

in again and do it in the right order. I was supposed to be No. 2 in the second rank."

That was Warfield's contribution to history: he saw no one fire a shot.

He looked at the framed photograph taken of him when he was in the 1st Battalion of the 25th Infantry—just before he went to Brownsville. It showed a handsome man of 21 in his dress blue uniform.

"I was 5 foot 10," he said, "weighed 205. I always tried to be strict through my life. I always tried to keep my word."

"To get ganged up in something like that thing in Brownsville—it's just got to make you sorrowful."

The Army's inquiry found a pile of empty shell casings outside the fort, and found them to be from Springfield rifles, then a new weapon recently issued to the infantry. Weaver said the Army found they had been fired by four rifles—one of which later turned out to be that of a Ft. Brown sergeant on furlough at the time of the Brownsville gunfire.

"At Ft. Reno, they formed us like this," said Warfield, making a three-sided square with his hands on his old discharge papers on the table before him. "A general from the inspector general stood here." He pointed to the fourth side of the square.

"He told us, 'Men, I've come here from Washington, D.C. I want to find out who did the shooting at Brownsville. If I don't find out, I'm going to see that you are dishonorably discharged from the United States Army, and forever debarred from serving in the U.S. Army, or holding civil employment with the government.'

"If I don't find out, you will lose your honor—all your life."

NO CONFESSIONS

"He went to the headquarters to wait for someone to step forward. No one ever did. They discharged us all."

After a 1909-10 inquiry into the case of the Army permitted 14 of the 167 soldiers to reenlist, and Warfield was one of the 14. He had testified before the inquiry, which held the troops to blame. The Army later called the 1906 discharges the only documented case of mass punishment in its history.

Warfield served a hitch, then quit the Army. He reenlisted in 1917, served in France in World War I and was honorably discharged in 1919.

[News Release, Department of Defense, Sept. 28, 1972]

ARMY REVIEWS 1906 DISCHARGES

Secretary of the Army Robert F. Froehlke today announced that the Army has changed to honorable the discharges of some 167 black soldiers of the 1st Battalion, 25th Infantry ("colored") who were discharged in 1906 without honor as a result of a shooting incident which occurred in Brownsville, Texas.

The Secretary of the Army's action grants honorable discharges to all of the individuals concerned.

Around midnight on August 13, 1906, some 16 to 20 individuals on horseback rode through the streets of Brownsville firing their weapons into homes and stores. As a result of the shooting, one man was killed and two were injured. Witnesses alleged that the riders were "colored" soldiers. At the time, the 1st Battalion, 25th Infantry ("colored") was stationed outside the town of Brownsville.

A series of military inquiries and a county grand jury failed to establish the identity of the riders involved. Finally, all members of Companies B, C, and D of the 1st Battalion, were assembled and the guilty told to step forward and identify themselves or all would be discharged without honor. None stepped forward; all maintained their innocence. Their discharge without honor followed.

Subsequent courts of inquiry failed to recommend remedial action and relief legislation

introduced on behalf of various individuals was never enacted.

An internal Army review of administrative and judicial policies brought this instance of mass punishment to the attention of the Secretary. Although the practice was occasionally invoked under extreme circumstances during frontier times, the concept of mass punishment has for decades been contrary to Army policy and is considered gross injustice.

[From the Brownsville Herald, Oct. 31, 1972]

AUTHOR PUTS RECORD STRAIGHT ON "RAID"

(By Ward Colwell)

On Thursday, Sept. 28, the U.S. Army got around, after 66 years, to exonerating Negro soldiers who had been dismissed without honor by President Theodore Roosevelt as the result of a disturbance in Brownsville the night of August 13, 1906.

In its press release to the wire services, the Army neglected to credit the action to California Rep. Augustus F. Hawkins and to John D. Weaver, the author of an exhaustively documented volume entitled "The Brownsville Raid," in which detailed evidence showed that the soldiers not only were blameless but received probably the most grotesque injustice of this country's military history.

Weaver spent a good deal of time in Brownsville researching his book. While here he interviewed local historians Eddie Valent, Alfonso Champion and others. He spent many hours viewing back files of The Herald in pinning down the sequence of events surrounding the "Raid."

The Herald reviewed the Weaver book shortly after its publication two years ago, and localized the United Press International dispatch on the exoneration of the soldiers.

Since Brownsville was the focal point of the entire situation, and since the Army's version of the action was so full of discrepancies and inaccuracies, Author Weaver has written another report exclusively for The Herald. Here it is.

REPORT BY JOHN D. WEAVER

Now that the army has cleared the military records of the 167 black soldiers of Companies B, C and D, First Battalion, 25th Infantry, who were dismissed without honor by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1906 following a midnight shooting incident at Brownsville, Texas, the record of the event itself should be set straight.

"Around midnight on August 13, 1906, some 16 to 20 individuals on horseback rode through the streets of Brownsville firing their weapons into homes and stores," states the press release announcing the decision of the Secretary of the Army to grant the black troops honorable discharges.

Actually, there were about 8 to 15 men, and they were on foot. They appeared to fire into the air and at oil lamps which might cast a light on their faces as they ran up the dark alleys of the border town on a moonless night. They killed one man and wounded another. Both victims happened to stumble directly across their path.

"Witnesses alleged that the riders were 'Colored' soldiers," the press release continues.

No mention is made of the character of that eyewitness testimony. One man who took the stand was 72, blind in one eye, and with defective vision in the other. He claimed to have recognized the raiders as black men in army uniforms at a distance of 150 feet on a night so dark that the battalion's white officers were unable to recognize their own men when they were ten feet away.

One witness was convinced the raiders were blacks, because he had heard two men speak nine words. Another witness was a local loafer who had waited five months before telling his story. Meanwhile, he had been rewarded with a job as deputy sheriff.

March 7, 1973

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A white woman testified she had seen black soldiers shooting from B Co. barracks at a time when the men and their officers all swore the company was lining up for roll call.

"A series of military inquiries and a county grand jury failed to establish the identity of the riders involved," the press release states.

The investigations by a citizens' committee, the War Dept. and a county grand jury were based on the fixed belief that the soldiers were guilty. No effort was made to determine whether as local gossip had it, a pack of border ruffians might have staged a mock assault on the town in order to cast suspicion on the black battalion and have it replaced by white troops.

"Subsequent courts of inquiry failed to recommend remedial action," the press release goes on to add, thus implying that the case was reviewed on more than one occasion by objective bodies which had found no reason to remedy the action taken by President Roosevelt and carried out by his Secretary of War and hand-picked successor, William Howard Taft.

In reality, there was only one court of inquiry, and in the opinion of Brig. Gen. Aaron S. Daggett, who had commanded the 25th Infantry in Cuba, it was "packed" against the men. It refused to hear the testimony of a key witness who might have been able to identify the attacking party as civilians.

The army's decision to correct the "gross injustice" done the Brownsville soldiers was taken not because the men were innocent, but because "the concept of mass punishment has for decades been contrary to army policy." Under our system of justice, the men should have been presumed to be innocent until they were taken into a legally constituted court and proved to be guilty. Two of the black battalion's white officers were court-martialed and acquitted, but not a single soldier was ever put on trial and convicted of any wrongdoing.

The War Dept. proceeded on the premise that a handful of soldiers had shot up the town and the rest had joined a "conspiracy of silence" to shield the criminals. To this day the military bureaucracy has refused to abandon this untenable position. Justice demands a candid statement from the Secretary of the Army that the black soldiers have been given honorable discharges posthumously not because of the method by which they were punished but because they were innocent.

[From the Plain Dealer, Oct. 16, 1972]  
AUTHOR SEES NO JUSTICE FOR BROWNSVILLE  
SOLDIERS

(By Thomas J. Brazaitis)

When the Army cleansed the records of 167 black soldiers discharged without honor for their alleged "conspiracy of silence" 86 years ago, most Americans applauded.

But John D. Weaver, a California writer, said the exoneration made last month was an empty gesture.

"Justice has not been done," Weaver said. "For two generations this episode has lain under history's rug. Now the Army has dragged it out for another whitewashing."

Secretary of the Army Robert F. Froehlke last month ordered honorable discharges for the soldiers who were accused and punished without a trial after a band of raiders shot up the town of Brownsville, Tex., in 1906.

"Although the practice was occasionally invoked under extreme circumstances during frontier times," Froehlke said, "the concept of mass punishment has for decades been contrary to Army policy and is considered gross injustice."

Weaver, who wrote "The Brownsville Raid," the only authoritative history of the incident,

said the soldiers' records were cleared for the wrong reason. The Army has yet to admit the men were innocent.

"If a gross injustice was done, as the secretary said, the question is, who committed the injustice," Weaver said. "The answer is two Republican presidents."

An Army spokesman said the case was brought to Froehlke's attention during a review of administrative and judicial policies and, after 66 years, the secretary wanted to set the record straight.

With the presidential election only six weeks away, the Nixon administration, eager to win friends among blacks, was pleased to exonerate the unit designated as 1st Battalion, 25th Infantry (Colored).

Officials said no attempt would be made to determine whether any of the men are still alive. The action ruled out any back pay and allowances for their descendants.

Weaver, interviewed by telephone at his Beverly Hills home, said his interest in the case was aroused five years ago when his mother, Mrs. Henry B. Weaver, mentioned a trip she had made to Brownsville "when those soldiers were kicked out the Army."

Weaver's father had been the court reporter during a 1909 Army inquiry in Brownsville. Mrs. Weaver insisted there had been no trial.

Believing at first the soldiers were guilty but wrongfully punished, Weaver began to examine records of what history recorded as "The Brownsville Affray." His search took him to the Cincinnati Historical Society, where he read the papers of Ohio Sen. Joseph B. Foraker, a Republican, who had vigorously opposed the soldiers' dismissal.

"As I read, the odor of venality came from the pages," Weaver said. "What I came to feel was that Foraker had died frustrated that the truth had never gotten out. I had to finish his unfinished work."

For what he termed "two grueling years," Weaver played historical detective.

"I never worked so hard," said the author. "It was an emotional thing. Finally the book came out late in 1970, and promptly died. Here was an incident involving two presidents—Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft—and an assault on 167 black soldiers, and nobody seemed to care."

But U.S. Rep. Augustus F. Hawkins, D-Calif., read the book and was shocked by the well documented findings. After checking Weaver's sources, Hawkins introduced a bill in March 1971 to clear the soldiers' military records.

"To this day not one of those men has ever been proved guilty of the offense for which all of them were dismissed, with no chance to face their accusers in a public trial," Hawkins said.

"From the outset the War Department took the soldiers' guilt for granted," Hawkins said, "but time and again, as the Weaver book documents, the evidence its investigators dug up to convict the men turned out on further examination to be persuasive evidence of their innocence."

"Two generations of children, black and white, have grown up hearing about Teddy Roosevelt's storming of San Juan Hill, but not about his shameful treatment of the black soldiers who protected his flank at the bloody battle of El Caney."

Eighteen months later, without mentioning Hawkins or Weaver, the secretary of the Army announced the 167 soldiers would be honorably discharged. The question of their innocence was not raised.

In a story filed for national consumption, the Associated Press gave a typical history-book account of the Brownsville Affray, which differed sharply from Weaver's findings. Here, key points are contrasted:

History: "According to the history books, about midnight Aug. 13, 1906, some 16 to 20 armed men rode on horseback through the

streets of Brownsville, firing wildly into the homes of whites. One resident was killed and several others injured."

Weaver: The Brownsville raiders were on foot, not horseback. For about 10 minutes, they riddled the town with bullets, killing a young bartender and wounding a police lieutenant. No others were injured."

History: "The shooting followed a fight between a black soldier of the 1st Battalion and a white merchant . . ."

Weaver: Actually, the shooting spree was touched off by a white woman who claimed she had been assaulted by a black soldier. So incensed were the townspeople, the soldiers were ordered to stay at Ft. Brown after 8 p.m. Motive for shooting was on the side of the townspeople.

Brownsville had been hostile to the soldiers from the day they arrived, two weeks before the raid. Lincoln had freed the slaves decades before, but black soldiers were not citizens in the minds of the townspeople.

History: "The townspeople claimed the raiders were Negro troops from Ft. Brown, but a series of military inquiries and a county grand jury failed to establish the identity of any of the men involved. No soldier would give evidence against his comrades."

Weaver: Hours after the shoot out, a citizens committee was formed to gather unsworn testimony from townspeople. Each would-be witness was told, "We know they were Negro soldiers. If there is anything that would throw any light on the subject, we would like to have it."

To Foraker, this testimony seemed "loose, conflicting, disjointed and contradictory." To Roosevelt the same testimony proved conclusively "the soldiers were the aggressors from start to finish."

The committee telegraphed Roosevelt, demanding the black soldiers be replaced by whites. Roosevelt dispatched his own military investigators, not to search for truth, but to find which soldiers were guilty.

"By George! The men's guilt is as clear as the day!" Roosevelt said.

History: "Finally all members of the battalion were assembled. The guilty were told to step forward and identify themselves or all would be discharged without honor. No one moved. And on Nov. 5, 1906, Roosevelt ordered 167 privates and noncommissioned officers discharged . . . because of the 'conspiracy of silence.'"

Weaver: The soldiers were transferred to Ft. Reno, Okla., where for weeks they were badgered, bribed and threatened. Finally, they were given 24 hours to confess or be discharged without honor. When no one came forward, all were branded guilty.

On the "conspiracy of silence" Weaver quoted a Boston lawyer who doubted that even a Roman emperor would have punished men "for not disclosing what they did not know, and therefore could not disclose had they been willing to."

What caliber of soldiers were the men of the 1st Battalion? Maj. Charles W. Penrose, their commanding officer, said they were "the best drilled and best disciplined battalion that I have ever seen in the Army."

Penrose, at first convinced the men were guilty, later declared. "There is a strong, a very strong belief in my mind that my men had nothing to do with it."

Brig. Gen. Andrew S. Burt, who was in command when the 25th Infantry was called up for the war in Cuba in 1898, said of this black battalion: "Fight, did you say? Why they would charge into hell, fight their way out, and drag the devil out by the tail."

Mingo Sanders, first sergeant of Company B and a 26-year veteran of the Indian wars, Cuba and the Philippines, was described by the New York Times as having "a better record as a soldier than Roosevelt."

Weaver, who in researching the Brownsville Affray came to know the soldiers as well

as any of their contemporaries, offered this evaluation:

"There were no finer soldiers because they were black, they had to try harder. And they did. They were the best."

Taft, the secretary of war and heir to the presidency, carried out the dismissal order. The soldiers were "discharged without honor," an administrative procedure, rather than "dishonorably discharged," which requires a court-martial.

Later, three of the battalion's five white officers were court-martialed and found innocent of complicity.

Roosevelt was careful to refer to the soldiers' dismissal as discipline, not punishment, because punishment required bringing the men to trial on specific charges. Ironically, in revoking the order 66 years later, Froehlke termed the action "mass punishment."

Forsaker, an eloquent man, persuaded his fellow senators to conduct an investigation. The Senate Military Affairs Committee, after hearing 106 witnesses, voted, 9-4, to uphold Roosevelt's action.

Weaver analyzed the majority vote this way: "Four Republicans found them guilty of trying to embarrass the President and Secretary Taft; five southern Democrats found them guilty of being black."

In 1908 Taft was elected President and Forsaker was forced out of the Senate. Forsaker, who once was offered an ambassadorship of his choice if he would drop the Brownsville matter, pressed on. In his final days in the Senate, he proposed a court of inquiry. Five ex-generals examined official records and visited Brownsville one weekend for the hearing Weaver's father reported. In his book, Weaver said the so-called inquiry could be nothing more than a whitewash:

A pride of retired generals, serving a southern Democrat secretary of war appointed by the Republican President who had executed the dismissal order of his predecessor, could hardly have been expected to set about their business in such a way as to

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

prove that a scattering of black enlisted men were innocent of any wrongdoing and that two presidents (along with an incalculable number of West Pointers) were guilty of a monstrous injustice."

Curiously, the generals voted, 3-2, to allow 14 of the soldiers, probably picked at random, to re-enlist. The others were barred from making any further appeal.

With that, the government slammed the door on the Brownsville Affray until Froehlke reopened it last month.

"The Army has not granted justice to these soldiers," Weaver said. "The Army repeated the error of two generations ago by assuming the soldiers were guilty. Justice demands that these men be declared innocent and restitution be made to their descendants."

Hawkins, the California legislator, has asked Froehlke to do just that.

"He has not done all that should have been done," Hawkins said. "I command him on clearing the record, but the decision not to press forward to locate and compensate survivors and their relatives is, in my opinion, unforgivable."

If Froehlke does not take action, Hawkins said, he would introduce legislation to clear up the Brownsville Affray.

Weaver said a black newspaper in Chicago is printing the names of the 167 soldiers in an effort to locate survivors and descendants.

"This is going to boomerang against the administration," Weaver said.

In gathering information for his book, Weaver spent six months in Brownsville, a dusty Mexican border town of 50,000.

"I hated the place," Weaver said. "It has not changed."

Weaver said the Brownsville raiders probably were vigilantes who could not tolerate black soldiers in their town.

One of the letters Weaver received after the book was published was from a Texas man, who recalled, "My grandfather used

to talk about the night they shot the negroes up in Brownsville."

A young newspaper reporter who was raised in Brownsville told Weaver she did not learn of the Brownsville Affray until she went away to college in Austin. After reading the history-book version, she assumed the soldiers were guilty.

"But why has no one ever brought up the subject in my hometown?" she asked Weaver.

"Did it ever occur to you the soldiers might have been framed?", he answered.

In Shirley, Mass., 40 miles west of Boston, Harriet Lyon, whose father, then a captain, had commanded D Company of the 1st Battalion received the Army's announcement with mixed feelings.

"I felt a tremendous surge of thankfulness," she said, "but, at the same time, I was slightly embittered by the fact the men are not alive to see their records cleared."

Miss Lyon, then 3 years old, was asleep at Ft. Brown the night raiders shot up the town.

"My father never had the slightest doubt the men were completely innocent," Miss Lyon said. "He was bitter at President Roosevelt for denying the men the right of trial. Some of these men were within days of retirement, with years of honorable service behind them."

Capt. Lyon, found innocent by a military court in 1910, retired as a lieutenant colonel in 1920 after 30 years of service. He died in 1939.

Miss Lyon said among her father's belongings were several badges and medals earned by the soldiers but not awarded until after the unit had split up.

"When I heard the men were honorably discharged, my first impulse was to go to Arlington National Cemetery, where my father is buried, and read the announcement at his grave," Miss Lyon said.

"He would want to know."

### ATTACHMENT 2

#### LIST BY STATE OF ORIGINAL ADDRESSES, TOGETHER WITH YEAR OF BIRTH, OF BROWNSVILLE SOLDIERS

[The following list contains more than 167 entries, since some names are listed more than once. This is because the State of birth is different from the State of last residence. In these cases, an asterisk appears beside the name]

Rank and name	Year of birth	Birthplace	Last known residence	Rank and name	Year of birth	Birthplace	Last known residence				
<b>ALABAMA</b>											
Pvt. Henry Jones*	1882	Courtland, Ala.	112 Lookout St., Chattanooga, Tenn.	Pvt. Samuel McGhee*	1880	Arworth, Ga.	524 East Lewison St., Chattanooga, Tenn.				
Cook Leroy Horn*	1873	Meridian, Miss.	Birmingham, Ala.	Pvt. Willie Lemons	1879	Macon, Ga.	171 Long Lane, Macon, Ga.				
Pvt. Frank J. Lipscomb	1880	Sumter County, Ala.	Bessemer, Ala.	Pvt. Brister Williams*	1882	Beaufort, S.C.	State St., Savannah, Ga.				
Pvt. George W. Mitchell	1882	Selma, Ala.	1325 North St., Selma, Ala.	Pvt. William Thomas*	1882	Macon, Ga.	213 10th St., Chattanooga, Tenn.				
<b>ARKANSAS</b>											
Pvt. Lawrence Daniel*	1883	Little Rock, Ark.	Galveston, Tex.	Pvt. Isaac Goolsby*	1876	Jasper County, Ga.	Post Office Box 284, Leavenworth, Kans.				
Sgt. George W. McMurray	1853	Little Rock, Ark.	1808 West Sherman, Little Rock, Ark.	Pvt. Boyd Conyers	1885	Covington, Ga.	Monroe, Ga.				
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>											
Musician Walter Banks*	1879	Macon, Ga.	Sacramento, Calif.	Pvt. Ernest English	1878	Warrenton, Ga.	Catskill, N.Y.				
<b>DELAWARE</b>											
Pvt. William A. Matthews*	1882	Symona, Del.	407 Welch St., Chester, Pa.	Musician Henry Odom	1877	Macon, Ga.	Macomb, Ga.				
<b>GEORGIA</b>											
Pvt. William Brown	1872	Savannah, Ga.	5010 Ninisis Ct., Savannah, Ga.	Sgt. James R. Reid	1875	Hancock County, Ga.	Newman, Ga.				
Pvt. Clifford I. Adair*	1882	Dallas, Ga.	709 Cedar St., Chattanooga, Tenn.	Pvt. James Sinkler	1877	Cartersville, Ga.	Cartersville, Ga.				
Pvt. James Allen	1878	Macon, Ga.	(None).	Cpl. John H. Hill	1876	Thomson, Ga.	Marrietta, Ga.				
Pvt. James Bailey*	1881	Mewman, Ga.	Chattanooga, Tenn.	Pvt. Mark Garmon	1871	Campbell County, Ga.	Douglasville, Ga.				
Musician Walter Banks	1879	Macon, Ga.	Sacramento, Calif.	Cook George Grier	1875	Newman, Ga.	Newman, Ga.				
Pvt. John Butler	1880	Washington, Ga.	420 Washington St., Washington, Ga.	Pvt. Alphonso Holland	1877	Columbus, Ga.	Columbus, Ga.				
Pvt. Wesley Mapp	1879	Atlanta, Ga.	Atlanta, Ga.	Pvt. Thomas L. Moseley	1877	Henry County, Ga.	Henry County, Ga.				
Cpl. David Powell	1877	Augusta, Ga.	1814 Twiggs St., Augusta, Ga.	Pvt. George Smith	1878	Augusta, Ga.	120 King St., Augusta, Ga.				
Sgt. Jerry E. Reeves	1871	Pike County, Ga.	Liberty Hall, Pike Co., Ga.	Pvt. Lewis Williams*	1880	Kingston, Ga.	Chattanooga, Tenn.				
Pvt. George W. Newton	1865	La Grange, Ga.	La Grange, Ga.	Pvt. Samuel L. Scott*	1873	Baldwin County, Ga.	1517 North 26th St., Omaha, Nebr.				
Pvt. Edward Jordan	1878	Madison, Ga.	Madison, Ga.	Pvt. John Holomon*	1875	Baldwin County, Ga.	Valentine, Nebr.				
Pvt. Joseph H. Howard	1880	Columbus, Ga.	1322 5th Ave., Columbus, Ga.	Pvt. Frank Jones*	1876	Atlanta, Ga.	102 East Cain St., Atlanta, Ga.; 562 Cedar St., St. Paul, Minn.				
<b>ILLINOIS</b>											
Cook Robert Williams	1878	Galveston, Tex.		Pvt. Zachariah Sparks	1878	Eatonont, Ga.	Macon, Ga.; Mrs. Savannah Sparks, 1198-B McDaniel St., SW, Atlanta, Ga.				
Cpl. Anthony Franklin*	1871	Prince Edward County, Va.		Sgt. George Thomas	1878	Carsville, Ga.	7245 South Pyror St., Atlanta, Ga.				
Pvt. Learist Webb*	1879	Evansville, Ind.									
<b>ILLINOIS</b>											
Cook Robert Williams	1878	Galveston, Tex.		Cook Robert Williams	1878	Galveston, Tex.	2812 South State St., Chicago, Ill.				
Cpl. Anthony Franklin*	1871	Prince Edward County, Va.		Cpl. Anthony Franklin	1871	Prince Edward County, Va.	215 South 3d St., Springfield, Ill.				
Pvt. Learist Webb*	1879	Evansville, Ind.		Pvt. Learist Webb*	1879	Evansville, Ind.	Armory Ave., Chicago, Ill.				

March 7, 1973

Rank and name	Year of birth	Birthplace	Last known residence	Rank and name	Year of birth	Birthplace	Last known residence				
<b>INDIANA</b>											
Pvt. John R. Jones	1882	Evansville, Ind.	Evansville, Ind.	James E. Armstrong	1873	Gaston City, N.C.	Lowell, N.C.				
Pvt. Charles E. Rudy	1870	Dixon, Ky.	Mount Vernon, Ind.	Pvt. Isaiah Raynor	1877	Raleigh, N.C.	Releigh, N.C.				
Pvt. Thomas Jefferson	1870	Indianapolis, Ind.	171 Indiana Ave., Indianapolis, Ind.	Pvt. Joseph L. Wilson	1883	Glen Alpine, N.C.	Glen Alpine, N.C.				
Pvt. James Perry*	1867	Russellville, Ky.	Evansville, Ind.	Pvt. Alexander Walker*	1877	Fort Lawn, S.C.	305 S. Graham St., Charlotte, N.C.				
Pvt. Leartis Webb*	1879	Evansville, Ind.	3731 Armory Ave., Chicago, Ill.	Pvt. Shepherd Glenn*	1882	Old Town, N.C.	1237 9th St. NW, Washington, D.C.				
<b>IOWA</b>											
Henry T. W. Brown	1877	Davenport, Iowa	Davenport, Iowa	Pvt. John Cook	1871	Wilksborough, N.C.	Greensboro, N.C.				
<b>KENTUCKY</b>											
Pvt. Henry W. Arrin	1880	Pembroke, Ky.	Pembroke, Ky.	Cpl. Wade H. Watlington	1874	Caswell County, N.C.	Lawsonville, N.C.				
Cpl. Ray Burdett	1882	Yosemite, Ky.	(None)	Pvt. George W. Harris	1874	Littleton, N.C.	Littleton, N.C.				
Pvt. Strowder Darnell*		Middletown, Ky.	Xenia, Ohio	Pvt. Erasmus T. Dabbs*	1872	Charlottesville, Va.	Oxford, N.C.				
Musician Hoyt Robinson	1880	Mount Sterling, Ky.	Mount Sterling, Ky.	Pvt. William McGuire, Jr.	1877	Lexington, N.C.	Lexington, N.C.				
Pvt. Samuel Wheeler	1865	Clark County, Ky.	(None)	Pvt. Joseph Shanks	1876	Lincolnton, N.C.	Charlotte, N.C.				
Pvt. Richard Crooks	1876	Bourbon County, Ky.	2200 Brooks St., Louisville, Ky.	Pvt. Charley Hairston*	1882	Henry, Va.	Spray, N.C.				
Pvt. Edward Robinson	1881	Mulborough, Ky.	Louisville, Ky.	Pvt. James Johnson	1878	Newbern, N.C.	Williamston, N.C.				
Pvt. Benjamin F. Johnson	1877	Fayette County, Ky.	New Zion, Ky.	Pvt. Edward Lee*	1871	Yanceyville, N.C.	Washington, D.C. (1948); Mother: 1833 Monroe St., Danville, Va.				
Pvt. Charles Jones	1875	Nicholasville, Ky.	283 Constitution St., Lexington, Ky.	Pvt. Edward Johnson		Warrenton, N.C.	Littleton, N.C.				
Musician Joseph Jones	1876	Midway, Ky.	Midway, Ky.	<b>OHIO</b>							
Pvt. Thomas Taylor	1880	Clark County, Ky.	Winchester, Ky.	Pvt. Strowder Darnell*		Middletown, Ky.	Xenia, Ohio.				
Sgt. Luther T. Thornton	1877	Aberdeen, Ohio	Flemingsburg, Ky.	Sgt. Luther T. Thornton*	1877	Aberdeen, Ohio	Flemingsburg, Ky.				
Cpl. Preston Washington	1876	Lexington, Ky.	191 Blackwell St., Lexington, Ky.	Pvt. Frank Bounslar	1874	Champaign County, Ohio	Springfield, Ohio.				
Pvt. Charles E. Rudy*	1870	Dixon, Ky.	Mount Vernon, Ind.	<b>OKLAHOMA</b>							
Pvt. James Perry*	1867	Russellville, Ky.	Evansville, Ind.	Pvt. Elmer Peters*	1883	Henderson, Tex.	Guthrie, Okla.				
Pvt. William Van Hook	1871	Odville, Ky.	Cynthiana, Ky.	Pvt. Edward Warfield*	1883	Waco, Tex.	330 East 2d St., Oklahoma City, Okla.				
Pvt. August Williams	1882	Hartford, Ky.	Hartford, Ky.	Cpl. Charles H. Madison*	1872	Staunton, Va.	Wallston, Okla.				
Pvt. Stansberry Roberts	1878	Woodford County, Ky.	Lexington, Ky.	<b>PENNSYLVANIA</b>							
Pvt. William Smith	1873	Lexington, Ky.	North Limestone, Lexington, Ky.	Pvt. William A. Matthews*	1882	Symona, Del.	Chester, Pa.				
Pvt. John Green	1881	Mulborough, Ky.	Louisville, Ky.	Pvt. James Newton*	1872	Knoxville, Tenn.	107 Elm St., Pittsburgh, Pa.				
<b>KANSAS</b>				Pvt. George Cann	1878	Mechanicsburg, Pa.	Mechanicsburg, Pa.				
Pvt. Henry Robinson*	1877	Memphis, Tenn.	Wichita, Kans.	Sgt. Samuel W. Harley*		Elmira, N.Y.	Harrisburg, Pa.				
Cook Charles Dade*	1855	Culpepper, Va.	Abilene, Kans.	Pvt. Perry Cisco	1879	Newton Falls, Pa.	Allegheny, Pa.				
Pvt. Isaac Goolsby*	1876	Jasper County, Ga.	Post Office Box 284, Leavenworth, Kans.	<b>SOUTH CAROLINA</b>							
<b>LOUISIANA</b>											
Pvt. Walter Johnson	1872	1830 St. Peters St., New Orleans, La.	(None)	Pvt. Henry Barelay	1876	Charleston, S.C.	(None.)				
Pvt. William J. Carlton*	1880	Curtis, La.	Franklin, Tex.	Pvt. Brister Williams*	1880	Beaufort, S.C.	State St., Savannah, Ga.				
<b>MARYLAND</b>				Pvt. Julius Wilkins	1861	Spartanburg, S.C.	Spartanburg, S.C.				
Pvt. John Brown*	1869	Baltimore, Md.	50 Montgomery St., Jersey City, N.J.	Pvt. Alexander Walker*	1877	Fort Lawn, S.C.	305 South Graham St., Charlotte, N.C.				
Pvt. Elmer Brown	1870	Middletown, Md.	Baltimore, Md.	Pvt. William Harden	1879	Chester, S.C.	Chester, S.C.				
Sgt. Darby W. O. Brawner		Charles County, Md.	(None)	Cook Solomon Johnson	1877	Wilkins, S.C.	Wilkins, S.C.				
Pvt. Elias Gant*	1877	Washington, D.C.	Gritton, Md.	Pvt. Carol.na DeSaussure	1879	Richland County, S.C.	Eastor, S.C.				
Cpl. Winter Washington*	1877	Gloucester, Va.	1321 Argyle Ave., Baltimore, Md.	Sgt. Mingo Sanders	1858	Marion County, S.C.	Fort Niobrara, Nebr.				
Pvt. Charles H. Hawkins	1877	Baltimore, Md.	111 Walnut St., Baltimore, Md.	Pvt. James Sinkler	1876	Sumter, S.C.	8 American St., Charles-ton, S.C.				
Alfred N. Williams*	1873	Prince Georges County, Md.	Washington, D.C.	Pvt. James W. Newton	1880	Greenville, S.C.	314 Leach St., Greenville, S.C.				
George Jackson	1867	Baltimore, Md.	(None)	Pvt. James Duncan	1874	Greenville, S.C.	521 East McBee St., Greenville, S.C.				
Pvt. John T. Hawkins		Howard County, Md.	Guilford, Md.	Pvt. Calvin Smith*	1872	Winsboro, S.C.	Omaha, Nebr.				
Pvt. John Slow	1864	Logtown, Md.	Easton, Md.	<b>TENNESSEE</b>							
Pvt. William J. Kernal	1871	Baltimore, Md.	214 N. Vincent St., Baltimore, Md.	Pvt. Sam M. Battle	1878	Davidson County, Tenn.	Nashville, Tenn.				
<b>MINNESOTA</b>				Pvt. Clifford I. Adair*	1882	Dalles, Ga.	709 Cedar St., Chattanooga, Tenn.				
Pvt. William Mapp*	1877	North Hampton, Va.	St. Paul, Minn.	Pvt. James Bailey*	1881	Newman, Ga.	Chattanooga, Tenn.				
Pvt. Dorsie Willis*		Jackson, Miss.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Pvt. Alonzo Haler	1870	Calhoun, Tenn.	Calhoun, Tenn.				
Pvt. Frank Jones*	1876	Atlanta, Ga.	102 E. Cain St., Atlanta, Ga.; 562 Cedar St., St. Paul, Minn.	Pvt. Henry Robinson*	1877	Memphis, Tenn.	Wichita, Kans.				
<b>MISSISSIPPI</b>				Sgt. Jacob Frazier	1868	Jefferson City, Tenn.	57 Russell St., Knoxville, Tenn.				
Pvt. Charles W. Askew	1878	Panola, Miss.	Lespedeza, Miss.	Pvt. James Newton*	1872	Knoxville, Tenn.	107 Elm St., Pittsburgh, Pa.				
Pvt. James C. Gill	1880	Trinidad, S.A.	Lyman, Miss.	Pvt. Len Reeves*	1877	Bolivar, Tenn.	212 Chestnut St., San Antonio, Tex.				
Cook Leroy Horn*	1873	Meridian, Miss.	Birmingham, Ala.	Pvt. William R. Jones	1876	Murry County, Tenn.	1627 James St., Nashville, Tenn.				
Pvt. Dorsie Willis*		Jackson, Miss.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Pvt. Barney Harris	1881	Chattanooga, Tenn.	109 Elm St., Chattanooga, Tenn.				
<b>MISSOURI</b>				Pvt. Samuel McGhee*	1880	Arworth, Ga.	524 East Lewiston St., Chattanooga, Tenn.				
Pvt. Edward Wickersham	1873	Lebanon, Mo.	Lebanon, Mo.	Pvt. William Thomas*	1882	Macon, Ga.	213 10th St., Chattanooga, Tenn.				
<b>NEBRASKA</b>				Sgt. Walker McCurdy	1866	Clarksville, Tenn.	Cumberland, Tenn.				
Cpl. Jones A. Coltrane*	1878	Danville, Va.	928-H 23rd St., Omaha, Nebr.	Pvt. Harry Carmichael	1882	Hawkins County, Tenn.	Mooreburg, Tenn.				
Sgt. Mingo Sanders*	1858	Macon County, S.C.	Fort Niobrara, Nebr.	Cpl. Solomon P. O'Neill	1877	Columbia, Tenn.	No. 51 11th St., Columbia, Tenn.				
Pvt. Samuel L. Scott*	1873	Baldwin County, Ga.	1517 North 26th St., Omaha, Nebr.	Cpl. Willie H. Miller*	1874	Coal Creek, Tenn.	2120 Selden St., Richmond Va.				
Pvt. John Holomon*	1875	Baldwin County, Ga.	Valentine, Nebr.	Pvt. James T. Harden	1882	Knoxville, Tenn.	Knoxville, Tenn.				
Pvt. Calvin Smith*	1872	Winsboro, S.C.	Omaha, Nebr.	Pvt. Robert L. Collier	1876	Gallatin, Tenn.	Gallatin, Tenn.				
<b>NEW JERSEY</b>				Sgt. Newton Carlisle	1865	Clarksville, Tenn.	Clarksville, Tenn.				
Pvt. Battier Bailey*	1886	Henrico County, Va.	722 Van Hook, Camden, N.J.	Pvt. William E. Jones	1877	Knoxville, Tenn.	Knoxville, Tenn.				
Pvt. John Brown*	1869	Baltimore, Md.	50 Montgomery St., Jersey City, N.J.	Pvt. West Logan	1881	Elizabethtown, Tenn.	Elizabethtown, Tenn.				
<b>NEW YORK</b>				Pvt. John Streeter	1876	Nashville, Tenn.	Chattanooga, Tenn.				
Pvt. Ernest English*	1878	Warrenton, Ga.	Catskill, N.Y.	Pvt. Lewis Williams*	1880	Kingston, Ga.	Chattanooga, Tenn.				
Sgt. Samuel W. Harley*		Elmira, N.Y.	517 State St., Harrisburg, Pa.	Pvt. Robert L. Rogan*	1880	Nashville, Tenn.	1011 Velvet St., Nashville, Tenn.				
<b>TEXAS</b>				Pvt. Henry Jones*	1882	Courtland, Ala.	112 Lookout St., Chattanooga, Tenn.				
Pvt. William Anderson	1883	Matagorda, Tex.	Bay City, Tex.	Pvt. John Smith	1878	Carter County, Tenn.	Elizabethtown, Tenn.				
Pvt. John B. Anderson*	1861	Richmond, Va.	Fort Worth, Tex.	Pvt. John Kirkpatrick	1873	Davidson County, Tenn.	(None.)				
Pvt. Elmer Peters*	1883	Henderson, Tex.	Guthrie, Okla.								

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 7, 1973

## ATTACHMENT 2—Continued

## LIST BY STATE OF ORIGINAL ADDRESSES, TOGETHER WITH YEAR OF BIRTH OF BROWNSVILLE SOLDIERS—Continued

[The following list contains more than 167 entries, since some names are listed more than once. This is because the State of birth is different from the State of last residence. In these cases, an asterisk appears beside the name]

Rank and name	Year of birth	Birthplace	Last known residence	Rank and name	Year of birth	Birthplace	Last known residence				
Pvt. Len Reeves*	1877	Bolivar, Tenn.	212 Chestnut St., San Antonio, Tex.	Pvt. Oscar W. Reid	1882	Portsmouth, Va.	708 Crawford St., Portsmouth, Va.				
Cook Robert Williams*	1878	Galveston, Tex.	2812 South State St., Chicago, Ill.	Pvt. Robert Turner	1876	Chesterfield, Va.	Granite, Va.				
Pvt. George Lawson	1881	Houston, Tex.	Galveston, Tex.	Pvt. Robert James	1873	Montgomery, Va.	113 South McDowell St., Roanoke, Va.				
Pvt. Edward Warfield*	1883	Waco, Tex.	330 East 2d St., Oklahoma City, Okla.	Pvt. John W. Lewis	1878	Roanoke, Va.	534 Campbell Ave., Roanoke, Va.				
Pvt. Lawrence Daniel*	1883	Little Rock, Ark.	Galveston, Tex.	Pvt. Charley Hairston*	1882	Henry, Va.	Spray, N.C.				
Pvt. William J. Carlton	1880	Curtis, La.	Franklin, Tex.	Pvt. George Jackson*	1864	Culpepper, Va.	Washington, D.C.				
VIRGINIA											
Pvt. Butler Bailey*	1886	Henrico County, Va.	722 Van Hook, Camden, N.J.	Pvt. Edward Lee*	1871	Yanceyville, N.C.	Washington, D.C. (1948); Mother: 1833 Monroe St., Danville, Va.				
Pvt. John B. Anderson*	1861	Richmond, Va.	Fort Worth, Tex.	Pvt. Charles F. Cooper	1877	Harpers Ferry, W. Va.	Boliver, W. Va.				
Pvt. Alexander Ash	1879	Marshall, Va.	Marshall, Va.	Pvt. George W. Gray*	1882	Salem, Va.	Sun, W. Va.				
Cpl. James H. Ballard	1869	Alexandria, Va.	617 Altor St., Alexandria, Va.	WASHINGTON, D.C.							
Pvt. Thomas Jones Green	1866	Prince Williams County, Va.	Prince William County, Va.	Pvt. Elias Gant*	1877	Washington, D.C.	Grifton, Md.				
Pvt. John A. Jackson	1865	Danville, Va.	Danville, Va.	Pvt. George W. Hall*	1877	218 D St., Washington, D.C.	Cedar Forest, Va.				
Cpl. Temple Thornton	1878	Gloucester County, Va.	Gloucester County, Va.	Pvt. Alfred N. Williams*	1873	Prince Georges County, Md.	Washington, D.C.				
Sgt. Israel Harris	1870	York County, Va.	York County, Va.	Pvt. Shepherd Glenn*	1882	Old Town, N.C.	1237 9th St. NW., Washington, D.C.				
Cpl. Winter Washington*	1877	Gloucester County, Va.	1321 Argyle Ave., Baltimore, Md.	Pvt. George W. Perkins*	1866	Lewis Court, Va.	1533 P St. NW., Washington, D.C.				
Cook Charles Dade*	1855	Culpeper, Va.	Abilene, Kans.	Pvt. James A. Simmons	1875	Washington, D.C.	354 F St. SW., Washington, D.C.				
Pvt. George W. Hall*	1877	218 D St., Washington, D.C.	Cedar Forest, Va.	Pvt. George Jackson*	1864	Culpeper, Va.	Washington, D.C.				
Cpl. Edward L. Daniels	1876	Charlottesville, Va.	Charlottesville, Va.	Pvt. Edward Lee*	1871	Yanceyville, N.C.	Washington, D.C. (1948); Mother: 1833 Monroe St., Danville, Va.				
Cpl. Jones A. Coltrane*	1878	Danville, Va.	928-H 23d St., Omaha, Nebr.	UNLISTED							
Cpl. Anthony Franklin*	1871	Prince Edward County, Va.	215 South 3d St., Springfield, Ill.	Pvt. James Woodson							
Cpl. Albert Roland	1873	Palmyra, Va.	Charlottesville, Va.	Pvt. Lewis J. Baker							
Cpl. Willie H. Miller*	1874	Coal Creek, Tenn.	2120 Selden St., Richmond, Va.	Pvt. Taylor Stroudemire							
Cpl. Charles H. Madison*	1872	Staunton, Va.	Wallston, Okla.	FOREIGN							
Pvt. Joseph H. Gray*	1878	Roanoke County, Va.	(None)	Pvt. Joseph Rogers	1879	St. Michaels, Barbados	St. Michaels, Barbados.				
Pvt. George W. Gray*	1882	Salem, Va.	Sun, W. Va.								
Pvt. Erasmus T. Dabbs*	1872	Charlottesville, Va.	Oxford, N.C.								
Pvt. William Mapp*	1877	North Hampton, Va.	St. Paul, Minn.								
Pvt. Andrew Mitchell	1877	Catawba, Va.	Catawba, Va.								
Pvt. George W. Perkins*	1866	Lewis County, Va.	1533 P St. NW, Washington, D.C.								

(Attachment 3)

GANGES, BRITISH COLUMBIA, CANADA,  
December 8, 1972.

Representative AUGUSTUS HAWKINS,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Congratulation on the passage of your bill proposing full exoneration of the men of the 1st Battalion of the 25th Infantry, U. S. Army. Newsweek of October 16, 1972, states that "Hawkins has now demanded that the Army try to locate any survivors or their direct heirs, and to pay them full Army benefits."

This is to state that I am the son, and sole heir of the late John Holloman (private Company B, 25th Infantry) who died at Louisville, Kentucky, on October 2, 1947. I am very grateful to you for your efforts in restoring honor to my father and his comrades. Much success to you in your further efforts to balance the scales in connection with an admitted injustice.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT HOLLOWMAN.

DECEMBER 12, 1972.

Mr. ROBERT HOLLOWMAN,  
Ganges, British Columbia, Canada.

DEAR MR. HOLLOWMAN: I certainly was glad to hear from you.

As you know and indicated in your letter, I and my staff have been engaged in an intensive effort to locate the heirs and survivors of the Brownsville soldiers. The fact that you are John Holloman's son and have gotten in touch with us is excellent.

I would hope that I could ask your assistance in two respects: (1) Could you send me a letter indicating in some detail the hardships (if any) that your father and his family went through as a result of his discharge

without honor, as well as what you know about your father's career in the service, and (2) If I hold hearings in Congress on the Brownsville incident and its effect on the families of the soldiers, could you come and testify? The ultimate purpose of the legislation would be to obtain full compensation to the heirs of the soldiers for the wrongs done them.

I hope to hear from you soon.

Sincerely,

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,  
Member of Congress.

GANGES, BRITISH COLUMBIA, CANADA,  
January 3, 1973.

Mr. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,  
House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAWKINS: In response to your letter of December 12th, the following is offered in the hope that it may be of some benefit in connection with your efforts in behalf of the survivors and heirs of the Brownsville soldiers:

1. Immediately following discharge from the army, my father settled in St. Louis, Mo.; in an effort to re-establish himself in civilian life and re-unite a family of three left stranded in Macon, Georgia. During the next four years life was grim for this family unit of three, consisting of my mother, my sister, and myself who had been partly supported by my father in the days prior to Brownsville.

The realization of his objective came only after the death of my mother (probably from malnutrition), the death of my sister (the victim of a fire while baby-sitting for a fee), and only I was left to re-unite with my father in St. Louis.

2. My father, the late John Holloman, was

born in Sandersville, Georgia, February 1, 1876. He died in Louisville, Kentucky, October 2, 1947. At the outbreak of the Spanish American War he enlisted in the U.S. Army and served with the 9th Cavalry in Cuba, where he was wounded in action. After Cuba, he transferred to the 25th Infantry and served with this unit in the Philippines, at Fort Niobrara, Nebraska, and Fort Brown, Texas. During a four year stay at Fort Niobrara, John Holloman was "finance man" and money lender to the soldiers of his battalion, supplying them with necessary credit for the fulfillment of their needs and requirements, including transportation over the five miles between the fort and Valentine, Nebraska.

At Brownsville, Texas, he promoted and financially backed the promotion of a saloon, in protest against the discriminatory practices of the community. It was the feeling of John Holloman that "the opening of the saloon and the subsequent economic loss to the white community" was the real cause behind the false charges and the expulsion of the soldiers of the 25th Infantry from Fort Brown.

3. I observed a birthday on December 25, 1972, and suffer from all the normal disabilities of a seventy-five year old man. But I am able, willing and anxious to attend any congressional hearing held in connection with this matter, even at my own expense, if necessary.

I think you should know that I was president (1950-1956) and board chairman (1956-1966) of Mammoth Life and Accident Insurance Company of Louisville, Kentucky. I have been a permanent resident of Canada for the past twenty years, and a Canadian citizen since 1960. My father's experience at Brownsville and my personal experience in

World War I, convinced me that the U.S. was unable or unwilling to defend the rights of the black people who go forth to defend it. It was because of this conviction that I became a voluntary exile from the country of my birth.

My declining years are being spent here in dignity on a small island (Salt Spring) thirty-five miles off the coast of British Columbia. It was first settled in 1858, by ex-slaves and free men of color, who came from the gold fields of California, seeking freedom from persecution. My wife and I have been most happy in researching the history of those early black pioneers who settled in Canada before emancipation.

Sincerely,  
ROBERT HOLLOWAY.

PARKESBURG, PA.,  
October 12, 1972.

HON. AUGUSTUS HAWKINS,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: You are to be congratulated for your efforts to right the wrong done B, C, & D, Cos. 25th US Inf. in the Brownsville Affair.

I served with some of the men who were restored to duty. The greatest hurt was to 1Sgt. Mingo Saunders who was within the retirement bracket but died like many of the others without enjoying the privilege of an honorable discharge.

A review of the GCM of 1st Lt. Henry O. Flipper the first colored graduate of West Point will reveal that the dismissal charge of conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman was without foundation.

I served as an enlisted man in the 10th US Cavalry under Col. Charles Young who was my last Commanding officer before being commissioned a Captain in WWI. My last command was as the Commanding Officer 366th Infantry WW2.

Respectfully yours,

H. D. QUEEN,  
Colonel, U.S. Army, Retired.

VASSAR COLLEGE,

Poughkeepsie, N.Y., October 3, 1973.  
HON. AUGUSTUS HAWKINS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: As a young Black historian, I was particularly moved upon reading in the *New York Times* edition of Tuesday, 3 October 1972, of your efforts to bring the Brownsville incident and its allied injustices to the attention of the nation in a speech before Congress on 18 March 1971. It is significant, I think, that the Department of the Army release to the press concerning the clearance of the 167 Black soldiers by the present Secretary of the Army (66 years late) neglected to mention your contribution to this belated act—especially considering that this is an election year. However, I am writing this letter to bring to your attention another case involving Black soldiers in Texas which disputes the Army contention that the Brownsville case of 1906 was the "only documented case of mass punishment" in its history. This is regrettably not true.

I must bring your attention to the infamous case of the court-martial of 64 Black soldiers of the all-Black 24th Infantry which took place at Houston, Texas, on 1 November 1917, some 11 years after the Brownsville incident. These Black soldiers were tried by an all-White military tribunal in a one-day proceeding which was not only grossly unfair and biased in all its aspects but which also constituted the largest mass murder trial in military and American history! How could the Army have overlooked this flagrant miscarriage of justice when its spokesman told the press this past week that the Brownsville incident was "the only documented case of mass punishment" in its history? It is especially revealing that both

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the Brownsville and Houston episodes involved all Black soldiers and that "mass punishment" was a feature of both incidents. I must point out that the details were much alike in both instances inasmuch as Black soldiers faced hostile and aggressive White mobs whenever they left their posts in Brownsville and in Houston and attempted to assert their ordinary rights as citizens and soldier. In the case of the 24th Infantry soldiers at Houston, a number of soldiers struck back and killed a number of Whites. But the evidence did not sustain the shocking conclusion of the one-day court-martial when 54 of the accused were convicted and others were retained in custody pending further investigation. At this largest mass murder trial in history, the all-White military tribunal sentenced 13 of the convicted men to death by hanging and 41 to life imprisonment. This court-martial of 1 November 1917 sent a shock wave through the Black community, and badly shook the pride of Blacks and their faith in the decency of White America. A Black Baltimore newspaper proclaimed: "The Negroes of the entire country will regard the Negro soldiers of the 24th Infantry executed as martyrs." The *New York Age* editorialized: "Strict justice has been done, but full justice has not been done . . . And so sure as there is a God in heaven, at some time and in some way full justice will be done."

Representative Hawkins, I think the court-martial of the 24th Infantry Black soldiers is an even more flagrant case of racism and injustice in the Army than the Brownsville incident of 1906, and I wanted to bring this episode to your attention in the hope that the Army can be made to completely purge itself of these tragic remnants of an often racist past.

I am beholden to you as a Black elected office holder for your concern and effort on behalf of all Black Americans in this regard. We have all been sullied by the astonishing acts of discrimination and denigration which can be found in all areas of American institutional life. I think we have a duty to search out these injustices wherever we find them in history in order to set the record straight and to give our young people a truer and clearer vision of themselves and their forebears—not one distorted and calumned by racist deeds.

In my book *Black History*, published by Monarch Press in 1971, and *Breaking the Chains of Bondage*, published by Simon and Schuster this month, I give mention to both the Brownsville and Houston (24th Infantry) incidents as being among the most unhappy examples of racism in Army history.

I hope you will give the matter of the court-martial of the Black soldiers of the 24th Infantry (1 November 1917) your attention—more especially because it refutes so dramatically the Army contention that the Brownsville incident was "the only documented case of mass punishment" in its sometimes shameful history.

Thank you.

With sincerity,

NORMAN E. HODGES,  
Associate Professor.

HAMPTON INSTITUTE,

Hampton, Va., October 30, 1972.  
HON. AUGUSTUS HAWKINS,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I was pleased to read in the October 26th issue of *Jet Magazine* of the part you are performing in helping to restore the good reputation of the 167 Black soldiers who were dishonorably discharged in about 1906 in Texas.

I wish that someone would investigate the facts and circumstances surrounding the court martial of Cadet James Smith from West Point in 1871 and the facts, circumstances, etc., surrounding the court martial

of 1st Lieutenant Henry O. Flipper from the U.S. Army about 1882. Will you try to influence such investigations? It appears that unfairness surrounded each case.

JESSE J. JOHNSON,  
Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army, Retired.

WYCKOFF, N.J.,  
January 1, 1973.

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAWKINS: I read in the *New York Times* yesterday, p. 33N, the report by reporter Andrew H. Malcolm of the case of Doris W. Willis, age 86, and other veterans of the 25th Infantry, U.S. Army, who received dishonorable discharges after the Brownsville incident for, of all unconstitutional reasons, remaining silent when charged with a military offense (alleged). I further noted that all such discharges were made honorable by the Department of the Army in 1972, denying veterans' privileges to heirs or descendants. Since this action at least restored Mr. Willis to rights in his own behalf, it would certainly appear to be correct for the Veterans Administration to pay him a pension forthwith and for him to have access, if needed, to Veterans Hospital care: in fact the question would appear to arise as to whether he does not have rights to a pension for some time prior to 1972.

I note with pleasure that you intend introducing legislation to correct the injustice on behalf of the other soldiers and their families. If President Teddy Roosevelt were around, I can hear him say "Bully!" If you will send me a copy of your bill, I will be happy to consider favorably writing my congressman and senators on its behalf. I am writing the Army.

Yours sincerely,

AUSTIN S. PHILLIPS,  
Major, JAGC-USAR, (Hon. disch.).

NOVEMBER 6, 1972.

DEAR MR. HAWKINS: I have read very recently about your successful efforts to clear the names of the Negro soldiers dishonorably discharged in WWI for acts allegedly committed against the civilian populace of a Texas community.

You are to be congratulated. I have been on active duty for 20 odd years both in an integrated and segregated Army. Your stand and the subsequent results have made me feel that my service has been worthwhile.

I have a few friends in California residing in your district and I have contacted them and as they are voters I have encouraged them to vote for you.

Your actions transcends partisan politics and I like that.

There isn't much I can do to help you get re-elected being stationed in Thailand but I want you to know that your actions are appreciated.

I have no axes to grind or favors to ask. I assume you have more than enough constituent problems.

My best wishes are yours.

Respectfully,

RUSSELL W. HAWKINS.

COLUMBUS BROADCASTING CO., INC.,  
Columbus, Ga., December 11, 1972.

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HAWKINS: Your letter and enclosures of December 5 have been received.

From this material our News Director has prepared a release calling attention to the former residence, either by birth or by last known residence, in order that survivors or descendants, if any, may be apprised of the cause which you have espoused.

A copy of this release, presented on WRBL-TV and WRBL Radio, is enclosed.

We appreciate your calling this to our attention.

Sincerely,

J. W. WOODRUFF, JR.

THE EVENING STAR—  
THE SUNDAY STAR,  
Washington, D.C. December 19, 1972.

Hon. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Several weeks ago you wrote Star-News Editor Newbold Noyes asking support for your project of trying to locate survivors and descendants of the 167 soldiers of the 25th Infantry Regiment.

At the time, I turned your material over to our staff with the suggestion that they look into it and see what might be done. Today they reported back that we will publish "a good story on it all" before this week is out.

Sincerely,

I. WILLIAM HILL,  
Associate Editor.

NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO., INC.,  
Washington, D.C., December 18, 1972.

Hon. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HAWKINS: A copy of your letter of December 5, to WRC-TV, in Washington, regarding the 167 soldiers of the 25th Infantry Regiment, has been forwarded for our information. WRC-TV has informed us of their routing of your correspondence through the News Department and they will make every effort to be of assistance.

We would also like to suggest that you may wish to send the same correspondence to the National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, to the attention of Vincent T. Wasilewski, President of the Association. As you know, there are thousands of broadcasters in the United States that are members of NAB, and it is entirely possible that the Association may be able to provide some assistance in this project.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

PETER B. KENNEY,  
Vice President.

WFBC-TV.

Greenville, S.C., December 19, 1972.

Hon. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAWKINS: WFBC Radio and Television is happy to cooperate in your project to locate the survivors and descendants of the 25th Infantry Regiment. Under the direction of our Public Affairs Director, Bill Wheless, we are making announcements regarding those members in our coverage area.

We will be happy to forward any response.

Most cordially,

DOUGLAS A. SMITH,  
Vice President and General Manager.

WSB-TV,

Atlanta, Ga., December 7, 1972.

Hon. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: WSB-TV will go to work on your project to locate survivors and descendants of the 25th Infantry Regiment. Georgia was heavily represented in that regiment and there may well be descendants back in this area.

Best wishes in your efforts and hope we can be of help.

Cordially yours,

DON ELLIOT HEALD,  
Vice President and General Manager.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

(Attachment 4)

FEBRUARY 2, 1973.

Hon. ROBERT F. FROEHLKE,  
Secretary of the Army,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Enclosed are two copies of the replies I received to my letter to you of November 3, 1972.

Quite frankly, I do not consider the replies responsive to my inquiries, and I would very much appreciate a response that demonstrates in detail and in simple terms why the language in question does not discriminate against the heirs or descendants of these soldiers, if such be the case.

Moreover, the reply of 14 December 1972 in telling me that the survivors themselves (if any) were entitled to benefits was, I presumed, simply stating the obvious. Yet, it is increasingly clear that even the survivors are having their problems getting benefits, as illustrated by the case of Mr. Dorsey Willis of Minneapolis, Minnesota.

It is becoming increasingly clear that both legislation and rather exhaustive hearings here in Congress would be quite helpful in this matter.

Please let me hear from you at your earliest convenience in regard to the discriminatory language aspect.

Thanking you in advance, I am

Sincerely,  
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,  
Member of Congress.

NOVEMBER 3, 1972.

Hon. ROBERT F. FROEHLKE,  
Secretary of the Army,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This letter is in regard to the Brownsville incident of August 13, 1906, and your recent action in respect thereto.

I notice in the orders issued by your office amending Paragraph 1, Special Orders 266, War Department, 9 November 1906, the language "No back pay, allowances, benefits or privileges shall accrue by reason of the issuance of this order to any heirs or descendants," is included.

Frankly, I consider this language discriminatory, and I wonder if you would give me the reasoning behind it.

If you could delete this wording, I feel that justice would be far better served. And, in all honesty, it appears to me that entitlement to full benefits, if any, would be the very least that the U.S. Army could do after doing what is obviously in large measure irremediable harm to these men of the 25th Infantry and their families.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,  
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,  
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,

Washington, D.C., December 14, 1972.

Hon. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HAWKINS: This is in further reply to your letter to the Secretary of Army concerning the recharacterization of the discharges of the soldiers allegedly involved in the Brownsville incident of 13 August 1906, in which you state that you consider the language of the implementing orders to be discriminatory.

The Secretary of the Army recharacterized the discharges after careful and detailed study of the case. He felt that this was a just and proper approach and that all Americans could be proud of this historical action.

After re-examining the matter, I am unable to agree that the language used in the orders is discriminatory. It does not preclude the award of benefits to which any of the discharged soldiers who are still alive may

March 7, 1973

be entitled. Similar wording has been used in the past when changing the characterization of discharges for a group of soldiers, and is also used in private relief bills when the limited purpose, as in this instance, is to remove the stigma of a less than honorable discharge.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated and I hope that the above will be helpful.

Sincerely,

HADLAI A. HULL,  
Assistant Secretary of the Army,  
(Manpower and Reserve Affairs).

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,

Washington, D.C., November 9, 1972.

Hon. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HAWKINS: The Secretary of the Army has asked me to reply to your inquiry concerning certain language in the orders recharacterizing the discharges of the former soldiers involved in the Brownsville incident of 13 August 1906.

Your inquiry has been passed to the Army General Staff, where the orders were prepared. When this office has received sufficient information to be responsive to your comments, a more detailed reply will be provided to you.

TOGO D. WEST, JR.,  
Staff Assistant for Civil Rights.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,

Washington, D.C., September 28, 1972.

INFORMATION FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS:  
BROWNSVILLE INCIDENT

The following is the substance of a news release being made today.

The Secretary of the Army, Robert F. Froehlike, announced today that the Army has changed the discharges of some 167 black soldiers of the 1st Battalion, 25th Infantry who were discharged without honor as a result of a shooting incident which occurred in Brownsville, Texas in 1906.

Around midnight on August 13, 1906, some 16 to 20 individuals on horseback rode through the streets of Brownsville firing their weapons into homes and stores. As a result of the shooting, one man was killed and two were injured. Witnesses alleged that the riders were black soldiers. At the time, the 1st Battalion, 25th Infantry was stationed outside the town of Brownsville.

A series of military inquiries and a county grand jury failed to establish the identity of the riders involved. Finally, all members of Companies B, C, and D of the 1st Battalion, were assembled and told to step forward and identify the guilty soldiers or all would be discharged without honor. None stepped forward; all maintained their innocence. Their discharge without honor followed.

Subsequent courts of inquiry failed to recommend remedial action and relief legislation introduced on behalf of various individuals was never enacted.

An internal Army review of administrative and judicial policies brought this instance of mass punishment to the attention of the Secretary of the Army. Although the practice was occasionally invoked under extreme circumstances during frontier times, the concept of mass punishment has for decades been contrary to Army policy and is considered gross injustice.

The Secretary of the Army's action grants honorable discharges to all the individuals concerned.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,  
OFFICE OF THE ADJUTANT GENERAL,  
Washington, D.C., September 22, 1972.

AMENDMENT OF ORDERS

So much of: Paragraph 1, Special Orders 266, War Department, 9 November 1906.

As reads: "discharged without honor from the Army by their respective commanding officers and forever debarred from reenlisting in the Army or Navy of the United States, as well as from employment in any civil capacity under the Government."

How changed: Is amended to read: "honorable discharged from the Army by their respective commanding officers."

Is amended to add: No back pay, allowances, benefits or privileges shall accrue by reason of the issuance of this order to any heirs or descendants.

Is amended to delete: The discharge certificate in each case will show that the discharge without honor is in consequence of paragraph 1, Special Orders, No. 266, War Department, November 9, 1906.

Pertaining to member(s) of: Company B, 25th Infantry: First Sergeant Mingo Sanders, Quartermaster Sergeant Walker McCurdy, Sergeant James R. Reid, Sergeant George Jackson, Sergeant Luther T. Thornton, Corporal Jones A. Coltrane, Corporal Edward L. Daniels, Corporal Ray Burdett, Corporal Wade H. Watlington, Corporal Anthony Franklin, Cook Leroy Horn, Cook Solomon Johnson, Musician Henry Odom, Private James Allen, Private John B. Anderson, Private William Anderson, Private Battier Bailey, Private James Bailey.

Private Elmer Brown, Private John Brown, Private William Brown, Private William J. Carlton, Private Harry Carmichael, Private George Conn, Private John Cook, Private Charles E. Cooper, Private Boyd Conyers, Private Lawrence Daniel, Private Carolina DeSaussure, Private Ernest English.

Private Shepherd Glenn, Private Isaac Goolsby, Private William Harden, Private Charley Hairston, Private John Holomon, Private James Johnson, Private Frank Jones, Private Henry Jones, Private William J. Keran, Private George Lawson, Private Willie Lemons, Private Samuel McGhee.

Private George W. Mitchell, Private Isaiah Raynor, Private Stansberry Roberts, Private William Smith, Private Thomas Taylor, Private William Thomas, Private Alexander Walker, Private Edward Warfield, Private Julius Wilkins, Private Alfred N. Williams, Private Brister Williams, Private Joseph L. Wilson.

Company C, 25th Infantry: Quartermaster Sergeant George W. McMurray, Sergeant Samuel W. Harley, Sergeant Newton Carlisle, Sergeant Darby W. O. Brawner, Sergeant George Thomas, Corporal Charles H. Madison, Corporal Solomon P. O'Neill, Corporal Preston Washington.

Corporal Willie H. Miller, Corporal John H. Hill, Cook George Grier, Cook Lewis J. Baker, Musician James E. Armstrong, Musician Walter Banks, Artificer Charles E. Rudy, Private Clifford I. Adair, Private Henry W. Arvin, Private Charles W. Askew, Private Frank Bounslar, Private Robert L. Collier.

Private Erasmus T. Dabs, Private Mark Garmon, Private George W. Gray, Private Joseph H. Gray, Private James T. Harden, Private George W. Harris, Private John T. Hawkins, Private Alphonso Holland, Private Thomas Jefferson, Private Edward Johnson, Private George Johnson, Private John Kirkpatrick.

Private Edward Lee, Private Frank J. Lipscomb, Private West Logan, Private William Mapp, Private William McGuire, Jr., Private Thomas L. Mosley, Private Andrew Mitchell, Private James W. Newton, Private George W. Perkins, Private James Perry.

Private Oscar W. Reid, Private Joseph Rogers, Private James Sinkler, Private Calvin Smith, Private George Smith, Private John Smith, Private John Streeter, Private Robert Turner, Private Learis Webb, Private Lewis Williams, Private James Woodson.

Company D, 25th Infantry: First Sergeant Israel Harris, Quartermaster Sergeant Thomas J. Green, Sergeant Jerry E. Reeves,

Sergeant Jacob Frazier, Corporal Temple Thornton, Corporal David Powell, Corporal Winter Washington, Corporal Albert Roland, Corporal James H. Ballard, Musician Hoyt Robinson, Musician Joseph Jones, Cook Charles Dade.

Cook Robert Williams, Artificer George W. Newton, Private Samuel Wheeler, Private Charles Hawkins, Private Henry Barclay, Private Sam M. Battle, Private Henry T. W. Brown, Private John Butler, Private Richard Crooks, Private Strowder Darnell, Private Elias Gant, Private James C. Gill.

Private John Green, Private Alonzo Haley, Private George W. Hall, Private Barney Harris, Private Joseph H. Howard, Private John A. Jackson, Private Benjamin F. Johnson, Private Walter Johnson, Private Charles Jones.

Private John R. Jones, Private William E. Jones, Private William R. Jones, Private Edward Jordan, Private Wesley Mapp, Private William A. Matthews, Private James Newton, Private Elmer Peters, Private Len Reeves, Private Edward Robinson, Private Henry Robinson.

Private Robert L. Rogan, Private Samuel E. Scott, Private Joseph Shanks, Private John Slow, Private Zachariah Sparks, Private William Van Hook, Private Edward Wickersham, Private Doris Willis.

Company A, 25th Infantry: Private James A. Simmons, Private August Williams.

Company G, 25th Infantry: Private James Duncan.

Unassigned, 25th Infantry: Private Perry Cisco.

Troop C, 9th Cavalry: Private Alexander Ash, Private Taylor Stroudemire, Private Robert James.

Troop H, 10th Cavalry: Private John W. Lewis.

By order of the Secretary of the Army.

VERNE L. BOWERS,  
Major General, U.S.A.,  
The Adjutant General.

## THE LIGHT THAT WILL NOT GO OUT

### HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, today a brave young man rots silently in Russian isolation, living witness to the stifling tyranny the Soviet Union still believes in and practices behind its facade of detente and reasonableness.

This man is only one of many. His name is Misha Ullman. He happens to be a Jew, and is proud of it. He also has been guilty of the heinous crime of wanting to emigrate to Israel.

Misha is 27 years old and a radio construction engineer. Unemployed for almost a year because of his announced desire to leave Russia, he lives or exists alone in Riga, Latvia, U.S.S.R.

This man is seeking to obtain an exit visa to Israel in order to be reunited with his mother. Both mother and son were granted such visas in 1971, but only Mrs. Ullman was allowed to leave. She was told that her son would be allowed to follow her in 2 months. Mother and son are still waiting.

Here is only one of the milder cases. The world little notes nor is aware of the many other people like Ullman, who carry on in their persons the tragic tradi-

tion of Russian persecution of the Jewish people.

Russia may live under a different flag than the imperial eagle of the Romanoffs. She may pay lip service to equality and freedom for all men and women. But all these claims are lies, attested to by the living shame of Jewish hostages rotting away in Soviet prisons, damned, and found guilty because they are unashamed of their faith and open about their desire to live in a free Israel.

Until the last of these people are free, and the last Jew who wishes to emigrate from Russia is allowed to go, the Soviet Union will not attain the international respectability and recognition she so ardently seeks.

Several years ago the captive Jews of Russia began to speak out, even more strongly and persistently, demanding the right to live as Jews and to go to Israel. Enraged and apprehensive, the Kremlin struck them down with all its might.

Today this terror continues, marked by suspension from jobs, ostracism, spying, invasion of privacy, and overt violence against any Jew who dares speak out on behalf of his faith and who seeks migration rights to Israel. One after the other of these activists has paid the price. One after another, they have disappeared into the gaping maw of the Russian prison system, operated by the secret police. The world has come to know the names of Sylvia Zalmanson, Edward Kuznetsov, Victor Boguslavsky, Boris Penson, Lassal Kaminsky, Michael Kornblit, Mark Dymshits, Lev Yagman, Yuri Brind and over 35 other Russian Jewish prisoners who now suffer the agonies of Soviet labor camps.

Has anything really changed about Russia for the Jews with the replacement of the despised Romanoffs by the Soviets? Only the names have been altered. The Soviets may have changed the face of Russia physically, but they have not altered the heart of Russia internally. There runs through Russian national life a dark and ugly stain, coursing deep into the very marrow of Russian existence.

It transcends time and regimes, rearing up like some prehistoric beast to rend and tear at innocent people. Anti-Semitism is not just the mark of national immaturity. Rather it is the mark of barbarism upon a people. After thousands of years and tens of millions of lives and hundreds of eras and generations, so-called civilized men still single out the Jew as an enemy because of his faith, his manner, his religious practices and his innocent way of life.

In many areas of the world today, the doors are still closed to these people. In some countries they are just beginning to close, Uganda has just done this. Several north African countries have just taken Arab oil money as a bribe in return for banishing the Jew.

Few are surprised by the actions of Idi Amin. Few are taken aback by the actions of the nations of the southern Sahara. But the Soviet Union is supposed to be a developed nation. It has scientists, modern cities, a well-developed economy, a great cultural tradition and a place in

the sun. Why, then, does this mighty state tread so methodically in the footsteps of pharoahs, the Inquisition, the crusaders, the hated Romanoffs, Adolf Hitler and those other degraded creatures who soil the pages of history with their anti-Semitic excesses?

No nation in history has ever countenanced such degraded practices without paying a disproportionate price in return. No matter what their other accomplishments, they are always remembered in the history books as persecutors of an ancient people, marked indelibly by the stain they have applied to themselves.

The Russians are an intelligent people. They seek international respectability and broadened trade relations with our country and other Western nations. How, then, can they be so blind to the consequences of their policies? It is the essence of shortsightedness and immaturity to continue to harass these people, imprison them and hold them up to the world as martyrs.

The same is true of the infamous exit tax imposed only upon Jews as the price for allowing them to emigrate to Israel.

So even while the Russians pose piously to the world as mature rulers of a developed nation, underneath the facade is the same old Russia, the bear that walks like a man.

Until the last Misha Ullman is allowed to shake the dust of Russia from his shoes, the world will know that Russia has not changed. The flag and its symbols may change. The National Anthem may have different music. But the elementary barbarism of Russia's heritage still pursues and haunts her today.

Any civilized man and woman knows that anti-Semitism is the ultimate mark of national juvenile delinquency. It is a confession of intellectual bankruptcy on the part of a society. It says that, "Because we cannot cope with our own problems, we must have a scapegoat to take the heat off the regime, and the Jews are ready made for such a purpose."

That is why these hateful policies are being pursued. And because the Jews of Russia have lit a flame of freedom, and try as the massed might of Russian oppression may, it cannot snuff out that little fire. It flickers and wobbles, but never quite goes out.

The Misha Ullmans shield it with their lives and bodies. Let it never be said that we abandoned them in their hour of need.

#### RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE ON RISING MEDICAL COSTS

**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 6, 1973*

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, today I reported to my people on the rising cost of medical care. I include the text of that report in the RECORD at this point:

#### MEDICAL CARE

If you or any member of your family or friends have spent any time in a hospital under a doctor's care recently, you know that the cost of medical care has risen dramatic-

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ally over the last few years. The Consumer Price Index in fact shows that health care expenditures are the fastest rising items.

Critics of the American medical care system are quick to point out that our medical system is a failure, not nearly as successful as the socialized systems of England, Sweden and other countries with similar national health insurance programs. Our low comparative ranking on international statistical charts are cited to justify the prescription for the medical crisis: more government intervention, more government money and more government control.

But before we are too quick to attack Marcus Welby or Young Dr. Malone—the physicians engaged in the private practice of medicine or the private hospitals as the causes of our so-called medical crisis, let's examine the facts. I thought today we'd look at some of the aspects of the growing national concern over health care costs.

The popular attitude today seems to be to think in terms of "crises"—the fuel crisis, the ecology crisis, the Middle-East crisis, the dollar crisis. So when difficulties or problems arise in the medical field, it may be expected that they be labeled a "medical crisis". The rallying point of these "crisis makers" in medicine is some sort of national health insurance, to provide "free" medical care, equal services to everyone. The various critics of the present proven system of private medical care would have you believe that under newly proposed plans, the quality of medical care would be improved, the costs would be lowered, and the alleged crisis would be solved. But even a limited study of the medically socialized nations that are held up as models we should use to reform our system are far from an improvement. Increased governmental intermeddling—political interference—into the medical field would lead in the opposite direction.

Campaigns for federally financed national health plans are certainly nothing new. They have, in one form or another, been proposed for almost 60 years and have been introduced in Congress for almost 30 years. This session of Congress is no exception. The usual socialized medicine schemes have been reintroduced into the 93d Congress as well.

But there is something different this time: a massive campaign to undermine public confidence in our private medical system. Even the average citizen, who wants to maintain private medical and hospital care in his community, when faced with soaring medical costs, is tempted to throw up his hands in despair and become a part of the growing "free medical care for all" movement. The profit motive in hospital operations comes under attack, as not being an acceptable philosophy for medical care.

Let's look for a moment at one reason for the sharp boost in hospital services during the past year. Last spring, HEW sent out a directive to all hospital facilities requiring them to give a percentage of their facilities and services to charity and non-paying patients. Twenty-five percent of the net income of the hospitals from paying patients was designated for free use by those unable to pay.

Anyone who has watched federally controlled programs grow over the years knows that nothing is free, someone must pay or there is no service. Federal giveaway programs simply return something to the people that the Federal Government has first taken away from others.

In this instance, the intended "free medical service for those unable to pay, constitutes an added tax on the paying patient . . . otherwise, the hospital would go bankrupt. Private hospitals must operate on a fixed budget, and by demanding that these medical care facilities to give "no-charge" treatment to some, the government has forced the hospitals to increase their charges to those patients who pay their bills, or carry insur-

ance to cover such expenditures. They must make the financial loss up somewhere, or the high caliber of medical service they offer must surely suffer. Presently, about 52% of a hospital's income is from private paying patients. Any additional increase in free health benefits, will proportionately increase the discontent among paying patients with the high cost of medical service.

Medical costs generally are rising at a rate of 13 percent a year. These increased costs are tied directly to the overall economic problem in this country of inflation. If you look carefully at government statistics, you'll see that while physicians' fees have risen over the last few years, they have increased at almost exactly the same percentage as the rise in the average hourly earnings of workers on private, non-agriculture payrolls. Many trade and union wage scales have increased at a much higher rate.

Our inflation-ridden society, higher wages for non-technical hospital workers, increased construction costs, and high cost of sophisticated modern equipment have all contributed to driving medical costs up.

In proclaiming an alleged "crisis" in American medicine, critics overlook the fact that most Americans under age 65 are already covered by private insurance plans which are far cheaper than any projected government plans. By 1970, 164 million persons under 65, or about 89 percent of the total, already had some form of protection against medical costs. The vast majority of these people had protection well above the minimum. So when the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare proclaims: that the Administration's aim is to have 90 percent of the population enrolled in Health Maintenance Organizations by 1980, the bureaucratic bumbling in the health field becomes ever so clear. If a national health system were to become law, the government program would replace all of these private plans—at a much higher cost. Since private policies already protect 89 percent of the population, what possible value is there in substituting these health policies for expensive government ones which are expected to increase coverage only one percent by 1980?

The only value would be to create yet another federal bureaucracy for the taxpayer to support. Rather than providing more efficient health care, systems of national health insurance tend to do just the opposite. The citizen no longer deals with his physician in the traditional doctor-patient relationship. Instead, he must deal with a bureaucratic government agency. The efficiency of such agencies can be expected to be no different in the field of medicine than in other areas the federal government has taken over. The classic tail-wagging-the-dog examples of massive growth of Federal Agencies are HEW and the Department of Agriculture. The Agriculture Department has grown into such a monster, at one time there was a bill introduced in Congress to limit the number of Agriculture Department employees to no more than the number of farmers. If a socialized medical agency becomes entrenched in the Federal maze, it is not hard to imagine some day when the administrators of such a program would outnumber the doctors—or, heaven forbid, outnumber the patients.

Let's look for a moment at the medical system we have now. The free interprise system, where a physician practices his healing art on a fee-for-service basis, has produced what is probably the most efficient and effective medical system in the world. Health care facilities in European countries which have national health programs are far below the standards of the United States. With socialized medicine there is no personal treatment and attention—patients are numbers—like cattle—lines and waiting lines without appointments known today. Even the new hospitals in most of these countries

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

would not meet the standards of accreditation used to measure U.S. hospitals. Advances in preventative medicine are being made in the United States, while doctors in medically socialized nations are snarled with the excessive paper work and statistics not remotely connected to treatment of patients.

Life expectancy in the US today is more than 70 years, and half the babies born today can expect to live at least 74 years. The infant mortality rate is 21 per thousand. Tuberculosis and polio have virtually been wiped out. Open heart surgery is almost commonplace. The death rate from certain forms of cancer have been cut in half during the last 30 years. The progress made by American medicine under free enterprise in recent years has been phenomenal. But no more so than in other areas where the private enterprise system has been allowed to operate. The American medical system, without political interference should be a model for improvement not a scapegoat for dismantling.

In the United States today there are 318,000 medical doctors. With a national population of just over 200 million, that is an average of one doctor for every 640 persons. No other major nation in the world enjoys anything close to this ratio. In fact, there is a notable decline in the number of physicians in many of the nations that have nationalized their medical systems. Sweden has experienced such a shortage of medical men that the government has shortened medical studies by two years, filled many positions with interns and medical students, and imported a large number of foreign doctors. From Canada, reports of the exodus of 3,000 medical specialists to escape the clutches of socialized medicine in Quebec province made headlines a few years ago. It caused such a problem that the government passed a law requiring the doctors to return or face a fine and imprisonment. This involuntary servitude of physicians shows the impersonal nature and scope of socialized medical service—where the doctor and patient are regarded as property of the state rather than free individuals.

Certainly there are problems in the medical field. A small percentage of the population is not covered by health insurance, doctors are often scarce in the inner-city and in rural areas, and hospital care is inflated. But we cannot be backed into a position of accepting socialized medicine in this country because of scare rhetoric crying "crisis".

We must not allow our politicians to crowd their way into our doctors' offices, our hospital rooms and into our medical bills.

The promises of political doctors, political medicine and political medical services can only prove to be what politicians promise—"cheaper" in service, but more expensive in price considering the tax cost.

And the image of medical services under the free enterprise system as experienced today must not be confused with socialized medicine. They are two separate systems.

We must not allow this isolated issue to emotionally mislead our people into an inferior, inadequate medical service system just for the sake of change.

## THE FACTS ON EXILES

## HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, much of the current discussion of a policy of amnesty for those who have deserted from the armed services and those who have left the country in order to avoid military service is clouded by a misunderstanding, or a misrepresentation, of the facts.

Some who advocate a policy of conditional amnesty, for example, declare that the number of young Americans living in exile may be as high as 70,000. Others, led by attorney Joseph Rauh, have called for blanket amnesty and declared that—

There are at least 70,000 and some say as many as 100,000 young American men in Canada, men who have quit the military or refused the draft.

Similar reports have been circulating, unchecked, throughout the news media. What are the real facts in this matter?

Writing in the *New York Times*, Patrick Buchanan, a special consultant to the President, pointed out that the U.S. Government places the figure of verified deserters and draft dodgers in Canada at just under 4,000. Outside Canada and the United States, it estimates an additional 1,200.

Of the 2,533 "deserters at large" outside of the United States, the Pentagon places about 1,800 plus in Canada, while of the 2,400 "fugitives" from draft law indictments, Selective Service places just under 2,000. Official Canadian statistics do not contradict U.S. estimates.

Considering all of the available information, Mr. Buchanan concludes that the statistics mean that "7,000 to 10,000 seems a more justifiable estimate of the actual Canadian contingent of draft dodgers than the 70,000 to 100,000 we have been constantly fed."

Mr. Buchanan expresses the view that—

Because of an ideological bias, otherwise competent American newsmen have engaged in inexcusably sloppy journalism, swallowing whole without inspection bogus statistics fed them by . . . anti-war groups.

To set the record straight I wish to share with my colleagues the article by Patrick Buchanan which appeared in the *New York Times* of February 20, 1973. That article follows:

## THE "FACTS" ON EXILES

(By Patrick J. Buchanan)

WASHINGTON—On Dec. 14, 1971, introducing his Amnesty Act of 1972, Senator Robert Taft of Ohio observed, ". . . estimates of the number of young Americans living in exile range as high as 70,000." Therein lies a tale.

Within 72 hours one free-lance journalist found Taft's highest estimate low and reported that "over 70,000 of these young men are now sitting in exile or in prison because of their opposition to the war in Vietnam."

Clearly, the situation called for a manifesto. On Jan. 1, 1972, sixteen worthies, anchored by the indefatigable Joe Rauh, issued a call for a blanket amnesty: "There are at least 70,000 and some say as many as 100,000 young American men in Canada, men who have quit the military or refused the draft. . . . We say: Let them go and let their records be made clean."

The next morning a nationally syndicated columnist redeployed the 70,000-man army somewhat, declaring, "There are 15,000 exiles in Canada, some 55,000 in other countries."

By Jan. 11, however, The *New York Times* reported from Ottawa, "As many as 40,000 exiles . . . are in Toronto, the favorite haven, and some 10,000 may be in Montreal. Many others of the 50,000 to 70,000 draft resisters in Canada are not fortunate where jobs are concerned."

So it went through '72 and throughout the U.S. media. By early February of 1973, a Washington correspondent was declaring categorically, "There are about 60,000 to 100,000 draft evaders in exile from the United States."

What are the facts? Well, the fact is the United States Government places the figure of verified deserters and draft dodgers in Canada at just under 4,000. Outside Canada and the U.S. it estimates an additional 1,200.

Of the 2,533 "deserters at large" outside the U.S., the Pentagon places about 1,800 plus in Canada, while of the 2,400 "fugitives" from draft law indictments, Selective Service places just under 2,000 with our neighbor.

Official Canadian statistics do not contradict U.S. estimates. Between 1960 and 1964, before Vietnam became an American war, roughly 1,300 U.S. males between the ages of 15 and 29 annually became "landed immigrants" in Canada. If one concedes that every single American male, over 14 and under 30—above that annual average—who became a "landed immigrant" in Canada between January 1965 and January 1972, was either a draft dodger or a deserter—an obvious impossibility—even then the official total for all of Canada could have come to no more than 17,000 at the very time The *New York Times* located 40,000 in Toronto alone.

What about the "55,000 in other countries"? Well, the second most popular sanctuary for the "over the hill" army has been Sweden. On that situation The *Washington Post* reported two weeks ago "Sweden, generally believed to have the next (after Canada) largest number of American deserters or war resisters, does maintain an official count of deserters. A count made last fall said there were 602 deserters in Sweden."

This squares with official U.S. figures.

Thanks to the statistic-mindedness of Mr. Palme's regime, we have an idea what the Stockholm crowd is up to when not guarding the national conscience. The Swedish Director of Immigration William Leth was quoted as saying last November that from 1967 to 1970, of the 585 Americans allowed to enter the country, 110 were involved in major crimes, citing the following: 36 thefts; seven robberies; 49 drug-related cases including pushing . . . He said that 52 deserters had been jailed and nearly thirty persons deported. Quite a performance.

What Mr. Leth is telling us in a nice way is that in one three-year period, 20 per cent of our Stockholm Brigade was involved in major crimes; 10 per cent jailed, and 6 per cent deported. Those statistics seem not only a trifle high for "guardians of the national conscience"; they would have been considered an embarrassment by Crazy Joe Gallo and the Brooklyn Mafia.

What do these statistics say? This, I think. First, 7,000 to 10,000 seems a more honest, justifiable estimate of the actual Canadian contingent of draft dodgers and deserters than the 70,000 to 100,000 we have been constantly fed. Secondly, that because of an ideological bias, otherwise competent American newsmen have engaged in inexcusably sloppy journalism, swallowing whole without inspection bogus statistics fed them by Canadian-based anti-war groups—when a few phone calls and a little arithmetic would have shown the number almost certainly outlandish. Third, that, for two years, some of the nation's principal news organizations have thus grossly misled the American people about the magnitude of the problem they confront in the matter of amnesty for runaways. Fourth, that some U.S. journalists and politicians have been characterizing as the "best of our younger generation," and the "guardians of the national conscience" a collection of draft-dodgers and deserters whose statistical profile and performance in exile show them to contain more than the customary complement of malingerers, opportunists, criminals and cowards.

Especially as one watches the genuine heroes of our age and time depart at Clark Field, to hear the boys who ran away to Toronto and Montreal and Stockholm lionized as "moral heroes" is—obscene.

## LAKE COUNTY HONORS AUGUST CEPON

## HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, at the end of a long and successful personal and public career, it seems entirely appropriate to commend those who have rendered valuable service. The event which I call to your attention today is the retirement from public life of a distinguished citizen of Waukegan and the 13th Congressional District, the beloved August P. Cepon.

It seems only a brief few years ago that as a candidate for public office myself, I called upon Augie Cepon as one of the great and influential political leaders in the Waukegan area. His service to his community, and his exemplary personal and public life enabled Augie Cepon to attract a substantial following throughout his entire career.

Mr. Speaker, it seems well to recall that Augie Cepon's earliest service was as a successful businessman in the south side of Waukegan. Augie and other members of his family were the successful operators of a meat market and general grocery store. Indeed, the Cepon brothers were synonymous with high quality and faithful service. It was largely upon this initial business reputation that Augie Cepon became a popular choice for member of the Lake County board of supervisors.

During his more than 40 years of public service on the county board and in other offices, Augie Cepon's conscientious service and his talents for leadership attracted a broad and popular following.

This resulted in his election on three different occasions as chairman of the county board where he became, in effect, the titular head of the government of Lake County, Ill.

Mr. Speaker, I will not recount here the achievements of our Lake County government during Augie Cepon's service. However, let me state simply that as our county grew in population and in economic importance, Augie Cepon and his colleagues kept pace with this growth and influence. This enabled our county government to measure up to the challenge of its growth, including the need for improved public services, including the establishment of large open-space areas which came with the creation of the Lake County Forest Preserve—which he supported.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to his four decades of service on the Lake County Board, Augie Cepon served prominently as a trustee of the north shore sanitary district. Through his vision this agency was able to provide the vital collection and treatment facilities of a vast sanitary sewer system, including more recently a successful program to eliminate all effluents from Lake Michigan, and thus to take a great forward step toward improving the quality of this great and precious body of water.

Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 8, Augie Cepon will be joined by a great

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

many of his friends at the Swedish Glee Club in Waukegan to pay tribute to him on the occasion of his retirement, to express grateful appreciation on behalf of the public whom he served, and to extend heartfelt wishes for good health and pleasant days to Augie and his wife, Mary.

Mr. Speaker, I expect to be present on that occasion and to present a copy of these remarks from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in behalf of the U.S. House of Representatives in recognition of this outstanding example of the vitality and efficacy of county and local government.

Mr. Speaker, I know that in these paragraphs, I will be communicating in a small measure, the innumerable thoughts and good wishes which are being tendered at this time to a beloved and faithful public official.

## HUNGARY'S SEARCH FOR FREEDOM

## HON. STANFORD E. PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1973

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt submitted to me by one of my constituents from a dissertation by Dr. Siert Frederick Riepma on the similarity between the search for freedom in Hungary and in the United States:

YOUNG HUNGARY AND YOUNG AMERICA  
SEARCHES FOR FREEDOM

(By Siert Frederick Riepma, Ph. D.)

Young Hungary. And Young America. How natural that, in our time, these names should call up image of "new generationism" and youthful rebellion! And indeed both Young Hungary and Young America were, in a real sense, movements of revolt. The times, the places, the conditions, however, were all quite different. For Young Hungary and Young America took place more than a century ago, during the long period of half-repressed struggle which followed the French Revolution. In fact it is correct to think of them as rather unique events that, like sparks from a bursting skyrocket, spun out brilliantly from the French Revolution and over the generation that followed.

History loves comparisons, but also mocks comparisons. These two episodes from nineteenth century history may remind us of modern and other youth movements in mankind's past. But in fundamental ways they were very different. Some definition is needed to put them in their proper time and place.

Young Hungary is a name, a label, applied to the loose, almost formless group of mostly younger men who after 1830 desired and spoke for basic reforms in Hungary. These reforms were several—a national language, a national literature, much greater self-rule within the Hapsburg Empire and, eventually, independence from the empire. In other words, a typical liberal protest movement of the time, in which writers penned books and pamphlets, zealots argued, poets sang, and leaders orated for more freedom and for country.

Young America also is chiefly a name, a label, applied to a literary movement in the United States at about the same time, and which desired American writers to compose with native themes—the American history, character, society, scenery. Young America as a popular expression also came to signify

the new generation in the sense of brash, restless youth, a younger generation which seemed to reject many of the ways of its fathers and demanded less restraint, more luxury in living style, long hair and whiskers, and generally a more extravagant attitude toward life and manners.

But most important, Young America became dramatized as a small but influential political project in the early 1850s, aimed to win for Stephen A. Douglas—the "Young Giant of the West"—the presidential nomination by the Democratic party in 1852. The program, if so it may be called, of this interesting event in the history of the times, combined various things and probably meant different things to different people—getting government aid for steamships and railroads, expanding the nation's territory at the expense of other countries, putting younger claimants into political offices; and—above all—asserting the United States in foreign relations as a new, fighting power among the nations of the world.

How different these two events were! On the one hand, those who used or took the name, however temporarily, of Young Hungary had to make as their targets the most basic objectives—legalization of the Magyar language, fostering a sense of national identity and pride, winning even the rudiments of real political independence. Young America commenced with all these achievements well in hand.

Were there connections between the two? Young Hungary as such appears to have been almost unknown in the United States. And Young America existed mainly as a slogan for various things—a slogan few Hungarians ever heard expressed. Nevertheless there was a connection of sorts; or, rather two of them. And in these links lies much of the interest of these two happenings.

For one thing, both Young Hungary and Young America were part of the great movement of western European liberalism and nationalism of that era; for precision, from about 1835 to about 1855. In their individual ways, each reflected a hope, a zeal, a raising of the battle flag, a statement of national identity, a search for freedom. Each was in fact one of the many endeavors to gain more liberty that comprises one of the striking characteristics of European development from the storming of the Bastille to the Crimean War. It was indeed one of the remarkable, stirring epochs of history—so like our own and so unlike.

## FREEDOM AND VETERANS

## HON. FRANK E. DENHOLM

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States know freedom because they have never forsaken the cause of liberty.

Liberty includes the freedom of the people to govern at all times with vigilance. I commend the veterans for participation therein. I commend them for vigilance in the public interest. Many have governed—all of them have stood for God and country—others have died for freedom. They gave much for liberty and they understand the cost of victory.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars have gone to foreign lands to defend our homeland. They meet today in the Nation's Capital to honor youth in the contest of "Voice of Democracy."

I am proud to submit the full text of the oration of Miss Ann M. Goltz, the

March 7, 1973

representative and winner of South Dakota. Miss Goltz is an example of the high ideals of the Veterans and her words of expression emphasize the objectives of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

#### MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

(By Ann M. Goltz)

"The world has never had a good definition of the word freedom, and the American people, just now, are much in want of one."

I too, believe in these words spoken by former President Abraham Lincoln, and I today, as he did then, have a deep concern for America. It seems logical, that before I talk about freedom and my responsibility toward it, I should first, in the words of Mr. Lincoln, have a good definition of what freedom really is.

Mr. Webster tells us that it is the absence of necessity, coercion, or constraint in choice of action. I disagree. Under a free society there is still room for necessity, coercion, and constraint, there is just no room for them to dominate.

I could redefine freedom as self-expression, liberty, non-discrimination, or unrestraint, but these are all just words, and words are what I am trying to avoid, for words are nice in theory, or in bread and butter politician's speeches, or in Mr. Webster's book, but they don't do much for us in reality. I believe there must be more.

What is a word without concrete and pertinent meaning? Let me dare to lend a hand to Mr. Webster. Freedom is sitting in the front seat of any bus, anywhere, anytime, no matter what color my skin happens to be. It is worshipping God in anyway I want, or not worshipping Him at all if that is my choice. It is voting for whoever I wish, and saying what is on my mind. Freedom is where the people take care of the government. It does not mean that we have no rules to follow, but it does mean that we have a voice in what these rules will be.

Now that the word is defined, how do I fit into it? What can we do to build this freedom? How do we turn an abstract word into a concrete thing? One that we can touch, and label, and look at, saying, "See, over there. See that? That is freedom!" Do we employ an architect, carpenter, mason, and instruct them to build a solid, magnificent, indestructible dome that seemingly no mortal could destroy? Should we call this freedom?

This is not a fairy tale, or some fantasy of my imagination. The great structure freedom really does exist. Not on solid land, but in each of our hearts, where it stands just as firm and sure as if it were built on a rock. This is where it must stand. Here we are free until we ourselves let the great dome crumble. We each have to fight individually to hold freedom secure; and when man fights for something as precious as this, he must be victorious.

My responsibility to freedom is to support what the framers of the Constitution fought to give us. Freedom of speech and expression; of every person to worship God in his own way; freedom from want and freedom from fear. It is up to me, when needed, to advocate dissent and revolution, but only when they are without destruction or riot and ruin. I must question, but then pause long enough to listen to the answers. It is my responsibility to be heard where my voice counts, and to vote where my vote counts. These are the best safeguards of our freedom. The real freeman became that way by making the truth free. I must give freedom to others at every opportunity by dissolving all prejudice and discrimination in my own heart first. These are responsibilities which I cannot shirk in hopes that 'someone else' will take care of them. It's up to me.

No orator has ever made or kept a nation free, and I am far from the greatest of those who have tried to do so. It is not my purpose

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

to have everyone who hears me start waving the flag or memorize the Bill of Rights, for if that were my purpose, I would have failed before I began. My intention is rather to have you know and appreciate freedom as it affects you, and to have you know that you too must take an active part to help retain it.

If everyone would try, not superficially, but genuinely, we could make freedom more than just a word, or an idea, or something that sounds nice in politician's speeches; we could make it a reality.

### CHOICES FOR 1976: PLANNING OUR OWN FUTURE

#### HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a number of Members of Congress from the Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey metropolitan area would like to call to the attention of our colleagues an unusually important project, Choices for '76, which is aimed at giving citizens a more direct voice in confronting the urban problems facing our region. Congressman WILLIAM B. WIDNALL of New Jersey and I are honored to be joined in this bipartisan undertaking by our colleagues Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. FISH, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KOCH, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REID, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, and Mr. WOLFF.

Designed to help determine the direction in which the region should move as our Republic enters its third century, the project is a series of 20th century town meetings connecting people through our 20th century mass media—television, the press, radio, magazines.

The region stretches from Trenton to New Haven, from Poughkeepsie to the end of Long Island. It has a population of 20 million people, one-tenth of the Nation. As the oldest urbanized section of the United States, its problems are serious: A severe housing shortage, racial tensions, air and water pollution, financially starved public transportation, high unemployment among minority citizens, valuable open space urbanized and little saved for future generations.

Too often our constituents feel overwhelmed by such problems. Solutions are lost in a torrent of words and pictures which emphasize the difficulties. Plans for solving these problems frequently conflict, and the citizen is confused. The search for improvement is limited because citizens sometimes see only the viewpoint of their local community.

Now, the Regional Plan Association, the oldest and one of the most respected metropolitan planning organizations in the world, has devised a means of allowing our constituents to reason together by using the collective mass media of our region.

Beginning on March 17, the 18 television stations of the metropolitan area will broadcast a series of five 1-hour programs—on housing, transportation, environment, poverty, and cities and sub-

urbs. A sixth on Government will be shown in the fall. These programs, appearing every 2 weeks at various times on Saturday, Sunday, and Monday, will focus on the solutions to our urban ills. In presenting possible solutions, they will use the extensive research of the association, much of which has been funded by Congress. To assist the Regional Plan Association in selecting the issues, in posing the range of solutions, and in formulating the questions, a citizen advisory committee was organized. Headed by Francis Keppel, the former U.S. Commissioner of Education, its diverse membership represents the many political views and ethnic groups of the region. The committee members are local civic leaders, well known in their communities.

An essential aspect of the project is that everyone can respond by filling out ballots that will be run in many newspapers and distributed by the Association.

On the TV programs, alternative policies will be proposed, illustrated, and argued. Newspapers throughout the region will print background articles in advance of the television presentation, and radio stations will offer discussion programs focused on the Choices that will be asked. A paperback book, further explaining the issues and possible solutions, is being published under the title "How to Save Urban America."

Finally, hundreds of thousands of persons are being urged to come together in small groups—in homes, classrooms, meeting halls—to view the programs and then to discuss the issues before filling out their ballots. Churches, civic groups, labor unions, schools, and minority organizations throughout the region are assembling these discussion-viewing groups.

The completed ballots will be returned to the Gallup organization for tabulation and the results will be widely publicized. It is fair to say that we will be watching for the results with great interest.

Never before has the mass media ever participated so massively in a public service project. This is the first time that so many television stations in an area have agreed to cooperate in showing the same program, and it is the first time that newspapers and radio have joined television in the same large-scale enterprise.

The six Senators from our three States, in successfully urging the Department of Housing and Urban Development to provide an initial grant to the program, stated:

In recent years, the Federal government has been urging greater citizen participation in planning for the expenditure of Federal dollars. The focus has largely been on efforts to involve the poor; but we believe the time has come to find a way to get a cross-section of citizens from all walks of life to talk to each other about common destiny.

One thing is certain. If it can be done in the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut urban region, it can be done anywhere in the country. This project could thus be a major advance for all of urban America.

Additional funding for the project has come from foundations and corporations. Editorials from three of our re-

spected newspapers endorsing Choices for '76 indicate the acclaim this project is receiving.

The New York Times, in its editorial on Choices, stated:

The Regional Plan Association, an organization of long established usefulness in the metropolitan area, has launched a campaign to involve citizens, to a greater degree than is common, in decisions affecting their future.

The ferment that it should stir up, the focusing of public interest, the informed discussion of pressing problems—these are hopeful products to be expected from what promises to be a constructive and creditable project.

The Westchester-Rockland newspapers of suburban New York State commented:

Another attempt to bring to the people the urgent message of the need for planning will be undertaken by Regional Plan Association. Through an elaborate and ambitious project called "Choices for '76," RPA will use the mass media and thousands of local "town meetings" to try to break the related logjams of apathy, fear, and status-quo worship that are holding up attempts to solve regional problems.

The Hackensack newspaper, the Record, endorsed Choices for '76, and said:

The Regional Plan Association may have come up with one of the epoch's more brilliant ideas. Everyone knows the New York urban region is going to change. The trick is to get people who are not associated with government or planning or academia interested enough in what's ahead to inform themselves about the options and come to some conclusions that are sustained by more than prejudice and obstinacy. . . .

The point is not that here we will have a referendum on change and development; the point is rather that if a widely representative part of the public will become informed on what the broad issues are the whole area will be in a better position to proceed, using brains instead of narrow self-interest. It's a bold effort RPA is making. It deserves to succeed.

The Members of Congress from the tri-State region wish Choices for '76 success. Our citizens who participate in it certainly will be well briefed on the possible solutions to urban problems. With well-informed citizens, it is our belief that we can move on a course of our Choice to give our country real reason for celebrating the occasion of our 200th birthday.

#### NARCOTICS ADDICTION TREATMENT BREAKTHROUGH—AREA OF BRAIN AFFECTED BY HEROIN IS LOCATED

#### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, on occasion there is positive news concerning the fight to end drug abuse and drug addiction in America. Two Johns Hopkins scientists have brought us just such news.

During a time when the number of deaths from methadone overdoses is rapidly challenging deaths due to heroin, it is my hope and prayer that this breakthrough will enable us to find a safe

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

antidote to heroin that will allow this Government to stop all aid to the increasingly dangerous practice of methadone maintenance.

The New York Times of Tuesday, March 6, carried the report of this discovery:

##### BRAIN TISSUE SITES FOUND TO BE NARCOTIC RECEPTORS

(By Harold M. Schmeck, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 5.—A research accomplishment, described by a government agency as a major advance toward understanding and treating narcotics addiction, was announced at the Johns Hopkins University today.

The accomplishment, by Johns Hopkins scientists, was the direct demonstration that narcotic drugs attach to specific sites in brain tissues to produce their effects on the mind. The scientists also showed that narcotics compete with narcotic antagonists for the sites.

A statement by the National Institute of Mental Health called the research findings "a major advance toward understanding and treating narcotic addiction."

An obvious practical application would be to use the techniques of the research to screen drugs rapidly for use as narcotic antagonists—drugs that would tend to block the narcotic "high" sought by the drug abuser.

There are problems associated with currently available antagonists, among them is the basic fact that some addicts do not like the drugs' effects in blocking the "high." The hope of finding better antagonists, however, is only a part of the reason for interest in the new research findings. More important, presumably, is the hope of learning more about the process of addiction itself.

Discovery of the specific sites to which the narcotic drugs attach in the brain might well lead to a better understanding of the chemistry of addiction and hence, better ways of combating it.

The experiments at Johns Hopkins showed that narcotics such as morphine and methadone, and antagonists such as naloxone, bind two specific sites in brain tissue.

Existence of these sites, called opiate receptors, has been suspected but never demonstrated directly, according to the scientists' report, which is published in the forthcoming March 9 issue of *Science*. The authors are Dr. Solomon H. Snyder, professor of pharmacology and psychiatry, and Mrs. Candace Port, a graduate student of pharmacology.

"Demonstration by Dr. Snyder and Ms. Port of the specific opiate receptors in the animal brain represents a significant step toward understanding how opiates may work in man," Dr. William E. Bunney, Jr., director of the Division of Narcotic Addiction and Drug Abuse of the N.I.M.H., said in the institute's formal statement.

"These findings in laboratory work will help speed progress on many fronts toward better understanding and clinical treatment of addiction," he added.

In their experiments the scientists tagged samples of the narcotic antagonist naloxone with radioactive material so that they could trace it and then pour it over samples of homogenized brain tissue from such animals as rats, mice and guinea pigs.

They could tell the amount of binding by the uptake of radioactivity by the brain tissue. Dr. Snyder said the experiments made it possible virtually to count the receptor sites.

By adding samples of narcotic and noting the decrease in binding of the narcotic antagonist, they demonstrated competition for the sites between the drug and the antagonist.

The scientists found that the known potency of a narcotic paralleled its tendency to

bind to the receptor sites in brain tissues. The most potent narcotics seemed most avid in binding to the receptor sites.

##### CONFINED TO NERVE TISSUE

There was no binding to non-nerve tissue from other organs of the animal's bodies. In short, the opiate receptors appeared to be confined to nerve tissue. Dr. Snyder said the receptors were particularly associated with nerve cells in which the chemical called acetylcholine is the nerve impulse transmitter.

The receptors seemed to be most numerous in a structure in the forward part of the brain called the corpus stratum, but this does not necessarily mean that this part of the brain is important in addiction.

Dr. Snyder said one obvious line of further research would be to see whether animals that are addicted to narcotic drugs have more opiate receptors in their brain tissues than nonaddicted animals.

The answer to this is unknown, but the scientists said the appropriate experiments were in process. If an addicted animal has more of the receptors, this would go far toward explaining the nature of addiction itself.

The research has already shed some interesting light on the activity of various drugs in the body. For example, the pain killer codeine proved to have far less affinity for the receptor sites than might be expected, considering that it is a close chemical relative of morphine.

#### A SALUTE TO MR. WALTER S. DILLON, RETIRING EDITOR, READING EAGLE

#### HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, another of my hometown's fine journalists and respected citizens, Mr. Walter S. Dillon, is retiring after 56 years of continuous service with the *Reading Eagle* as editor.

Mr. Dillon was hired in 1911 as a cub reporter on the old *Reading Times* newspaper. He became assistant city editor in 1928 and 4 years later was named city editor. Mr. Dillon became managing editor in 1934 and succeeded to the top position, editor, in 1967. Therefore, his career spanned an historic period during which the United States became engaged in two World Wars and emerged as a major world leader; the rise of the Soviet Union; prohibition repeal and the depression; the growth and maturity of air transportation; and the entry into the space age.

During his years as managing editor, Mr. Dillon was responsible for a number of changes in the practices and format of the *Reading Eagle*. He increased the staff in order to provide greater and more effective coverage in the Sunday edition, sports and social departments. He also hired personnel for specialized coverage of urban affairs, politics, business, and labor while adding new, informative, and entertaining features which have put the Sunday *Eagle* on an even par with other major metropolitan newspapers.

I would like to congratulate Mr. Dillon on his many years of excellent service to the community and to express my

sincere best wishes for his continued success in retirement. Walter S. Dillon will certainly be remembered in the fine journalistic tradition of excellence which has personified the 105-year history of the Reading Eagle.

#### NO AMNESTY, CONDITIONAL AMNESTY, OR GENERAL AMNESTY?

#### HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, now that the Vietnam War has finally ended, our Nation is faced with the grave problem of amnesty. Just as the war wrought huge divisions among the American people, the issue of amnesty threatens to do the same. Amnesty is indeed a sensitive subject, but I feel that it is an issue that, handled with care and foresight, can be solved without causing irreconcilable divisions to tear at our country's citizenry once again.

If we logically and intelligently analyze the various options involved in this subject, I am sure that we can reach an equitable solution eventually. A panel discussion on this very subject was held in Berkeley at the St. Mary Magdalen Parish, where three different views of amnesty were expressed. The Catholic Voice, December 14, 1972, has published excerpts from this discussion, which I wish to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today. Mr. Holt Ruffin of the World Without War Council describes the reasoning for issuing conditional amnesty. Mr. Quentin Rosenberg, vice chairman of the national security council of the American Legion then states why he feels no amnesty should be issued at all. And finally, Mr. Joseph Skillin, rector of St. Francis de Sales Cathedral and chairman of the social justice commission of the Diocese of Oakland writes in full support of complete and general amnesty. All three of these views are well articulated, and thoughtfully expressed.

In the final analysis, it will be up to our Federal Government to make the final decision in regards to amnesty. Before we make that decision, I feel it is necessary that we have a deep understanding of the various options available. It is for that reason that I insert this article into the RECORD today, so that my colleagues will have the opportunity to share the thoughts of these men; so that we can reach an equitable solution based on a thorough awareness of the various alternatives involved.

The article follows:

#### AMNESTY?

(By Holt Ruffin)

What is the policy I propose?

Amnesty means, "A general determination that whole classes of offenses and offenders will not be prosecuted."

I favor general amnesty. But I propose that granting amnesty be conditional upon fulfillment of some generously defined and appropriately limited alternative service.

This allows men now outside the law because of presumed moral objections to military service to reenter our political commun-

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

nity and find ways of serving it which do not violate their integrity.

Conditional amnesty insists on these men being held accountable to and fulfilling a concept of obligation which others—by going to Vietnam, or to jail, or by doing alternative services as c.o.'s—accepted and without which our nation would not be a nation, of any kind.

What we can do together tonight.

Amnesty is such a large and complicated issue that we can't possibly deal with all its aspects in the two hours we have together tonight. In order to be clear about what we can do, I'd like first to suggest what we cannot.

We can't list all the offenses under the Selective Service Act of 1967 or the Uniform Code of Military Justice for which this amnesty proposal is designed. There are many offenses. Some individuals in exile or underground committed more than one offense.

I also think that we can't decide why these men did what they did.

There are almost as many reasons involved in their rejection of responsibility to the law as there are reasons for wanting to return to our community in a legal way. Some acted out of conscientious opposition to all killing. Some supported Hanoi's reasons for killing and only opposed America's. Some thought carefully of their social and political obligations. Others acted out of narrow personal concerns.

I'm not saying we should disregard their motivations, but for tonight, we should simply recognize that these men acted within a wide range of motivation and that neither the "hero" nor "traitor" terms described them accurately.

How to do it.

If we are going to try to decide what this country should do, we should determine the basis of our values. The religious institution plays an important role at this point. Most of us turn to basic values of our religious heritage. And out of this heritage I see values coming which bear on the amnesty proposal I make.

I see four major values involved: political obligation and responsibility, respect for conscience, equity, and reconciliation.

1. Political obligation. The fact is the United States of America is a political community I want to sustain. It can't be sustained if its members cease to feel obligation toward it and its laws. Acts of conscientious disobedience can be a tremendous spur to good change, but only if they demonstrate a respect for law and legitimate authority.

That's what ending war is about: developing and strengthening the authority of transnational political and legal institutions capable of handling conflicts that would otherwise be violent.

This means affirming not sneering at or rejecting, concepts of law, obligation, and political responsibility.

2. Respect for conscience. On the other hand, I want to strengthen the idea that we have responsibilities to not only the nation, but to all men and to our consciences.

When a nation orders a man to kill, I think he ought to refuse if he sincerely believes that all killing is wrong. And I think this principle should be respected by the community.

Acts of open, nonviolent, civil disobedience based on this principle and which recognize the authority of law by accepting its penalty, can help tremendously to move our society toward desperately needed change in its attitudes toward war.

I recognize that this does not describe the manner by which all men broke the law and refused to participate in the military during the Vietnam War.

Still, I think these men—mixed as their motives and their forms of refusal were—deserve special consideration by our govern-

ment, deserve a general amnesty policy which allows them to return subject to fulfillment of some appropriate form of alternative service.

My reasons are that the Vietnam War forced these men to make terribly difficult ethical choices. Moreover, the moral and political climate was confusing; the Selective Service law itself was changing rapidly.

3. Equity. The idea that men ought to receive equal treatment before the law is fundamental to the concept of justice. In the present case, it is impossible to treat everyone who faced the agonizing moral choice of military service or refusal during this war equitably.

We would not wish to impose—even if we could find it—an equivalent for loss of life, or for time spent in a POW camp, or for the trauma and stigma of a conscientious objector's jail sentence.

Time magazine recently stated in an essay on amnesty: "Uneven justice is no justice." James Finn, in an article on the same question in Commonweal, very aptly replied: "Uneven justices would be contemptible as an ideal but it is not as an attainment; it is all that men have ever attained."

Clearly, to allow those who denied their responsibilities to return with no conditions would be grossly unfair to those who accepted military service or jail out of a sense of political obligation.

We can, and should try to, achieve a measure of equity by requiring those who evaded or refused their responsibilities to accept an alternative service assignment consistent with a principled opposition to war.

4. Reconciliation. Finally, I think we have to consider the value of reconciliation. All of us are disturbed by the deep divisions and the breakdown of civility our nation has suffered as a result of the Vietnam War.

An amnesty policy which reconciles major differences in point of view spawned by the war could be an essential element in healing a divided country and developing a new sense of community in America.

Unfortunately, arguments for and against amnesty often seem aimed at driving home a particular view of society and Vietnam policy than at finding policy which speaks to the conflicting values at stake and tries to reach agreement.

Moreover, little thought has demonstrated appreciation for the different requirements of a private and a public judgment.

My estimate of the moral and political virtue of men now in exile or underground clearly influences my thinking about amnesty. But we should all recognize that this personal judgment is just that and no more. It cannot serve adequately as a public policy because it does not deal with the values which we, as a nation, wish to sustain, nor does it offer a means of reconciling a divided community.

#### AMNESTY: CONDITIONED, GENERAL, OR NONE?

(By Quentin Rosenberg)

#### NO AMNESTY

The suggestion that amnesty be granted astounds anyone devoted to effective government.

Anarchists, those who feel that no government should have the right to exercise any control over the populace, delight in seeing the same government that levied the obligation of military service being called on to grant "oblivion or a general pardon" to those who violated the obligation levied.

Governments that enact legislation carelessly, that repeal the carelessness whimsically; then by way of apology for the carelessness, offer amnesty, those governments are ineffective and short-lived.

Hopefully, no one here is interested in seeing the United States Government rendered unworkable. Unworkable governments are

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

nongovernments, and create a power vacuum.

Let us for a moment approach the situation negatively. Let us declare that the greatest freedom for man is when he bears no restraints of government whatsoever. Therefore man's perfect state is anarchy.

The nature of humankind is such, however, that containment of another's freedom is a real challenge. Show a young lady a freewheeling bachelor and the challenge is often irresistible.

Show a sovereign a productive community and the challenge to convert its productivity to his own use is contained only by the community's ability to resist such conversion.

The world's most magnificently productive society became that way because it originated with the concept that government should be subservient to the society—not the society subordinate to the government.

Lincoln said, "Good government is little government." And in our society where the government is subservient to the people, any determination of the people becomes a mandate on the government.

There are those who, because of religious conviction, ask to be excused from participation in armed conflict. Legislation permits such excuses to be accepted if it can be established that such conviction is sincerely held.

Further, our courts have been increasingly criticized for excessive leniency. And these same courts will hear evidence to mitigate a defendant's defiance of the selective service regulations.

In the past, upon conviction, the levy of atonement for the defiance is minimal compared to the sacrifice made by those men who interposed their bodies between our free society and the threats against it.

It is quite competent to let our courts hear the evidence in each case and give whatever sentence the facts will merit.

It is abominably irresponsible to suggest that the government grant "oblivion or a general pardon" to a citizen who refused to protect the constitutional government when that government asked him to respond to the most basic debt of any free man.

Selective service legislation is essential to national survival. It was not carelessly drafted nor whimsically considered. It was created by solemn and deliberate legislators, fully aware of the constraints imposed on those men it affected, fully aware that their vote on this issue would be noted most carefully by those who elected them, and remembered at election time. And it is the law of the land.

Therefore, to those men who defy the law of our land, may it be proclaimed, "These are our laws. Obey them or leave the land. Or if you defy them and would still dwell in our land, be prepared to pay the penalty."

Amnesty for open and overt defiance of laws preserving our security is, in the minds of patriots, pure heresy.

If we accept the idea that the protection of our free society is superior in importance to the convenience of any individual within it, we cannot condone amnesty. If we believe that our form of government deserves protection from assault by all citizens, most particularly those citizens whose youth and energy is particularly suited to providing such protection, then we cannot condone amnesty.

If you as American citizens recognize the obligation to protect our country from assault, you cannot support propositions that dilute its security.

If you as American citizen would remain free, under a government of our own choosing, you would not support the whimpers of those who defied that government and plead for amnesty for their defiance.

That is why our government is the oldest on earth. It has survived longer than any

other. Because it is by design and dedication responsive to the mandates of those governed. It enjoys a continuum because any time a majority of the citizens wants it changed, it gets changed. It survives because its citizens are confident that it is responsive to their needs. That is to say, it survives within its borders because it is responsive.

It survives on earth because it has always been able to resist assaults by force of arms decisively.

Should we ever get so confused in our thinking that we abandon our defenses to the point where resistance to assault becomes ineffective, forget the bounties of freedom. History books are substantially chronicles of those governments who were unable to resist assault effectively.

Simply, if we permit a vacuum in our capacity to resist, there is no more United States of America.

A substantial portion of our ability to resist is trained manpower. All the military hardware on earth without the skilled manpower to direct it is just so much junk.

Therefore, if we would remain a free society, there must be incorporated within our social framework a contribution of time by each member of our society learning the mechanics of operating the military hardware. There must be universal military training.

And, should our elected representatives determine that it is essential to our common welfare that the operation of the military hardware be practiced in earnest on a battlefield, then it is our obligation as free men to respond to the urgency as seen by those we elected to represent us.

This, then, should resolve the issue before us. Our government has survived within its borders because it is responsive to the sentiment of its citizens. Our government has survived between nations because it can resist assaults successfully. So the question is:

If legislation enacted to preserve our security by impressment of selected citizens into military service is distasteful to the citizens selected, and the ones selected defy the legislation, should the government grant "oblivion or general pardon" to those in defiance?

In this instance, as in all preceding instances, the people of our society say "No."

It is one of the paradoxes of freedom. If we would be free, we must on occasion forfeit the freedom we cherish by subjecting ourselves to military service. Such subjection could quite foreseeably require the ultimate forfeiture, *id est*, our lives. This has been the result in an appalling number of instances. In our history, countless men have given their lives that their posterity may live as free men.

## GENERAL

(By Joseph Skillin)

We deal with the issue of amnesty in terms of resisters to the Viet Nam War. We are talking about amnesty for the estimated three thousand to three hundred thousand young men who refused military service, and, therefore, went to jail, went underground, or went to Canada. Another group that could be granted amnesty are those who deserted the military when they came to realize that their participation was immoral. They all broke a civil or military law.

I suggest—and I believe—that all these should be granted complete and unconditional amnesty. I believe this position is urged (if not demanded) by the Gospel of Jesus Christ; and I believe that this position is consistent with the Constitution of the United States and the American Tradition.

Amnesty has been granted many times in United States history, usually by the President, who is given the power by the Constitution to do so.

In doing some research for Senator Robert

March 7, 1973

Taft of Ohio, McJob Etridge from the Library of Congress counted 37 instances of amnesty.

True, none of these instances completely parallels our situation today; but each case is a general pardoning of a class of people who committed a crime.

We must talk about the word "crime". There is no question that evaders, resisters, and deserters committed an illegal act and a crime. But, we cannot, therefore, call them immoral. Illegal, yes; but immoral—not necessarily.

The question of conscience comes in, and that's where mortality is in fact decided. I know deserters and resisters personally who acted in good conscience. And I believe that they acted morally, although illegally.

I think that most people who are generous would agree to some form of amnesty. But most want to make it conditional. It seems to me that those who call for conditional amnesty are asking that some price be paid for violating the law. But, as one author says, "Paying the price for violating the Law" would serve as a pretty good antonym for amnesty."

Proponents of conditional amnesty or no amnesty feel that evaders and resisters have failed in their duty to their country. They speak of everyone's obligation to society, and feel that these men cannot be forgiven until they "put in" two years or more of service to their country.

Senator Taft, for example, was asked to draft a bill granting amnesty to draft resisters and deserters if they agreed to work for four years at subsistence pay in hospitals, the Peace Corps, the Vista program, or if they were willing to sign up for a four-year hitch in the peace-time armed services.

The fault with such thinking—conditions for amnesty—is a failure to see that prophecy can be as real a service to our nation as can military service or humanitarian endeavors.

I believe that resisters, evaders, and deserters already served this country as prophets.

They have made us examine our national conscience about war—and the Viet Nam War in particular.

I'm not saying they are the heroes of our nation. All I am saying is that they, along with the October and November moratoriums of the last few years, along with people like the Berrigans, Joan Baez and Pope Paul, along with groups like Another Mother for Peace through their varied actions and witness have moved us to think about the horrors of war.

A prophet pricks consciences. I believe that most of these men are part of the corporate prophet that moved this country to change its attitude about war.

Read the polls: more people are against our involvement in Viet Nam now; more want a pull-out. Even the Nixon administration said (after the election) that we should stop trying to be world policeman. That's change; we have changed. As a nation, we have become more conscious of the destructiveness and immorality of war. And I believed that the evaders and resisters are part of the force that changed us.

For that change and for that growth, I say thank you to them.

Presently, we hope the war will end. As a nation we have to decide how we will treat those people who refused to serve in that war and who refused to have anything to do with a system that presumes every young man should go to war unless he can prove that he is a complete and long-standing pacifist.

Legally, we can punish these people, because they broke a law, or we can demand that the president grant amnesty. Values, not law, will be the basis of our decision.

What is our value? Eye-for-eye? (They broke the law so they have to pay!). Vengeance? (Look, my kid went over there and

risked his life, and I'm not going to let those chicken draft evaders get off free!). Nationalism? (You can't let everyone in the country follow their conscience! What kind of a country would we have then?) Americanism? (I'll do whatever the American government tells me to do; and America is first and honorable and right!).

Or we value life, and the equality of all people, and the brotherhood of man rather than the supremacy of one nation? Do we value forgiveness and reconciliation rather than vengeance? (I emphasize that amnesty does not condemn or in any way judge those who actually served in Viet Nam. I presume their good conscience as much as I presume the good conscience of those who would not serve.)

I can not make any one decision for them. But we can reflect and begin to realize that we can't think about amnesty unless we already made some decisions about the morality of war, about the possibility of alternatives to war as a means of resolving conflict and about the freedom of conscience.

In a democracy, we make the decisions. What will be the nation's decision about amnesty?

Will we make it, or will we pass the buck to the President and his advisors.

#### FARMERS DO ENCOURAGE WILDLIFE

#### HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I was dismayed when the rural environmental assistance program was terminated, because coming from the countryside, I was well aware of its many beneficial aspects.

Even though the House has now re-passed a REAP measure, it is facing a veto by the President.

I am preparing legislation on this matter, eliminating the controversial sections. I believe these changes will make this program more acceptable.

Along this line, I recently read an article in the Canby News in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District, detailing some of the benefits that accrue from the REAP program.

For my colleagues who do not live in the countryside, this article can be of considerable benefit in pointing out to them some of the contributions made to the general welfare by American farmers through the REAP program.

Mr. Speaker, I insert this enlightening article in the RECORD:

#### FARMERS DO ENCOURAGE WILDLIFE

America's farmers feed not only cattle, hogs, and poultry, but everything that flies, swims, runs, or crawls on farm and ranchlands—an estimated 80 percent of the nation's wildlife.

And, says Mel Niehaus of the Soil Conservation Service, end-of-the-year figures show that farmer encouragement of wildlife is on the increase.

In fiscal year 1972, according to Niehaus, SCS assisted farmers, ranchers and other landowners in the U.S.A. in improving more than 7½ million acres of land and water areas for the benefit of wildlife—a 28 percent increase over last year.

Further, SCS reports, more than half a million acres of other rural land converted

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

from crop or rangeland into wildlife and recreation areas during 1972.

SCS helps landowners improve food, water, and cover for wildlife. Improved habitat, says Mel Niehaus, increases wildlife populations even faster than stocking.

He points out that the 7½ million acres of habitat improvement is only a small part of the American farmer's aid to wildlife.

"Such widespread farm and ranch conservation practices as stripcropping (alternating banks of crops and grass), building ponds, protecting woodland areas, planting wildbreaks and improving rangeland also attract many wild creatures," he said.

Lincoln County farmers in 1972 improved 217 acres of wetland for wildlife and 233 acres of upland for wildlife purposes. Twenty-two ponds were dug in the county for live-stock and wildlife purposes.

"These and many other conservation practices indicate that American farmers and ranchers continue to be the 'host with the most' for wildlife," said John Bedish, SCS biologist.

#### RESOLUTION BY THE RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

#### HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1973

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the National Council of the Reserve Officers Association adopted a resolution on February 16 concerning the right of Congressmen to hold Reserve commissions. This activity on the part of the Reserve Officers Association is in support of an appeal to the Supreme Court following a ruling by a lower court judge who stated that Congressmen may not hold Reserve commissions. Many Members of Congress are interested in continuing their work in the Organized Reserve, and I submit this resolution for reprinting in the RECORD:

#### PETITION TO SUPREME COURT TO PERMIT ROA TO FILE BRIEF IN CASE TO DETERMINE RIGHT OF CONGRESSMEN TO HOLD RESERVE COMMISSIONS

Whereas, the decision of the United States District Court of the District of Columbia in the case of Reservists Committee to Stop the War v. Laird, 323 F. Supp. 833, held that the Constitution bars members of Congress from holding commissions in the Armed Forces Reserves, and

Whereas, such decision was further affirmed by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, and

Whereas, the Reserve Officers Association of the United States by resolution at its 1971 Convention urged appeal of these decisions, and

Whereas, this vital issue has now been appealed to the United States Supreme Court, and

Whereas, the Reserve Officers Association is committed to the concept of the citizen-soldier and believes that members of Congress who voluntarily continue their activity as military Reservists should be honored for this "twice the citizen" patriotic commitment, and

Whereas, the participation of Congressmen in military reserve activities helps insure the Constitutional mandate of civilian control over the Armed Forces,

Now therefore be it resolved that the Reserve Officers Association of the United States

petition the Supreme Court of the United States for permission to file an *amicus curiae* (friend of the court) brief in the case of Reservists Committee to Stop the War v. Laird in support of the right of members of Congress to hold active commissions in the Armed Forces Reserves.

#### BACKGROUND OF NATIONAL CIVIL PREPAREDNESS

#### HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, Col. John Bex, a prominent constituent of mine, is currently serving as the Director for the Region Two Defense Civil Preparedness Agency located at Olney, Md.

In this day and age of high tax rates, the American taxpayer frequently is left to wonder what he is getting for his tax dollar. I am happy to inform him that in Colonel Bex, he has a talented, energetic, and industrious civil servant that is truly giving him his tax money's worth.

Toward the end of setting the stage for proving this point, I would like to set forth some background information on the Defense Civil Preparedness Agency in general and the Defense Civil Preparedness Agency at Olney, Md., in particular. In sequence, I will outline the superlative part that Colonel Bex has played in catalyzing and implementing the dynamics of this service which has a very vital application to America and to all Americans.

Because these observations shed light on one of those civil servants who provides assurance for and deserves recognition of the American taxpayer, I insert these remarks into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

Defense Civil Preparedness Agency, formerly the Office of Civil Defense in the Department of the Army, entered the 70's, with its national programs to provide protection from radioactive fallout becoming less credible.

The 60's had launched and perpetuated a massive effort to survey facilities for shelter, and to stock these shelters with emergency supplies.

The planning for the use of these shelters by the public in time of emergency was undertaken as were programs to develop and deploy radiation measuring instruments.

Doctrine for the conduct of emergency operations by governments was developed and training programs were launched.

Training consisted largely of preparing personnel to operate in a sheltered environment including the management of shelter facilities and the reading of instruments.

In the 60's, the rioting in the cities, the devastation from many severe storms, hurricanes and tornadoes sorely tasked local governments, and even State governments, to maintain order, save lives and restore property losses. The Federal civil defense establishment, i.e., OCD, was only minimally engaged in day-to-day emergencies.

Congressional appropriations that reached a high of \$207.6 million in 1962 had receded to \$61 million for the 1969 fiscal year.

With the change of administration in 1968, a new national leadership was established by John E. Davis, former Governor of North Da-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

kota. Seeking revitalization for the 70's, he advocated the emergence of two philosophies: One was that governments could only be prepared to protect their people in a nuclear emergency if they were prepared to meet day-to-day emergencies. The second was that the era of the 60's had produced too much sophistication in programs and program development, and that their relevance to State level organization and activities was at best doubtful. To support these philosophies, a policy of redirection for the national civil preparedness effort was established.

## BACKGROUND OF ONE REGIONAL AGENCY

The Defense Civil Preparedness Agency, located in Olney, Maryland, was assigned an area of responsibility of delivering the civil defense of the 60's to the District of Columbia and the seven States of Delaware, Maryland, Kentucky, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia. As a field agency and operating agency, its record of performance was commendable in the terms of the 60's.

These terms were defined as cost effectiveness and quantitative measurement:

41,033 facilities produced Fallout Shelter Spaces for 39,632,000 people.

24,764,000 spaces licensed for public use.

9,304,000 spaces stocked for emergency occupancy.

100% of the political subdivisions of the States had completed community shelter plans for the use of facilities.

Information for 99% of the regional population had been prepared for emergency dissemination. These locally oriented readiness materials tell people what they should do and where they should go.

100% of the States were engaged efficiently in a day by day radiation instrument maintenance effort and 90% of the data required for training in the development of a monitoring capability were automated.

Other statistics were available to support regional efforts to develop then existing national programs including funding support to State Departments of Education to conduct civil defense curricula in public schools.

Public relations activity was minimal. Of the civil defense public relations activity, Congressman Bob Wilson was very kind in his indictment when he said a group of public information specialists, "you people sure have maintained a low profile over the years."

The Federal personnel of the Region, all civil servants, were experienced, well indoctrinated in the programs of civil defense, maintained sound working relationships with the States and their political subdivisions, and in areas of interest were competent, resourceful and dedicated. Their production, like the program effectiveness, was measured in quantified terms.

## THEN ALONG CAME JOHN

John E. Bex, age 51, of Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, was appointed Regional Director and reported for assignment on January 5, 1971. His background as a small businessman, a public relations consultant, and an Air Force veteran of World War II, with continued Reservist training and Air War College experience, lent extra strength to his qualifications as a manager in the redirection of civil defense. His philosophies of what was going on for the protection of the people and their property, and for the administration of the program spelled revolution.

Based upon his personal research and active observation of public attitudes—of the effectiveness of civil defense education in the schools—of performance of reportedly trained State and local personnel—of the habitability of facilities designated as shelters—of the condition of shelter stocks—of the relevance of community shelter planning and radiation monitoring—of the low visibility of the national effort to the public (even to governments) of the mediocre approach to public relations—and of the tun-

nel-like version of the regional personnel brought about by the discipline of the 60's, John went public with his heresy.

The primary concern of John Bex was not the inadequacies of the bureaucracy, nor the program effort of the agency. Rather his concern focused on the lack of objectivity of the total effort—

Why was jeopardy expressed more than survival?

Why was threat more significant than protection?

Where was the defense for civil defense?

Why did fact pale and myths prevail?

Where was preparedness evidenced when the emergency occurred?

John felt most strongly that there was a lack of qualitative measurement, and that the government was failing to communicate within itself and with the public.

His bywords became "The Name of the Game is Communications and Public Relations." It became a part of the mast of a house-organ type of publication that he introduced and named SURVIVAL. (He revamped the regional "newsletter" from a wordy leaflet into an award winning potpourri communication. The content aimed at capturing widespread public and private sector readership.) SURVIVAL became the deck from which ensued great rocking of the boat, a dynamic initiative movement toward greater effectiveness in every phase of disaster preparedness.

Some quotes:

"The condition of our (survival supplies) . . . in public shelters is a national disgrace. These stocks should be moved and dumped."

" . . . We need to rethink our whole approach to civil defense, disasters and emergencies . . . we need a new agency . . . we need a program to capture the imagination of the American people."

"Emergency preparedness is everyone's business, public and private. It should be considered one of today's Growth Industries . . . of the 'professionals' in civil preparedness, not one could perform or meet his responsibilities . . . unless he improves his communications . . ."

"The crux . . . we have so far failed to sell the American public on the meaning and importance of civil defense. The best four letter word I know is s-e-l-l."

"In general, the situation of the entire civil defense effort is, when seen in proper perspective, quite unsatisfactory."

On the civil defense budget, decrying it at about 1/10th of 1% of the total defense budget: "By this measure, the value this government has been placing on the lives of our civilians and their need for protection doesn't look very good."

"Shelter preparation . . . even compared to smaller countries . . . ever since World War II as a matter of fact, can hardly be regarded with anything but dismay."

Of his effort to stir the pot, to make the people and governments aware, he disdained Armageddon talk:

"You have to tell it like it is," John would say. "You tell me after ten years of survey there is more than 200 million shelter spaces for 200 million people. Then why is it you have a shelter and I don't? The fact is, there is one shelter for the two of us and I'll bet you don't know where yours is."

Of the continuation of the ten year survey effort to locate more shelter spaces in existing buildings, John said, "That should no longer be in our priorities, there should be a moratorium on all survey work."

John Bex was determined to be a doer in the government. He holds to the outstanding principles of management—communicating with employees, peers and superiors, delegating authority, objective setting, guts in decision-making, etc. As to the nature of his personality, one could obtain descriptions

March 7, 1973

from others ranging from the flamboyant to the dynamic. They would all be accurate descriptions.

He persuaded the people with whom he would work to identify the need for a greater visibility in the eyes of the public. The numbers of articles published, media interviews, public speaking engagements and film showings increased a hundred fold. He initiated a person-to-person effort he labeled "Speaking With A Million" and exhorted his office personnel to set the example: talk up civil preparedness and get others to talk is still a theme.

He achieved the reality of the only region throughout the nation where all governors proclaimed December 7th as Civil Defense Day, Civil Defense Week, or Civil Defense Month. When he established the public information office and stressed an upgraded education for school children, live programs came into being. These efforts and accomplishments have set the example throughout all regions as well as at the national level.

He was able to take the motherhood out of civil defense and achieve firm commitments for action and funding from governors and mayors.

West Virginia faced several serious disasters in a two year period. John Bex, communicating in a serious way, became a team with Governor Arch Moore infusing new authority, new support and new concern in the civil preparedness of that State. Today, West Virginia's response to disasters and its threat to its people is a measurable part of effective government in emergency.

As a result of a concentrated effort on the part of DCPA to furnish direct assistance in upgrading governments' emergency operating capability, and with John's insistence on priorities and objectivity of effort, many local governments which otherwise would have collapsed at the onset of Tropical Storm Agnes, as some did, were able to acquit themselves quite credibly by preparedness standards.

John's vitality and advocacy for change proved difficult to cope with within the regional structure. This was particularly true where inbred programs and approaches needed change and change was needed to support the new policies of the national leadership. In some significant areas his energy has prevailed. Public survival education is getting a whole new face, as is survival education in the public schools; non-supporting programs have fallen out of the priorities of activities, plans to heal some old ills are being made.

At the national level John developed the rapport to maintain his influence in court. He was able to convince the national leadership, or as a minimum to confirm suspicions, or intentions, with his eager advice and sound judgments.

Nearly every front where change had to be instituted, John attacked—"Sacred cows make good hamburger," he would quote. He is an ardent persuader, as ardent a listener, and is a masterful tactician in the art of the attack. Where he was constrained from penetration, he outflanked with another attacker, maybe a Congressman, a publisher, an industrialist, maybe a civic organization. A patriot in deed, he believed these actions to be demonstrations of truth with loyalty, and to be touchstones of strength and will in pursuit of his feel for the needs of the country's defense.

But no one bats a thousand. When John was directed to achieve closer harmony with the Office of Emergency Preparedness, currently an agency to be abolished under the President's Reorganization Plan, he had an animal cartoon published showing an angry American eagle wearing a civil defense patch under the same umbrella with a turtle. The turtle represented "remarkable sense of proper direction, planning, and coordinating abi-

lity oriented to survival" and was labeled "OEP". The Office of Emergency Preparedness objected vigorously to being a turtle.

John campaigned among the U.S. Civil Defense Council, a social bureaucracy of local government officials and a recognized centerpiece of mediocrity, to open its regular membership to Federal and State professionals. He felt such a move could provide a broader base for communicating preparedness to the public. Typically, change appalled the incumbent membership, and activities continue as before.

It is a truism that the measure of effectiveness in government, any government, has to be in its ability to deliver service to its public and to maintain objectivity in the effort expended.

The formula calls for the bureaucracy to support the leadership if the public trust is to be kept. And the leadership must be a highly personal leadership, the prime qualities—energy, guts and interest—being visible and demonstrable.

John Bex brought life and vitality and new dignity to the bureaucracy. He brought meaning and significance to qualitative achievement, and purpose to effort. It would seem, from the foregoing account that in a measurable way, the truism has received rare edification because John came along.

#### THE LATE HONORABLE WINTHROP ROCKEFELLER

#### HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 1, 1973

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, we will hear a great deal about the wide-ranging contributions made by the late former Governor of Arkansas, the Honorable Winthrop Rockefeller, during his short life span. It is entirely proper that those who know his outstanding record best should detail his many contributions here so that all may be aware of what can be accomplished for one's State and Nation in a single lifetime.

We will hear of "Win's" versatility. We will be told of his penchant for hard work—despite the fact that he was born to one of the country's wealthiest families. A philanthropist, a business executive, a tireless worker in civic affairs: Governor Rockefeller was all of these, and he handled each endeavor well.

There is another aspect of "Win's" career upon which I want to focus my brief remarks. In addition to all the above, the Governor was a consummate host at his "Winrock Farms" estate. Once, when I had the occasion to speak in Fayetteville, Ark., I received the full force of that generous hospitality. Practically from the time I crossed the border of his State, my comfort and well-being became the special interest of Gov. Winthrop Rockefeller.

We made a stop at Winrock to change clothes, and then proceeded to the speaking engagement in Fayetteville. After the banquet I was flown back to Winrock to spend the night before returning to Washington the next day. It was during that period that I really came to know Winthrop Rockefeller.

It was clear that Winrock was not merely the lair of a gentleman farmer who had no real knowledge of farming,

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

or a business tycoon looking for a good tax writeoff. This was a real working farm, and I found that my host was an expert in the field of agriculture. He spoke easily about the intricacies of cattle breeding and scientific farming. He had a sincere concern for ecology and the environment, but not because it was fashionable and chic to feel that way. Win had a deep respect for nature that is found in men who work hand-in-hand with her, to the benefit of both.

Just as I will long recall my short visit to Winrock, this country will remember the impression left upon it by Winthrop Rockefeller.

#### BROADCAST INDUSTRY REQUIRES LICENSE RENEWAL CLARIFICATION

#### HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues, Mr. BROTHILL of North Carolina and Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania in sponsoring legislation dealing with the renewal of broadcast licenses.

This bill meets problems faced by broadcasters at license renewal time in two significant ways. First, it extends from 3 years to 5 years the period for which the license is granted. And second, it spells out in the law the procedure that must be followed by the Federal Communications Commission in considering a license renewal application.

Under the terms of this bill, a broadcast licensee who has filed with the Federal Communications Commission an application for renewal shall be awarded the grant if he is legally, financially, and technically qualified and if he shows that in his previous licensing period he has, in his broadcast service to the public, made a good-faith effort to serve the needs and interests of the area served by his station. He must also show that he has not demonstrated a callous disregard for law or the regulations of the FCC.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation became necessary as a result of a decision by the U.S. Supreme Court in June, 1971. At that time the Court ruled that the Federal Communications Commission lacked authority to initiate a policy it had followed for years, namely, that preference be given an existing license holder over a competing applicant if the licensee's service has been substantial.

I do not believe the public interest is served by continuing to subject broadcasters to the uncertainty of Commission action which may be brought about by the submission of competing applications from groups whose only claim to better performance is a vague promise.

Certainly, continuity of service is important if the broadcasting industry is to remain a stable, vital, and viable instrument of communication in our society. Both industry stability and the public interest would be well served by the continuity of service that this bill would provide.

#### THE HANDICAPPED AT WORK: TOMORROW'S CHALLENGE

#### HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a copy of the winning essay in the 1973 "Ability Counts" contest sponsored by the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped in my State of Oklahoma. Miss Susan Irwin of my congressional district placed first in the State competition, and I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate her on her outstanding writing abilities. It is with a great deal of pride that I submit for the RECORD Miss Irwin's winning essay:

#### THE HANDICAPPED AT WORK: TOMORROW'S CHALLENGE

(By Susan Irwin)

The cafeteria in the basement of the Federal Building in downtown Oklahoma City is clean, well organized, efficiently run. Newspapers are brought in every morning and placed on a counter for sale. If a customer asks for a candy bar or a pack of cigarettes as he is leaving, he will notice, if he is observant, that the fingers of the man behind the counter are carefully counting every row of boxes, to make sure they find what the customer wants. All the employees in this cafeteria are blind.

This cafeteria should be an inspiration to employers and to the handicapped. This cafeteria is living proof of the amazing ability of the handicapped at work.

Yet, despite numerous examples of the success of the hard-working handicapped, barriers still remain. There are seven million young Americans who are handicapped. Forty percent of them are underemployed, and twenty-six percent are unemployed.

Tomorrow's challenge—to find jobs for these handicapped people—can be met by accomplishing three things: personal encouragement of the handicapped, rehabilitation for the handicapped, and enlightenment of employers about the abilities of the handicapped. The story of Roger Robb from Fayette, Missouri, shows how these challenges can be met.<sup>1</sup>

A sudden flash of sparks crackled through the air as more than seven thousand volts of electricity struck a young lineman named Roger Robb. On that day in June, 1948, Roger was rushed to the hospital. Both of his arms were amputated soon afterwards.

This tragic accident radically changed the lives of Roger Robb and his family. In one day Roger had lost both his hands and his job. An expression of despair and helplessness must have flickered through his eyes as he wondered what he was going to do. Mrs. Robb bought a platform rocker for him. There Roger would sit for hours and listen to the radio. Roger believed that he would be spending the rest of his life in that rocker.

Then new hope came. Jean Cahill, a rehabilitation nurse, had driven from Chicago to encourage Robb. Though he was skeptical at first, she convinced him that he could work again. By the end of October, Roger was training with artificial arms at a rehabilitation center in Boston.

Roger went back to work for the electric company, and now he is Line Superintendent. Although he is busy with church and American Legion activities, he still finds time to visit recent amputees and to encourage them to go back to work. That old rocking chair has been empty for a long time.

<sup>1</sup> Performance, April 1969, pages 3-6.

Roger built confidence and pride in himself again through the encouragement of his family and his rehabilitation nurse. This is the first vital step to get the handicapped to work: to boost their morale and give them a sense of self-worth and to convince them that they can work.

Step two—rehabilitation—is being met across the country through employment services, welfare agencies, veterans organizations, and rehabilitation centers. Some handicapped at rehabilitation centers learn to use artificial limbs. Others, like David Hardwicke, must learn to talk. Three years ago, David, an honor student in my high school, won seventh place in the Ability Counts contest. After serving six months in the Army, David used his two-year scholarship at Southwestern State College at Weatherford. Last fall the automobile in which he was a passenger rolled off an embankment, killing the driver and leaving David severely disabled with head injuries and partial paralysis. David still does not hear well and cannot speak coherently. Fortunately, through his participation in the essay contest, David's parents knew about the rehabilitation agencies to help him. They are hopeful that, in time and with patient help, David may once again enjoy a productive life.

The most important challenge of all is to encourage employers to hire the handicapped. To accomplish this, doubts of the employers must be replaced by knowledge about the handicapped. Employers would be much more willing to hire the handicapped if they knew that they are not an insurance risk, that they are loyal, careful workers, and that they have good records of observing company rules, attendance, and productivity.

Closed minds often do not recognize how much ability and potential the handicapped actually have. Employers who believe that the handicapped are unproductive should read a history book. The great writers Milton and Homer were blind. Beethoven probably never heard his heroic last symphonies as deafness closed in upon him. The painter Michaelangelo had a deformed back. Franklin Roosevelt was a four-term President in a wheelchair. The electrical wizard Steinmetz and the famous French writer Voltaire overcame twisted bodies to benefit mankind.

Roger Robb did not want sympathy or charity. He wanted to live a life of dignity; he wanted to prove his ability and to become a vital part of society. His rocking chair, still empty, is a beautiful symbol of what a little courage and hope can do. Yet, on David's porch and elsewhere, other rocking chairs are not empty. The former challenge of Roger Robb, met by a few determined and dedicated workers, should give hearts new hope for success with others, like David. The challenge of the future—tomorrow's challenge—is to inform the employer and to encourage the handicapped so that the life of another Roger Robb or David Hardwicke will not be spent in despair and helplessness.

#### ESTONIA

#### HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I take pride in offering my congratulations to the people and friends of Estonia as they celebrate the nation's 55th anniversary. Though the Soviet Union's forceful occupation of Estonia has continued since 1944, it is certain that Estonian patriots

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

and their supporters in America still remain committed to the goal of a free and independent Estonia.

In man's quest for liberty few struggles surpass those of Estonian patriots. Between 1721 and 1918, Estonia was under Russia's heavy and oppressive control; however, their music, plays, poetry, and books still flourished. A remarkable tribute to a tenacious people. In addition, this period also nurtured Estonian nationalism which showed itself in the Estonian rebellion of 1905. Though Russian soldiers ruthlessly crushed the revolt, the spark of nationalism still burned and emerged again in 1917-18.

The Estonians proclaimed their independence after the czarist government fell, and from 1918 until 1940, when their country fell to the Communist forces, they enjoyed a period of freedom and progress.

The tragedy and suffering of Estonia's people under Soviet Russia are almost beyond belief. Their ability to endure and continue their own culture in light of Russian occupation and impositions is a truly marvelous feat. But how long can we expect that resistance to continue without more tangible aid from the free world?

As we offer congratulations and cite Estonia's past achievements, let us also consider her future. Let us pledge anew our promise to aid her in her quest for freedom and independence. Estonia's plight must become the concern of all free men.

#### A NEW CITIZEN, MR. KARL NICOLAI

#### HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from a constituent who in his own simple way best expresses the love for his newly adopted country and I should like to insert excerpts of his letter and a poem he has written for the occasion.

Thank you very much for your letter of January 24, last. I was most pleased to receive your congratulations on my new citizenship.

As one of your local constituents, I would like to introduce myself. I came to America from Germany with my family in 1962 to seek a new way of life. In World War II, I fought as a young volunteer on the Russian Front, and spent four years as a P.O.W. In this way I learned first-hand of the bitter life in the Soviet Union. I learned to value democracy and freedom.

At the present I am employed as a machinist, but in my spare time I am studying at night school. I hope soon to better myself. I am a member of Knights of Malta, and Community Leaders of America. I am also an amateur poet and accordingly am proud to present you with my original poem, "The Prayer of the Nation."

The poem is as follows:

#### PRAYER OF THE NATION

Dear God, where are You in this universe?  
I send my pleading with this verse.  
Do You see me when I fall,  
Or are you far or not at all?

Do You see me when I'm rude,  
Am I deceiving You with my mood?  
Do You hold me in your arm  
To keep me from every harm?  
Hold out your hands to my friends,  
For we are fearful our faith bends.  
Guide the soldiers in the field,  
Let the enemy seek right and yield.  
Watch over those who seek redress  
For evils that grow to great distress.  
Our President needs the golden light  
To scatter evil and press for right.  
Dear God, Master of us all,  
Let us not fall and to death fall  
Until all men find your hand  
With Nations and people from every land.

#### PEACE WITH HONOR

#### HON. LAWRENCE G. WILLIAMS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, after 12 long years of war, the guns are becoming quiet throughout all of Indochina. The peace accord was the best news in months. The President is quickly withdrawing the last American troops in accordance with the settlement.

President Nixon has kept his promise of "peace with honor." There can be no doubt that he has brought us through a most difficult period. We have negotiated from a position of strength and honesty. None can doubt that it would have been impossible for the President to have reasoned with Soviet and Chinese leaders last year, had Russian-made tanks been rumbling through the streets of Saigon. I am proud to have supported President Nixon all of the way.

All Americans can be proud of our POW's. As each plane load has arrived at Clark Air Force Base, we have been able to share the joy of seeing them step from the "Freedom Plane." The POW's have shown a deep abiding sense of patriotism and have expressed their pride in having served their country. No nation has been better served than the United States has been by these men. The basic strength of our Republic is mirrored in the way these men came through their ordeal, unbent.

There are still many men not yet accounted for. The lists already released do not include many men who have previously been identified as prisoners, or other men who were seen to escape from their crippled aircraft and parachute to safety. We will continue our efforts to get a full accounting from Hanoi and other sources.

The 93d Congress—On Wednesday, January 3, 1973, it was an honor to take the oath for the fourth time to represent all of the residents of the Seventh Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

Office hours—My Washington office is open from 9 to 5:30 every weekday, and on Saturday mornings from 9 until noon. My district office, located at 50 Powell Road, in the Springfield Township Building, is open from 8:30 to 5 every weekday, on Tuesday evenings from 7:30 to 9, and on Saturday and Sunday by appointment.

To better serve you—if you require assistance or wish to share your views, it is always better to send a letter with full details. In this way, there can be no confusion and there is always a record for reference.

## OLDER AMERICANS

I have cosponsored a joint resolution to name May as "National Arthritis Month." Arthritis and rheumatic diseases are second only to heart disease as the most widespread chronic illnesses in America, but they have failed to get the public attention which would lead to more adequate consideration and research into their causes and cures. These diseases are particularly associated with the elderly, and I wish to help ease the pain and suffering caused by these crippling afflictions.

My bill, H.R. 2713, would allow medicare to pay for prescription drugs. Even with medicare, our aged pay a disproportionate share of their income for medical expenses. This bill would allow doctors to prescribe or certify drugs for their elderly patients and know that they would be utilized. I have also cosponsored legislation to allow medicare to pay for the cost of flu shots for the aged. Since influenza strikes the elderly most severely, this proposal is extremely meritorious.

## THE ECONOMY

The U.S. economy expanded at an 8-percent rate during the last quarter of 1972, according to the U.S. Department of Commerce. The pace for the non-inflated growth of the gross national product did not equal earlier predictions of 8.5 percent, but did indicate a continuing healthy expansion of the Nation's businesses.

During the same 3 months, inflation increased at a rate of 2.8 percent—which satisfied President Nixon's announced goals—while the economy grew by \$30.9 billion in terms of dollars. The total gross national product for 1972 grew by \$101.4 billion to \$1.15 trillion.

Congress must help the President slash unnecessary Federal spending. Last September, the Congress rejected the President's request to place a spending ceiling of \$250 billion for the current year. He had my full support on that measure. Now, he has sent a budget calling for \$269 billion for the next fiscal year, and the projection for the following year is \$288 billion. Each of these budgets contains substantial Federal fiscal deficits.

Such gross overspending is causing the dollar to be worth less—and we have seen inflation accelerate again during January and February. We hope to bring it back under control in the near future. In 1962, the operating budget was supposed to be less than \$100 billion but a deficit spending of over \$7 billion increased the fiscal year budget to \$107 billion. Now the majority party in Congress says that today, even \$269 billion is not enough. My promise is to continue to oppose all increases in the debt ceiling and all irresponsible and unnecessary expenditures.

## AID FOR IRAQI JEWS

Senators SCOTT and SCHWEIKER, and seven area Congressmen joined me in calling on President Nixon to personally

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

intervene "to halt the inhumane treatment of the Jewish minorities of Iraq and Syria." In a letter to the President, we cited the recently reported execution of "nine or 10 prominent members of the Jewish community of Iraq.

In 1969, a similar wave of arrests and persecutions swept over Iraq. At that time, 14 persons, including nine Jews, were tried by military courts on trumped-up charges and then hanged in public squares in Baghdad and Basra. Then, just as now, the victims were first taken from their homes and held incommunicado, their property seized, and their families driven from their homes.

Our letter to the President stated that we were aware that in the past, despite the fact that our Government did not have diplomatic relations with Iraq or Syria, the State Department made substantial efforts on behalf of Iraqi and Syrian Jewry. "Now, however, is a time when your personal intervention would be extremely helpful. We urge you to use your good offices, through whatever means you consider appropriate, to aid these helpless persons."

## THE ENERGY CRISIS

The United States faces a major energy crisis. The combination of rapid population growth and greater dependence on automatic equipment has caused our energy needs to grow at an astonishing rate. Our reserves of natural fuels are being depleted rapidly. This is the reason we must conduct extensive research and make greater use of nuclear power.

Because of national defense considerations, we cannot become dependent on other countries. Our fuel needs are among our most important. If we were to depend too much on imports, then we would lose some of our power to act independently. Also, other Nations are feeling the shortage of natural fuels and are becoming less willing to export their own supplies.

New energy sources are needed at once. I am reintroducing the same energy bill which I sponsored in the last Congress. This bill grants important tax benefits to businesses for utilizing new technology to provide energy from waste products and providing energy to heat or to produce electrical power. The process is almost totally pollution free and could produce large amounts of energy.

## IMPOUNDMENT AND THE NEED FOR FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

## HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents has requested that I insert his views in the RECORD. I offer his letter now:

BLOOMINGTON, MINN.,  
February 3, 1973.

To all Members of Congress:

As I see it the so-called coming battle between the Executive and the Congress boils down to this. The Executive wants to relinquish some of its powers and responsibility

to Congress where they once belonged and the Congress doesn't want them. In other words the Congress would rather continue to "bug out." What we are paying the Congress to do? "Bug out?"

It's a neat trick. The Congress, without the responsibility of leadership, can direct all criticism whether it is much or little (depending on the proximity of the next election) at the Executive when actually it is Congress itself that surrendered its powers willingly in the first place.

I address myself to you, members of Congress. Step forward! We need your vital leadership as well in uniting our country.

HARRY W. STRING,  
(One of the Minnesota voters.)

## MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

## HON. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to congratulate the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for its contribution to American democracy through conducting the Voice of Democracy contest annually.

I am told that this year almost a half million secondary school students participated in the contest competing for the five national scholarships which are awarded as top prizes.

I think it is extremely fitting that this year the contest theme was "My Responsibility to Freedom."

The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington for the final judging as guests of the VFW. I am proud to announce that the winning contestant from the State of Virginia is Miss Cynthia Alane Ballard, a resident of Petersburg, Va., which is in the Fourth Congressional District of Virginia which I have the honor to represent.

Her first paragraph reads as follows: I commend it to your reading.

During every minute of each day clocks throughout the world are ticking off seconds that can never be repeated. Time can be the menace endangering my responsibility to freedom.

She then questions that the lack of time to give concern to her responsibility as a citizen is a legitimate rationale for lack of action.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD the speech delivered by Miss Cynthia Alane Ballard of Petersburg, Va., a 17-year-old student from Gibbons High School.

I commend it to your reading.

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM  
(By Miss Cynthia Alane Ballard)

During every minute of each day clocks throughout the world are ticking off seconds that can never be repeated. Time can be the menace endangering my responsibility to freedom.

In the faster than light speeds of activity in our ultra-modern America, it is indeed possible that I could truthfully claim to lack the time to give concern to my responsibility as a United States citizen. But I must question this rationale until all attempts of escape from my duties are found to be fragile and hollow.

My inability to appropriate that precious commodity called time to its best potential, can result in a gross misjudgment. I have no excuse for not responding to the problem of providing enough time in direct social, economic or political dedication to my country's ideals. These ideals have history and depth. They need a future. I have a direct duty to reinforce these ideals in order to insure their future.

When citizenship is involved, it means *action* and *work*. Is there a need for a community center in my city? My responsibility to freedom demands research. It demands that I take time and start to build on that center by contacting specific people to start working on financial problems, construction ideas, activities, and organizational groundwork. Is there an adequate lunch program in my area's school system? My responsibility to freedom demands intelligence. It demands that I think. It demands that I ask school officials why the program isn't sufficient. It demands that I ask what *I can do* to make the program adequate and then take the initiative to actually carry out the plans. Is there an important bill up for decision in state or federal legislature? My responsibility to freedom demands that I not only read about issues, but discuss them intelligently with qualified resource people. It demands that I draw conclusions.

Greatest of all, my responsibility to freedom demands that I have dedication. If I have enough desire and feeling to become involved and stay active, I can efficiently respond to my duties as a citizen. These 3 questions are only a minimal cross section of the issues a responsible person must concern himself within today's America. To fully explore and organize solutions to our problem, I've got to provide the main ingredient of true dedication: *Time*. If I can give this ingredient generously without wasting it, I can meet the demands of freedom. I can make *political* decisions if I take the time to do my citizenship homework. I can provide action and drive in social work if I can allot the time to develop community programs. I can respond to the challenge of America's ideals if I do not rationalize or misjudge daily situations regarding community, state and national government.

Regardless of where or when those clocks tick off the invaluable seconds of my life, I must make sure that those seconds are used to validate my responsibility to freedom.

#### ANTIWAR ACTIVISTS CHANGING CAUSES

#### HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, some of us have wondered what the bulk of the anti-war rabble will do with themselves now that an honorable peace has been obtained in Vietnam. Surely they would not think of going back to work, or school.

Thanks to a recent column by Jack Anderson, we have at least a partial answer now. So that all of my colleagues will know what to expect from our professional malcontents this summer, I insert an excerpt from that column, which appeared in the Washington Post on March 5, 1973, at this point in the RECORD:

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

##### WASHINGTON WHIRL: CHANGING CAUSES

Antiwar activists have been looking for a new cause since the Vietnam cease-fire was signed. Many are switching to the anti-poverty crusade. Already, antiwar leaders are trying to rally their followers to demonstrate against the budget cuts in the antipoverty programs. They're talking about a "summer of discontent" this year and promising to fill the jails to dramatize the plight of the poor.

#### OCEANSIDE, CALIF., BLADE-TRIBUNE ON "A TRULY FREE PRESS"

#### HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, an editorial carried recently in the Oceanside, Calif., Blade-Tribune succinctly reminds us that allegations of abuse of press freedom are not new and that such criticism of the press was also weighed by the framers of the Constitution at the time of enactment. Perhaps no more scurrilous attacks by the press directed against public officials have been conducted in our entire history than were directed against some of our Founding Fathers, even including George Washington.

But such men were able to rise above even what must have been frequent resentment and anger over these scurrilous personal attacks in order to preserve the liberty of all of our people, and to restrain the power of government, which are dependent on the exercise of a free press.

We ought to similarly be able today and in the Congress and the executive branch to rise above whatever small or large personal resentments we might possess and to do no less in preserving freedom of the press than did earlier statesmen in their wisdom.

The Blade-Tribune editorial follows:

##### A TRULY FREE PRESS

In the context of current court efforts to force newspaper reporters to reveal the sources of their information, it seems appropriate to recall Thomas Jefferson's famous assessment of the Fourth Estate. On January 16, 1787 he said:

"... were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter."

Jefferson, of course, was not arguing for an anarchic nation, nor was he advocating an anarchic press. He was, we have to believe, stressing the essentiality of a truly free press . . . a press that can probe and report the activities of the public, of the world of business, of governments in the light of the public interest. The great antidote to anarchy and to despotism alike is an informed public.

Jefferson did not see freedom of the press as freedom from all restraints, but rather as freedom to carry out decently, diligently and fully its responsibilities to the people.

Becoming a newspaperman does not miraculously make a man decent or trustworthy, any more than does election to office, although we like to think it may sometimes help. There are boundaries that must be respected, news sources carries with it a very large responsibility not to use it fraudul-

ently but intelligently and in high principle as a means of providing information essential to the public.

To jeopardize that privilege would not destroy the newspaper industry, but it would be a significant diminution of the public's right to know.

#### U.S. SYSTEM WORKS BETTER THAN MOST AMERICANS ADMIT

#### HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the John Roche column which follows appeared in the March 3 issue of the AFL-CIO News and makes a lot of sense:

##### U.S. SYSTEM WORKS BETTER THAN MOST AMERICANS ADMIT

(By John P. Roche)

The one unforgivable sin that the United States commits—at least in the eyes of the intellectuals—is that it works.

Thus a distinguished European statesman put it during my recent trip.

"For example," he continued, "a few hundred kilometers from here (Zurich) Italians and Germans are busy tearing down street signs. It seemed like an intelligent compromise in an area contested by Austria and Italy to put the signs in both languages, but extremists at both ends want all or nothing. Belgium has the same problem."

"Do you realize," he added, "that the Bretons have been engaged in some violent separatist activities in France? And the Basques, too? The Bretons are up in arms because under French law they cannot give their children ethnic names (Breton is a version of Gaelic). It's rather as though American law forbade Negroes from giving their children Muslim first names. And I hardly need to mention Ulster."

"What you Americans have, without realizing it," he concluded, "is one of the most stable societies in history. You absorb and thus neutralize your potentially disruptive elements: a movement that in Europe would become an ideological cult becomes in the United States a club that meets regularly, wears funny clothes on feast days, and gets letters of felicitation from the President."

After the past decade, I confess that my fundamental optimism about the United States has on occasion been shaken a bit. The combination of the civil rights movement, the upsurge of youth, and the anti-war militancy often seemed to be bringing the nation close to the abyss.

One reassuring thing was that the prophets of "revolution" and "disintegration" were intellectuals whom I had known for years and their compasses were locked on True South. That is, in specific terms, if they predicted X, one could invariably count on the occurrence of anti-X. But first in Washington and then on the campus the noise-level was horrendous: it was like being in a steel drum being hit with baseball bats.

This discussion with an impartial observer who spent years as a diplomat in the United States, was therefore reassuring. When, for instance, I raised the question of turmoil in American colleges and universities, he asked me, "How many universities do your leftists control?" Now, although various elements of the counter-culture have gained considerable power within certain schools, the correct answer is "none."

They may have a veto power, they may drive non-conforming faculty members insane and send despairing administrators off

to religious retreats. But no university is in fact controlled by the leftists. He chuckled and said: "I could name you a dozen in Europe—all state schools, of course—which are now the private property of the extreme left."

Moreover, he went on to point out, we Americans tend to blame everything on the war in Vietnam: drugs, venereal disease, inflation, student unrest. But everywhere in Europe precisely the same problems exist.

Indeed, the United States has the lowest inflation rate of any major industrial power, the student riots in France made Berkeley

look like a fraternity prank, Sweden has the highest venereal disease rate going, and the drug crisis exists across the board. "And," he noted, "we have had no war in Vietnam."

As I have suggested here before, we Americans have a fondness for flagellation, a rather likeable characteristic. Yet, every so often it is worthwhile to stand back a bit and look at what we have accomplished in a positive way. There is much left to be done, but if we look around the only world we have, we can take some modest pride in our accomplishments.

## "911": A NEEDED CONCEPT

**HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, as I promised last week, I now submit an updating on the place where the emergency telephone number "911" is now in operation:

911 REPORT, DECEMBER 1972 (A.T. & T. SYSTEM)

	Date in service	Scheduled	Services provided <sup>1</sup>	Population served (thousands)		Date in service	Scheduled	Services provided <sup>1</sup>	Population served (thousands)
<b>ALABAMA</b>									
Alexander City	October 1972		PFA	32.0					
Athens	December 1969		PFA	33.0					
Birmingham	July 1970		PFA	506.0					
Childersburg	October 1971		PFA	10.0					
Clanton	July 1968		PFA	15.0					
Dadeville	October 1972		PFA	3.0					
Decatur	February 1972		PFA	52.0					
Demopolis	December 1971		PFA	18.0					
Eufaula	December 1971		PFA	20.0					
Evergreen	July 1970		PFA	10.0					
Fairhope	December 1971		PFA	13.0					
Fort Deposit	February 1972	February 1975	PF	1.0					
Goodwater	October 1972	December 1974	PFA	2.0					
Greensboro			PFA	26.0					
Hartselle	February 1972		PFA	20.0					
Jackson	June 1969	January 1973	PFA	14.0					
Jasper	July 1969		PFA	42.0					
Livingston	January 1972		PFA	2.0					
Madison County (Gurley, Hazel Green, Huntsville, Laceys Spring)			PFA	168.0					
Marion	August 1971		PFA	4.0					
Moulton-Town Creek-Courtland		February 1975	PFA	25.0					
Prattville		October 1973	PF	23.0					
Selma	August 1970		PFA	30.0					
Sylacauga	September 1971		PFA	32.0					
Tuscaloosa	December 1970		PFA	114.0					
Tuskegee	April 1969		PFA	21.0					
<b>ARIZONA</b>									
Grand Canyon		Indefinite		1.0					
Sierra Vista	October 1969		PFA, S	20.0					
<b>ARKANSAS</b>									
Jonesboro	November 1969		PFA	29.0					
West Memphis	July 1972		PFA, HP, S	27.6					
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>									
Alameda	April 1970		PFA	66.0					
Dunsmuir	January 1973		PFA	2.2					
Gustine	March 1970		PFA, O	3.0					
Monterey County	March 1973		PFA, O	308.0					
Mount Shasta	January 1973		PFA, O	4.5					
Rancho Santa Fe	December 1970		PFA, HP, O	2.0					
San Clemente	September 1970		PFA	17.0					
Sunnyvale	November 1972		PF	100.0					
Yreka-Montague	January 1973		PFA, O	3.5					
<b>COLORADO</b>									
Boulder	April 1971		PFA, S	70.0					
Denver	May 1971		PFA	600.0					
Estes Park	July 1973	September 1974	PF, S	9.0					
Greely			PF, S	40.0					
Longmont	May 1972		PFA, S	30.0					
Loveland-Berthoud	February 1971		PFA, S	17.0					
<b>CONNECTICUT</b>									
Ansonia	January 1970		PF	20.0					
Cheshire	January 1970		PF	16.0					
Derby	January 1970		PF	15.0					
Glastonbury	December 1972		PFA, O	21.0					
Guilford	September 1970		PFA, O	11.0					
Huntington	January 1970		PF	24.0					
Middlebury	October 1969		PF	6.0					
New Britain	June 1970		PFA	87.0					
Newington	April 1970		PF	22.0					
Simsbury	January 1969		PFA	16.0					
Seymour	January 1970		PF	12.0					
Shelton	January 1970		PF	24.0					
Watertown	September 1970		PF	13.0					
Waterbury	October 1969		PF	109.0					
Watertown	October 1969		PF	18.0					
West Haven	December 1971		PFA, O	52.0					
<b>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA</b>									
Washington, D.C.	January 1972		PFA	764.0					
<b>FLORIDA</b>									
Gainesville	January 1974		PFA, S	70.0					
<b>GEORGIA</b>									
Albany			PF	89.0					
Macon	May 1970		PF, O	130.0					
Thomasville	May 1971		PF, S, HP, O	35.0					
<b>IDAHO</b>									
Ada County-Boise		December 1973	PFA, S	112.2					
<b>ILLINOIS</b>									
Brookfield			PF	20.0					
Evanston	March 1970		F&P	88.0					
Forest Park, River Forest			F&P	29.0					
Mount Vernon	May 1970		F&P	16.0					
Oak Park		March 1973	F&P	63.0					
Plano	June 1972		F&P	5.0					
Selem	December 1969		F&P	6.0					
Vandalia	September 1970		FPA	6.0					
<b>INDIANA</b>									
Anderson		March 1973	PFA	71.8					
Bluffton		November 1973	PF	8.0					
Huntington	March 1968		PFA	16.0					
Kendallville	October 1972		PFA	9.0					
<b>IOWA</b>									
Burlington	October 1970		PF	35.0					
Clinton	February 1972		PF	37.0					
<b>KANSAS</b>									
Dodge City	March 1971		PFA, S	15.0					
El Dorado	April 1971		PFA	13.0					
Elwood	July 1972		PFA	1.2					
Lawrence	November 1969		PF, S, HP	34.0					
Neodesha	February 1972		PFA, O	4.0					
Salina	August 1973		PFA, S, O	42.0					
<b>KENTUCKY</b>									
Frankfort	March 1970		PFA	21.0					
Mayfield	April 1970		PFA	11.0					
Paris	June 1970		PFA	17.0					
<b>LOUISIANA</b>									
Alexandria	April 1970		PFA	110.0					
Baton Rouge	September 1970		PFA	287.0					
Bunkie	January 1972		P&F	10.0					
Lake Providence									
Rayne	July 1971		PFA	13.0					
Ruston	July 1972		PFA	44.0					
Tallulah	January 1971		PFA	14.0					
Thibodaux		September 1974	PFA	53.0					
<b>MAINE</b>									
Boothbay	April 1972		F&P	.6					
Boothbay Harbor	April 1972		F&P	1.9					
Camden	October 1969		F&P	3.5					
Southport	April 1972		F&P	.7					
<b>MARYLAND</b>									
Prince Georges County		4th qtr, 1973	PFA, O	750.0					
<b>MASSACHUSETTS</b>									
Amherst	November 1970		PFA	10.3					
Auburn	March 1973		PFA	16.0					
Boston	November 1972		PF	800.0					
Brookline	November 1972		PFA	52.8					
Clinton	October 1972		PFA	15.4					
Dalton	June 1971		PFA	7.4					
Easton	April 1972		PF	12.0					
Framingham	September 1971		PFA	63.0					
Hamilton-Wenham	May 1973		PFA	10.1					
Haverhill and Groveland	April 1973		PFA	51.2					
Mattapoisett	March 1971		PFA	5.0					
Medfield									
Middleboro	February 1973		PF	7.7					
Millbury	April 1972		PF	13.6					
Newton	March 1973		PFA	17.2					
Northampton	November 1973		PFA	91.0					
West Haven	November 1972		PFA	29.6					

Footnote at end of article

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 7, 1973

911 REPORT, DECEMBER 1972 (A.T. &amp; T. SYSTEM)

	Date in service	Scheduled	Services provided <sup>1</sup>	Population served (thousands)		Date in service	Scheduled	Services provided <sup>1</sup>	Population served (thousands)
<b>MASSACHUSETTS—Con.</b>									
Quincy	August 1971		PF	89.3		Batavia	March 1970		20.0
Randolph	August 1971		PFA	28.4		Broome County	June 1973		221.8
Southbridge	December 1971		PFA	19.4		Buffalo	July 1969		530.0
Southwick	February 1971		PFA	1.2		Lockport	September 1972		25.4
Springfield	April 1969		PFA	174.5		Nassau County	April 1973		1,413.0
Topsfield		May 1973	PF	5.4		New York City	July 1968		8,000.0
Westboro		March 1973	PFA	19.2		Olean	August 1970		20.0
Westfield	February 1970		PFA	26.3		Riverhead	June 1969		20.0
Woburn	August 1971		PFA	35.0		Salamanca	April 1972		7.9
Worcester	August 1970		PFA	186.6		Southold	June 1969		20.0
Wrentham	January 1972		PFA	7.2		Suffolk County	June 1969		1,000.0
<b>MICHIGAN</b>									
Detroit		September 1973	PFA	1,511.0		Wellsville	June 1971		5.8
Monroe	October 1970		PF	8.0					
Oak Park	October 1970		PF	30.0					
Sterling Heights	April 1972		PFA	61.4					
<b>MINNESOTA</b>									
Austin	February 1972		PFA	30.0					
Windom	May 1969		PFA	5.0					
<b>MISSISSIPPI</b>									
Belzoni	January 1971		PFA	4.0					
Canton	August 1970		PFA	11.0					
Crystal Springs	October 1970		PFA	5.0					
Greenville	June 1971		PFA	55.0					
Greenwood	February 1971		PF	24.0					
Indianola	October 1970		PFA	10.0					
Jackson	April 1969		PFA	165.0					
Laurel	January 1974		PFA	35.0					
Leland			PFA	NA					
Lexington	October 1971		PF	4.0					
Louisville	September 1970		PFA	5.0					
Magee	January 1971		PFA	5.0					
McComb	July 1970		PFA	17.0					
Mendenhall	January 1971		PFA	3.0					
Moss Point	April 1971		PFA	7.0					
Pascagoula	June 1971		PF	28.0					
Philadelphia	December 1970		PFA	5.0					
Vicksburg	December 1969		PFA	24.0					
<b>MISSOURI</b>									
Cape Girardeau	November 1969		PFA	30.0					
Poplar Bluff	March 1971		PF, S, HP	20.0					
St. Joseph	December 1971		PFA, HP, S	80.5					
<b>MONTANA</b>									
Billings	August 1972		PFS	75.0					
Conrad	February 1971		PFA	7.2					
Glendive	May 1970		PFA, S, HP	11.2					
<b>NEBRASKA</b>									
Ainsworth	1st qtr. 1973		PFA	2.7					
Alliance	October 1971		PF	8.5					
Chadron	August 1971		PFA	6.2					
Crawford	February 1972		PFA	4.0					
Fremont	September 1972		PFA	25.0					
Gordon	November 1971		PFA	4.0					
Gothenburg	December 1971		PFA	3.0					
Grand Island	May 1970		PFA	40.0					
Holdrege	September 1972		PFA	7.0					
Kimball	March 1971		PFA	5.8					
Lexington	September 1971		PFA	7.0					
Minden	September 1972		PFA	3.0					
Norfolk	January 1971		PFA	16.0					
North Platte	September 1970		PFA	20.0					
Ogallala	May 1971		PFA	5.7					
Omaha	April 1970		PFA	475.0					
O'Neill		1st qtr. 1973	PFA	4.5					
Schuyler	January 1972		PFA	2.0					
Sidney	August 1969		PFA	8.0					
<b>NEVADA</b>									
Humboldt County and City of Winnemucca	June 1971	Yes		5.0					
<b>NEW HAMPSHIRE</b>									
Dover	July 1972	No		26.0					
<b>NEW JERSEY</b>									
Atlantic City	July 1970		PFA	58.0					
Bayonne	November 1971		PFA	69.9					
Jersey City	December 1972		PFA	305.9					
Trenton	April 1972		PFA	102.2					
<b>NEW MEXICO</b>									
Albuquerque	November 1971		PFA, S, HP, O	300.0					
Las Cruces	August 1970		PF, S, HP, O	40.0					
Las Vegas		March 1974	PFA, S, HP	21.0					
Los Alamos	February 1970		PF	16.0					
Roswell	November 1969		PFA, S, HP	40.0					
<b>NEW YORK</b>									
Batavia	March 1970		PFA						
Broome County	June 1973		PFA						
Buffalo	July 1969		PFA						
Lockport	September 1972		PFA						
Nassau County	April 1973		PFA						
New York City	July 1968		PFA						
Olean	August 1970		PFA						
Riverhead	June 1969		P						
Salamanca	April 1972		PFA						
Southold	June 1969		P						
Suffolk County	June 1969		P						
Wellsville	June 1971		PFA						
<b>North Carolina</b>									
Newland	August 1969		City police A, rescue squad, S.						10.0
<b>North Dakota</b>									
Grand Forks	November 1969		PFA						
<b>Ohio</b>									
Sandusky	January 1969		PF, O						
Springfield	March 1973		PF						
Toledo	Indefinite		PF						
<b>Oklahoma</b>									
Alva	December 1968		PFA						
Duncan	May 1972		PFA						
Fairview	November 1970		PFA, S.						
Lawton	December 1970		PFA, HP, S.						
Woodward	September 1970		PFA, S.						
<b>Oregon</b>									
Douglas County	March 1974		PFA						
Echo	February 1973		PFA						
Florence	January 1973		PFA						
Heppner	June 1974		PFA						
Hermiston	May 1972		PFA						
Milton-Freewater	February 1973		PFA						
Seaside	January 1972		PFA						
Stanfield	February 1973		PFA						
The Dalles	February 1974		PFA						
Toledo	September 1971		PFA						
Yamhill County	December 1974		PFA						
<b>Pennsylvania</b>									
Allentown	April 1973		PFA						
Bradford	November 1970		PFA						
Clearfield	December 1970		PFA						
Du Bois	September 1968		PFA						
Greensburg	November 1970		PFA, O.						
Milton	February 1970		PFA						
Norwood	December 1969		PFA						
Tarentum	January 1970		PFA						
<b>South Carolina</b>									
Florence	April 1972		PFA, S.						40.0
<b>South Dakota</b>									
Rapid City	1st qtr. 1974								
Sioux Falls	2d qtr. 1973								
Yankton	March 1972		PFA						10.0
<b>Tennessee</b>									
Athens	January 1973		PFA, S, HP						
Bolivar	August 1969		PF						
Brownsville	June 1972		PFA						
Carthage	June 1970		PFA, S, HP						
Cleveland	October 1971		PFA						
Clinton	October 1971		PFA						
Columbia	November 1969		PFA, S, HP, O						
Cumberland Gap	October 1971		PFA						
Daisy-Soddy	August 1972		PFA						
Dayton	June 1969		PFA						
Decatur	November 1971		PFA, S, HP						
Dickson	August 1970		PFA						
Franklin	March 1971		PFA						
Gallatin	June 1969		PFA						
Gatlinburg	May 1972		PFA, S						
Germantown	July 1973		PFA						
Halls	October 1971		PF						
Harriman	June 1969		PFA, S, HP						
Hendersonville	June 1972		PFA						
Humboldt	July 1969		PFA						
Jefferson City	December 1972		PFA, HP						
Knoxville	January 1973		PFA, HP						
Lawrenceburg	May 1971		PFA, HP						
Lebanon	October 1969		PFA						
Lyles	December 1971		PFA, S, HP						
Madisonville	September 1971		PFA, S, HP						
Maryville	November 1968		PFA						

Footnote at end of table.

	Date in service	Scheduled	Services provided <sup>1</sup>	Population served (thousands)		Date in service	Scheduled	Services provided <sup>1</sup>	Population served (thousands)
<b>TENNESSEE—Continued</b>									
Memphis	July 1971	July 1973	PFA	701.0	Renton	May 1971	PF	22.0	
Milan	July 1971		PFA	5.0	Seattle	April 1971	PF, rescue	600.0	
Morristown	July 1971		PFA	48.0					
Murfreesboro	January 1969		PFA	56.0	<b>WEST VIRGINIA</b>				
Nashville	April 1972		PFA, HP, S, O	485.0	Richwood	May 1972	PFA	4.1	
Newport	July 1971		PFA	26.0	Summersville	January 1970	PF	4.0	
Oakridge	May 1971		PFA	32.0					
Portland		October 1973			<b>WISCONSIN</b>				
Pulaski	July 1972		PFA, S, HP, O	19.0	Eau Claire	September 1971	P & F	38.0	
Rockwood	April 1971		PFA, S, HP	5.0		June 1973	PFA, S	3.0	
South Pittsburg	August 1972		PFA, HP, S, O	20.0	Menomonee	2d qtr., 1974	PF, S	14.0	
Spring City	August 1972		PFA, HP	4.0	New London	October 1971	PF, S	6.0	
					Whitewater	October 1969	PF, S	20.0	
<b>TEXAS</b>									
Alice	September 1970		PFA	21.0	<b>WYOMING</b>				
Galveston	August 1970		PF	65.0	Afton	June 1971	PFA, S	3.5	
Hearde	August 1972		PFA, S	5.0	Basin	July 1970	PFA, S	3.5	
Huntsville	October 1971		PFA, HP	18.5	Cody	April 1972	PF, S, O	6.0	
Odessa	April 1970		PFA	80.0	Evanston	April 1970	PF, S, HP	4.9	
Quanah	October 1971		PF	5.0	Gillette	August 1969	PS, O	4.5	
					Glendo	October 1972	PFA, S	2.0	
<b>UTAH</b>									
Bountiful	July 1969		PFA	30.0	Green River	January 1970	PF, S, O	3.5	
					Greybull	June 1970	PFA, S	2.0	
<b>VIRGINIA</b>									
Nelson County	March 1970		PFA	10.0	Jackson	June 1970	PFA, HP, S	1.4	
					Kemmerer	March 1972	PF, S	3.0	
<b>WASHINGTON</b>									
Mercer Island	April 1971		PF	19.8	Powell	August 1972	PF, S, O	5.0	
Port Angeles	October 1972		PF	16.5	Riverton	February 1970	PFA, S	6.8	
Puyallup	December 1969		PF	15.0	Rock Springs	January 1970	PF, O	10.3	
					Thermopolis	November 1969	PFA, S	3.9	
					Wheatland	January 1970	PF, O	2.3	

Total—249 systems in service, 20,729,000 population; 60 systems scheduled, 6,788,400 population.

<sup>1</sup> Note the following abbreviations are used—Service provided: A—Ambulance; F—Fire; HP—Highway patrol; O—Other, e.g., poison control, suicide prevention, etc.; P—Police; S—Sheriff.

### LINCOLN AND JIMMY BATTS

### HON. DONALD J. MITCHELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. Mr. Speaker, during the month of February, a great many people from all walks of life took advantage of the opportunity to honor our 16th President. The legend of Abraham Lincoln is familiar to us all and we each have our own favorite anecdote relating to his life. I need not elaborate on the qualities of Lincoln nor on how much he means to us all. However, I did recently read an interesting commentary on Lincoln that was reported in the Utica Observer-Dispatch, a widely respected newspaper in my district. The writer of this column was Mr. Joseph Ray, a member of the newspaper's copy desk staff. Mr. Ray has been the recipient of several Freedom Foundation Awards and is well known in our area for his writings on America and its heritage.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to share this article with my colleagues in the House and with all Americans:

LINCOLN AND JIMMY BATTS  
(By Joseph E. Ray)

The trim six-foot National Park Service Ranger concluded his brief lecture at the base of the 19-foot marble figure of Abraham Lincoln with these words: "The forces that unite us today are greater than the forces that would destroy us."

The crowd drifted away to study the beautiful timeless words of the Second Inaugural engraved on one great wall and the Gettysburg Address on the other and the young man in his neat forest green uniform and Boy Scout campaign hat gathered up his portable mike and speaker and carried them to a tiny office in one corner of the Lincoln Memorial.

I walked up to the young man and seeing his nameplate on his jacket, said: "Mr. Batts, what is your title?"

"I'm called a technician," he said.

"Why did Daniel Chester French (sculptor of the heroic figure) form Lincoln's hands that way?"

"Mr. French was a great supporter of the work for the deaf and dumb and as Lincoln was for ALL people Mr. French wanted all people to see something in the statue. You will notice Lincoln's left hand is closed and the right open. The left forms the letter A in the deaf alphabet and the right forms the letter L."

Taxis were leaving Lincoln lovers at the foot of the broad steps on this magic spring evening.

A man and his wife came up to us leading a small boy, and the mother said to Mr. Batts: "He wants to know where Lincoln is buried."

"In Springfield, Illinois," said Jimmie Batts. (That is the 5th most frequent question Batts gets, the first being when the Memorial was started and completed).

"You gave a very nice speech," I said.

"I wrote it myself. I do my own fact-finding," said Batts. "They tell us what we have to include and let us throw in what else we want."

Some more of what Jimmie Batts "threw" into his speech was this line: "Ladies and gentlemen, you can look out across the reflecting pool as Lincoln does and you see the Washington Monument and beyond it the Capitol. Well, Washington formed the government, represented by the Capitol. We erected the Monument to honor Washington and now Mr. Lincoln sits here and can gaze out at the nation that he saved for us," said he.

The 84 broad steps were alive with people, going up, going down, children all over, old couples resting on the landings, men silently studying the stark, chiseled, living words of the Railsplitter's Second Inaugural.

The evening air was sprinkled with the smell of linden and tulip tree buds. It was not Virginia air, or Maryland air but the fragrant scent of Freedom.

Every minute or two the beautiful spectacle of common Americans honoring the man who considered himself as common as any

(yet surely in his ever-honest heart Abe knew better) was shattered by a jet arriving or departing, its roar an intrusion at this shrine to a simple man who lived in a simple but bloody time.

"I'm alone tonight. One of the other men called in sick," Jimmie Batts said finally.

He left to get his equipment and prepare to deliver his speech again. As he walked away he said to me in his jasmine soft North Carolina accent: "Lincoln was a simple man and a complex man, but also a very great man," and I began the long descent to the street congratulating myself and America that the story of the world's foremost advocate of Government by the People was entrusted to people like Jimmie Batts, a black American who looks up his own facts about our 16th President. And again his closing words drifted down to me on the soft night air . . . "the forces that unite us today are greater than the forces that would destroy us."

And I felt certain, as I gazed once more at those three beautiful glowing beacons of Freedom gracing L'Enfant's spacious Mall, that they and all they represented would last a thousand years.

### TELEVISION BIAS

### HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues an interesting advertisement in this morning's Washington Post, page A-21. The advertisement is entitled "Letters the Editor of the Washington Post Refused to Print," and cost, I might add, approximately \$1,800. The ad was paid for by Accuracy In Media, Inc., 1232 Pennsylvania Building, 425 13th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20004.

The point the insertion is trying to

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 7, 1973

make, and it does it very, very well, is that the media is biased. In this case the Washington Post.

Out of the five letters that the Post refused for one reason or another to run selected by the AIM, I am inserting one concerned with TV bias for the RECORD. It will be found at the conclusion of my remarks.

All I would like to say in this regard is that it is a shame that when the administration is being vilified for being "down" on the press, and supposedly wanting to "twist" the news, the media itself is doing that very thing. The free press in this case has certainly taken several steps backward when it is necessary to set the record straight with an \$1,800 advertisement.

I commend Accuracy In Media, Inc., for bringing this to the attention of the public. They seem to know that the public does indeed have a right to know—in this case it seems, if the price is right.

The insertion concerns itself with previous biases we have all become all to accustomed to recently on network television:

## MORE TV BIAS

Mr. In a recent speech the president of NBC, Julian Goodman, charged that "some Federal Government officials are waging a continuing campaign aimed at intimidating and discrediting the news media." Singling out an official who recently charged that there was bias in TV network news, Mr. Goodman said: "He did not say how we are biased."

Accuracy in Media, Inc. has spelled out in detail many specific cases of TV network bias. Many of these involve NBC, and Mr. Goodman knows of them. He misleads the public when he implies that charges of bias are lacking in documentation.

In the AIM Report for February 1973, we cite the following cases of bias in NBC News programs in recent months.

1. An attack on private pension plans in America in a documentary called "Pensions: The Broken Promise." The program was very one-sided.

2. An attack on private health care systems in a documentary called "What Price Health?" Another one-sided presentation.

3. A documentary on San Francisco's famed Chinatown based entirely on the carping criticisms of two radical youths whose sympathies for Mao Tse-tung came through loud and clear.

4. A documentary about the drug traffic in Southeast Asia transmitting the views of those who wanted to portray America and its Southeast Asian allies in a bad light. At the same time, NBC did not report the testimony on the other side that was given by Marine General Lewis W. Walt before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

It is not the government that is discrediting the networks. The networks are discrediting themselves by their one-sided presentations of controversial issues of public importance.

## JAYCEES ESTABLISH CENTER FOR IMPROVED CHILD NUTRITION

## HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, this week two young men from the U.S. Jaycees'

Center for Improved Child Nutrition in Bloomington, Minn., are walking the Halls of Congress in an attempt to make the Congress more aware of the Jaycee program to improve child nutrition.

Center director, Bob Benedict, is credited with exciting the interest of the national Jaycee organization toward child nutrition. With him in Washington is David Jones, who also works full time for the center.

Most of the Jaycees' work is done directly with school district boards in helping to inform them of the opportunities and alternatives that are available to them in nutritional programs. However, a certain amount of their activities must be legislative. The Jaycees have found that no matter how good the nutritional programs are, they cannot be put into effect in some of our schools because of a lack of adequate kitchen or food handling facilities. Therefore, their principal legislative aim this year is to improve funding for kitchen facilities in schools where no nutrition programs are now being offered.

In the hope that many Members of Congress may be interested in the Jaycee program and in the Center for Improved Child Nutrition, I include here in the RECORD the first edition of the center's newsletter, Common Sense:

## JAYCEES ESTABLISH CENTER FOR IMPROVED CHILD NUTRITION

Following a national campaign last August and September to expand the School Food Program, the U.S. Jaycees have established a National Center for Improved Child Nutrition. The headquarters, located in Bloomington, Minnesota, will serve as the nerve center in the Jaycees' effort to involve nearly 8.7 million children in over 18,000 "no-program" schools.

According to the Center's director, Robert Benedict, who led last fall's legislative campaign, "Studies have shown that it is far less costly and far more humane to deal with a child nutritionally during his formative years than to pay for him both medically and on welfare in later years."

As a result, the new office's primary goal is to individually locate and ascertain the needs of these no-program schools, providing them with up-to-date, concise information and assistance in overcoming the particular obstacles they now face.

"Many school officials just don't know what is available, what costs they will incur, or specifically how to get involved. Moreover, many do not understand how utterly imperative proper nutrition is to a child's physical, mental, and emotional development. This country can make no greater investment than to feed its children."

Recent studies have shown that where school food programs have been introduced into economically deprived areas, they have greatly aided in:

1. Drastically reducing the drop out rate
2. Increasing overall academic performance by up to a grade and a half
3. Substantially decreasing health care problems and costs

In the coming months, the Center will be formulating brochures, organizing statewide workshops, and adding its lobbying impact to the goal of better nutrition for America's children.

## AMERICAN SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE APPLAUDS JAYCEES EFFORT

True builders of peace

"Who are the real builders of peace? Certainly peace is more than merely the absence of war. It is more than merely uprooting the weeds of a garden and letting it lie fallow.

Rather, it is the planting of that which will grow and bring forth fruit. It is the establishment of an environment where a child can progress as far as his God-given abilities will allow him. And in the building of a real 'generation of peace', the true builders of peace are in the audience today."

So began Robert Benedict, National Jaycees Director for Improved Child Nutrition, as he addressed the American School Food Services, Seventh Annual Industry seminar. Speaking to the top members of the food industry and school food service, Benedict continued,

"Proper nutrition is the imperative prerequisite for a child's physical, mental and emotional development. America can make no greater investment than to feed her children."

Benedict, who in 1967 founded a nationwide organization (Teen Corps of America) which has provided millions of dollars worth of goods and services to America's poverty areas, and in 1972 wrote a book (*The Possible Dream*) about his years in the poverty areas, pointed out that,

"It is senseless to talk about improved education in poverty areas, without first talking about improved nutrition."

"And talking about improved medical or dental health, without first regarding improved nutrition, is about the same as putting a bandaid on a broken leg."

"If we really intend to build a 'generation of peace', we must provide our children with the necessary environment. It is the people in the business of feeding children who are the true builders of peace."

Dr. John Perryman, Executive Director of the 49,000 member American School Food Service Association, returned Benedict's visit and addressed the Jaycees Bosses Night in Minneapolis, Minnesota:

"I believe that the Jaycees will add a sizeable and highly significant force to the long and difficult battle of feeding America's children. We of the American School Food Service Association welcome your efforts in this highly crucial endeavor."

In an address met with great response, Perryman was given a standing ovation for 25 years of dedicated service in feeding America's children.

## Breakthrough in Baltimore

Officials from the Maryland School Food Program, the F.N.S., the U.S.D.A., as well as representatives from 30 non-public, "no-program" schools, welcomed the Jaycees into the fight to involve all children in School feeding programs. In his address to the Notre Dame College Child Nutrition Seminar, David Jones, Associate Director of the U.S. Jaycees Center for Improved Child Nutrition, explained that,

"We as Jaycees do not intend to tell non-public schools what your needs are, but rather to listen to your needs and do all we can to help you feed your students."

The seminar, which materialized through the imagination and hard work of Miss Eleanor Weagly, Coordinator of Maryland Food Service Programs, provided such school food service experts as Dewey Wood and Tom Heafy of the F.N.S. and Dave Overbagh of the U.S.D.A.

According to Overbagh:

"One of the major road blocks facing these private schools is lack of information. I think the Jaycees can have a tremendous impact in this area through publicity and through direct contact with the schools. We must also convince these schools that government aid in the kitchen does not lead to government control in the classroom."

The seminar apparently did a superior job of informing and convincing. At the day's end, four schools were ready to begin programs and most of the other schools requested in-depth information as to how programs could be most economically instituted in their situations.

**Legislative Help**

The Chicago Jaycees were there in force at the Jaycees "mini-seminar", and were interested not only in seeing Chicago's children fed, but in viewing the national plan of action for reaching over eight million children in 18,000 "no-program" schools.

The Chicago Jaycees effort is led by a young "fireball" named Amy Nielson, who is already lining up allies for the nutritional campaign.

"If the real need is to increase the awareness of parents, the public, and politicians, as well as increasing our legislative impact, we are going to need other community groups beyond the Jaycees."

Nielson has already laid the ground work for a joining of efforts with the national P.T.A., and will be meeting with the P.T.A., national president later this month.

**Jaycees Center receives funding**

Convinced that the Jaycees effort to involve "no-program" schools will work, two organizations have already granted their economic support. The National Child Nutrition Project, headed by Mr. Lewis Straus, has contributed \$20,000 for the period from March 1, 1973 to February 28, 1974.

"I fully believe the impact of the U.S. Jaycees entrance into this field will be felt heavily. They are a well respected national group that will swing a good deal of weight in locales across the country. Their approach of having local people talk to local people, about a local situation, is going to have impact."

The National Child Nutrition Project will also be providing the Jaycees effort with technical and resource assistance.

Also received to date is a \$2,000 grant by the Eli Lilly Foundation, which has long been active in the fields of human improvement.

Yet, while the Jaycees effort is really gathering steam, it is still in need of funding. According to Jerry Kane, Publicity Director for the Center,

"We still need from \$50-60,000 to conduct the type of effort necessary to reach those eight million kids."

If you are interested in supporting the Jaycees effort, please write:

Jerry Kane, U.S. Jaycees Center for Improved Child Nutrition, 8200 Humboldt Avenue, Bloomington, Minnesota 55431.

**Excitement in Chicago**

With over 235 non-public schools unable to obtain access to the School Food Program, the Jaycees scheduled a "mini-seminar" in Chicago to see what could be done. Sponsored by Swift and Company, the all day session brought together some of the "big guns" in the nutrition field, including Dr. Paul LaChance of Rutgers University; Dr. John Murphy of Swift's Research and Development Center; and Jaycees personnel from throughout the country.

The main problem facing Chicago's non-public schools was outlined by a determined and capable Irishman named Jim O'Malley.

"Just getting parents and residents to understand the program is the major obstacle we face. Once they understand it, they're sold."

A coordinated effort emerged from the seminar, designed to do just that. O'Malley, Director of School Lunch for the archdiocese of Chicago, and Robert Cobb of the South East Jaycees have set the wheels of progress in motion. O'Malley stated—

"We're keying on 35 core-city schools that desperately need the program, and will work out to the peripheral 200 schools from there."

The Jaycee "Plan of Action" includes the door-to-door dissemination of circulars, placing posters in local stores, and securing major publicity about the positive effects of the program in local publications.

According to Robert Cobb, who is leading the effort for Chicago's South End Jaycees:

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

"We fully understand the necessary of this program, and if it takes going door-to-door to tell about it, we've got the manpower and desire to do just that. We intend to see the children of Chicago fed."

**Swift makes it happen**

The Jaycees Chicago "mini-seminar" was made possible through the kindness of Swift and Company. Swift not only provided the excellent meeting facilities at their Research and Development Center, but a \$2,000 grant to get the top nutritional and Jaycees personnel to the conference. The success of the Chicago effort is due in large part, to the concern and generosity of Swift and Company.

**MICHIGAN AND MINNESOTA—NEXT TARGET AREAS****Michigan goal—Over 600,000 children**

A statewide Jaycees seminar is planned for late April, to involve over 600,000 children in Michigan's more than 1,000 "no-program" schools. Jaycee chapter presidents, local school personnel, and city mayors are being invited to an all day seminar that will:

1. Explain the program's value in investment terms. This will include specific information dealing with the relationship between introduction of the school Food Program and:

- (a) Decreased drop-out rate.
- (b) Upgrading of academic achievement.
- (c) Reduction of health care problems and costs.

(d) Increased federal revenue into a community, as well as increased employment.

Overall emphasis will be on the role of the School Food Program in producing a healthier, more educated citizenry, that is far more able to break the poverty cycle.

2. Provide testimonies of a teacher, principal, and school board member as to the value of the program to the students physical, mental and emotional performance.

3. Outline presentations on the numerous methods available for installing breakfast and lunch programs.

4. Distribute an information packet, containing:

- (a) Application form
- (b) Simplified version of regulations and steps required for involvement

5. Displays and presentations by food industries involved in breakfast, lunch systems.

The seminar will be preceded by a major mailing of Jaycees brochure and cover letter, as well as a massive public campaign.

**Minnesota—Minneapolis' 19 schools**

"It is tragic that these children should not have some type of feeding opportunity."

So stated Lowell C. Kruse, President of the Minneapolis Jaycees, in referring to Minneapolis' 19 "no-program" schools:

"This is especially detestable, since it was the Minneapolis chapter that sponsored the school Lunch Resolution to the U.S. Jaycees National Convention. It is highly important to clear up this problem in our own back yard."

The Jaycees nutritional center has organized a seminar for mid-March to do just that—feed American children whoever they might be.

**ARE RISING FOOD PRICES PART OF "PEACE WITH PROSPERITY?"****HON. JEROME R. WALDIE**

OF CALIFORNIA

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a rather eloquent letter from one of my constituents, Mr. Frank H. Hitchcock of Martinez, Calif., regarding

the soaring price of food, and his reaction to the present administration's handling of this problem. Mr. Hitchcock began the letter by enclosing two articles from the front page of the San Francisco Examiner, February 21, 1973, which pointed out the disparity between the goals of President Nixon's programs, and the actual results. The relative excerpts from the articles follow:

**NIXON PREDICTS PEACE WITH PROSPERITY**

(By David Barnett)

WASHINGTON.—President Nixon said today the United States can look forward to a prolonged period of "genuine prosperity in a time of peace" for the first time in nearly 20 years.

**MEATLESS DAY A WEEK IS URGED**

WASHINGTON.—The Nixon administration disclosing that food prices last month took the biggest jump in a generation, says consumers might consider going meatless one day a week, or maybe switching from hamburger to cheese.

After quoting the above articles, Mr. Hitchcock continues, as follows:

Frankly I would be happy to settle for one meatless day per week in lieu of the two or three that we must have in these days of high prices and a fixed income.

I don't know what you can do about it but I am sure that one voice raised in the House of Representatives can be heard better than one in two hundred million people.

So please stand up and yell.

Sincerely,

FRANK H. HITCHCOCK.

P.S. It is difficult to remain calm when a high salaried appointed member of the Administration says that consumers might consider going meatless one day a week, or switching from hamburger to cheese, when you know that he is going home to a nice slice or roast beef, and if he isn't it's not because he can't afford it.

It is unbelievable that the Administration can't do something to stop the inflation and rising food prices. 2.5% for January—Ridiculous!

It is ridiculous, indeed, and as an elected representative of people like Frank Hitchcock, I feel it is my obligation to stress the thorough discontent running throughout our country over the inflationary trend in the price of food-stuffs. The administration uses wage controls to maintain the levels of income received by the average laborers, the people on fixed incomes, while at the same time does relatively little to keep prices low in our neighborhood supermarkets. In fact, we are told to expect prices to continue to rise. We can also expect to continue receiving thousands of letters like the one Mr. Hitchcock has sent until the administration makes a successful effort at keeping prices down.

Frank Hitchcock has asked me to stand up and yell in the House of Representatives because he is only one in 200 million. However, I stand here today not because of one individual, but because hundreds of thousands of people like him across the land are affected in exactly the same way Mr. Hitchcock describes. And Mr. Hitchcock, who faces the daily hardships inflicted by the present economic state of affairs, perhaps states it more eloquently, more personally at least, than I could ever hope to. Thank you, Mr. Hitchcock. Although you are only one in 200 million, your voice has been

heard in the U.S. Congress. Perhaps it can have an effect. Hopefully, someday soon, your family and families across the country, will be able to enjoy a complete meal, including the meat that you now forego, without worrying where the next meal is coming from, or how frightfully expensive it will be.

THE URGENT NEED TO INSURE THE  
RIGHT TO LIFE

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply distressed at the recent Supreme Court ruling on abortion. The Court, in its decision striking down the laws of Texas and Georgia regulating abortion, has in my opinion misapplied the exercise of the power of judicial review. I can find no justification in the Constitution for the imposition of this improvident decision on the people and the legislatures of the 50 States. The Supreme Court has proscribed definite standards and criteria with regard to what kind of fetuses may have their lives extinguished and what type may be given the right to be born. Such a ruling fails to protect the most basic human right—the right to life.

Mr. Speaker, this new legal arrangement is a step backwards in the protection of the sanctity of life. The Court holdings are contrary to the fundamental principles of morality, and contrary to the best interest of the American people. In an attempt to bring about a reversal of the Supreme Court decision and to restore respect for unborn human life in our society, I have recently introduced an amendment to the Constitution which would insure that due process and equal protection are afforded to an individual from the moment of conception.

Mr. Speaker, I have received over a thousand letters of protest against the Supreme Court decision within a month after the abortion ruling. One letter which caught my attention in particular was from an understandably distraught mother who included a letter written by her 14-year-old daughter. The genuineness and sense of deep concern expressed in the letter of Mrs. Joyce Josten's daughter, Charlotte, reveals the conscience, the ideals, and the aspirations of this young lady. The affirmations of Miss Josten are a response on behalf of the many voiceless, unrepenting lives that have been condemned by the Court in the interests of convenience and expediency.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to insert Miss Josten's letter in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

WAUWATOSA, WIS.,  
February 22, 1973.

DEAR HON. CLEMENT ZABLOCKI: I am enclosing, along with my letter, a letter written by my fourteen year old daughter.

She has been asking questions, such as, what is abortion, how is it done, and most important, why. When you raise children to respect even the smallest form of life, it is

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

difficult to answer the question, why abortion. Because of her concern, I told her she should write her feelings down.

I feel that no human being has the right to play God or has the power to say who lives and who doesn't. I also feel everyone has to answer for the things one has done. It is extremely difficult for me to understand how anyone could take part in abortion and feel that they have done a service to humanity.

I could go on, but, I wanted to be brief, so that this letter would be read.

Sincerely,

MRS. JOYCE JOSTEN.

DEAR HON. CLEMENT ZABLOCKI: I really feel that I have something to say on the decision the Supreme Court made on abortion recently.

I'm really very concerned about this. I feel the babies that had been and still are being aborted have as much right to live as anybody else.

I asked myself this one question, "What if one of those unfortunate babies were me?" This really set me thinking. If the Constitution promises anyone life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness why deprive those babies of what the Constitution promises them—Life?

Who can tell what those aborted babies had to give this world? They might have been doctors, lawyers, scientists, manual labor workers, and who knows what else, but somebody didn't give them a chance.

My personal opinion of abortion is that it is nothing short of murder, yet worse because those innocent babies cannot fight back, or in any way protect themselves.

Although this is only one letter I sure hope this can change someone's thinking on this very controversial topic—abortion.

Sincerely,

CHARLOTTE JOSTEN.

STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS  
SHOULD BEWARE OF GIFTS

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, as one who has supported revenue sharing in the past, I am amazed that many State and local officials have not learned, as I am forced to admit, the bitter lesson that what President Nixon is advocating is not a sharing of anything but the chaos of a dispersal of the Nation's problems and a reduction in social programs in order that certain favored Federal taxpayers will not be forced into assuming a greater share of the burden.

No one doubts that most of the local governments are hard pressed and need financial assistance—no one, that is, except the President, who flatly asserts the "hour of crisis has passed," and on that rosy note he is willing to turn great national problems of housing, health, manpower, and transportation over to local officials, but with limited cash, glowing promises, and assurances that "they know best" how to deal with the multitudinous problems which will be on their doorstep by July of this year.

If these local officials are depending on sharing revenues collected by a Federal Government as heavily in debt as the present one—and are expecting the Congress to back the President's "deals"

being made with them, they should take the time to read the editorial in the Washington Post under date of March 7, 1973.

In order that this notice of caution may be given greater public attention, I offer it for the RECORD and suggest that my friends in local government take heed:

POVERTY WITH HONOR

President Nixon seems to be applying to the cities the strategy that Senator Aiken recommended years ago for Vietnam: He is declaring victory and withdrawing his troops. It can only be a matter of time before the President declares that he has achieved—what? Poverty with honor? "The hour of crisis has passed," Mr. Nixon proclaimed last weekend. "The ship of state is back on an even keel, and we can put behind us the fear of capsizing." In fact, this suggests that the administration's urban mission over the past four years was primarily to quiet the cities and put down the poor. It is a curious, approach, heralding a retreat which is neither warranted nor wise.

Mr. Nixon's assessment of the state of the cities indicates that a few items might have been left out of his daily news summaries recently. "City governments are no longer on the verge of financial catastrophe," he stated. But there is Detroit, where the public schools are fast running out of funds. There is Philadelphia, where the school system has barely avoided collapse. There is Newark on the edge of bankruptcy. There is Gary, Indiana, where—according to a sobering analysis by Godfrey Hodgson and George Crile in Sunday's Outlook section—the white community which dominates the local economy is pulling out, leaving a largely black, poor population unable to cope. There is the massive concentration of physical decay and social devastation in New York's South Bronx, surveyed recently in the New York Times. There is the fear and desolation in the highest-crime blocks of Washington along 14th Street, which John Saar described in this newspaper on Sunday.

When Mr. Nixon's claims of progress are measured against these realities, the gains don't disappear—but they certainly shrink. The President emphasized, for instance, that crime is dropping "in more than half of our major cities." To the extent that crime statistics relate to actual crime, any reduction is an accomplishment. But reported crime is still rising, though slowly, in the suburbs, and violence and fear still permeate too many urban neighborhoods. Similarly, the urban air may be getting cleaner, as Mr. Nixon announced but in more than two dozen cities it is still so unhealthy that traffic controls will have to be imposed to meet the 1975 air quality standards. And to say that a poor child in a rat-ridden ghetto might be breathing slightly more easily these days is not to say that child has any better prospects for a decent home, a solid education, a productive job or a healthy life. To say that a working-class family in an aging neighborhood might be slightly less afraid is not to say that family has been relieved of its heavy tax burdens or its sense of insecurity.

The situation in the cities is nowhere near as rosy as the President maintains. But the same token, federal programs for the cities, in the aggregate, have not been ruinous, as he pretends. Some of those programs were hastily conceived, many were under-funded, and most have come due for review. But his complaint about "high-cost, no-result boondoggling" is wide of the mark. Indeed, most cities could not have achieved even limited gains since the "hour of crisis" unless some federal assistance had been timely and well-targeted.

It is worth recalling that federal intervention in the cities, as in other areas of national need, has had two aims: to provide resources which state and local governments

lacked, and to focus public effort on serious problems which communities were not equipped or inclined to take on by themselves.

Mr. Nixon used to recognize this. The heart of his welfare reform program, now abandoned, was the national assumption of responsibility for the problem of poverty. Back in the early days of his first term, there were even a few attempts to shape an enlightened urban strategy, one which recognized that the underlying social and economic woes of central cities often require regional solutions.

But those constructive efforts have now been jettisoned, along with everything else. Mr. Nixon seems to believe, despite all the evidence to the contrary, that urban governments have been so enhanced, and urban problems somehow so reduced, that all the cities need from Washington is money—and less of that than before, it comes down to a prescription for self-reliance coupled with the elimination of those programs that could help people achieve it.

**A BILL TO AMEND SECTION 40(b)  
OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT  
OF 1970**

**HON. FRANK M. CLARK**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 7, 1973*

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill I have introduced today is to correct a gross inequity caused by circumstances unknown to the Congress at the time the Merchant Marine Act of 1970 was being considered and passed.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 (sec. 805(c)) contained a limitation of \$25,000 upon amounts which could be paid to seagoing personnel for which subsidy reimbursements could be made. This limitation did not have any practical effect until about the middle 1960's, when a number of the officer ratings aboard American-flag vessels began to receive in excess of \$25,000. As the ensuing years went on, the amounts paid out in excess of the limitation grew considerably.

When the Merchant Marine Act of 1970 was drawn up, one of the purposes was to reimburse companies for payments in excess of the limitation amount. However, as a prerequisite to entitlement for this payment, a company must have had an operating-differential subsidy contract on October 21, 1970, the date the act was signed, and also must give up its existing contract in exchange for a new operating-differential subsidy contract containing the new subsidy formula contained in the 1970 act.

At the time the bill was drawn—sometime during the year 1969—all the subsidized lines were, of course, covered by operating-differential subsidy contracts and, therefore, eligible to recover the excess subsidy payments. However, the contract covering the vessels owned and operated by United States Lines was due to expire late in 1969. United States Lines applied for a 2-year extension of its contract.

Just about that time, this particular company was in the process of converting its conventional break-bulk vessels to containerships. In view of this, the

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

Maritime Subsidy Board, by action dated February 16, 1970, extended the subsidy contract only for 6 months, which was the period estimated for complete conversion of the vessels to container types.

The Maritime Administration felt that this revolutionary new type of vessel was so efficient and so vastly superior to the types of vessels then being operated by foreign competitors that they could be operated profitably without the assistance of Government subsidy. United States Lines was willing to accept this challenge, and to try to operate the vessels without subsidy.

Had United States Lines been granted the extension of 2 years for which it applied, the matter of "over \$25,000" participation would have been resolved, with the payments called for by the 1970 act. Thus, as a consequence of the action taken by the Maritime Subsidy Board, and by reason of the courage and enterprise displayed by the company in trying to make a go of it without Government aid, United States Lines did not have an operating-differential subsidy on the date the 1970 act was passed—namely, October 21, 1970—and therefore was not eligible to receive substantial back amounts paid out over a period of almost 10 years, which exceed the \$25,000 limitation.

This resulted in the anomalous situation of companies which continued on subsidy—albeit a different formula for subsidy—being able to recoup the excess salary amounts, but a company like United States Lines, which elected to try to make it on its own—without Government assistance—was foreclosed from recouping the excess salary payments.

I firmly believe that this is a very inequitable situation, one which neither the Congress nor the executive branch intended, and one which Congress should now remedy. That is the purpose of this bill.

**STUDENT AID**

**HON. JOHN DELLENBACK**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 7, 1973*

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, with some sobering decisions on aid to education, and particularly aid to students, close at hand for the Congress, I want to share with my colleagues excerpts from an address recently delivered to the Southern Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators by R. Frank Mensel, vice president of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Mr. Mensel has done an excellent job of projecting the great possibilities for expanded learning opportunities which are at hand for student aid in the basic educational opportunity grants enacted last year. This program takes dead aim on one of President Nixon's highest priority goals—to give the Americans who need college and career studies the chance to get them, and not be locked out of the system by financial need as many presently are.

Those colleges hurt by leveling enrollments should look very hard, as Mr. Mensel suggests, at the potential of the basic grants. BOG's brings to higher and postsecondary education an opportunity floor that was never possible under the old programs. In our judgment, BOG not only gives the student greater entry power, but transfer power and staying power as well.

In recognizing these great possibilities, Mr. Mensel's views run very much in harmony with the stand that the National Association of Student Financial Aid Officers has just taken. It is very important that Congress proceed with dispatch to fund President Nixon's fiscal year 1973 and fiscal year 1974 requests for the BOG.

Excerpts from Mr. Mensel's talk follow:

ADDRESS TO THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF STUDENT FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATION, JACKSONVILLE, FLA., FEBRUARY 20, 1973

(By F. Frank Mensel)

I would fly a thousand miles any time to visit with such a group of college student financial aid officers. I think there is nothing on the campus today more important to higher education and its future than you and the work you are doing. And I say this to college presidents every chance I get. There seem to be many colleges still that have novices running their student aid programs. Such colleges are losing untold enrollment and income. The loss to community colleges is incalculable. Student financial aid work should be among the highest professional posts on the campus.

Your leadership asked me here to talk about two things—the Educational Amendments of 1972 and the struggle to get them funded with, of course, special emphasis on the student aid. I know I don't have to explain to this audience the difference between the two. Between authorization and fundings. At this moment, the gap between the two runs almost \$5 billion.

If we're candid with ourselves, we know the gap is partly of our own making. It is one more yardstick of the credibility gap that education must contend with.

And to our credit, we are, I think, stepping up the fight on both fronts. Against the funding gaps. And against information, or credibility gaps.

Essentially, I hope I can get just three points across here today that relate to the '72 Amendments and the funding outlook. Naturally, funding looms biggest in all of our minds. But let me make two other points first, and then get back to funding.

All of us are going to make the most of the new authorization only if we do our best to see what Congress had in mind in writing it. So first, let's examine Congressional intent.

I think I can sum it up very simply. Congress did not write P.L. 92-318 for the benefit of institutions. Or the benefit of educators. It wrote it for the benefit of people. The people who want and need more postsecondary opportunity, which in part means new and more comprehensive kinds of college programs.

The Congress is asking the States to put their postsecondary houses in order. To get the graduate school, the community college, the private college, and the vocational leadership all working together as peers. And to plan and coordinate programs that give first priority to the need, the interest, and the convenience of the consumer—not the interest and convenience of the institution.

The focus of this bill is the student. The consumer of our services. We're going to have to show that we are meeting this in-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

terest and this challenge, if we want to sustain and hopefully expand our base of federal support.

With the consumer, we get to my second point. It is this same focus which accounts for the advent of Basic Educational Opportunity Grants—or BOG's or Pell Grants, for short. Here, I know, we get on to touchy ground for many of you.

Understandably so. Many of you have worked with the old student aid programs for a long time. You have grown very comfortable with them. You have a great pride in them, and a protective instinct toward them. Rightly so. Much good has come into the lives of thousands upon thousands of students through these programs.

In Basic Grants, you are in some degree moving from the known into the unknown. That is not easy. But I hope you can see the enormous promise of the BOG concept, and the much greater dollar potential for students over the long haul.

While we are on touchy ground, too, let me make a point about slumping enrollments. The colleges that are hit by falling or leveling enrollments should look especially hard at Basic Grants. If we can ever succeed in getting BOG well funded, a lot more students will be showing up at your doors. New students. Older students.

Remember that roughly a quarter of our students are emancipated students, who are running their own households. They are not living in the dormitories. They are not living off mom and dad. They are getting their own start in life—on their own—and they are trying to complete their education at the same time.

I happen to think, from my own experience, that this too has been part of the new dawn that came to the campus with the old GI bill. I was in high school when World War II ended, so I just missed by a year or two the usual stint in the service and the GI benefits. Most of the friends I made in college were veterans, living on the GI bill. They weren't waiting around for a sheepskin to get a job and start a family. So neither did I. I got a job. I started a family. And in my own sweet time, I finished my education.

This is typical of great numbers of our students today. I find it especially true of community college students. The luxury of higher education was beyond their reach when they left high school, so they got a job. As they have gained economic security, and with it perhaps a better sense of what they would like to study for, they are returning to the campus. In the urban community colleges, the average student age runs 26 or 27 years.

BOG's will help many, many more such students go to college. BOG's will bring a lot more full-time students into higher education.

Do colleges have something against the part-time student? I don't really think so. But it easily looks that way—from the way most colleges operate, and from the way most of our laws have worked in the past.

Up to now the full-time student has been getting all the breaks, while the part-time student who has a job and possibly a family is paying taxes that support both his own schooling and that of the non-working student.

More and more colleges are getting into curricula that suit the convenience of the working student. But I think we have hardly scratched the surface in going to the lengths we ought to go in flexibility, diversity and comprehensiveness.

I still hear college leaders say, "Oh, we just can't get our faculty to take those evening courses—or those week-end courses." When are we going to get over the notion that the institution exists for the benefit of the teacher? Or for the convenience of any

other professional? If twenty people on the graveyard shift in the nearest plant want sociology, or Spanish, at 11 p.m., then your college ought to furnish the teacher. And you ought to go looking for such chances to serve. If you don't meet the need, your competition soon will.

Recruit part-time faculty, from your business world, for those irregular courses! It will often turn out that they know more about the field they are teaching, anyway, because they work in it every day. Just watch—the more such part-time faculty you enlist, the faster your regular faculty will make themselves available at special hours.

So much for the sermonizing, and back to BOG's. Let me talk specifically for a moment to my junior college colleagues.

Imagine that for the next fiscal year—1974—BOG were fully funded. Should the program go full bore, \$1.5 billion might handle the student demand. We're talking now about grants to be made in the 1974-75 school year—a year from next September.

Bear in mind, too, that the Nixon Administration has already requested \$959 million for BOG for that school year. So the figures—our estimate and the Nixon request—are not that far apart. Parenthetically, that would be one of the great advantages of having the BOG partially installed and running in the coming school year—it would give us a much clearer fix on just how heavy the BOG demand would be.

Right now all we have are "educated" guesses—and I use the modifier loosely.

But if BOG were fully funded, the community college share of the dollars would run in the neighborhood of 20 to 25%. A recent estimate from the College Entrance Examination Board's Washington staff is 22% for the community college students.

Figures can be confusing. I want to emphasize again that the figures I've just given are a division of the dollars—not of enrollments. If we looked at total enrollment in higher education, the percentage of community college students receiving BOG's would run still higher, of course, because their grants would be smaller on the average than those going to students in the resident, private, and higher-cost colleges.

Just to give you CEEB's full projection, based on BOG funding of \$1.5 billion, it reads as follows:

22%—community college.  
2%—private junior colleges.  
24%—public universities.  
30%—public four-year colleges.  
5%—private universities.  
17%—private four-year colleges.

Like so many of higher education's leadership in Washington, we use CEEB's data because, up to now, CEEB has been the most diligent collector of information and analysis on students and student aid. If any of you have data you think is better, we would love to hear from you.

This could easily get me off on another great woe of higher education—the lack of data.

All of us are increasingly vulnerable—the community colleges, the state colleges, the vocational schools, everybody! On our lack of strong figures to give the Congress and the Administration. Those who fear that the federal commitment to higher education is peaking out, or in fact has already peaked—and I personally do not for a moment concede that it has—had better get down to some heavy, heavy, old-fashioned homework.

Who are you serving? What are their needs? What are you giving them? And more important, what is the applied value—where are they going on what you give them?

And equally important, who are the constituencies you might serve but are not yet reaching? What are their needs?

Some educators are now arguing that education, and particularly higher education, cannot be all things to all people. I won't

settle for that. When higher education ceases to be open-ended, it will cease to be education.

If we think in terms of a more modest beginning for BOG—say \$200 million to \$250 million for the current fiscal year, and thus for students starting next September; or better still, the \$622 million that the President's budget asks for—then the community college students are going to draw a still larger percentage, perhaps as much as 30%. That should be obvious, since the concept of rated reduction would apply, and the smaller grants would be cut less, relatively speaking.

Compare this, community colleges, with what you've been getting as a share of EOG.

In California, where the community colleges now enroll one out of every 11 or 12 Americans pursuing any program of higher education and now claim three-fourths of California's freshman, the community colleges have been getting less than 4% of the EOG funds allocated to that state.

Think of it—community colleges—CEEB estimates that more than 50% of all students presently enrolled in your programs would be eligible for BOG!

There are some other figures the community colleges and the rest of higher education ought to take to heart.

Did you know that of all the students enrolled in colleges in the 1970-71 school year, more than 40% of those from family incomes of \$4,000 or less were in the community colleges? The community colleges are carrying almost a million more students now than they were in 1970—so that figure has to be still higher.

Did you know that of all the Blacks in college, well over 40% are in the community colleges? That figure today could be crowding 50%. Our minority enrollment now dwarfs that of any other segment of higher education—and I make no exception for the Black colleges. Did you know that more than 50% of the Chicanos in college are in community colleges? At least that is CEEB's calculation for the five States of the great Southwest.

I also see BOG as the way around the stratification in higher education that my figures have brought into the picture.

Yes, BOG is going to bring more students into the community college. Coupled with SOG and Work-Study, it is going to bring more students into every other kind of college—proprietary as well as non-profit, public as well as private.

It not only helps more kids start college. It will help a lot more finish.

It will smooth and ensure the transfer of a lot more junior college students to four-year colleges. A lot more of the Blacks and Chicanos who are starting two-year programs at Dallas' El Centro, or in Los Angeles City Colleges, will wind up finishing four-year and higher degrees at the SMU's and UCLA's.

The bigger, more comprehensive the foundation that the community colleges become, the more all colleges have at stake. The worst mistake education could make is to let the community colleges become the slums of higher education, as some recent articles have speculated. And you can be sure the community colleges are not about to let that happen.

Within the minority enrollment itself, there are some startling facts that I think all of us have to worry about. If you look at all the Blacks who made A averages in high school, and compare them with the white segment that got A's, three times as many Blacks as whites, in proportional terms, wind up in community colleges.

If you then compare the segments that earned B averages in high school, twice as many Blacks as white attend community colleges.

If I sound divisive, believe me, I intend quite the opposite. I do not give these figures to boast about what the community colleges

March 7, 1973

are doing. I give them out of deep concern for all of higher education.

Some may feel the urge to say, if the community colleges are doing all of that, or if the community colleges are going to get all of that—all the more reason to fight for the old programs, and forget BOG. Such thinking, in my view, is the road to oblivion for student aid programs.

It is not your job to save old programs. It is not your job—and I do not care whether you are a university SFA officer or a community college SFA officer—to decide what is good for the student. This smacks of the elitism that has been strangling higher education. Many voices must be considered. Besides, that battle is over. BOG is the law of the land. I also think it is the road to the future, and a much greater future both for student financial aid and the SFA administrator. It takes little imagination to see the possibilities.

I mentioned the heyday of the GI bill. Many remember it as the high mark, the golden day of our long proud march forward in higher education. It all happened quite simply because a multitude of Americans who once could only dream of going to college suddenly could afford to go. The concept was simple—entitlement.

The concept of BOG is simple—entitlement. And through it, higher education, all the colleges here, can reach still greater heights.

What then is the funding outlook?

I see at least two major battles ahead. The first is to settle the student support for this fiscal year, 1973—the aid that will flow to students in the coming academic year. This could be settled in a Supplemental Appropriations Act, or perhaps added to some other funding vehicle. All of us agree it has to be settled quick.

Some in Congress, including Committee leaders who helped lead the bi-partisan drive for the adoption of the 1972 Amendments, are calling for both the approval of the President's requests and the application of the law. The student lobbies in Washington have another way of saying it—the harder we push for BOG, the better our chances of getting the ongoing programs, because the law requires the latter to be funded first. I really think all of us are saying the same thing, and working for the same thing.

The simple arithmetic is that, if we get both, the total student aid could break the billion-dollar mark. If the Congress voted what the President wants this year for BOG, \$622 million, and for Work-Study, \$250 million, then added what the law requires for Supplemental Grants, \$130 million, that's \$1 billion!

Then, too, if Congress also funds in this package, or in the FY 1974 package, what the law provides for direct loans (NDSL), which is another \$293 million (this is not necessarily a forward-funded program, as the others are), next year's students would draw benefits of \$1.3 billion—far more help to far more people than ever before.

More important than any immediate total is the long-range potential of the entitlement concept—the prospect it may hold for less stringent budgetary times.

Please forgive another digression, but let me toss in one more consideration for the colleges that are worried about levelling enrollments and partially filled campus housing. Why not revamp regulations to open your married student housing—and your housing for singles, for that matter—to students, man or wife, who are taking a half-time load?

Educators like to think they have a sense of history. We like to talk about perspective, continuity and continuum. Let's remember that if those of us working for higher education have wanted anything from federal support over the years, it has been

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

institutional aid, or capitation grants. Choose your own term for it. It is higher education's oldest and fondest dream.

Congress has breathed the first real life into that dream. Congress has met us halfway, yes more than half-way. It has said to the college world, prove to us that you can make your great gifts work for the nation as a whole—show us you can serve the less-affluent generally, as well as the affluent; show us that you can embrace more options and more needs—then bring us the proof, bring us the supporting data, document what it is you are doing and who is benefitting—and the institutional dollars can flow. Such provision is right there in the '72 Amendments. And you hold the key to all of this. The key is the student aid. You labor in a great challenge, and we are glad to be a part of it, and to be working with you.

### COST OF TRADE BARRIERS PUT OVER \$7.5 BILLION

**HON. BILL FRENZEL**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 7, 1973*

**MR. FRENZEL.** Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of March 5 carried an article under the by-line of Post staff writer Hobart Rowen which does a good job of outlining the economic impact of trade barriers and protectionism. The article reviews a Brookings Institution paper by Professor Magee of the University of Chicago. It reports Magee finding that the total cost to the United States of existing tariff and quota barriers now runs from \$7½ billion to \$10½ billion per year. Mr. Rowen indicates that that cost "would ultimately be doubled" if the controversial Burke-Hartke quota bill should become law.

Professor Magee's analysis indicates that 15 years after passage, losses from the Burke-Hartke bill would mount so rapidly that they could not be calculated.

In my judgment, the Rowen-Magee article is must reading for every Member of Congress now. The article follows:

**COST OF TRADE BARRIERS PUT OVER  
\$7.5 BILLION**

(By Hobart Rowen)

For the first time, a serious effort to "measure the unmeasurable"—the economic impact of trade barriers and protectionism—has produced dollar estimates of the costs.

The results are staggering, and although they are represented to be no better than "ballpark" estimates, they were considered important enough to be included in the latest edition of Brookings Institution papers.

The author is Prof. Stephen Magee of the University of Chicago, who found that the total costs to the U.S. of existing tariff and quota barriers now runs \$7.5 to \$10.5 billion a year—a cost that would ultimately be doubled if the controversial Burke-Hartke quota bill should become law.

Of current restrictions, the cost of U.S. import barriers of one kind or another is estimated at \$3.3 to \$5.0 billion a year, mostly due to quotas. Foreign restrictions on U.S. agricultural exports cost the nation \$4 to \$5 billion a year. Foreign tariffs on manufactured U.S. goods cost relatively little—\$300 million to \$500 million a year.

The Burke-Hartke proportional quota provisions, Magee said, would cost the United States \$1.1 billion a year for the first

five years, \$3.5 billion per year in the second five years, and at least \$7 billion a year in the third five years after enactment. Losses from Burke-Hartke after that mount so rapidly that Magee said they couldn't be calculated.

Looking at it another way, Magee reports that the U.S. has already suffered a "welfare loss" of \$120 billion because of existing restrictions on imports, and that foreign restrictions on our exports account for another \$137 billion loss.

The Burke-Hartke bill, which he labels "an extreme protectionist proposal," would ultimately create a new welfare loss of \$130 billion, \$80 billion of which would come within the first 15 years after enactment.

Magee's "welfare loss" concept capitalizes the gains that would result from free trade over time, using an interest rate factor of 8 per cent. Thus, taking 8 per cent, he calculates that existing U.S. restrictions on imports impose a net welfare loss of \$120 billion. Or, turning it the other way around, if there were free trade, the nation would gain the equivalent of an investment of \$120 billion yielding 8 per cent in perpetuity, now lost because of import restrictions; and \$137 billion lost because of export restrictions.

Magee's paper relies on highly technical mathematical formulae. To over-simplify, his cost figures represent a "welfare loss," which means the reduction in overall benefits to consumers when tariffs and quotas result in the payment of higher prices or less efficient goods and services.

Some of the higher price burden, he concedes, merely represents a shift of income from American consumers to American producers. But a part of the added cost is a "deadweight loss," with no offsetting benefits to other Americans, and thus represents a loss of "welfare."

For example, a high tariff causes a real loss when less satisfactory products must be substituted for protected ones. Quota restrictions cause a loss in two ways—creating an artificial scarcity that drives up prices, and in the loss of potential tariff revenue.

Quotas, Magee, said, also "stimulate monopoly behavior" and "hide the actual rate of protection given."

Similarly on the export side: restrictions raise costs to American producers, and deter some production that would be the most economic, resulting in the loss of jobs and profits.

In publishing Magee's paper, the Brookings Institution mentioned that there is no precise evidence on the extent to which consumers shift buying habits because of price. "He (Magee) has to rely on bits and scraps of evidence and on heroic assumptions," Brookings said.

Thus, the dollar estimates should be considered as "gauges of orders of magnitude, rather than pinpointed amounts."

Nonetheless, the amounts suggested by Magee are so vast that they are expected to evoke wide discussion, particularly with the debate over trade legislation and the Burke-Hartke bill promising to be bitter this year.

Magee's number work underscores the especially high cost of quota restrictions, the main device of the Burke-Hartke bill. Of the \$120 billion welfare loss on the import side, nearly \$90 billion is traced to quotas on oil, steel, textiles, sugar and a few other commodities, and only \$33 billion from tariffs.

As to exports, the overwhelming loss is associated with foreign protectionist devices on agriculture. He says these cost \$125 billion of the \$137 billion total, which explains why the U.S. is anxious to get the Common Market to modify its restrictive variable-levy pricing system.

Magee concedes that a shift to free trade would cause a "transitional" loss of jobs in industries here that compete with imports. He also admits that free trade would alter the job mix, with a redistribution of income away

from low-wage earners. But he argues that over the long run, trade restrictions do not increase total employment.

Apart from the "welfare loss," Magee notes that trade restrictions waste a portion of economic growth on protected industries; stultify gains from economies of scale that would be possible in an open world economy; encourage anticompetitive and monopoly forces; and result in costly political-lobbying efforts.

#### PROTESTING THE CONFIRMATION OF ROBERT LONG

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I have just yesterday sent a letter to the Honorable HERMAN TALMADGE, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, vigorously protesting the confirmation of Robert Long as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

After seeing how Mr. Long dealt with agricultural loans for small farmers in California as senior vice president in charge of agriculture for the Bank of America, I have grave reservations about how he would handle the \$1.3 billion budget in taxpayer funds for the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, the family farmers of California and elsewhere must be allowed to maintain their farms, and in this age of the frightening growth of corporate agribusiness, the family farmer needs even more assistance from the Department of Agriculture. I am afraid that Mr. Long will not be inclined to provide that assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to place my letter to Senator TALMADGE and my statement before the Senate Committee on Agriculture regarding Robert Long's confirmation into the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.

The letter and statement follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., March 6, 1973.

Hon. HERMAN E. TALMADGE,  
Chairman, Senate Agriculture Committee,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is written to express and register my strong opposition to the confirmation of Robert W. Long to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Conservation, Forestry, Research, and Education.

With his appointment, yet another advocate of agribusiness would be positioned in a key role within the Department of Agriculture, an agency which we would hope has as its first priority the interests of the family farmer and all the working people of rural America.

Tied with recent scandals involving the wheat deals with the Soviet Union, Mr. Long's nomination raises the most serious questions about the direction of farm policy in America—by whom and for whom is that policy being administered?

Mr. Chairman, rural America is dying. In California, more than 50% of our family farms have closed up in the past decade. Machines are replacing our people, and farms are controlled not only from corporation offices in San Francisco and Los Angeles, but also from boardrooms in Houston, Chicago,

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

and New York. While California remains the richest farming region in the world and food remains California's number one industry, the people of rural California are confronting social problems most Americans think are confined to Appalachia.

And one of the reasons why rural California—and rural America—is dying is because of people like Robert W. Long.

As vice-president and head of the agricultural section of the Irvine Land Company, Mr. Long presided over that company's evolution from a farming operation to a land speculator and developer, and with it the destruction of much of rural Orange County. Now, as senior vice president for agricultural loans of the Bank of America, Mr. Long has been in charge of 50% of California's farm loans. Mr. Long has always insisted that the business of agriculture must be kept separate and distinct from the rural and social environment of rural America. Therefore, as a "businessman," lines of credit were much more easily extended to conglomerates than to family farmers. During periods of "tight money" such as we have been experiencing lately, this philosophy simply meant that many family farmers were forced off the land for lack of credit, and damn the social consequences—which were of little interest to "businessmen" like Mr. Long.

Men like Mr. Long maintain that the new technology dictates that the family farmer "adapt or die." These men call themselves "realists" dedicated to "progress and efficiency."

But in reality, Mr. Chairman, these businessmen mean policies that can only lead to bankruptcy and frustration for the family farmer; if "progress" means a decaying rural America; and if "efficiency" means that the national farm policies of the United States mean throwing the people off the land and onto the welfare rolls of our crowded cities, then we can rightly ask if "reality" is worth what it is costing our nation and our society.

Mr. Chairman, if Mr. Long is allowed to administer an annual budget of \$1.3 billion in taxpayer funds for the Department of Agriculture in much the same manner in which he administered the \$1.5 billion in California agricultural loans, then the independent family farmer will be the unmistakable loser.

The research and extension that we do today will determine the shape and substance of agriculture tomorrow. America needs someone who can look beyond the components of an agricultural portfolio to direct our government programs in this area.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Committee give the most serious consideration to this important nomination, and that the Committee then deny confirmation because Mr. Long's posture is antithetical to the best interests of rural America.

Sincerely,

JEROME R. WALDIE,  
Member of Congress.

STATEMENT OF REP. JEROME R. WALDIE, D-CALIF., BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, REGARDING THE CONFIRMATION OF ROBERT W. LONG AS ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee,

The Senate should not confirm the nomination of Robert W. Long as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

The Department of Agriculture is already led by a Secretary whose commitment to the Corporate Farm concept over the Family Farm was well understood when President Nixon appointed him Secretary.

To further consolidate corporate agribusiness in the policymaking position of the Department of Agriculture would clearly spell a hastening of the demise of the small farm-

ing in America and a further expansion of the agribusiness concept of farming in America.

In California alone, during the decade of the 60's the number of California farms declined from about 100,000 to 50,000—and the loss was in the small family owned and operated farm.

And this decline was largely financed and encouraged by Robert Long and the policies of agricultural finance that he implemented as Senior Vice President for Agriculture Loans of the Bank of America.

The Bank of America financed over 40% of the agricultural loans made in California during that 10 year period marking the rapid decline of the family farm and the growth of the corporate farm.

Mr. Long's record is equally suspect with respect to his concern for or understanding of the small farmer in regard to his consistent efforts to render useless the excess Land Law. Mr. Long does not accept the law of the land since 1902 that landowners who utilize federally subsidized water must agree to sell off their excess acreage over 160 acres or four multiples thereof after 10 years of reaping profits from the taxpayers' water subsidy. He has sought to avoid the purpose of the law, namely to create and encourage land ownership of farms by many small farmers rather than by huge corporate owners.

Mr. Long calls the desire for a family farm that has been traditional in America to be a "myth", "a tangle of sentiment", and "economic unreality". It is clear that as an Assistant Secretary reinforcing Secretary Butz' views of antipathy toward the small farmer, that the family farm will soon be "the myth" that he suggests it already is.

There is certainly no myth about the corporate farm and there certainly is no "useless sentimentality" connected with corporate agribusiness.

Not only does Mr. Long have no sympathy for the "myth" and the "sentimentality" of the small family farm, but he also has no sympathy or sentimentality for the agricultural workers who labor in the fields of the corporate farms.

His attitude toward their sad and exploited status is best illustrated by the fact that the Bank of America contributed \$10,000 in favor of the big grower sponsored anti-agricultural labor Proposition 22 on last November's ballot.

When this contribution was made by Bank of America, Mr. Long was Senior Vice President in charge of Agriculture for the Bank of America and it is unlikely the contribution to this rejected attempt to continue exploitation of the field workers was made without his consent. It is more likely to assume and more consistent with his record, that it was made at his urging.

It is clear that President Nixon seeks to place the Nation's agricultural policies in the hands of Corporate Agribusiness. His designation of Secretary Butz and his nomination of Bunker Long attest to that conviction.

But it should be equally clear that the small farmer in America is entitled to one small voice at least in the determination of agricultural policies that today are destroying him by the thousands each year.

That small voice will not be present in a man whose background only involves corporate farm finance and a firm and frequently expressed contempt for the continued presence of the small farmer in the agricultural scheme of things.

The Senate should reject Mr. Long and clearly state to the President that they insist on representation in the Department of Agriculture for the small farmer. There aren't many left to be represented. There will be none left to be represented if Mr. Long and Secretary Butz continue to make agricultural policy in America."

March 7, 1973

A WORKING JOURNALIST TALKS  
SENSE ABOUT PRESS FREEDOM

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

**MR. ZABLOCKI.** Mr. Speaker, each year the Marquette University College of Journalism, Milwaukee, presents its "By-Line Award" to one of its outstanding graduates who has distinguished himself in the practice of journalism or a related field. It is an honor highly prized by the school's alumni.

The 1973 award was given on February 24 to William R. Burleigh, managing editor of the Evansville, Ind., Press, and a 1957 "magna cum laude" graduate of the College of Journalism.

In his acceptance address, Mr. Burleigh touched on many of the issues affecting the American press, including the question of freedom of the press. He observed that the constitutional right of a free press is guaranteed to the American people—not to publishers or reporters as a special caste.

He also emphasized the obligations which the press owes to our society—the matter of its responsibility.

Because it is a thoughtful approach to the question of journalistic freedom and responsibility at a time when Congress is debating a so-called shield law and other press-related issues, I am pleased to insert Editor Burleigh's remarks in the RECORD at this point:

BY-LINE AWARD ACCEPTANCE ADDRESS, FEBRUARY 24, 1973

(By William R. Burleigh)

Wherever journalists gather these days, there is much anguish—and rightly so—over the problems facing American journalism in this trying period of our history. A national administration wages declared war on segments of the press which dare to criticize members of the ruling family. Reporters languish in jails while the situations they sought to report go unprosecuted. Prosecutors, grand juries and legislatures seek to make newsmen unwitting handmaidens of the official state apparatus. Suddenly we seem to have forgotten the rules of the game. Thoughtless men are tinkering with the delicate system of checks and balances in which a free press operates. In essence, when you strip away the artifice, they are saying they don't trust freedom; liberty is not the wisest course. They are forgetting that everywhere the rule is the same and has been through the ages: whatever inhibits criticism distorts history. We should never forget that journalists are historians of the modern world; if we think of ourselves always as historians, then our duty will be clear. So a great issue is joined, one that surpasses in scope the grand jury subpoenas and the punitive court orders. It is not overstating the question to ask whether we as a free people can endure.

But before we sound the Macedonian war cry, I think it would be well to contemplate some of the wisest counsel I ever received. It came from Dean O'Sullivan and I am somewhat embarrassed to recall the circumstances for they date my college years more tellingly than my bald spot.

The Marquette Tribune had broken a story the dean of women didn't want out—that coeds were being forbidden to kiss their dates goodnight in front of the dormitories. Such orgiastic osculation was giving Marquette a bad image, she ruled. Well, that

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

wasn't half the image the school received as soon as we published the story. In keeping with our strongly-held conviction that the Tribune should never sensationalize, it's my recollection we played the dean's edict as the lead story. Immediately the Milwaukee press hopped aboard with glee and we editorialized with our usual profundity about the injustice of it all. At length the no-kissing story hit a national TV talk show at the time the university president was in New York shaking the corporate and foundation bushes for money. He saw the TV show, was horrified at the "unfavorable" light in which his school was being cast and promptly ordered an end to all this nonsense. The full force of the university's repressive hand was visited upon the Tribune's brash editor and I soon got the idea I'd better be looking for another school in which to practice my youthful enthusiasms. But about this time Dean O'Sullivan stepped in, banished the wolves howling at the door and gave me one sentence worth of advice. With the best O'Sullivan scowl, he snorted: "Don't let the bastards scare you."

That, I submit, is especially sound advice for journalists today.

The press, of course, is in the doghouse with a lot of people. I certainly wouldn't want to entrust our fate to a referendum. A U.S. senator sympathetic to our side recently polled 20,000 of his constituents and found an alarming number think "reporters as a class are almost as crooked as politicians." This is but one dramatic example in a growing number which reflect our problem. Abe Rosenthal, managing editor of The New York Times, says he doesn't need polls to tell him the press is in trouble with the public; he has a watch. He says the average time between his arrival at a party and the moment somebody starts flaying the Fourth Estate is 2 minutes, 42 seconds.

Some recent experience of mine indicates New Yorkers might be a little slow on the trigger.

However, as any student of Journalism history knows, this state of affairs is really nothing new. It's been with us from the beginning and has ebbed and flowed in intensity ever since. Those who see today's cause celebre as being without precedent in American history are being profoundly un-historical.

But the shrill nature of the current assault might be useful if it should shake the smugness which has infected too much of journalism for too long. It's not enough to cloak ourselves in the First Amendment and pity the poor public for misunderstanding the constitutional nuances and niceties that we think we grasp so well. Did it ever occur to us that they really don't understand? We must, I think, explain ourselves in ways we have never bothered to do before and in the process fearlessly examine the validity of some of the basic tenets of our faith. Are we so sure we possess the holy writ that we can airily dismiss all of those who don't understand as unenlightened Agnewites?

Times change, and so do our reasons for doing things. Intransigence born of smugness can lead us only to extinction. I am reminded of a haunting observation made at a conference here at Marquette a decade ago by Douglas Cater, the magazine writer. It is said the dinosaur became obsolete, Cater noted, principally because his system of communication broke down. His communications were too slow and too inaccurate; as a result, by the time his foot has sent word to the brain about what was going on, and the brain had sent word back, it was too late to do anything about it. This should serve as a rather grim warning to all of us who have a role in communications.

I am not suggesting that we blithely toss overboard the principles undergirding American journalism. Indeed, the time is at hand

to defend those principles of liberty with vigor and vigilance, to resist the controls which control-happy social planners would impose on our profession, no matter how subtly or under what guise.

But beyond that, what I am suggesting is that we have the courage, in light of the evidence confronting us in 1973, to examine how we should apply those principles, while at the same time defending them. Too many in journalism concern themselves only with that part of the First Amendment which guarantees a free press. Too few, it seems to me, concern themselves with the other half of the equation in which any freedom must be weighed, the question of responsibility. The Bill of Rights recognizes the right of the people to a free press. Note well, that doesn't say right of publishers or reporters. Neither is a special caste. The right belongs to the people. And to the degree that this confers any privilege on the press, it at the same time places obligations on us, obligations to compile and publish useful, sound, thoughtful information for the citizenry. It is to that end that we must soberly focus our attention and energies.

Now we obviously are not approaching a nirvana in which everyone loves us and smothers us in paeans of praise. If that condition should ever arrive, it would be a sure signal that the press was not doing its job. But I hardly think we are in danger of that happening. The man who said the duty of the newspaper is to print the news and to raise hell was really not far off the mark.

What we must strive for, in my judgment, is increased understanding of our role by the body politic and increased respect for the way we do business.

Certain obvious challenges face us.

First—and most fundamentally—we must strive for ever greater accuracy. This may strike you as so basic and rudimentary as to be assumed. But I think not. We must remind ourselves relentlessly that the integrity of a newspaper is built first on the accuracy of its news report, even ahead of the gutsiness of its editorial page. I am speaking of a positive passion for accuracy both in the small sense of getting names spelled correctly to the larger sense of presenting human happenings with perspective and proportion.

I hope I am not sounding too Faulknerian in saying we need accuracy, and accuracy, and accuracy. Mind you, that's accuracy, not advocacy. It's a distinction which appears lost on some of the misty-eyed partisans of the New Journalism. And spare me those arguments of the psychologists that no man can observe objectively. A professional reporter can and must be fair regardless of personal feelings or he has no business being called a reporter. That fine Hoosier teacher of language, Raymond Woodbury Pence of DePauw University, used to tell his students it is not enough to write so you can be understood; you must write, he said, so that you cannot possibly be misunderstood. That must become our first marching order—and it leads me to the second point of what I conceive to be the major responsibilities facing the press today.

If we're going to be accurate, just what are we going to be accurate about?

News is easier to write than to define. All definitions take sides. The prevailing definition holds that news embraces those events which flow through the tried-and-tested bottlenecks of human behavior—the police blotter, city hall, the hospital, the press conference, the corporate PR office, the White House. What comes off those beats is news, we say. Conversely, because we have thus stationed ourselves at the bottlenecks through which "news" flows, there is little inclination to look elsewhere. The approach is not entirely invalid. The material coming off those beats is frequently highly important, occasionally somewhat interesting and over

the years has helped to sell a lot of newspapers.

The only trouble is, the formula—if rigidly followed, as it is on most newspapers—really doesn't tell the story of how people live. At least not fully.

Basically, we still dwell on the extraordinary—man biting dog. Unfortunately, this approach offers little insight into the ordinary concerns of man, the problems that cut across the social strata and touch all mortals. A classic example is consumer affairs reporting. Until recent years newspapers ignored consumer news even though each reader is a consumer in many ways every day. This is what the real world is all about; it is proper grist for the journalist. The cops and robbers tales, the romantic sagas of the good guys versus the bad, really aren't pertinent unless they somehow are related to the average reader.

What comes our way through the traditional bottlenecks of news gathering is not entirely bad. But what is wrong, and what must be changed, is the notion that the bottleneck approach is the magic formula, that we need search no further to fill our reader needs, that when we go through the motions, sterling-pure news automatically will emerge.

A necessary corollary of expanding our concept of news is to tell the story of people through people. We know that names make news. That's part of our credo. Yet, according to much present practice, we make things as abstract as possible, bailing away the human insight, resorting always to the official spokesman and the faceless functionary.

Assume, for a moment, that we are able to translate an expanded definition of news into reality, and that we are able to do so accurately—how then shall it be delivered to our readers?

This takes us to the third and final challenge facing the press which I would like to discuss today.

We are on the threshold of wondrous technological innovation. An industry which hadn't come up with a basically new idea since the Linotype machine is suddenly fairly bursting with dazzling electronic wizardry. These machines promise not just to change, but to revolutionize the way a newspaper is produced. It will be possible shortly, for example, to transmit news from a master computer in New York directly into a storage unit in a newspaper plant, edit it on a video terminal—"message" it, in the new vernacular—and convert it into photographic type—all without ever touching human hands. It will be possible to take this a step farther through pagination by using the video display terminal and a laser pencil to make up and produce a page complete with news stories, photos and ads, again all before emerging from the computer and its satellite gadgetry.

Farther in the future, but nonetheless deserving of our thoughtful consideration, is an array of techniques for shortcircuiting the present cumbersome system of placing the completed package in the hands of the reader.

Editorial people have traditionally stood aloof from the production process, again with a certain smugness. No longer can this be the case. The CRTs and the OCRs and the VDTs are fundamentally altering our concepts of processing the news. When he sits down to his Selectric typewriter that is direct-wired to the computer, the reporter of tomorrow will, whether he likes it or not, be part of the newspaper production process. This carries vast implications for those whose concern is quality journalism. Will we rule the computers or the computers rule us? Will we use the technology as an ingenious tool to improve our editorial excellence or will we become, like man and his automobile, its captive?

These are questions which at once are both worrisome and potentially rewarding.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Will we seize the moment or be seized by it? It is not difficult to see that the press is passing through some extraordinary times.

Under seige from without, its liberties again being tested, the press at the same time faces challenges from within—challenges to generate self-criticism, to safeguard old virtues and to chart an innovative future.

Despite any problems, it's an invigorating moment in history to be a journalist. The sense of mission and the sheer joy of the profession are still there, beckoning eager minds.

Almost 2,500 years ago, Thucydides, a journalist of sorts, made clear what that mission is and what remains our reward today. He wrote: "If he who desires to have before his eyes a true picture of the events which have happened, and of the like events which may be expected to happen hereafter . . . shall pronounce what I have written to be useful, then I shall be satisfied."

## NORTHVILLE HISTORICAL SOCIETY

### HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the work of the National Register of Historic Places and its efforts to preserve those structures of historical value in America. Equally important to that effort is the work of local historical societies who have been responsible for the preservation and promotion of many historical areas throughout the country. I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House one such local group which exemplifies the best in such local initiatives.

Two years ago, the Northville Historical Society of Northville, Mich. began a detailed study of Northville homes which it felt had historical significance. As a result of their work, a square mile of Northville is now a National Historical District with some 75 homes being placed in the National Register of Historic Places. Most of the houses in the historic district are Victorian, Italianate or Queen Ann style of architecture. Although some of the homes date back to the 1840's, most were built in 1860 and 1880. The city and the Northville Historical Society are also planning a 7-acre Historic Village in Northville. The society is further active in the area of restoration and is currently working on an 1845 building which has been used as a library, church, and school office in past years.

The Northville Historical Society has not only worked hard at preserving those structures of historical significance, but has promoted the concept of preservation to the point that other citizens have become active participants in this process. A fine example of this participation is the progress of a local group of restaurant owners who have converted a former Methodist Church building into a fine restaurant, the Drawbridge. This is the first building within the Historical District to be transformed into a different use while preserving the gothic character of the architecture. It is a fine example of what can be done to keep an historic building while making it serve a useful

purpose. Because of their fine work in this area, I would hope that other historical societies will take note of the success of this group in Northville.

## TIGER CAGES AND OUR FOREIGN POLICIES

### HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, some time ago, the then Congressman from Tennessee, the Honorable William R. Anderson and myself, reported to the Congress our findings on the tiger cages on Conson Island off the shores of South Vietnam.

The direct connection of the United States in this outrage was established by financial assistance to the South Vietnamese Government in the operation of this prison and of our U.S. officials, who clearly had knowledge of the inhumane torture practiced and participated in concealing it.

Our Government's denials and excuses only served to exacerbate the hardships which our own prisoners of war suffered and to damage our international reputation for humane justice.

Recently, the "tiger cages" appeared in the news with details corresponding almost identically with those included in our report. The article from the Washington Post follows:

"TIGER CAGE" VICTIMS CITE SOUTH VIET TORTURE

(By Jacques Leslie)

SAIGON, March 3.—Displaying their paralyzed and atrophied legs, political detainees from South Vietnam's Conson Island Prison said in interviews this weekend that they were tortured, chained and deprived of food during captivity.

Thirteen prisoners from a contingent of 124 conditionally released by South Vietnamese government authorities more than two weeks ago agreed to be interviewed despite being warned by police not to talk to foreign journalists.

The prisoners all said they had lived in Conson Island's "tiger cages" and told of being beaten with clubs, sprayed with lime, and having to drink their own urine because of thirst.

"We were determined to live so that we could struggle for peace," one prisoner said.

The prisoners said they ranged in age from 24 to 53 and had spent a minimum of five and a maximum of 10 years in prison.

Asked why they had been arrested, a leader of the group said most "had demanded the right to live and the right to peace." This seemed a tacit acknowledgment that many prisoners supported the Vietcong.

Although it is possible that the prisoners exaggerated the severity of their experiences in confinement, their physical condition alone seemed to verify much of what they said.

The prisoners were examined by an American doctor, John G. Champlin, who was formerly associated in Saigon with Children's Medical Relief International, a charity organization which operates a plastic surgery unit here.

In a separate report to The Washington Post, Champlin said the prisoners have written to the Vietnam truce delegations and called for an investigation at the prison but

have received no reply, either from the four-nation International Commission on Control and Supervision or the four-party Joint Military Commission.

[He said further that the prisoners alleged that since Feb. 12 nearly 300 prisoners have disappeared after leaving Conson by government aircraft, that 400 prisoners have been consigned to the prison since the Paris agreement was signed, and that 30 "tiger cage" prisoners have been in ankle irons continuously for the past year.]

"The prisoners are not only paralyzed below the waist," Champlin said, "but they are also insensate below mid-high level. I think their leg problems are due to disuse, atrophy and malnutrition. A number of them have deep scars around their ankles which they said came from leg irons."

With proper food, exercise, and physical therapy, Champlin said, "the younger prisoners have a better chance of fully recovering the use of their legs than the older ones."

Champlin said he had listened to them discuss their imprisonment and "nothing they said flatly contradicted the results of my examination."

The prisoners said 124 of them were flown to Bienhoa, 15 miles northeast of Saigon, on Feb. 16. The Conson prison is 150 miles south of Saigon. Five days later, they were taken to a Buddhist pagoda in Bienhoa. They were then warned against going to Saigon and talking to foreign journalists, but were permitted to visit families not living in the Saigon area.

They were released on the condition that they return to Bienhoa police headquarters 10 days later with two relatives who would then be responsible for their whereabouts.

The reason for their conditional release is unclear. The leaders speculated that the South Vietnamese government was preparing for an inspection of Conson in accordance with the cease-fire agreement, and was therefore evacuating the most seriously ill prisoners.

Some prisoners said that immediately after arrest they were tortured with electric shock instruments or beaten. Prisoners were forced to drink water, then were struck on their bloated stomachs.

When prisoners refused to salute the government flag on Feb. 22, 1967, they were moved to Conson's "tiger cages"—cells of about three yards by two yards whose ceilings consisted of bars.

At first, they said, there were four prisoners per cell, but each week four more prisoners were added, until by the third week there were 12 prisoners per cell.

"This was the toughest period," the leader said. When prisoners wanted to lie down they had to do so on top of each other. "When the people on the bottom couldn't stand it any further, we switched," one prisoner said. While he explained, other prisoners gave a physical demonstration.

They said that after a visit by two American congressmen to the tiger cages in June 1970, they were moved to cells which had formerly been cattle stalls.

#### CALIFORNIA CONGRESSMEN RESPOND TO DAY CARE REGULATIONS

**Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke**  
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased at the important, broad-based support I received from my Cali-

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

fornia colleagues in cosigning a telegram to Secretary Weinberger asking that he withhold the immediate implementation of the proposed child care regulations until at least June 30, 1973. They also urged that Secretary Weinberger hold public hearings in the interim to assess the impact that these regulations would have on the future of child care programs in California and throughout the Nation.

Twenty-five Members of Congress from California and our two Senators joined in sending the following telegram:

We are greatly disturbed over the effects of the proposed HEW regulations regarding social services—particularly those affecting the operation under title IV-A of the Social Security Act. Eleven thousand children will lose eligibility in one program alone for Federally funded day care services. Migrant children will be almost totally excluded and many campus facilities will be shut down. These regulations, if implemented in their proposed form, will force many presently employed parents back onto welfare roles. Therefore, we urge you immediately to withhold implementation until at least June 30 and hold public hearings in the interim.

In addition to myself, the telegram was signed by Senators ALAN CRANSTON and JOHN TUNNEY, and California Congressmen HAROLD JOHNSON, JOHN MOSS, ROBERT LEGGETT, PHIL BURTON, RONALD DELUMS, FORTNEY STARK, DONALD EDWARDS, JEROME WALDIE, B. F. SISK, PETE MCCLOSKEY, CHET HOLIFIELD, AUGUSTUS HAWKINS, JAMES CORMAN, CHARLES WIGGINS, TOM REES, ALPHONZO BELL, GEORGE DANIELSON, EDWARD ROYBAL, CHARLES WILSON, RICHARD HANNA, GLENN ANDERSON, WILLIAM KETCHUM, GEORGE BROWN, JR., and LIONEL VAN DEERLIN.

#### R. C. BALLARD THRUSTON CHAPTER OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION OPPOSES AID TO NORTH VIETNAM

**HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI**

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I would like very much to call to the attention of my colleagues the following resolution regarding proposed U.S. aid to North Vietnam. This resolution was unanimously adopted on February 17, 1973, at the annual meeting of the R. C. Ballard Thruston Chapter of the Sons of the American Revolution at Louisville, Ky. I ask permission to have the resolution reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

LOUISVILLE, KY.  
February 17, 1973.

Whereas, news dispatches indicate that the Hanoi Government expects financial help from the United States rehabilitation program for North Vietnam, and

Whereas, such help from the United States would enable North Vietnam to maintain its armed forces in South Vietnam, and

Whereas, the armed aggression of North Vietnam has caused such great sacrifices of blood and treasure by the United States, therefore

Be it resolved, that the R.C. Ballard Thruston Chapter vigorously opposes the

contributions of the taxes of United States citizens for such purposes after fourteen years of suffering caused by the Communist Government of North Vietnam.

COLGAN NORMAN,  
Chapter President.

#### "ARTS" PROGRAM FOR SAFER SKIES COMPLETED

**HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that the automated radar terminal systems (ARTS) which will provide air travelers with increased safety and efficiency has been completed. Especially pleased since the 64 ARTS were ordered by the Federal Aviation Administration from the UNIVAC Defense Systems Division of the Sperry Rand Corporation in Minnesota's Fourth Congressional District. To bring this significant achievement in air traffic control to the attention of our colleagues I place in the RECORD the Department of Transportation's announcement of the ARTS completion:

#### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION NEWS

Production has been completed on all 64 of the new computerized automated radar terminal systems (ARTS III) ordered by the Federal Aviation Administration from the UNIVAC Defense Systems Division of the Sperry Rand Corporation, Secretary of Transportation Claude S. Brinegar announced today.

Production of the last ARTS III system was completed on 15 February. This system is scheduled for installation at San Francisco International Airport later this year when construction of a new terminal radar control room is completed.

The closeout of ARTS III production is the second important milestone within a month in FAA's air traffic control automation program. On 13 February, the agency completed Phase One automation of its air route traffic control centers when the Memphis center linked up with the other 19 centers serving the contiguous United States in a nationwide computer network for automatic exchange of flight data.

"I am pleased to find this program moving ahead at such an accelerated pace," Secretary Brinegar said. "I think we must continue to improve efficiency in all our transportation modes if we are to meet the needs of an increasingly mobile America."

FAA Administrator John H. Shaffer said, "ARTS III unquestionably has been one of the most successful technical programs ever undertaken at FAA. The equipment already is in operation at most of our major airports and has yielded significant benefits in terms of our ability to handle increasing traffic demands safely, efficiently and in a more expeditious manner. This is truly remarkable when you consider that only four years has elapsed since the initial contract award to UNIVAC in February 1969."

In the ARTS III system, radar blips are electronically tagged with luminous letters and numbers called alphanumerics. This data tag lessens the air traffic controllers workload, while providing him with continuous, positive identification of the various aircraft under his control. The "tag" also displays the actual altitude of the aircraft under control, its ground speed and other pertinent information. In addition, ARTS

III automatically updates each aircraft position from the time the aircraft enters the terminal approach area until final touchdown.

To date, 47 ARTS III systems have been commissioned at the nation's busy airports and three others are in use at FAA training and experimental facilities. The remaining 14 will be commissioned by years end and with 10 of these in operation by 1 July.

The ARTS III hardware is modular, permitting the capacity of the system to be expanded by adding units. Each system contains three basic elements: the data acquisition subsystem, the data processing subsystem and the data entry display subsystem.

The data acquisition subsystem receives signals from beacon transponders in aircraft, sorts them out, converts them into a suitable digital formats and transmits them to the data processing subsystem.

The data processing subsystem correlates the information on beacon targets, tracks them and computes their ground speed and then feeds this information into the data entry and display subsystem.

The data entry and display subsystem generates the alphanumerics and other radar information for presentation on 22-inch bright displays. It also has a keyboard device which permits controllers to communicate with the computer.

With the ARTS III programmable computer base established, there are many potentially beneficial functions which can be added. The system could track radar as well as beacon targets; receive, process and display weather and map data with the use of fully-digitized displays; provide for computer-aided metering and spacing of aircraft; and permit computer-aided collision prediction.

ARTS III is an integral part of FAA's master plan for automating the air traffic control system. Each of 61 airport installations will be linked to the automated system now being implemented at the 20 air route traffic control centers, permitting automatic data transfer between these facilities.

In addition to ARTS III, FAA is proceeding with a program to provide automated air traffic control services at lower activity airports. A contract for development of a prototype "ARTS II" was awarded last June and field evaluation of this unit will begin this month at the Wilkes Barre/Scranton Airport.

#### THOMAS GARRIQUE MASARYK

#### HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, March 7 marks the 123d anniversary of the birth of Thomas Garrique Masaryk, a remarkable statesman, scholar, journalist, and philosopher who is recognized as one of the premier figures in the struggle for independence in Czechoslovakia. Masaryk's ideals and dedication of purpose were at the very foundation of the democracy and personal freedom which he helped to establish in modern Czechoslovakia.

The son of a Slovak coachman, Masaryk though firm commitment and hard work, became the distinguished and revered President of Czechoslovakia. His stature as one of the foremost scholars, journalists, and philosophers of his day had an inspiring effect on freedom-loving Czechs. Many of Masaryk's countrymen were influenced by his belief that

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

spiritual, intellectual, and political values stand together as an integral whole. Because he was a commanding statesman, Masaryk, who had helped his country secure independence, was elected President at the age of 68 to serve a 7-year term.

Masaryk's policies embodied his virtues. The goodness, sincerity, and brilliance of this man was reflected in his promises of individual freedom to all Czechoslovakians. Because Masaryk remained faithful to his ideals and promises, the Czechoslovakians were given hope in the creation of a new democratic state.

Thomas Masaryk should be given tribute on this day as a great democratic hero. His dedication to his work and ideals gave the Czechoslovakians faith in themselves and pride in their nation. His legacy of achievement endures, as the spirit, if not the reality of freedom flourishes in Soviet-dominated Czechoslovakia.

#### A SALUTE TO MR. GORDON R. WILLIAMS, RETIRING EDITOR, READING TIMES

#### HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the fine accomplishments and achievements of my good friend, Gordon R. Williams of Reading, Pa.

Mr. Williams completed six decades of newspaper work in February when he retired from the Reading Times as editor. Gordon, a native of Scranton, began his career in journalism as an office boy with the Scranton Truth. He later moved to the New York Evening World and then to the New York Herald Tribune, the Pittsburgh Post and the Philadelphia Evening Ledger. He began his 40-year career with the Reading Times in 1933, starting as sports editor, becoming managing editor in 1954, and editor in 1967.

This long and distinguished career is indeed notable. Nevertheless, Mr. Williams is probably best remembered for his 21 years as the editor of the sports desk. As many of you know, I may well be the first Member of Congress who was a prizefighter and I think it is interesting to note that Mr. Williams was one of the first licensed boxing referees in the State of Pennsylvania. He handled the first boxing match sanctioned under the McBride Act.

Accordingly, I have known Gordon for many years stretching back to my high school and college days in and around my hometown of Reading. For these reasons, I would like to congratulate Gordon for his many years of excellent service to the community and to thank him for his wise counsel and warm friendship. Gordon has made an indelible mark upon Reading which will not be forgotten and I would like to extend my best wishes to him for his continued success in retirement. Gordon R. Williams will certainly be remembered in the fine

March 7, 1973

journalistic tradition of excellence which has personified the long history of the Reading Times.

#### INTENT OF AMENDMENT HAS NOT BEEN SERVED

#### HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, A. James Golato, past president of the Prince Georges County Maryland School Board, recently testified before the Maryland Senate on busing. Because of cogency of his remarks, I inserted them in the RECORD:

#### INTENT OF AMENDMENT HAS NOT BEEN SERVED

(By A. James Golato)

Mr. Chairman, and Honorable Members of the Maryland State Senate: A 1954 Federal Court decision mercifully removed skin color as a factor in determining where children go to school.

The recent Federal Court decision restores color as a factor—with a vengeance—in Prince George's County.

That 1954 decision held that Lynda Brown could not be kept out of her neighborhood school because of her color.

The recent decision deliberately keeps children out of their neighborhood schools in Prince George's County because of their color.

These contradictory decisions, apparently using different standards for different color, raise some fundamental questions about participatory and publicly responsive government. Not the least of these questions is the uncontrolled policy-making power assumed by the publicly unaccountable Federal judiciary, through the process of interpreting Supreme Court decisions more and more narrowly with each new case.

The judges hold that school integration is required by the 14th Amendment to the Constitution, as it was intended by its framers and ratifiers.

That is ridiculous. The same Congress that approved the 14th Amendment provided for segregated schools in the District of Columbia.

The obvious intention of that Constitutional Amendment was not to require integration, but to prevent discrimination by state action.

The court's recent breath-taking decision to reorder the lives of thousands of Maryland residents, is another development which will unfortunately further erode the already low public confidence in the judicial system of this country—and even in the democratic processes of government.

The decision appears to make a travesty of a written Constitution and changes government by the consent of the people to one by judicial decree.

As State Senators still committed to responsive government—and accountable to your constituents—I urge you to do something to "clip the wings of these high-flying Federal judges."

I urge you to do two things:

1. Pass a resolution asking the Congress of the U.S. to pass legislation to restrict the jurisdiction of Federal courts from ordering mandatory transfer of students in order to achieve a racial balance or quota; and

2. Initiate procedures for a Constitutional Amendment or Convention which will simply prohibit the assignment of students to any public school on the basis of race, color or creed.

You must do something to stop the destruction of our public school system especially in Prince George's, where the recent draconian decision also threatens the County's social and economic development.

## THE OTHER SIDE OF THE STORY

## HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on December 19 of last year the National Broadcasting Co. ran a TV news special entitled "What Price Health?" which, according to the president of the Ohio State Medical Association, left much to be desired in the way of accuracy. Dr. William R. Schultz of Wooster, Ohio, called my attention to his protest to Mr. Julian Goodman, president of NBC, in a letter dated January 26, 1973. In his letter Dr. Schultz stated, in part:

This was a deliberate, planned distortion and misrepresentation of the medical and health care picture in the United States today. It was a tremendous disservice to my profession, to the health care industry, to the voluntary and private insurance industry, to existing government medical care programs, and, above all, to the people.

In order that the other side of the story might be better known I insert at this point the two letters by Dr. Schultz addressed to Mr. Goodman of NBC and myself:

OHIO STATE MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,  
Columbus, Ohio, January 30, 1973.  
Congressman JOHN M. ASHBROOK,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: Enclosed for your information is a letter I have sent to the President of the National Broadcasting Company in protest of an NBC-TV program of December 19, 1972.

Because of the serious misrepresentations in that telecast, and because of the current Congressional concern over broadcasting practices, I hope you will read my letter very carefully.

If you would like any additional information, I will be happy to respond wherever and whenever possible.

I particularly want to call to your attention the fact that the little girl in Cleveland (referred to in my letter to NBC) was eligible for full assistance under two different programs established by the United States Congress, had her father's private health insurance not provided full coverage. This fact never was mentioned or even as much as hinted in the NBC program. Also, there was no mention that her father's insurance paid in full for the medical services and facilities.

The broadcast industry in general and NBC in particular could perform a great public service by informing the public of those government programs available to help those Americans who need help. In this case, NBC apparently preferred to practice "blind-fold broadcasting."

NBC could perform an even greater service by concerning itself more with accuracy rather than sensationalism. The entire broadcast industry has that responsibility to the people and to the Congress.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM R. SCHULTZ, M.D.,  
President, Ohio State Medical Association.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OHIO STATE MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,  
Columbus, Ohio, January 26, 1973.  
Mr. JULIAN GOODMAN,  
President, National Broadcasting Co., New  
York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. GOODMAN: The Ohio State Medical Association would appreciate NBC's support of the Broadcast Security Act, which will be proposed as federal legislation to assure broadcast accuracy, quality, scope and public participation by setting up a federal program administered by the Federal Communications Commission.

Under this program, a Federal Radio and Television Institute would be established to fix standards, guidelines and regulations to govern all programs of the broadcasting industry.

Radio and television in most other nations enjoy the benefit of government control and/or government ownership in order that government policies and programs be accurately presented to the people. For their own good, the people are enabled to see news casts and documentaries that are fashioned, directed and aired under direct government control. It is the purpose of our legislation to bring the benefits of all this government largesse to the poor, backward citizens of the United States.

Of course, this national institute will be made up of a majority of consumers. In order for the broadcast industry to be fully represented, each network will submit to the Chairman of the FCC the names of six vice presidents, from which he would select one for appointment to the Commission.

Since the costs of television and radio advertising\* have increased in recent years at a rate in excess of the cost-of-living index, there will be levied a tax on all radio and television networks, all radio and television stations and all radio and television receivers.

There will be no advertising. Funds from the tax would be apportioned to the various networks and stations on a quarterly basis, with the amount determined by an efficiency rating system promulgated by the Institute.

All officers and employees, all newscasters, entertainers, commentators, writers, producers and directors, etc., will be placed on salary scales fixed by the Institute.

All of this would be carried out on a non-profit basis.

To paraphrase Senator Edward M. Kennedy, we in the United States have progressed far beyond the point where obtaining radio and television broadcast services, information and entertainment can be left as a matter of survival of the fittest. *Caveat emptor*, a wise admonition in dealing with the practices of many radio and television interests, can no longer be tolerated as an operating principle in obtaining protection from the broadcast industry. Such a principle is not in the national interest.

This proposed Broadcast Security Act would protect the American people from inaccuracy, misrepresentation, poor performance, callousness and excess profits in the broadcast industry by establishing a government-controlled, efficiently functioning broadcast system that would benefit all the people while controlling excessive and highly escalating costs.

What I have done so far, Mr. Goodman, is apply the same misrepresentation, emotionalism and downright inaccuracy to the broadcast industry as your network applied to my profession December 19, 1972.

I am referring to the NBC special entitled "What Price Health?"

This was a deliberate, planned distortion and misrepresentation of the medical and health care picture in the United States today. It was a tremendous disservice to my profession, to the health care industry, to the voluntary and private insurance industry, to existing government medical care programs and, above all, to the people.

For example, consider the gross misrep-

resentation of the Kurstin Knapp case in Cleveland as presented by NBC. This was depicted as being a cold, cruel, and inhuman treatment of a little girl whose life is not as important as money.

The true facts, Mr. Goodman, the true facts are that this little girl's problem was recognized immediately after her birth, her case was referred to an excellent pediatrician and a specialist in cardiovascular diseases was involved.

The child was too young for the very serious surgery she required, so she was watched very carefully until she was old enough for an operation.

Further, although her father had been laid off at his place of employment, he was recalled to work with his medical and hospital insurance in full effect at the time of surgery on the child last November 8 by a widely recognized thoracic surgeon.

Even if there had been no private insurance, this child would have qualified for full assistance under the Ohio Crippled Children Program. Also, she would have qualified under the Aid to Dependent Children of the Unemployed. This child, regardless of her father's employment or unemployment, received the finest medical attention.

We produced all this accurate information regarding Kurstin Knapp in a matter of a few hours. A college journalism freshman could have done the same thing. Instead of producing accuracy, "What Price Health?" produced a travesty. And this is not the first time NBC health care "specials" have grossly and deliberately misrepresented the American health care picture.

Well-informed radio audiences and television viewers are concerned today with threats, some real and some implied, of a federal radio-TV take-over. I am one of these because I feel free expression is so essential to both the individual and the collective liberties of all Americans.

However, when the public is confronted with such inaccuracies, misrepresentations and diatribes as "What Price Health?" et al, one can not help but see an erosion of public support of your industry's right of self-determination. Why? The right of self-determination carries with it a moral and social responsibility that requires honesty and accuracy. If the broadcast industry destroys the confidence of its audiences—the people—then the destruction of your independence is only a matter of time.

And, speaking of destruction of independence, let us consider the legislation so highly touted as the great panacea for all health problems. Why does NBC, by airing such distortions as "What Price Health?" want to impose upon the American people the Kennedy plan—a national health care dictatorship?

That plan permits only a single source of payment—the federal government—for all providers of health care services and facilities. Does NBC equally advocate that all the radio and television be similarly controlled by the federal government?

Why does NBC advocate for the medical profession federal controls when federal controls are totally repugnant to the broadcast industry?

Why does NBC advocate legislation that would completely destroy one of the nation's major industries—the voluntary and private health insurance industry? If these policies are so terrible, why does the broadcast industry accept dollars to air health insurance advertisements?

Why does NBC advocate destroying the nation's pharmaceutical industry? The Kennedy plan would do that.

Why does NBC advocate destroying the private, independent practice of medicine, particularly solo practitioners, partnerships and small group practices? The Kennedy plan would accomplish that.

Why does NBC advocate a totalitarian health care program that could cost the American family triple its present annual health care expenses? The Kennedy plan would do that.

Why does NBC so consistently support the Kennedy plan that proposes to take an additional \$38.5 billions from general revenues that already suffer an annual deficit of more than \$25 billions? The Kennedy plan would do that.

Why does NBC not investigate why the estimated costs of the Kennedy plan are four to six greater than costs of other legislative proposals?

The United Nations Demographic Yearbook warns emphatically: "Lack of international comparability between area statistics arises primarily from differences in definition." Why does NBC wrongfully continue to cite false comparisons of United States health statistics with other nations in face of this strict international warning?

NBC most certainly would fight socialization of its industry. Why, then, does NBC so strongly advocate the Kennedy Plan, which is socialized medicine? "Socialized Medicine (is) any of various systems to provide the entire population with complete medical care through government subsidization of medical and health services, general regulation of those services, etc." (Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 1966 unabridged).

Why doesn't NBC interview for a "special" Dr. Robert Myers, who is one of the world's foremost authorities on social insurance and who resigned as Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration rather than permit himself to be muzzled by advocates of Kennedy-type legislation?

I recommend Mr. Goodman, that you read carefully Dr. Myers' book, *Medicare*, published by the McCahan Foundation, and *The Case for American Medicine: A Realistic Look at Our Health Care System*, by Harry Schwartz of *The New York Times*, David McKay Co., publisher. Also, please read *Hazardous to Your Health*, by Marvin Edwards, Arlington House, publisher.

I have studied thoroughly the American Medical Association's letter addressed to you January 10, 1973. I endorse and support that letter whole-heartedly.

To repeat for emphasis, if the broadcast industry destroys the confidence of its audiences—the people—then the destruction of your independence is only a matter of time.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM R. SCHULTZ, M.D.,  
President Ohio State Medical Association.

JAMES A. FARLEY: OPTIMISTIC  
ABOUT 1973

HON. WILLIAM R. ROY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, James A. Farley has a distinguished record of service in politics and business widely recognized not only in this body, but across America. With his strong and warm personality, Jim Farley continues to be an influential voice in the Nation.

An editorial in the Omaha World Herald on January 8, 1973, praised Mr. Farley as an "incurable optimist" in a world which needs optimism. I agree and wish at this time to call this editorial to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mr. Speaker, following is the text of the editorial:

### OPTIMISTIC FARLEY

James A. Farley has been around a long time and at 84 he should be a relic of the Roosevelt administration, long since retired from political and business life.

But he isn't retired. He remains the board chairman of two companies, the president of another and a director of several.

He keeps up an incredible correspondence—answering 3,000 Christmas cards personally, some of them from current prime ministers, international businessmen and just plain folks.

Columnist Ernest Cuneo talked to him recently and found him the incurable optimist he has always been. Said Farley:

"The outlook for 1973 is the most optimistic in some years. I gather this from the unusual buoyancy in these cards. People are not only sure that this will be a good year, but there's a resiliency of faith, of planning ahead based on continued international understanding and ensuing trade."

He said there seems to be a dawning realization that hating one's neighbor is no way to pursue life, liberty and happiness. And while this isn't a world where "all will love and let love, live and let live, it is a lot better than a world of hate and let down."

An optimist, surely. Maybe Jim Farley overdoes it. But it's worth more than a passing thought that this lively man who refuses to grow old sees this as a good year in a world which is getting better.

## SUPPORT FOR THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT AMENDMENTS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, we are approaching another phase in the continuing battle with the administration over budgetary priorities. The House will again consider today the Older Americans Comprehensive Services Act which was vetoed by the President last year as being inflationary.

The Education and Labor Committee, since that time, has worked to trim this important legislation to the bare minimum in financial authorization, while still affording badly needed services to the aged.

The aged in America have seen, if only through the President's one example of vetoing the social security increase last year, where the present administration's priorities lie with regard to the real needs of the American people.

We must not permit the direction of governmental policy to lead away from this group of people who have contributed so very much to our society. The momentum of programs which were begun with the passage of the Older Americans Act in 1965 must not be allowed to falter through lack of funding. But more importantly, the commitment that was expressed in 1965 should not be allowed to waver, for the findings of Congress then—that millions of older Americans in the Nation are suffering unnecessary harm from the lack of adequate services—is still true today.

I, therefore, urge all my colleagues to give their full support to this bill.

March 7, 1973

E. K. GAYLORD OBSERVES 100TH BIRTHDAY

## HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, Monday marked the 100th birthday of one of the most remarkable figures in the history of the State of Oklahoma and of American journalism—E. K. Gaylord, president of the Oklahoma Publishing Co.

Associated with the Daily Oklahoman for more than 70 of those 100 years, Mr. Gaylord is the dean of American editors and publishers. When he and two others bought a 45-percent interest in the struggling Daily Oklahoman in 1903, Oklahoma City was 14 years old and boasted a population of somewhat more than 10,000.

Since then, for seven decades, Mr. Gaylord has taken an unceasing role in promotion of the city and the State. He has seen the Oklahoma City metropolitan area mushroom to its 1970 population of more than 640,000. Twice during those decades he has spearheaded campaigns setting population goals that seemed impossible to many when first mentioned, but have long since been left far behind. And he is still looking ahead. Recently he has said that 800,000 would be a "fairly easy goal for 1980. Instead of being short, we might have some surplus."

Seldom has one man held a responsible position in a community through such a gigantic period of change.

Mr. Gaylord has always drawn cannily on many sources of information. A native of Kansas who grew up in Colorado, his interest in Oklahoma was first aroused when he read a statement by Mayor Carter Harrison of Chicago pointing to the great potential of the area. In following up on this lead, he tells us of having consulted such diverse persons as a traveling salesman who had covered the area and the cashier of an Oklahoma City bank. All their information was assimilated.

He has always known that a society is measured by more than just material growth. When he first looked over Oklahoma City he tells us:

My first objective was to look in all the retail store windows and see what kind of merchandise is for sale, because you can size up the kind of people by the class of merchandise they purchase.

Most of the stores showed an average, good type of merchandise for a frontier town, and I was surprised to find a music store, offering several Kimball pianos and one Steinway. This convinced me that there were people of refinement and education among the early settlers.

He returned to this theme in a speech to the Oklahoma Heritage Foundation last year, when he concluded:

Population, however, is not our major goal. The quality of citizenship, the facilities and opportunities for education and culture should be and are our primary goals. Oklahoma City can be proud of its schools and churches and colleges and universities, its Art Center, Symphony, its Cowboy Hall of Fame, its Mummers theater, its Frontiers of Science, its zoo and Planetarium and scores

of other organizations and institutions which upgrade the quality of life in Oklahoma. I have confidence that the booster spirit still lives and that the people of Oklahoma City will continue to embrace these goals.

It is impossible in a brief space to set forth the career of a newspaperman still active who gained one of his first scoops in Oklahoma journalism in an extra on the outbreak of the Russo-Japanese war in 1904.

The brief biography that follows gives a few highlights of the monumental impact of E. K. Gaylord in Oklahoma journalism:

#### E. K. GAYLORD—BRIEF BIOGRAPHY

Edward King Gaylord was born March 5, 1873, on a farm near Muscotah, Kansas, son of George Lewis Gaylord and Eunice M. Edwards Gaylord. In 1879, the family moved west, living first in Denver and later settling in Grand Junction, Colo. Between the ages of 11 and 15, Gaylord 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 was business manager and later, also, editor of the college newspaper.

In his junior year, he and a brother, Lewis, bought the controlling interest in the Colorado Springs Telegraph. Gaylord studied law at night and later was chief deputy court clerk in Cripple Creek, Colo. He was advertising salesman and an editorial writer for the Telegraph before the brothers sold their interest in it. Lewis Gaylord next invested in a St. Joseph, Mo., paper and Edward was its business manager.

In 1902, Edward Gaylord went to Oklahoma City, Oklahoma Territory. On Feb. 6, 1903, he and two others bought 45 percent of the stock in The Daily Oklahoman, then eight years old, and they formed the Oklahoma Publishing Co. Gaylord was business manager. In 1906, Gaylord bought property at NW 4 and Broadway where the present newspaper plant stands.

Gaylord was a leader in drives for Oklahoma statehood and to locate the capitol in Oklahoma City.

In 1911, he started a farm paper, known then as the Oklahoma Farmer-Stockman. It now is The Farmer-Stockman and also publishes editions for Kansas and Texas. The publication was sold in 1972 to a group of its employees.

On Dec. 29, 1914, Gaylord married Miss Inez Kinney, Bellaire, Ohio, a national YWCA secretary.

In 1915, Gaylord was elected president of the Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce. He has served as a director of it since that time.

In 1916, the Oklahoma Publishing Co. bought the Oklahoma City Times at a sheriff's auction for \$30,000. Gaylord became president of the Oklahoma Publishing Co. in 1918 and continues as president and general manager as well as editor and publisher of The Daily Oklahoman and Oklahoma City Times.

In 1928, Gaylord purchased radio station WKY in Oklahoma City. The company now also owns WKY-TV in Oklahoma City and other television stations in Houston, Tampa, Fla.; the Fort Worth-Dallas area and Milwaukee. Other divisions of the company include Oklahoma Graphics, a quality offset printing house; National Packaging, makers of printed cellophane and polyethylene packaging; and Publishers Petroleum, an oil and gas development firm.

In 1931, Gaylord formed Mistletoe Express, an express trucking service in Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, Missouri and Arkansas.

Gaylord has been president of the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association; direc-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tor of the Associated Press; and was an organizer of the Frontiers of Science Foundation of Oklahoma, Inc. He has fostered every major civic enterprise in Oklahoma City and the state personally and/or through his newspapers since 1903. In 1963, the newspapers began operating from a new \$3 million plant adjacent to the old building at NW 4 and Broadway.

Gaylord and his wife live in Oklahoma City. There are three children: Edward L. Gaylord, Mrs. Ralph Neely and Mrs. Edith Gaylord Harper, all of Oklahoma City, nine grandchildren, and one great grandchild.

Fifty years ago I had just joined the Daily Oklahoman as a cub reporter. On two subsequent occasions I again was a member of Mr. Gaylord's staff and have steadily observed his sustained achievements. I salute him on this anniversary.

### SOCIAL SECURITY WORK PENALTIES

#### HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, for many years the Members of Congress have been troubled with injustices resulting from the limitation on earned income by the recipients of social security benefits if they happen to be in the age group of 62 to 72.

A recommendation for the total abolition of these limitations has now come from the Commissioner of the U.S. Administration on Aging, Mr. John B. Martin.

Mr. Martin says categorically that—

I think the time is coming and should come when the retirement test will be completely eliminated.

For the benefit of my colleagues I insert in the RECORD Mr. Martin's article taken from the Washington Post of Wednesday, March 7, 1973:

#### SOCIAL SECURITY WORK PENALTIES

(By John B. Martin)

The retirement test under the Social Security Act which determines how much one can earn without loss of benefits has been liberalized by the passage of H.R. 1 in the closing days of the 92d Congress.

The amount that a beneficiary under age 72 may earn in a year and still be paid full Social Security benefits for the year was increased from \$1,600 to \$2,100. Under the earlier law, benefits were reduced by \$1 for each \$1 of earnings above \$2,880. The new legislation would provide for a \$1 reduction for each 2 of all earnings above \$2,100. There would be no \$1 for \$1 reduction as under the earlier law. Beyond age 72 earnings would not affect benefits.

Most social security beneficiaries regard social security benefits as an outright pension. Regarded in this way as an annuity, there is felt to be no excuse for reducing payments if the beneficiary receives earnings. The fact is that the original concept of Social Security was a form of insurance against loss of earnings. Consequently, benefits are never reduced because of investment income. Thus one may have income from stocks and bonds of \$20,000 and receive full Social Security benefits, whereas a beneficiary between 65 and 72 is penalized by loss of benefits if he or she earns more than \$2,100 as stated above.

As U.S. commissioner on aging I have heard complaints from older Americans about this treatment more often than any other complaint. "Why", they say "should John Smith, who does no work, be allowed to keep all his Social Security benefits, though he is in the \$30,000 income bracket, when I, who live on a modest Social Security income, am made to suffer because I am willing and able to work to supplement my much more limited income?"

I sympathize with this complaint. In the American ethic to be willing to work to support oneself and one's family has always been regarded as commendable. To be idle, living on some one else's effort has been regarded with suspicion or at least with a jaundiced eye. The reason is that we feel instinctively that it is wrong to create a negative incentive for those in society who are able to and want to work and thus to make a productive contribution to the nation's welfare. We feel this the more because most people who are healthy and active have a need to feel useful and wanted. Tests have shown that in our culture at least this feeling of being useful is met most effectively by doing productive work for which one is paid.

The fact is that our present law is a compromise which reflects both the theory that Social Security is insurance against loss of earnings requiring a deduction from benefits when earnings occur on the one hand and our instinctive feeling on the other that we should encourage and not discourage the desire to work and be productive. Thus we do permit some earnings without penalty or, to put it conversely, we do not penalize for all earnings. Furthermore, we do concede that at 72 we should provide no penalty for any earnings but should encourage as much self-support as possible.

The truth is that our unwillingness to go the whole way in recognizing that Social Security benefits are in fact a pension in the nature of an annuity and not subject to deduction for earnings is due to two factors—cost and the desire of many groups to remove the oldest part of the work force to make way for younger workers. The latter reason goes back to the depression days of the 1930s when Social Security was enacted in part to enable older workers to get out of the labor market. In my view this is still a motivating force in some arguments for retention of the retirement test. Cost is another matter. The recent liberalization of the retirement test is estimated to cost the system \$865 million in additional benefits during 1974. It has been said that removal of the test entirely before the most recent change would have cost in added benefits about \$3 billion.

I think the time is coming and should come when the retirement test will be completely eliminated. Traveling in the Soviet Union during the past summer I noted that the Russians retire men at 60 and women at 55 but encourage all retirees, so far as health permits, to get back into the labor force where they keep all of their pensions. Thus the Russians emphasize maximum productivity and meet the essential "need to be needed" feeling of retirees.

It may be argued that our situation in the United States is different in that there may be a lack of jobs to employ such retirees. The fact is that there may be a lack of jobs in private industry at wages which industry can afford to pay. But there is no lack of important jobs that need to be done in the field of public service. These are jobs which older persons may be fully competent to perform. Needed is machinery to link jobs with applicants and money to pay for performance. I predict that the time will come when every man or woman who wants to work will have the opportunity and will be paid for doing so.

## WEST'S STEEL MILLS PLAN FIGHT ON IMPORTS

## HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, last week my distinguished colleague from the district adjacent to mine (Mr. PETTIS) and I distributed a letter and some supporting material to those of our colleagues who represent districts in the Far West. The letter dealt with a problem which we are both concerned about; namely, the increasing share of the western steel market controlled by foreign manufacturers, with a resulting loss of jobs among employees of domestic steel suppliers on the west coast.

In an article appearing on February 25, Mr. Jack Miller, business editor of the San Francisco Examiner & Chronicle, described this problem in a concise, easy-to-understand manner. So that those who may have missed this article may better understand this problem, I hereby enter the article in the RECORD:

WEST'S STEEL MILLS PLAN FIGHT ON IMPORTS  
(By Jack Miller)

Do you insist on American made nails to fix your fence? Or house gutters or water pipe made of galvanized material from the U.S.A.?

If you do, your shopping job may be bigger than your repair job. For it isn't easy to find these—and a variety of other building products—made of steel that is not produced in a foreign mill.

Imported steel has deluged the Western market to such an extent that half or more of the entire demand for some products now is supplied from outside the country.

"It would take hard searching to buy a pound of American made nails in the Bay Area or anywhere else on the West Coast," a San Francisco steel executive told The Examiner.

"Half of all the galvanized sheets sold in the West are foreign," he added. These are used in a variety of building materials such as gutters, heating ducts and culverts.

Foreign mills also have gobbled up half or more of the market for hot and cold rolled sheets. These are used to make things like water heaters, farm equipment, locks, tools and instruments.

Foreign competition has had the West Coast steel industry howling for years. The pain has been especially excruciating because this region gets more than its share of this competition.

But the cries of misery hit a new crescendo this year as foreign mills poured a record tonnage of steel into the U.S. It cut still deeper into the Western market.

The result: While the industry nationally lost 16 percent of its business to foreign mills, the Western region got clobbered for a 36 percent loss in its market.

In other words, although the West uses only 9 percent of all the steel consumed in the nation, it is being flooded with about 20 percent of the imports coming into the country.

Price always has been the weapon that won business for foreign mills in the U.S. They now undersell by 7 to 14 percent, depending on the product. But the competition has become more rugged in recent years as foreign mills improved quality and service.

Each of the "Big-3" on the West Coast—Kaiser Steel, Bethlehem and U.S. Steel—is feeling the pain.

But Kaiser and a dozen or so smaller mills,

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

stretching from Los Angeles to Portland, are hit hardest since they have to share a bigger piece of a small pie.

"For companies such as Bethlehem and U.S. Steel, imports are only 16 percent of their problem since they sell nationally. For us, it's 36 percent of our market. So we find it twice as severe," a Kaiser spokesman said.

Some of the smaller firms are announcing layoffs which they blame on foreign competition. Pacific States Steel, Union City, is laying off 250 men. Cascade Steel Rolling Mills, Oregon, is cutting its work force by 60 and Northwest Steel Rolling Mills, Seattle, is laying off 70.

Jack J. Carlson, president of Kaiser, has written the State Department in his quest for relief from the "staggering impact" of imports.

Warning "the vitality of the domestic steel industry in the West will be severely damaged if the trend continues," Carlson declared:

"The excessive flood of imports has cost the West thousands of jobs and hundreds of millions in the last two years."

Kaiser Steel, which suffered almost a \$9 million loss last year, this week plans to launch a hard hitting campaign to inform "key senators, congressmen and other officials in Washington" about the problem.

The big thrust will be to step up the voluntary restraint program (whereby countries agree to hold down exports) so the West's share of the nation's total steel imports "is commensurate with its 9 percent share of the total U.S. market."

The industry in the West also has formed "The Labor-Management Committee for Fair Foreign Competition" to fight the battle in Washington.

A contingent of the group made the rounds in the nation's capital several weeks ago. They talked to White House aides, people in the State and Commerce departments and Western congressmen, Robert G. Free, executive secretary of the committee, said.

Their complaint went beyond imports. They also protested the huge shipments of scrap off the West Coast which, they claim, have driven up the price of this raw material 60 percent in the last six months.

Thus, the committee argued, Western mills get it coming and going. They are whiplashed by the additional price advantage for the foreign competitor which ships the same scrap back as a finished product.

But if the Labor-Management Committee gets what it wants—a lid on scrap exports to hold down prices—then there will be a new howl from another group.

That is, the exporters in the Bay Area whose survival depends on the foreign steel competitors' scrap purchases.

## THE 55TH ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

## HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, March 25, 1973, marks the 55th anniversary of Byelorussian independence. The Byelorussian Soviet Republic of today is not an independent state; it only possesses some external trappings of independence, such as its membership in the United Nations. Such normal functions of a sovereign state as relations with other states are not only strictly controlled by Moscow, but on the diplomatic level do not exist.

March 7, 1973

On March 25, 1918, the highest aspirations of the Byelorussian people for a free and independent life were fulfilled. During the past half century, the Soviet regime has deliberately and persistently tried to erode Byelorussian traditions, culture, education, and self-identity.

March 25, 1973, is a symbol of a dynamic spiritual force for Byelorussian independence which unites all Byelorussians wherever they may be. The fight for Byelorussian independence is also a fight for the emergence of all captive nations, which is a necessary prerequisite for the establishment of a lasting peace in the world.

A. D. LUSTER: COLONEL SANDERS OF THE CATFISH WORLD

## HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, in the First District of Arkansas, a little enterprise and a lot of hard work can take a man a long way. And if you add 4 pounds of catfish to the enterprise and work, you can go even farther. At this point, I would like to share with my colleagues the success story of Mr. A. D. Luster, who is fast on his way to becoming to catfish what Colonel Sanders is to chicken:

[From the Poplar Bluff (Mo.) Daily American Republic]

AND IT ALL STARTED WITH JUST 4 POUNDS OF CATFISH

(By Stan Berry)

(EDITOR'S NOTE: I have known A. D. Luster since he opened his first restaurant at Jonesboro, Ark. in 1968. I was a junior at Arkansas State University at the time, and A. D.'s restaurant was located only about 20 yards from the mobile home in which I was living. Some of this article might seem a little far-fetched, but I know the events related below to be true, because I was involved in most of them.)

Rockefeller made his millions in oil, Vanderbilt in railroads, Carnegie in steel and A. D. Luster in catfish.

Catfish!

Yes, catfish. Well, he's not quite a millionaire yet, but according to his accountant A. D. Luster, who owns A's Fish House here and other catfish eateries by the same name, is worth around half a million dollars.

Having known A. D. for four years, it's hard for this reporter to believe his meteoric success story.

A. D. opened his first restaurant in Jonesboro, Ark., in Oct. 1968. There was no grand opening and the newspapers carried no announcements about the establishment of a new catfish diner.

The reason: A. D. was broke.

During the course of three years, he had managed to lose \$25,000 while operating a combination amusement park-recreation area at Paragould, Ark.

It seemed the only thing A. D. made money on during his amusement park venture was a small stand which sold fried catfish.

When it became apparent he could no longer afford to operate his ill-fated amusement park, A. D. decided to take his one money-making operation and expand upon it.

The catfish stand moved from Paragould to A. D.'s hometown at Jonesboro, where the fledgling catfish king had rented a building to open his first restaurant.

At the time, this reporter was attending journalism school at Arkansas State University. The mobile home in which I was living was next door to the building in which A. D. was to launch his catfish career.

Webster must have had A. D.'s first restaurant in mind when he defined the word "dump."

The building, which had formerly been a hamburger stand, was horribly run down, a fact which was to aid the new occupant. In lieu of paying the first month's rent on the building, the moneyless A. D. offered to clean the place himself. The owner accepted. The job took A. D. six weeks.

As wild as it may seem, the first day A. D. opened his door for business, he was equipped with \$4.28, 10 lbs. of catfish, 50 lbs. of lard, a few pounds of hamburger, a package of buns, a head of lettuce and other condiments. For furnishings he had four tables with four chairs for each, two cookers and an ice box he had salvaged from his catfish stand at the amusement park.

As the catfish and other items were sold, A. D. would take the sales money and get this reporter or a neighbor to rush to any of the nearby grocery stores to replenish his stock.

It didn't take much of an accountant to figure the first three days take of \$8, \$12 and \$13.

"We could tell when the business started picking up," A. D. Joked, "we had \$28 in the cash box."

During the first four months of operation, the restaurant just didn't supply enough money to live on so A. D. started driving a school bus mornings and evenings.

The times were hard.

"At the start," A. D. remembers with a smile, "we used to stay open until 1 a.m. The glass factory changed shifts then and we normally picked up four or five customers for cheeseburgers."

When business was slow, as it was most of the time during the first few months, A. D. would invite this reporter and his college roommate to bring their guitars over, and, with the addition of some of A. D.'s musician friends, the catfish house became the stage for some "good" country and western music.

Should a customer come in he would receive a serenade right at his table. And, normally instead of ordering a catfish dinner, the customer would ask for a quick sandwich to go.

Then came a red letter date in the history of A.'s first Fish & Fries. Five months after opening, in February, A. D. experienced his first \$100 day. The "jam" music sessions stopped. A better supply line was established than the impromptu dashes to the nearest grocery. And, the operation became more businesslike.

Slowly but surely the news had spread that this shoddy-looking restaurant on Hwy. 1 just north of the college campus served good catfish, and all you could eat for a standard price.

Suddenly the converted hamburger joint became a popular restaurant. As many tables as possible were added, but the demand exceeded the capacity, and it was not uncommon to see people standing around the walls waiting for a table.

On many occasions during an extremely busy weekend, A. D. would rush over to this reporter's trailer and press him into service as a "waitress," short order cook or whatever he needed most at the time.

What really struck this reporter as funny was the clientele A. D. was getting. It must have really dumbfounded motorists passing on Hwy. 1 to see the parking lot in front of this dingy restaurant jammed with Cadillacs and other luxury cars.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

If the scene on the outside was funny, the scene on the inside was hilarious. Here you could find some of Jonesboro's top businessmen dressed in suits and accompanied by their wives, wearing expensive furs, jammed into tiny booths or being jostled by waitresses as they tried to pass between the crowded tables.

Suddenly A. D. was making money, and lots of it. Probably no one was more surprised about his good fortune than A. D. himself.

Finally the time came when his business demanded that he move into a larger and better building.

This writer watched and helped A. D. move to his new location with a sense of nostalgia. I looked back on the good times we had had knowing they could never be relived; A. D. was becoming a rich man.

One day after his move, A. D. visited this writer's trailer.

"You know," he said, "I'm thinking of branching out. I'd like to try putting a restaurant in another town."

Immediately I suggested Poplar Bluff, extolling all the attributes of this fair city.

A few days later, A. D. paid the author another visit and shocked him by saying, "You find me a place to locate, and I'll put a restaurant in Poplar Bluff."

Well, the writer did and A. D. did. And, according to A. D., "It was a wise move."

Since that time he has made a lot of wise moves. It's almost impossible to believe, considering his meager beginnings, but in November A. D. moved his Jonesboro restaurant into a new building.

There was a lot more fanfare in this grand opening than in the first. The grand opening was attended by Arkansas congressmen, Jonesboro city officials, a local television camera crew and newspaper reporters.

Why? Because A. D.'s new restaurant just happens to be the largest in the State of Arkansas. It comprises 16,000 square feet and can accommodate 1,500 people.

In Sept. 1971, A. D. organized a restaurant franchise. Besides his establishment here, he has A's Fish & Fries restaurants in Trumann, Ark., Paragould, Ark., and is currently setting up a catfish diner in Camden, Ark.

He also owns a mobile catering unit which he set up at the Indianapolis (Ind.) Speedway this past summer to feed Indy 500 race fans.

"I have plans to go nationwide with my franchise," A. D. revealed. "I've been approached by two big companies on the subject. By this time next year, I'd like to have 100 franchises."

Fresh river catfish is what A. D. advertises, and he admits that it is getting harder and harder to obtain the amount of fresh catfish to meet his needs.

"I sell 10 tons of catfish a month," he said. "Right now I have a fish company from Samburg, Tenn., under contract to supply my needs. My other seafood is purchased from various companies in Florida."

When this reporter was attending college, A. D. was just learning to fly an airplane. In fact, my first airplane ride was during one of A. D.'s lessons. Currently he owns two planes, a six-passenger Cherokee and a two-passenger plane, that he uses occasionally to pick up food items for his restaurants when he is in a pinch.

"Whenever A. D. and this reporter get together we always reminisce about the "old days" in that little "dump" on Hwy 1. Normally we are joined by Faye Chambers, who operates the catfish eatery in Poplar Bluff, and was A. D.'s first and only waitress when he opened that first restaurant.

During our conversations, there are always a lot of smiles. After all, who would believe an Arkansas country boy could get rich

off a restaurant he started with four lbs. of catfish.

## NIXON ADMINISTRATION CUTS FUND FOR FORESTRY RESEARCH

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 7, 1973*

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, next week the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee will hold hearings on funding of programs for fiscal year 1974 under the Cooperative State Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The McIntyre-Stennis cooperative forestry research program, along with three other cooperative State research programs, has had its funds severely cut by the administration. It is a paradox to promote Federal revenue sharing and at the same time cut funds to help States in cooperative programs like these.

The cooperative forestry research program was initiated in 1962 under the McIntyre-Stennis Act, Public Law 87-788, by unanimous votes of both the House and the Senate. The statute states its purpose:

It is recognized that research in forestry is the driving force behind progress in developing and utilizing the resources of the Nation's forest and related rangelands. The production, protection, and utilization of the forest resources depend on strong technological advances and continuing development of the knowledge necessary to increase the efficiency of forestry practices and to extend the benefits that flow from forest and related rangelands. It is recognized that the total forestry research efforts of the several State colleges and universities and of the Federal Government are more fully effective if there is close coordination between such programs, and it is further recognized that forestry schools are especially vital in the training of research workers in forestry.

While funding of the program has been modest, the results achieved have been substantial. In fiscal year 1972 appropriations for the program were at a level of \$4,672,000 and had generated some \$12 million in matching State funds to support sound forestry research programs at 61 participating institutions throughout the country.

The 92d Congress appropriated \$6,444,000 to continue the program in fiscal year 1973. Of this, only \$4,944,000 has been released to the States and participating institutions; \$1.5 million of the appropriated funds has been impounded. And for fiscal year 1974, the President has proposed to limit the program to a totally inadequate \$3,962,000.

For the University of Minnesota College of Forestry, this means a reduction in funding from \$123,000 to \$93,000. Unless funds are restored to previous levels, the university's sound and productive forestry research program will be curtailed severely, and it will be impossible to continue vital research on forest production and on environmental problems

March 7, 1973

concerning water and wildlife. Dean Frank H. Kauffert of the University of Minnesota College of Forestry states:

These programs are critical to Minnesota and its future.

At a time when the main thrust of the administration's domestic policy is self-reliance and encouragement of individuals to do more for themselves, it seems the height of folly to reduce the essential research base on which individuals can draw in attempting to help themselves. We have slighted nonmilitary oriented research in the recent past, and we have lost the competitive lead we once had in the world's economy. Let us not further reduce that lead by such shortsighted action as this.

The administration has increased the military budget for fiscal year 1974 by \$4 billion. Reinstatement of the McIntyre-Stennis cooperative forestry research program at a realistic level would entail only about one-third the cost of a single F-14 plane.

The Congress must reassert its authority over how our tax money is spent. I urge the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee to restore funds for the McIntyre-Stennis cooperative forestry research program at the fiscal year 1973 level of \$6,444,000, in order to enable this essential program to continue as Congress intended it should.

#### A TRULY BEAUTIFUL PLACE

#### HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, when my father died on February 15, I immediately went to Florida. That day my son had to write a composition for his English class. Chris is 12 years old. The composition was to be entitled "A Truly Beautiful Place," and my son wrote about the place where his grandfather lived and died. The composition follows:

My grandparents live in Florida. Their house is near a busy city called Bradenton. They live near the beach and on an island called Anna Maria.

Anna Maria is a truly beautiful place. It is a small town with tall, swaying palm trees that dance with every move of the wind. The bay is one side of the island and the beautiful Gulf of Mexico is sparkling in the sun like diamonds on the other side.

I like to listen at night when I'm in bed to the mighty waves crashing on the rocks. The waves crashing and the crickets letting the neighbors know that everything's peaceful. It reminds me of a masterpiece painting. It is a masterpiece in its own way.

In the day it is warm and the sun is bright and shining. It never rains, much. You can fish or swim and be assured of great fun.

I can remember every morning I got up and had breakfast with my grandfather. Then we would go and get the newspaper and the mail. He was a great man who never gave up and always fought to the end, and won. He died today and it is a great loss to his friends and loved ones. He is a great man and I'm sure he will go to heaven. I will go to Florida again, but it will never be quite the same.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALTER F. MONDALE OF MINNESOTA: THE DEMOCRATIC RESPONSE TO PRESIDENT NIXON'S MESSAGE ON HUMAN RESOURCES

#### HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 1973, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, the Honorable WALTER F. MONDALE, delivered a reply on network radio, on behalf of the Democratic leadership of Congress, to President Nixon's recent message on human resources.

I believe that Senator MONDALE's address is a powerful and compelling response to the President's statement, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senator's address be included at this point in the RECORD:

#### SPEECH BY WALTER F. MONDALE

Last month President Nixon submitted his budget proposals. Last Saturday, in a nationwide radio address, he defended his proposals for human resources.

The Congressional Democrats have received equal time and I have been asked by the leadership of the Congress to present our response.

There are some things in the President's message which we all agree with, and are proud of. We have made important advances in social security, medicare, higher education, human rights, cancer research, reducing hunger and elsewhere.

All of these came about through cooperation between the President and the Democratic Congress.

But most were Democratic initiatives. And some . . . including the 20 percent Social Security increase . . . were initially opposed by the President.

We have often disagreed with the President's proposals; he has often disagreed with ours. But when there has been a will on both sides to work together, programs have been enacted that have benefited all Americans.

This is as it should be.

#### PRESIDENT HAS CHALLENGED TRADITION OF CO-OPERATION BETWEEN CONGRESS AND THE EXECUTIVE

But now the President is challenging both our shared commitments . . . and our tradition of cooperation and constitutional government. And he is doing it in a way that is causing confusion and uncertainty across the nation.

This past week, mayors and governors came to the Congress to tell us they don't know where to turn. They know they'll be getting less help next year, but they don't know how much less . . . and the White House won't tell them. Those in the Executive Branch who will talk don't know the answers. And those who know won't talk.

It's ironic that this Administration talks so much about returning power to the local level . . . when they concentrate so much power in a small group of anonymous Presidential aides. The most fundamental decisions affecting the American people are now often beyond the reach of State officials, local officials, and even the Congress.

#### NIKON BUDGET CALLS FOR CUTBACKS IN SOCIAL PROGRAMS

The President's real message is not in his speech. It is in his budget. Where a government puts its money tells the truth about its commitments.

The President's budget calls for severe cutbacks in our existing investments in decent housing . . . employment . . . education . . .

health . . . the poor and the aged . . . the family farmer.

This budget would, among other things, eliminate 180,000 desperately needed jobs . . . end the federal aid for low and moderate income housing . . . slash health research, aid to education, medicare benefits for the aged . . . and abolish practically every effort to strengthen rural America.

While nearly 100 programs to help people would be destroyed, the defense and foreign aid budgets would rise dramatically . . . and not a single tax loophole for the rich would be closed.

The President claims that our investment in human resources is increasing. But these increases are in the social security program, which is separate and self-supporting. They are not inflationary because they are fully funded by the payroll tax. And we have passed most of them over the President's objection.

Aside from social security, this budget is nothing less than a disaster.

Can you imagine recommending that hospital charges for many older Americans under Medicare be doubled?

Can you imagine cutting job training programs by 29 percent in two years and abolishing public service employment?

Can you imagine reducing aid to our public schools?

That is what this budget does.

#### UNILATERAL EXECUTIVE ACTIONS TERMINATE OR CUT EXISTING PROGRAMS

And the President has not just proposed cutbacks for Congress and the Nation to consider, as Presidents have done in the past. In many cases, he has simply gone ahead on his own . . . often in direct violation of the law. This has caused enormous confusion and uncertainty . . . and created a serious constitutional crisis.

He is impounding . . . without legal authority . . . half the funds for pollution control enacted by the Congress over his veto.

Without consulting Congress, he is destroying the poverty program which he asked the Congress to continue . . . and he signed into law . . . last Fall.

By executive order he has ended virtually all of our housing and rural development programs.

We are not witnessing a policy of restraint. We are witnessing a retreat from our commitment to social and economic justice.

As one major newspaper said recently:

"This is a break with more than forty years of an essentially liberal momentum, supported by the dominant elements in both parties, that has carried this nation forward to a more just and humane society within the framework of enlightened capitalism."

#### PRESIDENT ABANDONS NATIONAL COMMITMENT TO PEOPLE

It is a call to abandon our national commitment to a better life for ordinary Americans . . . and especially the poor. It is telling us to ignore the difficult problems we've had the courage to face . . . and to forget our efforts to build a more decent America.

Yet this is the time . . . with the war ending . . . to return to our nation's fundamental pursuit of human justice.

It is a time, as John Kennedy said twelve years ago, for Americans to ask "not what your country can do for you—but what you can do for your country."

It is not a time, as we heard last month, to ask "What can I do for myself."

As a prominent economist said:

"Instead of restoring self-reliance, President Nixon is putting self-interest on a pedestal. Instead of restoring confidence in government, he is inviting contempt for government in general and Congress in particular. Instead of focusing efforts on a higher quality of life, he is appealing to instincts of crass materialism."

\* \* \* \* \*

"But somehow," he continued, "a crusade to think small, think simple, and think sel-

fish does not strike me as the best path to either personal salvation or national greatness."

And I agree.

The Administration asks us to forget our commitments to people . . . and to spend the money elsewhere. They propose an increase to \$10 billion for military and other foreign aid. They want \$8 billion for new Pentagon spending as the war ends. And we're told they may ask for \$7½ billion more for the two Vietnams.

#### PRESIDENT IGNORES WASTE AND SURPLUS IN OTHER AREAS

Yet their budget contains no proposals to close loopholes through which the wealthy escape their fair share of the tax burden. It doesn't deal with cost overruns in military spending. It contains subsidies for executive jets and business lunches.

One commentator said, "This is free enterprise for the ordinary citizen . . . and socialism for the rich."

If a farmer needs disaster relief, he's on his own. But if a major corporation loses money, we're expected to bail it out.

And who pays for all this? The ordinary taxpayer who has no loopholes.

We need to take a tough look at this budget. The American people cannot afford to repeat the deficits of recent years.

I agree that we must look for waste in "every nook and cranny of the bureaucracy." I agree we must "get rid of old programs that have outlived their time, or that have failed."

And I agree with the tests the President proposed last Saturday . . . to get more value out of every tax dollar . . . and to make our delivery system more efficient and less paternal. I don't know anyone in Congress who is opposed to reforming our programs, and making them more effective.

But every budget item must meet these tests. Waste, inefficiency and out-moded programs are not found only in agencies that deal with human needs.

Sure we've made mistakes.

Some human programs have not worked. And sometimes we promise too much.

But the answer to overpromising is to tone down the rhetoric. The answer to failure is to find new approaches which will work.

Our country has accomplished a lot. Let's not be misled.

In the last decade alone, 15 million people have been helped out of poverty;

In the last 20 years, the number of young people attending college has doubled.

And let's not forget . . . the comfort Medicare has brought to millions of old people who used to suffer alone and uncared for . . . the hope and the jobs our expanded education programs have provided to thousands of Americans . . . and the opportunities for a fuller life now available to handicapped children and adults throughout this country. And this is not a full list by any means.

The issue is clear. We can continue our commitment to social and economic justice . . . or we can turn away. The President has made his recommendation. His budget comforts the comfortable. But when it comes to helping those in need, it says, "If at first we don't succeed, quit."

We must do better.

Of course, there are limits to what we can afford. And, as everyone in Congress agrees, we must establish a non-inflationary budget ceiling. But we will not forfeit Congressional responsibility to decide how funds are spent within that ceiling. We will not give any President absolute power over how your money is spent.

#### CONGRESSIONAL ALTERNATIVE TO ADMINISTRATION'S HUMAN RESOURCES PROGRAM

If we take that tough look at every proposed expenditure . . . we can easily save \$8-\$10 billion in military waste . . . foreign aid . . . tax giveaways . . . and inefficient social programs. Over \$3 billion could be

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

raised by simply ending super depreciation breaks for big business. And we could responsibly cut Pentagon waste by \$5 billion . . . as we did last year.

I believe we should invest these hard-earned tax dollars wisely . . . in carefully designed programs meeting human needs.

We cannot do everything at once. But we can begin bringing health care within the reach of every American family . . . strengthening our rural and urban communities . . . improving housing opportunities.

And we can begin . . . mounting an effective campaign against crime . . . reducing pollution . . . cutting unemployment . . . improving education . . . and bringing dignity to the sick and the aged.

With these savings we could:

Find public service jobs for 300,000 unemployed Americans.

Double Head Start . . . bringing hope and opportunity to another 500,000 young children.

Prevent the proposed new hospital charges for Medicare . . . and roll back monthly Medicare premiums.

Ease the financial crisis in public education . . . and relieve the growing pressure on the property tax.

Restore disaster aid and housing programs.

Turn the tide against crime by expanding police protection and improving our criminal justice system.

And protect our environment to the fullest extent of the law.

These are the kinds of investments we need. They help people.

We can make them . . . or investments like them . . . and honor our national commitment to human justice.

Or we can accept the Administration's budget . . . and accept its decision to abandon that commitment, begun so many years ago.

#### FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS RESPONSIBILITY TO MEET COMPELLING SOCIAL NEEDS

This is an old debate for Americans. Those who fought against Social Security and rural development in the 1930's . . . or against Medicare and aid to education in the 1960's . . . used the same arguments we're hearing today. "These aren't national problems," they claimed. "We don't know how to solve them. And we cannot afford to try."

My answer is the answer Franklin Roosevelt gave 40 years ago:

"Governments can err," FDR said. "Presidents can make mistakes, but we are told that divine justice weighs the sins of the coldblooded and the sins of the warmhearted on a different scale. Better the occasional faults of a government living in the spirit of charity than the consistent omissions of a government frozen in the ice of its own indifference."

No matter how hard we try, we will make some mistakes. But with your help we can apply the power, the strength, the wisdom and the spirit of our great country to the solution of our problems . . . to meeting the compelling needs of our people.

## MRS. WILLIAM FARRELL

### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

#### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend to you a resident of my congressional district, Mrs. William Farrell of Port Washington, who recently was appointed a trustee of the Jones Fund, a Nassau County funding organization established by members

of the pioneer Jones family on Long Island to administer the Jones Institute in Hicksville, a home for the indigent.

Mrs. Farrell, a widow, who also is associate editor of a local weekly newspaper, the Port Mail-Reporter, is to be congratulated for her dedication to public services and on her desire to assist those less fortunate. Her untiring efforts on behalf of countless community projects and affairs deserves our recognition.

I recently had the pleasure, too, of attending the wedding of Mrs. Farrell's daughter, Frances, to Paul Jurkowski who also resides within my congressional district. Mrs. Jurkowski, an accomplished musician and singer, is rapidly following in her mother's footsteps by involving herself in numerous worthwhile community endeavors.

## FREEDOM FOR LITHUANIA

### HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

#### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the 55th anniversary of Lithuanian Declaration of Independence, I am pleased to enclose the resolution unanimously adopted by the Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., at an assembly in that city of February 18, 1973.

The resolution follows:

#### RESOLUTION

Lithuanians of Worcester, Massachusetts, assembled at the meeting held in the hall of the Lithuanian Naturalization Club at 67 Vernon Street on February 18, 1973 in commemoration of the fifty-fifth anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence:

"Whereas, Lithuania became a free and independent state by declaration of the Lithuanian Council on the 16th of February, 1918, was defended by the sacrifices of the Lithuanian people in combats during 1919-1920; and the independence of Lithuania was recognized by the international community including Soviet Russia;

"Whereas, Soviet Russia, in violation of the Peace Treaty of 1920, the nonaggression treaty of 1926, and the mutual assistance pact of 1939—attacked Lithuania, occupied it by military force and enslaved her people;

"Whereas, Soviet Russia perpetuates acts of genocide of Lithuanian people by deportations to Siberia and other remote areas, and by physical extermination of about one million Lithuanians; deprived remaining people in the country of their human rights and elementary freedom of speech, press, assembly and religion;

"Whereas, the free world has not recognized the incorporation of Lithuania into the USSR, and legally, Lithuania is an existing state with diplomatic and consular representatives in the United States of America and other nations of Europe and South America; Now therefore, be it

"Resolved, To demand the withdrawal of the Soviet Russian military forces and administrative apparatus from Lithuania and to allow the Lithuanian people to govern themselves;

To request the President of the United States of America, to instruct his delegation at the Conference on European Security and Cooperation in Helsinki, to demand the restoration to the Lithuanian people the free exercise of their sovereign rights in their land;

To ask Senators and Congressmen of the United States for their support of the above requests; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Richard M. Nixon; William P. Rogers, Secretary of State; John Alfred Scali, United States Ambassador to the United Nations; Senator, Hon. Edward M. Kennedy; Senator, Hon. Edmund W. Brooke and to our representative, Congressman, Hon. Harold D. Donohue."

PRANAS STANELIS,  
President, Worcester Area of Lithuanian Organizations.

ANTONIA M. WACKELL,  
Secretary.

#### ANTISEMITIC POLICIES OF THE SOVIET UNION

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Jethiel Orenstein, Congregation Beth El, has kindly sent me an article that is deserving of the attention of all our colleagues and their constituents. The anti-semitic policies of the Soviet Government must be of direct concern to all freedom-loving people, and the words of the heroic Soviet Jew quoted in the article are chilling in their portent.

Rabbi Orenstein's article, which appeared in the program for the congregation's Shabbus services of February 16 and in the New York Post and the Newark Star Ledger, follows:

##### A NOTE FROM YOUR RABBI

Yesterday my wife Sylvia and Gideon Gorren, Principal of the Central Hebrew High School telephoned Russia. I pray to God that the words that passed between them and Mikhail Agorsky may yet save the Soviet Union from a tragic error.

You are all probably familiar with "Judaism Without Embellishment," a vicious, evil, anti-semitic tract published in the Ukraine. The Soviet Government's argument was "What control do we have over these outer districts?" Now, essays and a new novel, "The Promised Land," have been published in Moscow, the heart of the Soviet Union and they are unbelievable in the monstrous barbarity of their base anti-semitism. "We Jews started World War II." "Eichmann was our agent." These incredible statements may do everlasting harm to the Jews of the Soviet Union. Agorsky is risking his life by asking that his words be quoted in the American Press. The students of our Central Hebrew High School who paid for this \$3.00 per minute phone call with their baby-sitting money have made the greatest investment in their lives.

If we can stop the Soviet Union from stooping to the vicious slanders of our people, we may yet save lives. I'm sending a copy of this statement to our Congressmen, to our Senators and to our President. I believe we have touched a moment of authentic history. Here are the words of Mikhail Agorsky:

"I want to make a statement.

The Moscow magazine *October* has published a strong anti-semitic novel, "The Promised Land," by Koleznikov recently. The massacre of Jews by Nazis are described there as a consequence of a Zionist plot. For example, Eichmann is said to have been a Jewish agent. This novel released Nazis from the responsibility for these massacres. All

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Soviet press strictly regulated. Such a novel could not be published without an official approval. Just because of this fact the publication of this novel is very alarming. So between the Soviet officials there are those longing to rehabilitate Nazi Germany. I don't feel that the above mentioned approval has been done by public Soviet rulers. I don't think so. Nevertheless, this fact shows very clearly: The powerful circles in Eastern Russia are aspiring to represent the Second World War as a result of a Jewish plot, and to rehabilitate Nazis. The Soviet leadership is likely not to be able to restrain these circles. It is a great potential danger to Soviet Jews. I make a strong protest against this pro Nazi statement in the Soviet press."

Every effort will be made to have these words reach the widest possible readership. Russia cannot be allowed to win over Eastern Germany by sacrificing the Jewish people as their guilt offering. It is ludicrous to blame the Jews for the Nazis. You were the first to know. Those wishing an entire transcript of the telephone conversation can receive them by calling the office, 763-0111.

#### FIGHT POLLUTION AND CONSERVE NATURAL RESOURCES

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, early in this session of the 93d Congress I joined in the sponsorship of H.R. 2461, a bill to reduce pollution and the waste of natural resources caused by litter composed of soft drink and beer containers.

This year the United States will manufacture, then throw away, a staggering 45 billion nonreturnable beverage containers. With only 6 percent of the earth's population, the United States currently consumes an estimated 50 percent of the world's natural resources. According to the National Wildlife Federation, our known reserves of aluminum will be depleted in 120 years, lead in 52 years, crude oil and uranium in 30, and natural gas in 15.

It is increasingly evident that we must begin to cut back our consumption, and this bill is a step in that direction.

The benefits of this bill to the consumer are quite clear. Not only would there be a decrease in roadside litter, but our consumer population as a whole would realize a direct savings of \$1.5 billion annually.

This problem must also be considered in terms of our Nation's massive and mounting solid waste disposal difficulties. It has been predicted that by 1980, my own City of Chicago will have to transport garbage 300 to 400 miles for disposal sites. Nationally, 48 million tons of waste are annually dumped into ocean waters. Although estimates vary, most experts would agree that about 5 percent of this refuse problem consists of throwaway beverage containers.

In terms of our diminishing energy supply, passage of this legislation is most urgent. According to a study of the beverage industry last year by the University of Illinois, it was calculated that reverting back to a returnable system of beverage containers would reduce the indus-

try's energy consumption by a full 55 percent.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of land usage, litter, decreasing energy supplies, mineral resource depletion, social costs, solid waste costs, and purchase costs, passage of this legislation is vital. This bill will begin to correct the grotesque misapplication of our Nation's social and economic resources.

#### FORCED REPATRIATION

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, for several years now I have, via the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, called attention to the efforts of Julius Epstein, a professor of international law and international relations at Lincoln University in San Francisco, to have released by the Department of the Army the Operation Keelhaul files which document the case of the forced repatriation to the Soviet Union of hundreds of thousands of Russian citizens held by the Allies at the end of World War II. So vehement were the objections of these people to being shipped back to the Soviet Union that some committed suicide rather than be returned. While several objections were offered by the Army as to why the material could not be made public, the only reason now offered for keeping the information classified is that the forced repatriation was a joint British-American venture and that British concurrence is required. To date, British approval has not been obtained. For a second time Mr. Epstein has gone to court to seek release of the files, his initial action being denied certiorari by the U.S. Supreme Court.

It is understandable then why an article in the Sunday Oklahoman of January 28, 1973, was of great interest to me. The article, authored by Jack Taylor, raises the possibility of forced repatriation of North Vietnamese prisoners who might choose to remain in the South if given the option by the recent Vietnam peace agreement. It will be remembered that at the end of the Korean war thousands of Red Chinese soldiers elected not to return to Red China when given the choice which is, of course, in keeping with the Geneva Convention which opposed forced repatriation.

Our policy in Korea and not that after World War II should be the precedent to be followed in the current case of the North Vietnamese.

I include the above-mentioned article in the RECORD at this point:

ENEMY POW'S MAY BE SENT NORTH AGAINST THEIR WILL

(By Jack Taylor)

The United States and South Vietnam apparently plan to repatriate even unwilling enemy prisoners of war under terms of the cease-fire agreement signed Saturday in Paris.

Both the Defense Department and the White House declined comment, although it

was acknowledged that in one survey of North Vietnamese POW's most said they did not want to return home.

The cease-fire agreement provides for the simultaneous exchange of prisoners within 60 days and, insofar as is known, makes no allowances for POW's who refuse repatriation.

Asked if that means unwilling POW's will be forcibly returned, Brig. Gen. Daniel James, Jr., deputy assistant secretary of defense for public affairs, acknowledged:

"It sounds like whether you want to go or not we're going to drag you on back and say, 'There you are, fellow'."

The repatriation of prisoners unwilling to return to their home countries would be an apparent violation of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 as previously interpreted by the United Nations and the United States.

The conventions require the release of POW's without delay following the cessation of hostilities. When the issue of forcible repatriation delayed the Korean War for 15 months, the United Nations voted 54-5 with one abstention to enunciate the principle embodied in the conventions that "force shall not be used against the prisoners of war to prevent or effect their return to their homelands."

Asked if honoring those accords would violate the cease-fire agreement, or if the cease-fire agreement violates the Geneva accords, the White House said:

"There are a number of things that remain to be worked out. The White House is not commenting on the substance of the agreement beyond Dr. Kissinger's briefing on the subject the other day . . . in which he was not asked about it."

Gen. James said: "The sensitivity of these negotiations while we've still got this four-party team over there that has to make certain modulations—we're not allowed to comment on it at all. Any spelling out or any speculation or clarification or interpretation of that agreement can only be done by Mr. Kissinger."

Asked about the apparent conflict between the cease-fire agreement and the Geneva Conventions, the assistant defense secretary added: "We're not going to get into that yet. If we start dragging our feet and talking like that, we're going to have a zillion families down on us."

Asked about a survey in May 1971 which showed only 13 of 570 sick and wounded North Vietnamese POWs were willing to return home, Gen. James said:

"Well, that is true. But right now, it would still be in the area of speculation because then we had a shooting war going on and after we sign the agreement, there won't be, so there won't be the kind of dishonor that maybe some of those people felt."

The Sunday Oklahoman asked, by letter in November, what accounting had been made of North Vietnamese POWs to determine how many would refuse repatriation. The letter also asked what plans the Defense Department was making in the event Hanoi refused to repatriate American POWs unless North Vietnamese prisoners were forcibly repatriated.

A month later, a spokesman in Gen. James' office said the Defense Department could not comment because of the Paris negotiations then in progress.

A letter made available to The Sunday Oklahoman showed that five days later, however, Dennis J. Doolin, deputy assistant secretary of defense for international affairs, said: "The United States Government intends to continue to abide by the provisions of this (Geneva) convention."

The letter was written to Julius Epstein of Palo Alto, Calif., a professor of international law and international relations at Lincoln University in San Francisco and a member of the White House Conference on

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Refugees during the administration of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

He said Doolin's letter is "ambiguous" and "lacks any assurance that no forced repatriation will be carried out."

The head of the POW/MIA program in the Defense Department is Dr. Roger E. Shields, assistant to the assistant secretary of defense for international affairs.

He has refused to accept inquiries on the issue of forced repatriation. But in a previously unpublished interview with The Sunday Oklahoman in November, he said such issues "are going to be the subject of negotiations."

He said about 10,000 North Vietnamese POWs are included in the 37,000 or so enemy prisoners and during May 1971, the allies tried to release unconditionally some North Vietnamese sick and wounded.

"Of some 570 who were interviewed, only 13 were willing to go," Dr. Shields said. "But those who were not (willing to go) expressed the opinion that this was only because the hostilities were continuing . . . (that) they would be willing to go home when the war was over."

Epstein believes "This is a terrible problem that has been completely ignored" and expects 60 to 80 per cent of the North Vietnamese POWs to refuse repatriation.

"Hanoi will immediately insist upon repatriation because the agreement stipulates we have to exchange every prisoner of war after the cease-fire takes place," Epstein said.

HON. J. MILES POUND

HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, a good friend and great supporter both of me and of the principles that made America great passed on some time ago. His name was J. Miles Pound and he had a keen mind and some finely honed patriotic sensibilities. A short time before his death, he prepared some remarks for the American Party Convention in Kentucky. I have been given permission to share these very important thoughts with my colleagues in Congress:

REMARKS BY THE LATE HONORABLE J. MILES POUND

"In the name of office every man is a liar," said Scipio Africanus over 2000 years ago. That was true of Rome; it is also true of America, which uncomfortably resembles Rome just prior to the period of decline. But we must ask, is it necessary? Is it not possible occasionally for Americans to elect an honorable man and a just one? Must we always have charlatans and hypocrites who are so lured by the power of office that they will speak piously, with their tongues in their cheeks? Are there no Americans of honor and uprightness who will not only ask for the office but will receive it? American politics have been arousing the amusement and disgust of other nations for decades and rightfully so. We have consistently elected liars, thieves, plunderers and rascals, until our political parties are notorious for their stenches and cannot be trusted either with their constituents' money or welfare.

These are the days when men in office should not be plunderers and hypocrites and liars. The events in the world, however we ignore them, will shadow our future, for we no longer are an island complete in itself.

We need Patriots—not betrayers.

We need Prudent men—not profligates.

We need politicians who will think first of their country before they vote in the Congress.

We need legislators who will not cater to special segments of our society but will consider the welfare of all the people. Equal justice for all, special privilege for none (Thomas Jefferson).

In inciting the basest instincts of humanity, such as greed and envy, lust and hate, any would-be politician is doing the most terrible disservice to his country.

Let us call attention to the fact that the greater part of the American people are "workers," whether they are surgeons, plumbers, planters, mechanics, merchants, bricklayers, business men, lawyers, layers of streets. Only those who have inherited fortunes—and they are few—cannot be considered "workers"—and the politician who attempts to create classes in America, will help to destroy America.

We have no distinct "Labor" in America. All who work with their hands or brains for their sustenance are "Labor." No man is a "common man." We are mightily uncommon in America. And we must remain that way! Let me address myself to the critics of our society and of our nation—

I am unalterably opposed to those who desecrate our flag, denounce our Constitution and extol the virtues of Godless ideologies of other lands.

I protest those who campaign and petition and parade for individual rights but have no tolerance for the rights of those who oppose them.

I protest those men of God who sow the seeds of conflict and encourage disrespect for temporal law and authority.

I protest broadcast commentators and newspaper writers who feed the flames of fear by allowing rumors, guesses, speculation, lies and conjecture to masquerade as fact.

In short, I protest those groups and individuals within our country who champion any system at variance with the basic concept of equal rights and equal opportunities—and equal responsibilities—that must be the hallmark of our way of life.

Let me make it clear—I have no apologies to make for my country, or my generation.

In one generation we have conquered or controlled diphtheria, smallpox, typhoid, polio, measles, tuberculosis and pneumonia. No longer do the ancient scourges sweep across our land, leaving death and tortured limbs and minds and hearts in their wake.

We have built more schools, colleges, hospitals and libraries than all other generations since the beginning of time.

We have trained and graduated more scientists, doctors, surgeons, dentists, lawyers, teachers, engineers and physicists than did our forbears for a thousand years before.

We have raised our standards of living and lowered our hours of work. Luxuries that only potentates enjoyed a generation ago are now available to all our people.

The automobile, the radio, the telephone, the airplane, the computer, television, antibiotics and a hundred other miracles have come to full flower in one generation.

We have taxed ourselves unmercifully to bring hope and health to our sick, our indigent, our young and our aged.

Each year our personal gifts to private charities exceed 14 billion dollars—more than 15 times the cost of running the entire Federal Government 50 years ago.

We have done more to bring dignity and equality and opportunity to all minority groups than any other generation has ever done in any nation since the dawn of history.

Please understand, I do not minimize the need for greater efforts in these areas. We have an urgent moral responsibility to move decisively in correcting injustices that have too long prevailed. At the same time, we

must not minimize the progress that has been made.

Don't let anyone sell you the idea that ours is a sick society. It is far from perfect, but it is also far and away the most enlightened, most unselfish, most compassionate in the history of the world.

I know what our generation has done—I'll stand on our record.

We may not have scored as high as we hoped. But we scored higher than ever before. There are still challenges to be met and hopes to be realized. They will not be attained by preachers and teachers of despair, or by sniffing flowers or staging love-ins or hate-ins. They will be attained by men and women who believe in God, our Constitution, and our way of life, and willing to work toward that end.

#### HARDSHIPS WROUGHT BY THE NIXON BUDGET

#### HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM OF NEW YORK IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the terrible hardships caused by the Nixon administration budget slashes in vital social service areas are hitting all age groups in our society. The children, the working poor, and the elderly are all reeling from the elimination or reduction of programs which have provided them with essential services. Federally assisted public housing construction has been frozen for 18 months, 10,000 senior citizens in New York City alone are being thrown out of the medicaid program. Eligibility for all types of federally funded social services is being restricted to welfare recipients.

A disgraceful example of this Nixon philosophy can be found in the proposed HEW regulations which would make working mothers ineligible for federally assisted child day care if their incomes are over the poverty level. In New York City, 17,000 working mothers and their children stand to lose out. The children will be hurt because they will be deprived of the enriching atmosphere of the day care centers. Their mothers will be encouraged to give up their jobs, go on welfare, and cease their efforts to improve their lives and their children's futures by hard work.

To paraphrase Mr. Nixon, these mothers and countless other social service recipients across the land will not need to "ask what their country is doing for them" because there will be only one answer to that question.

The following is a recent New York Times article which describes the plight of these working mothers of New York City:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 6, 1973]

#### MOTHERS FEAR END OF DAY-CARE AID (By George Vecsey)

They make a happy couple, the mother and daughter, riding the subway each morning down from the Bronx.

The mother, Irma McPherson, looks forward to her job at a glistening bank office on Park Avenue. Her 3-year-old daughter, Durell, looks forward to her jolly day-care center on East 53d Street.

"Durell chatters all the way downtown about the new words she can pronounce and

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

all her friends," Mrs. McPherson says. "I don't know what Durell would do if she couldn't go to school." "I don't know what I'd do, either."

Mrs. McPherson is afraid she may find out. New regulations from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare last month propose to terminate Federal support for social services to working mothers who, like Irma McPherson, earn salaries more than one-third higher than their state's poverty level.

In New York City, where the poverty level is \$3,600 for a family of four, working mothers are generally being accepted for day-care services if their incomes do not exceed \$7,500. As many as half the 34,000 working mothers now using day-care centers would fall above the \$5,400 maximum that would result if the proposed regulations are implemented by the Federal Government.

According to Georgia McMurray, Commissioner of the city's Agency for Child Development, if the new curbs are put into effect, the city and state intend to make up the difference—"at least through the fiscal year, June 30"—and no mothers will be barred from any centers.

But many day-care parents, voicing concern over the long-range status of the programs, will stage a protest at the Health, Education and Welfare office at 26 Federal Plaza from 10 A.M. to 1 P.M. today.

The demonstration is the latest in a series by several groups of parents who have lobbied against a state proposal to raise their fees—they now pay between \$2 and \$25 a week—and against the proposed cut in Federal funding.

Many of the working mothers seem both angry and disillusioned at the potential curtailment of what they had considered a function of government.

"I don't understand it," said Mrs. McPherson. "Maybe the Government is trying to use these day-care centers for welfare mothers. I'm all for working. I've been working since I was in the 12th grade. It makes me sick when I hear girls I know talk about having another baby to stay on welfare."

"But if I had to pay for day care, I couldn't keep my apartment. People say I could go on welfare and still work four hours a day. But why work four hours a day when I'm already working eight?"

Many working mothers say President Nixon is the source of Federal disengagement with day care.

Mr. Nixon has said, "All other factors being equal, good public policy requires that we enhance rather than diminish both parental authority and parental involvement with children—particularly in those decisive early years when social attitudes and a conscience are formed and religious and moral principles are first incubated."

#### SPENDING LIMIT CITED

However, Walter Angrist of the Community Services Administration of H.E.W. said yesterday that the proposed cut in Federal support for social services was a direct result of Congress's putting a \$2.5-billion limit on such spending. The official said that no Administration stand was being made against day care and stressed that all states were free to use revenue-sharing funds for day care if they wished.

Commissioner McMurray estimated that if the cutback went through, the city and state would have to make up a deficit of \$50-million a year to keep all the current families in the program.

"The Federal Government assumes that city and state will use revenue-sharing funds," the Commissioner said. "However, I'm not one of the greatest fans of revenue-sharing. It concerns me that the Federal Government appears to be regressing in providing for human needs. It's penny wise and pound foolish."

This sentiment was echoed by the working mothers whose children attend the brightly

March 7, 1973

colored Prescott Nursery School near Second Avenue. Several mothers the other day described themselves as having held middle-class outlooks until divorce or other circumstances had made them members of the so-called "working poor," unable to make as much money as the men who had left them with children.

When her husband left, Irma McPherson spurned welfare to commute from Freeport, L.I., to her bank job, leaving Durell with the little girl's grandmother. When the commuting became too much, Mrs. McPherson moved to the Bronx and saw her daughter only on weekends.

"My mother was great to watch Durell for me," Mrs. McPherson said during a lunch break. "But grandmothers tend to spoil children. Durell preferred her grandmother to me. That really hurt."

#### MOTHERS ARE CRITICAL

Mrs. McPherson, who makes \$123 a week and pays \$175 a month for her apartment in the South Bronx, said she knew of nobody she would trust to watch Durell in the city, even if she could afford the usual \$40 to \$60 weekly fees for private babysitting.

But then she heard about Prescott, a 30-year-old nursery that operates on 75 per cent Federal funds and 12½ per cent each for the city and the state.

"This school is good for both of us," Mrs. McPherson said. "Durell is really close to me again."

"It's a wonderful thing to see our mothers and our children starting to get their thing together," said Nan Nally, a social worker who handles admissions at Prescott. "But I'm afraid most of our mothers would not be eligible for Federal funds under the new regulations."

"I grew up in a conservative New England town," said another working mother, Bonnie Abbott, now of Manhattan. "I've always favored people like [California Gov. Ronald] Reagan cutting the welfare rolls. But I see Nixon as a self-made man saying, 'I made it on my own—everybody else should, too.'"

"Something's wrong here," said Michelle Oppenheimer of Manhattan. "There are times when I'm not proud of my country any more. We're out working. We pay taxes. Do they want us to go on welfare? Or is this Nixon's way of telling women they have no business working?"

"I love my job," said Christine Muolo of Elmhurst. "In another year I'll have a three-week vacation. Maybe soon I could afford a summer camp for my son. I'm trying hard to completely end my connection with welfare. But I might as well go on welfare if this day-care is stopped."

"Somebody said the other day that maybe it was time for people to move to Europe instead of Europeans moving here," said Marlies Messinger of Manhattan, a native of Germany.

"You'd get better care in most countries in Europe," Michelle Oppenheimer added.

"It doesn't make sense," said Bonnie Abbott. "They have something that's working, and they want to do away with it. It's like they offer you a lollipop—and then they pull it away."

#### ARE WE LOSING SIGHT OF THE FUNDAMENTAL PHILOSOPHY OF FREEMASONRY?

#### HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1973

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have read with profound interest a well written treatise on the place and the opportunities of Freemasonry from the pen of

Evans Crary, Jr. It appeared in the New Age magazine for March 1973. Mr. Crary, who lives in Stuart, Fla., is Grand Master of Masons in our State. He is highly respected for his contributions to the work of fraternal orders and to Masonry in particular.

I have more than usual interest in Mr. Crary's good work for it was my privilege to serve in the Florida Legislature with his father years ago and I have maintained close friendship with the family throughout the years.

Mr. Crary's fine article follows:

**ARE WE LOSING SIGHT OF THE FUNDAMENTAL PHILOSOPHY OF FREEMASONRY?**

(By Evans Crary, Jr.)

Philosophy is variously defined. Originally it meant the love or pursuit of wisdom, in its broadest sense. That original concept has been limited and is now generally accepted as the study of the truth or principles underlying all knowledge. It is a study which attempts to define a system for guiding life, such as a body of principles of conduct, religious beliefs, or traditions. Using this last definition, we can determine the fundamental teaching in our Masonic system for guiding our lives.

Albert Pike has said of Freemasonry that "It is philosophical, because it teaches the great Truths concerning the nature and existence of one Supreme Deity, and the existence and immortality of the soul. It revives the Academy of Plato, and the wise teachings of Socrates. It reiterates the maxims of Pythagoras, Confucius, and Zoroaster, and reverentially enforces the sublime lessons of Him who died upon the Cross." From this statement it immediately becomes apparent that Masonry's philosophical foundation is its teaching of the truths concerning the nature and existence of one God and the existence and immortality of the soul. In instructing on this philosophy, it utilizes the teachings of all ages and the symbolism of the builder's art.

Doctor Joseph F. Newton in his book, *The Builders*, a story and study of Freemasonry, discusses the Masonic philosophy at length and says that "... stated briefly, stated vividly, it is that behind the pageant of nature, in it and over it, there is a Supreme Mind which initiates, impels and controls all. That behind the life of man and its pathetic story in history, in it and over it, there is a righteous Will, the intelligent Conscience of the Most High. In short, the first and last thing in the universe is mind, that the highest and deepest thing is conscience and that the final reality is the absoluteness of love. Higher than that faith cannot fly; deeper than that thought cannot dig."

One cannot study and meditate upon Freemasonry and its teachings without eventually arriving at the unescapable conclusion that its fundamental philosophy dictates belief in one Supreme Being that is manifested in all things physical, material, mental and spiritual. By reason of the presence of this manifestation in the human personality, there is a part of man that is immortal and which binds us together from bonds which are impossible to renounce or sever. This philosophy is more simply stated as "the Brotherhood of Man under the Fatherhood of God."

If we accept this as the Fundamental Philosophy of Freemasonry, we now must approach the issue of whether we, the Free and Accepted Masons, are losing sight of this fundamental philosophy.

All regular jurisdictions of Freemasonry require of their initiates a statement of a belief in the existence of one everliving and true God. This is the first of our immut-

**EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**

able landmarks and is the foundation stone of all Masonic teaching and philosophy. More than at any time in the past, the members of the Craft are reaffirming this fundamental belief and are turning to the Supreme Architect of the Universe for guidance and understanding in their daily lives and in the operations and affairs of Freemasonry. There is a great hunger and thirst by good men everywhere, and particularly those associated with the Masonic Fraternity, its Allied and Appendant Orders, for knowledge and understanding of their individual relationship with Him. It is clear that we are not losing the sight of this fundamental basis of our philosophy, but rather we are living in a fortunate time when a deeper understanding of our relationship with First Cause is afforded all mankind.

Modern science and technology have advanced to levels of understanding which would have staggered the imagination twenty years ago. Education is available and is availed of by more individuals than at any time in the memory of man. There are many who feel that our scientific approach to life in this era has denied the existence of God and the immortality of the soul. Although it is true that at times this idea seems to overtake the more spiritual approach to life, a careful analysis of our current national and international scene will reveal that science and religion are in fact drawing closer together and that more evidence is being presented each day of the existence of God and the immortality of the soul than at any other time in modern history.

Within the organized churches we find movements of lay persons who seek to achieve a closer understanding with and of God and of their own capacities and potentials as children of God. Great numbers of our young people both within and without the organized churches are attempting to return to a fundamental philosophy of life and to revitalize an understanding and acceptance of the Brotherhood of Man. The immortality of the soul, as taught and instructed in that Holy Book of Law which graces the altars of our Masonic Lodges, is today a greater reality for more people than perhaps at any time since the dawn of recorded history. Freedom of thought and of personal liberties, two goals of the knowledgeable Mason, are today more widespread and accepted than at any time or period since their improper exercise constituted the original sin. These freedoms and the underlying social actions resulting from their exercise have lifted the principles of universal benevolence and charity from the rare action of the wealthy to the common effort of the masses.

While there are admittedly many abuses of the system, and its reevaluation is essentially necessary, nonetheless the underlying concern of men for those of less fortune than themselves, whether of health or purse, has become a standard of conduct rather than an exceptional act. These actions are in large part impelled and sustained by the same principles which constitute our basic Masonic philosophy and which have created our teachings and system of morality.

If there is any area where we might be losing sight of the Fundamental Philosophy of Freemasonry or weakening in our support of its teachings, perhaps it is in the concept of the immortality of the soul and the inescapable conclusions which come from a firm belief in this principle, namely, that all men are children of the everliving true God and as such are brothers and owe that certain brotherly consideration and concern one for the other. With an acknowledgment of the principle, the teachings of Him who died for us upon the Cross must sear the heart, mind and conscience of each individual, be he Freemason or profane, who fails to acknowledge this universal relationship of mankind and who fails to live accordingly.

Perhaps no more difficult task is set before us than that of recognizing and accepting all persons as our brothers. Although Freemasonry attempts to inculcate within its membership such a consideration of all mankind, we sometimes fail to see the message of these teachings and permit our own selfish personal and material desires to cloud our minds and activities. A world torn by war, societies torn by revolution and anarchy, churches separated by suspicion and greed for power and position, business communities rife with distrust, greed and unconscionable practices, news media and entertainment plagued by violence, destruction and lust, all attest too vividly to the standards adopted by mankind in dealing with each other. This sad state of affairs must first be changed within the hearts, minds and consciences of each human being before the results of such change will become apparent in the world without.

"God is Love," and to put God first in our lives is the first and only law. When we can achieve to this level of understanding, then this love will permeate all of our thoughts and actions and will automatically permit us to achieve the proper relationship with our fellow man and our physical surroundings. Freemasonry teaches this love—a love of concern for the welfare and well-being of others. Are we perhaps losing sight of this aspect of its Fundamental Philosophy? Only the individual can answer that question.

We, as Freemasons, have a unique opportunity granted to us by the Supreme Architect of the Universe to guide and direct the thoughts, actions and activities of our fellow man. Each of us must be so imbued with the teachings of freemasonry and with its Fundamental Philosophy that we may never lose sight of the greater objectives of bringing about the reign of God and the fulfillment and enthronement of His Kingdom here on this earthly plane of existence. The choice is ours, the responsibility is grave, but I know that Freemasonry, by reason of its historical destiny, shall rise to the task assigned, with your help and mine.

**POLICE ROLE NEEDS REVIEW, EXPERT SAYS**

**HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Kenn Rogers, professor of business administration at Cleveland State University, is an internationally known authority in human and organizational development, specializing in community dynamics, the study of forces which create tension in institutions and society.

As more and more varied responsibilities fall on the shoulders of law enforcement agencies, there is a growing need, as Dr. Rogers points out, "for a new look at police and their position in society, and the 'real' roles they play" as a starting point toward solutions to the major problems that face them in modern American communities.

Last Sunday's Plain Dealer devoted the entire front page of its editorial section to an excellent article by Dr. Rogers, "Police Role Needs Review," which contains some challenging thoughts that should be shared with other concerned Members of Congress. The editorial follows:

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 7, 1973

## POLICE ROLE NEEDS REVIEW, EXPERT SAYS

There is a serious crime problem in our cities. None of them, including Cleveland, has been able to solve it, but some have cut crime rates slightly.

This situation has many causes, related to basic social problems.

Society places police in the position of taking the heat for a variety of problems about which they can do little or nothing—and for which they lack training and resources even if a single group could solve them.

There is a need for an unaccustomed and realistic look at the metropolitan police's primary tasks, structure, policies and resources. There needs to be particular emphasis on the educational programs designed to recognize the many kinds of duties police perform.

This new look at the police, at their position in society, and the "real" roles they play could be a start at analyzing larger problems and conflicts and, we may hope, a step toward solutions.

The extent of the crime problem of the cities is revealed in a recent Gallup Poll. It reported that one person in three living in densely populated center cities was mugged, robbed or suffered property loss during 1972; four persons in 10 were afraid to walk out alone at night; six women in 10 were afraid to venture alone at night into their neighborhoods; and one person in six did not even feel safe and secure behind locked doors at night.

It would seem that our cities are surrendered from dusk until dawn to muggers, burglars, rapists and other assorted criminals.

Even the individual police officer is fearful for his life on the streets and self-protection is an increasingly serious concern.

To law-abiding citizens, black and white, criminal violence in streets and homes creates rage and raises increasing doubts about police competence and motives.

The result is a steady rise in tension, frustration, fear, bitterness, anger and hate; increasing charges of police brutality and dread of the possibility that irrational violence may break out.

"Crime brings fear. Fear breeds terror. And with terror comes the destruction of the spirit and the freedom of the people," according to L. Patrick Gray III, acting director of the FBI.

In the middle are the policemen—either legitimate targets of criticism and abuse, or scapegoats charged by society with unspecified tasks and limited resources.

Some policemen feel like the children of Israel ordered by Pharaoh to make bricks without straw. At least, police feel, the Israelites knew what was expected of them, and what it took to deliver.

By contrast, police tasks have never been defined on a working basis or in detail by any of America's cities. Police manuals offer detailed instruction on how to do police work, but there is a marked absence of working definitions of the work police are responsible for.

Because policemen are not clear about their duties and responsibilities, the personalities of individual policemen largely determine how they do their jobs. And this brings them to a curious contradiction.

Although members of a paramilitary organization, policemen are largely self-supervised agents. Without clear job specifications, they are tempted—and often are alleged—to "do their own thing" if they wish.

At the same time, organizational and individual rigidity tends to rule in a rapidly changing social environment which calls for flexible and innovative approaches from those who are to serve it.

Even more important, without generally accepted specifications for police tasks and the human and material resources they need

to carry out those duties, it is rationally impossible to judge whether the tasks are feasible and how well they are performed.

Crime and violence—the danger in our cities—attract the most attention.

But it is well known society faces an array of social problems: urban deterioration, racial tensions, drug addiction, uncontrolled sale and possession of firearms, housing abandonment, hard-core unemployment, educational failure, political frustration, over-crowded court calendars, penal institutions designed to isolate and punish more than rehabilitate.

These are such overwhelming problems that no police force by itself can hope to cope with them.

This very tense situation, with its distrust and anger, makes it harder and harder to listen to one another and to discuss problems rationally.

The police are a convenient outlet for frustration because they are on the front line where the problems explode—and they are expected to do something about them, now.

Some citizens assume that the police are justified in doing their duty any way they feel they must.

Others say the police will do anything in the course of their work, justified or not.

These opposing attitudes toward the police and their work are really a symptom of the larger conflicts in our society.

Citizens find themselves alienated from one another while, from a practical and self-interest point of view, they should be building bridges to cooperation, rather than increasing dissension and mutual resentment.

A realistic examination of the police department's true tasks, its organizational structure and policies, could substantially help build such bridges.

A close examination of this high point of tension—police-community relations—might lead to a better understanding of deeper problems and to their eventual solution.

This leads me to suggest adding a project concerned with the management of community conflict.

This project has now begun at Cleveland State University. Its purpose is to explore critical social conflict areas in the community.

It will focus on the destructive and self-perpetuating effects of certain social disorders. These are the disorders that all too often mark the lives of many—especially minority group members—with depression, hopelessness and violence.

The writer's recent work in Cleveland and other major metropolitan areas suggests that the work of the police, examined in the context of the community's needs, embraces three distinctly separate areas:

1. Peacekeeping: the protection of lives, property and general public safety.

2. Crime fighting: planning to combat and arrest suspected criminals.

3. Social services: emergency medical aid, rescuing cats from trees, helping elderly ladies across streets, and the like.

It turns out that Point 3—social services—takes up the greatest amount of police time. Estimates range from 33% to about 40%. Point 2, crime fighting demands the smallest share, generally in the 10% to 15% range.

Even a surface look at policemen's traditional tasks shows that each function demands a different skill. Perhaps even more importantly, each task involved calls for work attitudes and aptitudes best suited to an individual who differs in personality structures from those on other tasks.

It seems unlikely that those who derive satisfaction from shooting it out with criminals will enjoy chasing cats out of treetops, or providing mouth-to-mouth resuscitation for persons they might perceive as alien, perhaps even inimical, to their own sets of social values and beliefs.

This condition has a direct bearing on what one teaches, and how one teaches what has to be taught for each kind of police work.

Police education is invariably termed "training." All too often—and there is no exception—in Cleveland this training is not designed to help the learner develop his potential for dealing with general social problems.

Instead, it tries to train recruits in the mechanical exercise of purely police functions.

Training programs generally stress "Nuts and bolts" items: weaponry, marksmanship, stakeout techniques.

The training fails to convey few, if any, of the dynamics prevailing in the various subcommunities in which policemen are to work. Nor are policemen given chances to understand themselves and their own internal dynamics.

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice in Task Force Report: The Police 1967 states that:

"It remains doubtful whether even the majority of them (i.e., training programs) provide recruits with an ample understanding of the police task.

"For example, very few of the training programs . . . provide course material on the history of law enforcement, the role of police in modern society, or the need for discretion in law enforcement. . . . Current training programs, for the most part . . . do not prepare (the officer) to understand . . . the imperfections of the criminal justice system."

Aside from formal training, there is the "real" indoctrination young recruits receive from veterans who break them in on the beat after classroom work in the police academy.

The typical veteran may say something like: "Look sonny, you just forget what those professors in there told you. I'm telling you like it is, and you better learn it."

The added unspoken message is: "Because if you don't, you have no idea of the ways I can fix you. Your loyalty belongs to the department, not to the citizens, and especially not to those troublemakers out there."

The message encourages indifference to social conditions. This is not necessarily representative of the attitude of superior officers, but it tends to discourage the young and enthusiastic recruit.

So many, and perhaps the most promising, leave the service.

The policeman's record of arrests plays an important part in promotions.

This criterion works against the policeman who has been able to establish cooperation from members of the community. This cooperation can help prevent crime but cuts his chances to make arrests.

By contrast, policemen from whom the community remains alienated, and whose beats abound with crime, have many chances to chalk up arrests and therefore enjoy a greater chance of getting promoted faster.

Another critically important factor affecting police work is the social image of themselves many policemen hold. It is frequently negative. In the light of accepted social standards, this is logically understandable.

Policemen feel citizens do not appreciate their efforts; they hear themselves called names and often they are viewed as members of an enemy occupation force.

Even "straight" citizens do not seem to appreciate the policeman except when in dire need of help.

What contributes most to the low role-image policemen have is the salary society awards to police work. Their pay is well below that of most workers, none of whom is ever called upon to risk his life at work as policemen are.

In many ways, others see Cleveland as a sort of caricature city, a home of Bunkerism, the brunt of jokes as Brooklyn once was.

Some of this attitude is based on reality. But a greater part, I believe, is based upon others' realization that they exhibit the same

characteristics, so they try to "lay off" their self-criticism by making fun of Cleveland. It is a defense mechanism that lets them ignore their own problems at home.

I suggest that perhaps Cleveland could make a significant advance toward erasing that image by self-analysis—beginning with the flashpoint of police-community relations.

#### CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS ON PUBLIC PARTICIPATION, EMPLOYEE PROTECTION, AND SEX DISCRIMINATION

##### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 7, 1973*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to extend for 1 year certain funding provisions of the Solid Waste Disposal Act and the Clean Air Act. These extensions are identical to those in S. 498 which passed the Senate on January 26, 1973, by a vote of 93 to 4. They should be promptly enacted.

Not included in the Senate bill, but of great importance to all of us, are three sections to be added to the Clean Air Act. They are entitled: "Public Participation, Employee Protection, and Sex Discrimination."

Each of these sections is identical in substance to sections 101(e), 507 (a) through (e), and 13 of Public Law 92-500 of October 18, 1972—the water pollution legislation. They are noncontroversial. They are important, indeed essential. They cannot await the possibility of later amendments to the Clean Air Act sometime in the second session of the 93d Congress. They deserve the strong support of labor, environmentalists, civil rights groups, and the public in general. I urge your support.

The text of these provisions is as follows:

##### TEXT OF THREE PROVISIONS

###### PARTICIPATION OF PUBLIC

Sec. 3. Section 101 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 1857) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Public participation in the development, revision, and enforcement of any regulation, standard, emission limitation, guideline, plan, or program established by the Administrator or any State under this Act shall be fully provided for, encouraged, and assisted by the Administrator and the States. The Administrator, in cooperation with the States, shall develop and publish regulations specifying minimum guidelines for public participation in such processes."

###### EMPLOYEE PROTECTION

Sec. 4. (a) Title III of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 1857 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

###### "Employee protection

"SEC. 317. (a) No person shall fire, or in any other way discriminate against, or cause to be fired or discriminated against, any employees or any authorized representative of employees by reason of the fact that such employee or representative has filed, instituted, or caused to be filed or instituted any proceeding under this Act, or has testified or is about to testify in any proceeding re-

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

sulting from the administration or enforcement of the provisions of this Act.

"(b) Any employee or a representative of employees who believes that he has been fired or otherwise discriminated against by any person in violation of subsection (a) of this section may, within thirty days after such alleged violation occurs, apply to the Secretary of Labor for a review of such firing or alleged discrimination. A copy of the application shall be sent to such person who shall be the respondent. Upon receipt of such application, the Secretary of Labor shall cause such investigation to be made as he deems appropriate. Such investigation shall provide an opportunity for a public hearing at the request of any party to such review to enable the parties to present information relating to such alleged violation. The parties shall be given written notice of the time and place of the hearing at least five days prior to the hearing. Any such hearing shall be of record and shall be subject to section 554 of title 5 of the United States Code. Upon receiving the report of such investigation, the Secretary of Labor shall make findings of fact. If he finds that such violation did occur, he shall issue a decision, incorporating an order therein and his findings, requiring the party committing such violation to take such affirmative action to abate the violation as the Secretary of Labor deems appropriate, including, but not limited to, the rehiring or reinstatement of the employee or representative of employees to his former position with compensation. If he finds that there was no such violation, he shall issue an order denying the application. Such order issued by the Secretary of Labor under this subparagraph shall be subject to judicial review in the same manner as orders and decisions of the Administrator are subject to judicial review under this Act.

"(c) Whenever an order is issued under this section to abate such violation, at the request of the applicant, a sum equal to the aggregate amount of all costs and expenses (including attorneys fees), as determined by the Secretary of Labor to have been reasonably incurred by the applicant for, or in connection with, the institution and prosecution of such proceedings, shall be assessed against the person committing such violation.

"(d) This section shall have no application to any employee who, acting without direction from his employer (or his agent) deliberately violates any prohibition or limitation established under this Act.

"(e) The Administrator shall conduct continuing evaluations of potential loss or shifts of employment which may result from this issuance of any requirement, emission limitation, standard, or order under this Act, including, where appropriate, investigating threatened plant closures or reductions in employment allegedly resulting from such limitation or order. Any employee who is discharged or laid off, threatened with discharge or layoff, or otherwise discriminated against by any person because of the alleged results of any emission limitation or order issued under this Act, or any representative of such employee, may request the Administrator to conduct a full investigation of the matter. The Administrator shall thereupon investigate the matter and, at the request of any party, shall hold public hearings on not less than five days' notice, and shall at such hearings require the parties, including the employer involved, to present information relating to the actual or potential effect of such limitation or order on employment and on any alleged discharge, layoff, or other discrimination and the detailed reasons or justification therefor. Any such hearing shall be of record and shall be subject to section 554 of title 5 of the United States Code. Upon receiving the report of such investigation,

the Administrator shall make findings of fact as to the effect of such requirement, standard, or order on employment and on the alleged discharge, layoff, or discrimination and shall make such recommendations as he deems appropriate. Such report, findings, and recommendations shall be available to the public. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require or authorize the Administrator to modify or withdraw any requirement, standard, or order issued under this Act."

(b) The first sentence of section 307 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 1857h-5) is amended by inserting "or carrying out section 317(e) of this Act," before "the Administrator".

###### SEX DISCRIMINATION

SEC. 5. No person in the United States shall on the ground of sex be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal assistance under the Clean Air Act, the Solid Waste Disposal Act, or any other law administered by the Environmental Protection Agency. This section shall be enforced through agency provisions and rules similar to those already established, with respect to racial and other discrimination, under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. However, this remedy is not exclusive and will not prejudice or cut off any other legal remedies available to a discriminatee.

#### COMMUNITY ACTION—THE HUMAN APPROACH TO SOLVING HUMAN PROBLEMS

##### HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 7, 1973*

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, many voices have been raised in opposition to curtailment of numerous social and educational programs as proposed in the Federal budget for fiscal year 1974. My mail, and I am sure the mail of every other Member of this legislative body, has been filled with comments from individuals objecting to some of the proposals which are stated or implied by the budget submissions made by the administration on the 29th of January.

One of the letters I have received is so comprehensive, so human, and so down-to-earth that I believe it merits the attention of every Member of the Congress. The author of this letter is currently employed by the Tyler County Community Action Association which is a delegate agency of the West Central West Virginia Community Action Association, Inc., in Parkersburg. Her current work is devoted primarily to improving the lot of low income youth in the 14- to 25-year-age bracket. She has, however, been indirectly involved with other Tyler County Community Action Association programs, including senior citizens activities, arts, and crafts production and marketing, Homestart, job development, and community development. Her letter follows:

DEAR MR. MOLLOHAN: As a very concerned citizen I am writing to express my feelings and state some facts concerning some of the programs which are now under OEO and other social and educational programs.

I am involved with low income people every day. I see their strengths and weak-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

nesses and their problems. I also see some of their triumphs and progress in their daily struggle to get into the mainstream of the "good American" way of life.

As a Community Action worker in a rural county, I cannot understand the senseless and heartless cutting off of the self-help programs which are of benefit to low income families. In the past three years I have seen families move from a sense of vast hopelessness to the point where they are now moving forward to the benefit of all family members.

Statistics are surely available to you showing the number of low income people involved in OEO programs, the increases in family income, the number of people who gained employment or upgraded their employment capabilities. Regrettably you don't see the child who is third generation welfare and who—through participation in Community Action youth programs—grows and sees that there is indeed a future and he doesn't need to depend upon welfare. A door is opened and he is ready to go through that door and take his place in the world of the working class of America.

Nor do you see the family who, because Mom has put her sewing and quilting skills to use with others like her, has additional income with which to buy more food, school supplies, clothing and health services. Or the senior citizen whose skills enable her to supplement her income at home and thereby purchase food, medication or transportation—all of which are very real needs for the rural senior citizen. A Social Security check has very little "stretch."

If we are indeed entering an "era of peace for mankind," why are these human services programs which are quietly attempting to develop human potentials being cut while defense spending goes on at its present level? This is an "era of Peace"?

It would seem, also, that with all the veterans coming home at long last, social services will be in far greater demand than ever before. I have worked in mental health services and I know what war can do to the minds of men.

To students who depend upon government loans for educational aid; to the farmer who depends on agricultural programs; to the ill who have no hospital beds—what will be the solution of the problems of all these people after a drastic, unreasonable budget cut?

The frustrations that I feel when I think of the results of the proposed budget cuts cannot really be stated in a letter. However, it seems it might be compared to the small child who comes home eagerly from school to find that his home is no longer there. Beneath all the numbers and statistics are living, breathing people who are counting on the help provided by the above mentioned programs.

Can we as a nation of Christian people let that happen? I pray to God we aren't that callous and indifferent to the needs of others.

Most sincerely,

Mrs. JEANNIE PYLES.

Many fine people like Mrs. Pyles have strived in the past 7 years to help those less fortunate to overcome their economic plight. It is the participation of dedicated individuals like her which results in the optimum of human involvement, of helping others to help themselves, that makes the retention of the OEO Agency, and the community action programs which it supports, so vital to this Nation. The continuation of this obvious concern for our fellow man typifies the American spirit which must be fostered and which must be an underlying humanitarian consideration in every action taken by the U.S. Congress and all other elements of the Federal Government.

## ABORTION

## HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, Monday I inserted excerpts from the testimony of various pro-abortion and pro-life medical experts given in the criminal abortion trial Commonwealth against Brunelle. Today I would like to insert additional evidence. It is my opinion that anyone who honestly considers the evidence will conclude that abortion destroys a unique human person who will never be replaced.

The evidence follows:

CROSS EXAMINATION OF WILLIAM A. LYNCH, M.D., BY MR. OTERI

Q. (by Mr. Oteri) The simple fact of the matter is that you consider personally and in your medical judgment as to whether or not you do abortions or abortions should or should not be done is colored by your philosophical, metaphysical, religious belief that the moment the egg or the ovum is fertilized, it becomes a human being?

A. (Dr. Lynch) Let's say it adds a surety to my medical convictions.

Q. You say, Doctor, it adds assurance to your medical convictions. Can we divide your convictions into two categories: religious and medical?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, Doctor, taking your medical judgment first, as to abortions, let me ask you this: When the zygote results from the fertilization of the ovum, this occurs at the instant of fertilization, does it not?

A. Right.

Q. And you consider that zygote, and have so testified, as being a human being?

A. Yes.

Q. And you tell us that at the time the zygote comes into being, it has all of the characteristics of a human being?

A. It has the genetic package, I think was the word I used, for the characteristics for a human being.

Q. Have you ever at any time seen a one day old zygote or are you ever aware of a one day old zygote surviving on being expelled from a womb at any time?

A. I don't think anyone has ever seen a one day old zygote.

Q. How about a one month old zygote?

A. If you want to know the earliest stage a pregnancy has lived, I believe it is five months and one week.

Q. When you say "lived" . . .

A. Independent existence, outside of the uterus.

Q. For 30 years or one day?

A. Indefinite.

Q. It is, after what?

A. Just as you and I.

Q. After how many months?

A. I believe it is five months and one week.

Q. We can, for the purpose of our questions and answers, assume that prior to five months there is no evidence of an embryo or fetus being capable of sustaining life outside of the womb?

A. It is considered non-viable for independent existence.

Q. Not viable for independent existence?

A. Yes.

Q. Are there doctors of whom you are aware and probably number as friends who would differ with your opinion as to whether or not this embryo is a human being at one month or one day?

A. Yes, I am sure there are but they have to believe this is not human, or otherwise they couldn't kill it.

March 7, 1973

Q. How about the fact that many of your doctor friends who don't believe in this don't do abortions—they may be psychiatrists?

A. I believe this is very significant.

Q. Now, Doctor, continuing with the zygote, actually, it has the genetic package, does it not?

A. Yes.

Q. This package, one day old package found in the zygote, is it similar to a blueprint? In other words, the color of the eyes are determined?

A. I never saw a blueprint of itself develop into a building, Mr. Oteri.

Q. I didn't ask that.

A. No.

Q. No. It does have all the characteristics, does it not, laid out, planned? The scheme is made?

A. Yes, it does, as a whole package.

Q. Are you familiar with the statistics on spontaneous abortions?

A. Well, yes, I am familiar with them.

Q. You are aware that a significant number of pregnancies terminate by reason of spontaneous abortions, do they not?

A. Sure. Yes. One out of five.

Q. Now, Doctor, you tell us that this particular zygote of one day or one month duration is a human being, is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And you tell us this based upon your medical training, is that correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. You tell us this medical training is reinforced by your religious belief, is that correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. And can you tell us, is your medical decision colored by this reenforcement?

A. You have asked me that before, and the answer is no. It is reinforced.

Q. Will you tell us how it is reenforced?

A. Because I happen to believe, as a Christian, since you're asking about religious beliefs, as a Christian, from the moment we are born we are on our way back to God, and the person we marry is the person who is going to help us get back to God, and the children we bring into the world are those given to us by God, to teach that child in life until we are back with Him, and I find it very rewarding to feel that the child is born, the child inside the womb of my wife, the child that grew and hiccuped, the child that can be shown by X-ray to be sucking his thumb, the child who can be defined by ultra-sound and electrocardiography to have a heartbeat as early as the 12th week; and this child is a human being and is going to be with all of us, my wife and I, in the hereafter. I find this very comforting and very rewarding, and I might say this is the general belief of the people through the beginning of the world.

Q. There are religions that disagree with you—Shintoism, Buddhism?

A. Yes.

Q. Jewish religion?

A. I'm not sure about the Jewish religion. Q. They don't consider that a human being until after it is born?

A. I don't want to speak for them.

Q. On the question of your religious beliefs as coloring your feeling in this matter, you are aware of many people who disagree with the religious beliefs which many of us share, and which you have expressed here?

A. Yes.

Q. Would you say that, assuming that a person did not believe the way that you do, that this zygote is a human being, that this zygote has a soul, I suppose you would have to say, it is going to share, according to you, with the joy of God later. If a person didn't believe these things, but the same person assumed, believed that it was not human and the termination of that life was right in

keeping with their religious belief, would you prevent them from getting an abortion?

A. Yes, I think that I would.

Q. Why would you do that?

A. Because if the child is a human being, even though a person might believe that it is not—and I have met atheists and Shintoists and various other people who would at least agree that it could be—then, if it is human or could be, then we have no right to destroy it, because it is totally innocent, and if it is a human being who is innocent, then we have no right to destroy it, and if it is a human being—and I have known no child who is not innocent—then it is a tenet of law—and it could be a man or a wolf—you still haven't the right to shoot it, because it could be a man.

Q. You have used the word "kill" a number of times in your direct testimony. Do you consider the termination of a pregnancy to be a killing, to be murder?

A. Yes—not only I, but those who did the abortion consider the same way.

Q. You speak for them?

A. I read what they write.

Q. You consider it to be murder?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. You are aware of the fact that the law does not?

A. I am aware of the fact there is such a thing as a statutory murder, and I am not competent to talk about that. That is your business and his Honor's, but there is a so-called classical definition of murder, in the sense that before the bar of justice the only plea we have is innocent, and to deliberately kill someone who is innocent I think has classically been called a definition of murder, whether it be statutory or not.

Q. Let me ask you, can you determine from the—could you personally, yourself, if you were given for examination a one month old fetus which had been expelled spontaneously, could you tell that was a human fetus as compared to that of a rhesus monkey?

A. Under adequate study, yes.

Q. You could tell it personally?

A. I am not a pathologist.

Q. How about a one day old zygote?

A. You must be aware of the fact that there is no thing available yet as a one day old zygote.

Q. I'm asking you if there were, one could determine the characteristics?

A. I believe an embryologist, pathologist, could determine that.

Q. What would be the difference as between the zygote of a human that expelled it one day, and the zygote of a rhesus monkey that expelled it one day?

A. This comes from embryology and pathology, and I wouldn't want to answer that.

Q. Based on your testimony and all that you have given today, what would you personally consider to be the difference between a one month old fetus of a human and a one month old fetus of an animal?

A. You are asking me essentially the difference between the human and animal.

Q. What is the difference between a human and animal?

A. The difference between a human and animal depends on the stage of development. In this developing, we come to whatever limits you would want. For example, the species' number of chromosomes could be determined from a tissue of one moment or one day old zygote, if you had it, if you are fortunate enough to get the chromosome in the specimen; if you get material that can be grown so that you could have a tissue culture, you could be specific and determine the chromosome pattern. I believe there are histochemical changes which can be used to determine on tissue whether it is human or not.

Q. Doctor, will you tell us the difference between a fetus at eight months and 27 days or 28 days or just prior to birth, and the dif-

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ference between an animal fetus, say a monkey fetus, just prior to birth.

A. A fetus at birth?

Q. All right. At birth, what is the difference between the two?

A. I think the question is just a little bit ridiculous in one aspect, I am sure you realize. A person who could not detect the difference between a human being and a dog at birth, I think. . . .

Q. We are talking about a monkey.

A. All right. A monkey. You are in an entirely different situation. You have an anthropological measurement with regard to the head and reference to the rest of the body, the anatomical connections, of the hip, shape of pelvis. We have an anthropoid type of pelvis where a human being might have an anthropoid characteristic, but not peculiar.

Changes in the blood, circulating of the blood. You can differentiate between blood values—not histochemical changes, but blood changes.

You could go through a whole gamut of anthropological and tissue differences if you wanted specific scientific differences, if your eyes wouldn't show you the difference.

Q. Is there one particular biological difference, is there any one thing that makes man different from the animal?

A. Yes, he is born of a human.

Q. What is it that makes people human, Doctor?

A. A human is a person who is born from human being. What makes you a human being? A human is such—he is one distinguished from the animals by a sense of compassion and pity, is one answer given by a Russian philosopher. The animal has no sense of compassion and pity. This is very germane and appropriate under these conditions, because the unborn child has always been the object of compassion since the beginning of time, and if we kill the object of compassion we will kill the compassion for man, as in abortions.

Q. Has the zygote of one day got any compassion? Anyone told you that a zygote at three months or one month has compassion or pity at that stage?

A. No, no one can determine compassion in a person at that stage.

Q. Now, Doctor, is there any other definition you would like to give us of a human thing?

A. What you are looking for—and I am sure this comes to do with my faith, but also with the faith of Socrates, who wasn't a Catholic either, and he used the term "psyche," and I use the term "soul."

I say that medicine and science can produce anything except a human soul. On this basis we would differ.

Now, if you are looking for a soul, I am sure you know that you cannot see it, but the marks of it you can see, one of which is the marks of compassion and pity, and various other determinations. The humanness of a growing person at any stage—you can pick out any characteristic, as you did with regard to compassion. You put a mother with her baby in her arms at three months—the mother can't find compassion in the baby in her arms, but she knows it is human.

Q. But there is no question it is human at that stage?

A. But it doesn't have compassion that shows, as it doesn't show in a zygote.

Q. Doctor, the fact of a soul, or the presence of a soul, that is a principal guide-light that determines your belief that the zygote immediately upon its coming into being is human, is it not?

A. To say that this is the principle, it is one of the two principles, because I am different than other Catholics: I am also an obstetrician and scientist. I can read the

opinions of people who believe in abortions and do them and those who don't believe in abortion and don't do them, and I can arrive at a medical judgment which doesn't have to be colored, but only supported, by my religious beliefs.

### CROSS EXAMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER TIETZE, M.D., BY MR. IRWIN

Q. (by Mr. Irwin) You think everyone who wants an abortion should have one?

A. (Dr. Tietze) Yes.

Q. Regardless of her reasons for wanting it?

A. Yes.

Q. Would you please tell us whether or not you have any opinion as to when a human being exists in the womb of a mother, if at all?

A. You want my personal view, or what I interpret to be the view of the community?

Q. No, I want your opinion, Doctor.

A. My personal view is that the fetus ceases to be—a begins to acquire the characteristics of a human being approximately at the time when it becomes capable of independent existence.

Q. When is that?

A. Somewhere between 20 and 28 weeks.

Q. Your testimony is that your opinion is that at that time this infant or fetus is a human being, is that correct?

A. I think that, for a variety of reasons which have nothing to do with the district attorney's thrust, it is more undesirable to delay an abortion up to this time, and I also believe that very few people would do this if they had free access to abortion.

Q. Do you understand, Doctor, the question that I asked you? Let me repeat it to you: Do you have any opinion as to whether or not a fetus in its mother's womb at any time while it is in the womb has the nature of a human being?

A. I don't believe that a fetus, prior to viability, has the nature of a human being.

Q. Do I understand after viability, it is considered a human being?

A. After viability I would consider it as a human being.

Q. Is that after 28 weeks you consider it a human being; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. It is your theory, then, Doctor, even after 28 weeks, a woman has a right to kill that human being or order that human being in her womb to be killed on demand?

A. It is not until after 28 weeks it has viability; therefore it is not answerable.

Q. What if she demands it after five months?

A. "Sorry. You waited too long."

Q. Is that what you tell the woman?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Under any circumstances would you terminate that pregnancy?

A. If I were an obstetrician, I can imagine in very rare circumstances where such a termination would be necessary. They hardly occur in civilized countries any more. They did when I went to medical school.

Q. You want to limit what you testified to, or qualify what you testified to by saying that you are in favor of unlimited abortion only up to the time of viability, is that correct?

A. I do not want to qualify it, because you asked me about abortion, and you cannot have abortion after viability is attained, and I always had this in mind, but if you wish me to be more precise, I would be happy to.

Q. Why don't you be more precise, because I think you are trying to indicate there is a term after viability that is used instead of abortion.

A. It is the custom in the medical community to define abortion, both spontaneous and induced, as a termination of pregnancy prior to viability. Therefore, the termination

of pregnancy after viability has been attained cannot be abortion, and I cannot assume that your question would assume this type of activity.

Q. Let me ask you this: Are you in favor of termination—let's use that word; is that what the word was that you used—termination of the fetus?

A. No, I said termination of pregnancy. No one terminates a . . .

Q. Pregnancy exists after viability?

A. Yes.

Q. Are you in favor of termination of pregnancy after viability?

A. Do you mean artificial termination with the purpose of doing away with the fetus? No, sir.

CROSS EXAMINATION OF E. J. LIEBERMAN, M.D.  
BY MR. IRWIN

Q. (by Mr. Irwin) As a psychiatrist, will you tell the Court at what point you believe that the fetus in the mother has to be considered by you in determining whether or not you recommend a termination of pregnancy?

A. (Dr. Lieberman) At what point the fetus has to be considered?

Q. Right. Do you believe that the fetus in the mother is human?

A. I believe that this goes outside the area of medical science and psychiatry. I do believe that it is a relevant question, in that what the mother regards is important, and as a psychiatrist I would naturally want to find out in my evaluation what the mother thinks, but my own position is not relevant, my own theology is not relevant to it.

Q. You are a doctor?

A. Yes.

Q. You are an M.D.?

A. Yes.

Q. Now, are you aware of fertilization? You are?

A. Yes.

Q. Is that a human growth at that time?

A. I believe this is not a question I can answer as a scientist or a physician.

Q. You can't answer that question?

A. That's right.

Q. Medical science is fully aware whatever might be, whether you want to classify it or not, it is growing inside the mother?

A. Yes.

Q. Is it your testimony that medical science is not in a position to categorize something that is growing in the mother?

A. It can be categorized as a zygote or blasto or fetus.

Q. Those . . .

A. Those are scientific classifications.

Q. At 12 weeks can they detect by means of an electrocardiogram the heartbeat of the fetus?

A. Yes.

Q. At that point is it human?

A. That question goes outside of my scientific competence.

Q. You say that you are not qualified?

A. Scientifically.

Q. Medically?

A. That is what I mean by medically.

Q. You don't know, is the answer?

A. I suppose that is the way I would have to answer the question: I don't know.

Q. You are aware of what amniotic fluid is?

A. Yes.

Q. You are aware that there are medical processes by which amniotic fluid can be withdrawn?

A. Yes.

Q. So that determinations can be made as to whether or not there is a possibility of a youngster being Mongoloid, is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. Whether there is a possibility, because of hereditary factors involved, as to whether

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

a youngster will suffer from hemophilia if he happens to be a male?

A. Yes.

Q. So that we can determine sex?

A. Yes.

Q. We can determine whether or not a youngster in his mother's womb is going to run the likelihood of inheriting a disease of the mother, can we not?

A. Yes.

Q. When medicine is able to make those determinations, do you say that fetus then is something other than human?

A. We can do it on horses and sows, also.

Q. I didn't ask you that, did I? Have you ever seen any human being deliver a horse or a cow?

A. No.

Q. All right. Then will you answer that question, then, Doctor?

A. The question whether it is human is not related to the question of whether we can determine sex or whether we can determine hereditary disease.

Q. It is related to whether or not somebody has a right to kill it in its mother's womb, is it not?

A. In the mind of a mother-to-be, the question is important. It is important to know whether she regards the fetus in a particular way—that is, whether it is human, whether it is potentially human. I believe that the physician's role, scientist's role, would be to inform the mother, the person, anyone concerned, about the scientific facts, and let the person be informed by their own moral, ethical or religious training as to the issue when it becomes a human being, and . . .

Q. When it becomes a human being is up to the mother?

A. It is up to the mother and whatever counsel and education she may have in that area.

Q. And whether it lives or dies is up to the mother, is that correct?

A. Well, it is part of her body. I would say yes.

Q. Your testimony, then, is the mother and the mother alone decides whether a youngster in her womb lives or dies?

A. I qualify that answer by saying that I am not in favor of abortion on demand, which is this question and which this question relates to, and that the judgment of the physician is always required, and that a physician is not a technician, simply to do the bidding of anyone that comes to him for procedure. However, he does not, either, attempt to apply his particular moral or religious training or metaphysical judgments to a sphere which is of her concern.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF WILLIAM A. LYNCH, M.D., BY MR. IRWIN

Q. (By Mr. Irwin) Doctor, with reference to the questions that were asked you about Catholic hospitals not permitting abortion, could you tell us from your own experience what "non-Catholic hospitals" forbid abortions in their hospitals?

A. (Dr. Lynch) There have been in the past, and I believe now still, Lutheran hospitals do not. Many municipal hospitals also associated with medical institutions—Margaret Hague Maternity in New Jersey, one of the biggest in the country, for 35 years as a matter of policy has not allowed a therapeutic abortion, and this is a county institution which of necessity legally has to take anything that no other hospital can take. In fact, if a woman had leprosy and was pregnant, a private hospital might feel for the patient or esthetics they shouldn't take her, Margaret Hague would have to take her, by law. Thirty-five years that institution was presided over by Dr. Samuel Cosgrove, who happened to be the son of a Methodist minister, and he would not allow abortions, be-

cause he felt that anyone who is doing abortions because of a difficult problem is either too lazy or didn't know how to manage the problem. And here is an institution that in 35 years did something in the neighborhood of a quarter of a million deliveries, all kinds of problems—783 cardiacs without a death—not allowing abortion, and their patients doing very well and perfectly happy with the situation as it was.

## ONE VIEW ON HOW "TO WORK OFF AMNESTY"

### HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in this Chamber, and throughout this Nation, in recent months on how to resolve the issue of the young men who avoided the draft or deserted the Armed Forces during the Vietnam conflict.

There have been charges, on the one hand, that those who oppose amnesty of any sort are vindictive, and on the other hand, that those who favor sweeping amnesty are soft.

This controversy over amnesty carries the same threat of dividing the Nation as did the war itself. And I believe that we should try to resolve this controversy without reaching for either extreme, and without challenging either the motives or the patriotism of the opposing point of view.

For myself, I have opposed any general amnesty, pardon, or reprieve for those who refused to obey their country's laws. I do, however, support the concept used so well by President Truman following World War II—the creation of a special commission to review each case individually, and to decide each case on its own merits.

Should my colleagues decide on a different course, I recommend for their consideration the proposal made recently by Mitch Kehetian, city editor of the Macomb Daily of Mt. Clemens, Mich., who suggested in a recent column that the draft evaders and deserters be allowed, in effect, to "work off their amnesty," by serving 2 years in labor battalions assigned the task of rebuilding South Vietnam.

Mr. Kehetian offers no defense for the men who sat out the war. But neither does he judge them harshly. He merely proposes a method whereby these men would pay their dues to society, and then return to full citizenship in what he calls "the greatest land on the face of this earth."

Mr. Speaker, I offer the full text of Mr. Kehetian's column entitled "An Answer to 'No Amnesty'" for the urgent consideration of my colleagues:

AN ANSWER TO "NO AMNESTY"

(By Mitch Kehetian)

Should the United States help rebuild the bombed cities of North Vietnam—the same cities U.S. bombers flattened to dent the military threat of the "enemy?"

Should the United States, in a gesture of

"let's come together," grant some form of amnesty to those who evaded the draft by deserting to Canada and Sweden?

President Richard Nixon was emphatic when he issued his "no draft amnesty" notice, and because of his landslide election last fall the President will apparently stick to his no amnesty edict for "four more years."

But in the meantime, American greenbacks will be used to rebuild North Vietnam. An ironic touch—capitalist dollars to rebuild the communist enemy.

First and foremost, the question of draft evaders must be resolved. Are these misguided young men a greater threat than the North Vietnamese? If the President is willing to help rebuild the enemy, should he not offer a "let's come together" message to American boys who fled their country to evade the draft.

Before we openly condemn the evaders, some of that condemnation must be aimed at members of the Congress who helped divide this nation over the Vietnam Question.

We should also condemn those who set up draft evasion counseling clinics—and members of the clergy who allowed draft evaders to seek refuge in the House of God.

While I have little sympathy for those who would flee from this land to avoid the draft, I for one cannot turn my back on a fellow American—whatever his reason or philosophy. Maybe it's because my immigrant parents taught me that this is the greatest land on the face of this earth—but unfortunately many Americans fail to recognize the freedom and greatness of America.

If the President is considering spending billions of dollars to rebuild North Vietnam—the same enemy responsible for the killing of 50,000 American boys—he should open his "let's come together" message to our misguided young men hiding out in foreign lands.

My suggestion would be to allow the evaders to return provided they served two years of hard labor" in rebuilding the devastated lands of South Vietnam—our friend in that costly Indochina war.

Let the draft evaders witness the horror the communists inflicted upon the brave people of South Vietnam—and let them tend to the thousands of unmarked graves of heroic South Vietnamese men and women who fought for freedom against the invading communists from the north.

And finally, remind them that while they sought refuge in foreign lands—50,000 of their fellow Americans gave their lives in the name of "peace with honor..."

Some liberal members of the Congress suggest the draft evaders be allowed to return and merely serve with a domestic-type Peace Corps unit.

My suggestion, I repeat, is to send them to South Vietnam to rebuild that small bastion of democracy—while billions of American dollars go to rebuild the northern cities of the enemy—the enemy that brought about the destruction of South Vietnam and the death of 50,000 American young men.

If there is a loser in the Vietnam war, it's the grieving family who lost a son or a husband in Vietnam—and the thousands more who saw their sons and husbands return mentally and physically crippled by the hell of war.

Even the most hardened criminal is granted probation when he completes a certain portion of his sentence—the American draft dodger can serve his sentence by working it off in war ravaged South Vietnam.

I'm certain the men and women of South Vietnam, a nation literally turned into a state of orphans, will make sure the draft evaders fulfill their two years at hard labor.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### WHY SHOULD RUSSIA HAVE THREE VOTES IN THE U.N.?

#### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, some people still attempt to justify Russia, with a population of 241,748,000 people, having three votes in the U.N. while we of the United States, with a population of 205,000,000 have but one vote. The Russian votes at the U.N. are identified as one for the Soviet Union; one for Ukraine, population 47,136,000; and one vote for Byelorussia, population 9,003,000. Each of these two Soviet states having votes in the U.N. are also included in the population of the U.S.S.R.

To those that think that the Ukraine or Byelorussia are a separate government or independent from the Soviet Union, I read from the constitution of the U.S.S.R., chapter 2, the State Structure, article 13:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a federal state, formed on the basis of a voluntary union of equal Soviet Socialist Republics, namely:

The Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic.

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Quite obvious, by the so-called Constitution of the U.S.S.R., Ukraine and Byelorussia are simply states of the Soviet Union, without any self-determination or independence in domestic, foreign, or international affairs any more than any of the States of the United States.

Then, there are those Soviet apologists who would seek to justify the inequities of giving the Soviets three votes in the U.N. by stating that the Soviet Constitution, at article 17, provides:

The right freely to secede from the U.S.S.R. is reserved to every Union Republic.

While the Soviet Constitution offers this propaganda, there has never been any secession by any of the Republics, and certainly neither Ukraine or Byelorussia has seceded or gained their independence as a condition to U.N. membership or as a result thereof.

On the basis of apportionment, giving the Soviets three votes to our one, gives the Soviet Union the equivalent voting power of one vote for every 80 million Soviet citizens, while we of the United States receive one vote for 205 million.

The combined assessed contribution of the three Soviet states to the U.N. is 16.1 percent compared to a 25 percent U.S. contribution. Back dues owned by Byelorussia, the Ukraine, and the U.S.S.R. amount to more than \$102.9 million.

The voting and membership composition and assessed contributions to the U.N. make it an Alice in Wonderland as far as any fairness or equal representation or financial assessments.

### MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

#### HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary annually conduct a most commendable program, the Voice of Democracy Contest. This year's theme was "My Responsibility to Freedom," and the winning speech from the State of New York was written by Miss Ellen Patten of Lawrenceville, N.Y., and a senior at St. Lawrence Central School, Brasher Falls, N.Y.

Miss Patten's speech is very thought inspiring, and it is with great pride that I insert a copy of her fine, prize-winning speech for the benefit of my colleagues and the general public.

#### MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

(By Miss Ellen Patten)

There has never been, nor ever will be a man born without the weight of responsibility placed on his shoulders, because responsibility, like the continuation of life is inevitable. Although the mood of responsibility may change as the world slowly elapses from one era to another, the essence of responsibility remains the same.

We all have basic responsibilities we can not, nor would we want to escape from, because they give us security and a purpose in life. But here in the United States we have another responsibility, a special responsibility that is our privilege as well as our heritage. We have a responsibility to freedom.

Although I share this responsibility with millions of people in our country today, people ranging from the socially prominent to the vast numbers of the silent majority, this responsibility is nevertheless a personal one.

I, as an individual, have a responsibility and that is first of all to understand freedom as it applies today. So often we tend to take for granted the many things that we are not continually reminded of, but we owe too much to freedom to let it fall in that category. We have the freedom to vote in local and national elections, and through this we are given the opportunity to express our opinions and beliefs in the affairs of our state and country. Our freedom has given us the right to a fair trial when we are accused, and when we are wronged, the right to ask for justice. We have the freedom to travel uninhibited and work as we chose, just as we are free to discuss, debate and voice our opinions without fear of suppression. Our entire lifestyle is based on freedom, a freedom we cannot afford to take for granted.

Beyond understanding freedom, I have a responsibility to preserve and protect the standards of freedom we now enjoy. If I use my freedoms selfishly or unjustly, without thought given to the rights of others, then I have made a mockery of freedom. I have freedom of speech, but in speaking if I unjustly incriminate another, then I have turned my back on my responsibility. I have the freedom to drive my own car, but in doing so if I drive recklessly or too fast, then again I have turned my back on my responsibility. Freedom is not just for one, but for many. Therefore my responsibility is not just to myself, but to many. I must use my freedom wisely, relying on good judgment and careful thought as well as laws and regulations instituted for my safety and protection and the safety and protection of others. This is my responsibility and through it I, as an

March 7, 1973

individual, am doing my part to ensure and uphold the freedom of the people.

My final responsibility is to take pride in my freedom as a part of my heritage and a vital part of the great country of which I am a citizen. If I am not proud to be an American and proud to live in a country such as this where freedom, democracy and the rights of the people are guaranteed to us by a government we the people have elected to serve us, then I cannot truly say I have a responsibility to freedom. Why? Because a responsibility shouldered without pride is doomed from the outset, just as a democracy without the strength and support of its citizens is doomed.

I was born into a country where freedom was wrought at the hands of my forefathers and I live in a country where freedom has been fought for and often times tested at the hands of my parents . . . but I have only just begun, and when I am through, I shall die in a country where freedom has survived my tests, heard my demands, and felt my mark upon it.

#### F-111 FULLY RECOGNIZED

#### HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

MR. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a portion of a newsstory contained in the prestigious Aerospace Daily of February 27, 1973.

Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, recently appeared before the House Armed Services Committee and in response to questioning was high in his praise of the F-111 operations in Southeast Asia. That testimony has not yet been printed and released; however, testimony given by Admiral Moorer before the House Appropriations Defense Subcommittee on January 9 has now been released and his statements fully recognize the unique capabilities of the F-111.

The Aerospace Daily story appears below, but I would like to point out the special mention made of the F-111 suppression missions on surface-to-air missile—SAM-2—sites and MiG airfields about 20 minutes in advance of the B-52 flights. After this tactic was adopted no B-52's were lost either to Migs or SAM's, also, I would like to point out that during this highly difficult and dangerous series of missions no F-111's were lost either.

Among the capabilities of the F-111 is its ability to fly at high speed and at only 200 feet above the ground at nighttime and in bad weather. The newsstory points out in this connection that:

The F-111s particularly were effective because during the bombing missions against North Viet Nam's two major cities between Dec. 18 and Dec. 29 there were only 12 hours of visual bombing weather.

The newsstory goes on to say that:

While North Viet Nam fired over 1,000 missiles during the period bringing down 15 B-52s and damaging nine others, there were no losses during the last two days of the December effort, partly because of the suppression missions, Moorer noted.

TESTIMONY ADDS FURTHER DETAILS OF F-111'S VIET SUPPRESSION ROLE

The heretofore heavily-classified story of the role F-111s played in suppressing North

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Vietnamese air defenses in raids on Hanoi-Haiphong has been partly lifted by testimony released yesterday.

Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, recounted how F-111s primarily, along with Navy A-6s, flew suppression missions on surface-to-air missile (SAM-2) sites and MiG airfields usually 20 minutes in advance of B-52 strikes. This partly helped keep B-52 losses well under projected loss figures, he told the House Appropriations defense subcommittee on Jan. 9 (Daily, Feb. 5).

The F-111s particularly were effective because during the bombing missions against North Vietnam's two major cities between Dec. 18 and Dec. 29 there were only 12 hours of visual bombing weather.

While North Vietnam fired over 1000 missiles during the period bringing down 15 B-52s and damaging nine others, there were no losses during the last two days of the December effort, partly because of the suppression missions, Moorer noted. Also "only 32 MiGs were airborne during this entire period," he told the subcommittee, "and not one B-52 was shot down by a MiG."

Moorer noted that since bombing over the North resumed May 8, about 2500 SAMs had been fired at U.S. planes. But in the 10 days of the Hanoi area attacks, the 1000 missiles managed to knock down only 2% of the B-52s which conducted over 700 sorties. Before the raids, a 3% loss was anticipated.

Moorer reported that a preliminary assessment showed at least five SAM sites around Hanoi were damaged or destroyed by F-111s and A-6s, out of around 11 or 12, while there were nine or 10 at Haiphong, "some of which are marginal."

Moorer said 500-pound bombs were used mostly against the sites, although cluster bombs were "good for keeping heads down," and F-105s and A-7s used Shrike missiles when daylight attacks could be conducted. F-4s were also used.

In all, 20,370,000 tons of bombs were dropped during the stepped-up campaign. Included were "smart" bombs which were capable of taking out the generator room alone in power plants, the admiral said. These, however, were used mostly during the 12 hours of visual bombing weather.

Moorer added that ". . . it would take them (the North Vietnamese) over a year to restore all those (rail) yards (the primary means of supply) to their capacity." This would be true "even with significant outside help."

#### SOVEREIGN ORDER OF CYPRUS HONORS ZENON C. R. HANSEN

#### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

MR. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the highlights of the ceremony at which a high distinction was conferred upon one of our foremost humanitarians and patriots in the United States, Zenon Clayton Raymond Hansen, chairman and chief executive officer of Mack Trucks, Inc. Mr. Speaker, the honor to which I am referring was the investiture of Mr. Zenon C. R. Hansen as a Chevalier of the Ordre Souverain de Chypre.

Mr. Hansen has distinguished himself in his community and throughout the Nation in various executive and directorial capacities in the interest of the Boy Scouts of America, YMCA, United Fund, U.S. Treasury Bond Drives and a

score of other civic, charitable, religious, educational and fraternal organizations. He is the recipient of a number of honors and awards for his efforts to foster and advance the high ideals of freedom and citizenship.

The ceremony took place at the Chapel of the World Church Center of the United Nations in New York, in the presence of distinguished church prelates and public officials.

The Sovereign Order of Cyprus, one of the oldest orders of chivalry, was founded in the year 1192, by Guy de Lusignan, King of Cyprus and Jerusalem, and confirmed by Pope Innocent III in the year 1200, who imposed upon it the dual mission of spreading the Christian faith and acting as a bulwark of Christendom in the eastern Mediterranean. The order was created on the model of the Hospitaller and Military Orders such as those of the Temple, and of St. John, installed in the Holy Land. Three hundred men of noble birth were inducted as knights in the new order and allowed to wear the red, eight-pointed cross of the order at the throat. They were obliged to defend the island route to the Holy Land and to prevent attack and infiltration of the infidels. The order also consisted of men-at-arms, chaplains, and serving brothers who, with the knights, were organized in commanderies. The distinguishing mark of the knights was a blue mantle with the red cross of the order upon it. The order attracted to its ranks some of the most vigorous nobles of Christendom, and these knights were to take an active interest in the affairs of the Holy Roman Empire and of the Byzantine Empire in addition to their defense of the pilgrims and their charitable works.

Under a succession of able grand masters, for more than 3 centuries, the deeds and influence of the Sovereign Order of Cyprus were enormous and its members played an important role in the political life of the times. After the annexation of Cyprus by Venice, the order entered into a period of decline and its members dispersed throughout the Balkan States and Western Europe. More recently the order was activated by the descendants of some of its most illustrious knights with the blessings of the Holy See and dedicated to the unique values of Christian civilization and the spirit of ecumenism. Its reorganizers, like their famous ancestors, felt obliged, in the face of the many dangers which beset our culture and our institutions, to reestablish this venerable and tradition-laden order of chivalry, springing from one of the most respected shrines of Western thought; affirming in this way, the continuity of Christian effort against terror and injustice on a far-reaching ecumenical level.

The Sovereign Order of Cyprus, today a modern organization, based upon ancient principles and traditions is dedicated "to strive for the maintenance of Christian ideals and Western humanism, the liberty and dignity of man, and to oppose all forms of oppression." Among its objectives is the building of hospitals, places of worship, and other charitable, spiritual and educational institutions. The order honors writers, artists,

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

men of science, culture, education and medicine; leaders of the free world from every walk of life, regardless of race, creed, color or national origin.

In its nearly 800-year history, only 900 men have received this coveted knighthood and symbolic cross. For the propagation and diffusion of its principles, the order has created an institute for the Study of Moral Philosophy and Social Sciences, "Academie des Etudes Supérieures" which it subsidizes.

Mr. Speaker, it is my particular pleasure to inform this House that His Excellency Lorenzo de Valitch, titular bishop of Ephesus and apostolic delegate to the United States, the hereditary grand chancellor of the Sovereign Order of Cyprus, heir to the rich traditions of this noble and ancient order, created an American commandery of the order more than 7 years ago, in recognition of the dynamic and crusading American spirit which has contributed immeasurably to bringing freedom from oppression to the many peoples of the world. Bishop de Valitch personally presided over the inauguration of the American commandery and has since personally overseen its affairs. A magisterial seat in Rome, Italy, enables the United States commandery to enjoy certain diplomatic privileges, and for the purpose of propagating the order as a subject of international law in such countries in which it is represented. It also enjoys the right of active and passive diplomatic representation and to guarantee and direct such representation in each and every place where its credentials have been presented. It can appoint ambassadors, ministers and consular representatives with specified districts and accordingly issue appropriate diplomatic passports, pursuant to international customs.

I would like to enter in the RECORD the names of some of the outstanding members of this order both in the United States and abroad:

H. R. H. Prince Louis de Bourbon.  
H. S. H. Prince L. Radziwill, Rome and London.

Count Stefan Potocki, diplomat, Paris.  
H. E. J. Velasco-Alvarado, President, Peru.  
H. E. Charles Allot, Ambassador, Ivory Coast.

H. E. Dr. A. Bellini, Noted Industrialist, Italy and Belgium.

H. E. Damaskinos Georgakopoulos, Archimandrite du Trone Oecumenique.  
General James H. Doolittle.

Lowell Thomas.  
Dr. Boris Prege, Scientist and Philanthropist.

Monsignor Patrick B. Fay.  
Hon. Ludovic Huybrechts, Industrialist.  
Henry S. Evans, Author and Professor of International Relations.

Rev. Fred P. Eckhardt.  
Maitre Jacques Gambier de Laforterie, Noted Lawyer, Paris.

H. E. Philibert Bongo, Ambassador to Rome.

Dr. Serge Korff, Professor, Nuclear Physics, N.Y. University.

Hon. Edward Thompson, Supreme Court Justice, New York.

Louis A. Brun, New York.  
Joseph James Akston, Patron of Arts, Palm Beach, Florida.

Victor Wallace Farris, Philanthropist, Inventor, Palm Beach, Florida.

Jean E. Saurel, Pan American Union, Washington, D.C.

S. E. S. Prince Francesco Capanera di Sebasti, Italy.

H. E. Count Luciano Pelliccioni de Poli, Italy.

H. Dale Hemmerdinger, Real Estate Executive, New York.

Stanley Carey, Insurance Executive, New York.

Frederick N. Kinne, Ph.D. Industrialist, New Jersey.

A. William Carter, New York.  
Donald W. Scholle, Investments, New York.

Emil V. Hegyi, Oil Company Executive, Dallas, Texas.

Frederick Paul Pittera, International Exposition Consultant, New York.

These distinguished contemporaries typify the caliber of men holding this high honor. I wish to congratulate Mr. Zenon C. R. Hansen at having been selected to join this illustrious group. I would also like to commend His Excellency Bishop de Valitch for his tireless efforts to bring about a better world and to wish him and the knights of the Sovereign Order of Cyprus continued success in their humanitarian efforts.

## DISARMING THE LAW ABIDING

## HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the brutal shooting down of prominent persons confronts us all with the question: What must be done to stop it?

With a great many Americans, the quick response is "gun control"—new Federal laws to disarm the potential murderers.

But is this the answer?

In my opinion, Rabbi Robert A. Kaufman of State College, Pa., has summed up the anticontrol legislation argument in ways that command widespread attention.

Writing to a newspaper—Pittsburgh Post Gazette—Rabbi Kaufman, a gun hobbyist, cited a recent TV interview with a condemned murderer and holdup man who pointed out that criminals always will be able to get guns, while laws will prevent law-abiding citizens from owning them. The rabbi asserted:

This statement is far more realistic than the approach of gun control advocates.

He also commented that the Bayh bill was not simply a measure to ban the Saturday night special but, if passed, would have eliminated many handguns of high quality and cost which are the cherished possessions of the hobbyists.

The rabbi continued:

Most Colt single-action western frontier style revolvers, and similar ones made by other companies, would have been eliminated from the market by the provisions of this bill. This would have been true even though this style pistol is large, difficult to conceal, and used mainly by sportsmen and gun hobbyists such as myself . . . In recent years I have never read of a crime involving handguns where this type of gun was used.

So why, it can be asked, take them from those who prize them in hobby or for sport?

Rabbi Kaufman contends that the best approach to the gun problem is, first of all, the strict enforcement of laws already on the books. He explained:

If this type of enforcement had taken place for example in the case of the man who shot Gov. Wallace, that man would not have been there with a gun at that time. He would have been in jail.

The Rabbi concluded:

Bringing back the death penalty, enforcing it where it has to be done, and an end to the general softness toward criminals will do more to cut down serious crime than a million gun control laws.

The solution to the gun problem, perhaps, has never been more tersely stated. The criminal has been getting by with murder in recent years because of super-tolerant courts and a wave of permissiveness generated by well-meaning, but misled people across the country. It is time that we deal with the crime problem realistically and fully and not with some vaunted hope of lessening it by the simple means of passing a gun control law that could not in itself be effective because the criminal element never would obey it. We need to pay attention to such men as Rabbi Kaufman who have given the matter deep thought and reached sound decisions about it.

## COMMUNICATION WORKERS SUPPORT WALDIE, REID NEWS BILLS

## HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the Communications Workers of America, under the sensitive leadership of President Joseph A. Beirne, have been particularly alert to threats of freedom in this country and have acted with intelligence and vigor in efforts to protect and preserve those values on which the freedom of us all is most dependent. The current consideration being given by Congress to proposed legislation that would guarantee the continued free flow of information to the public and protect the confidentiality of newsgathering activities, including legislation I have proposed, H.R. 2187, to achieve that objective, is an area that falls within the CWA's traditional scope of alertness and concern.

I am pleased to be able to inform the House, therefore, that the executive board of the Communications Workers of America, affiliated with AFL-CIO, has adopted a statement with respect to the current assaults against freedom of the press and in accordance with their historic sensitivity on this subject.

The importance of action to guarantee the ability of the press to function as it has in the past is ably set forth in the text of the CWA's executive board.

I wish to call the specific attention of the House to that portion of the statement referring to endorsement of the principles of H.R. 2187, introduced by myself on the House side, and of S. 158, the counterpart bill, sponsored by my

distinguished colleague from California, ALAN CRANSTON, on the Senate side.

The full text of the statement by the CWA executive board is as follows:

THE RIGHT TO KNOW

Never, since 1787, has the right of the public to know about public business been under so strong and concerted an attack than during the present time. This is an attack on a principal guarantee of the Constitution.

A little at a time, the administration has resorted to broadside attacks on the right of the news media to analyze and criticize the operations of government. The administration seems to be following the line of the present military government of Greece, which nominally guarantees a "freedom of the press" but in fact cracks down on news media which "abuse" their "freedom."

The most sinister development in the United States is the attempt to compel persons engaged in newsgathering to reveal sources of information. The practical effect of such disclosure of sources would necessarily be to stifle free expression.

When the Constitution was adopted, there was wide controversy over the question of freedom of the press. At that time, various segments of the press were carrying on scurrilous attacks on public officials, even including George Washington. The Constitutional Convention of 1787 at first rejected a provision to guarantee inviolable freedom of the press. Subsequently, as a capstone of the Bill of Rights, the Convention provided for the free press, to help ensure against abuse of power by government.

The situation in the early 1970's has become so serious that the Congress is looking into legislation to define, once again, the doctrine that the free flow of information must be unrestricted. The Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate are hard at work on legislation to prohibit government agencies from compelling disclosure of source materials. The proposed bills run from total privilege of the newsgathering persons to a "qualified" privilege.

A major reason for the intense interest within the Congress for legislation to protect the media is a series of federal and state court decisions in the last 3 years. Newsgatherers have been summoned before grand juries to produce mental and written notes, still film negatives, and film and tape "outtakes" not used in broadcast programming. Some news media representatives have been incarcerated because they were protecting news sources; the reason offered by government for jailing of reporters has been the implication that justice was being obstructed.

The United States Supreme Court in June 1972 threw over longheld tradition and established precedent by its decision in *Branzburg v. Hayes*, thus deciding on a 5-4 vote that an investigative reporter must disclose to a grand jury information gathered in the course of his duties. The tradition and precedents date back to Thomas Jefferson, James Madison and Alexander Hamilton through the "Pentagon Papers" case against the New York Times in 1971. In all of those, the weight of decision had been toward untrammeled disclosure of information vital to the public's right to know about its business.

Among the many bills the Congress presently is examining on the subject of legal privilege for newsgatherers to protect sources and continue to report the public's business without harassment are those introduced by Representatives Ogden Reid and Jerome Walde and Senator Alan Cranston. Congressman Reid's bill would provide for unqualified and total privilege for reporters, so that they might not be required to abridge the First Amendment's rights in proceedings before the Congress, federal courts and agencies. The Walde-Cranston proposal would extend the unqualified privilege to reporters in all federal and state proceedings.

The Executive Board of the Communications Workers of America subscribes to the principles of the Reid, Walde and Cranston proposals. This Board does not draw stringent

distinctions between the Reid and the Walde-Cranston proposals, since the basic right of news media must in the end be determined by the federal court system—which is, and must continue to be, governed by the United States Constitution as a result of the decisions taken by the Constitutional Convention of 1787.

The CWA Executive Board, moreover, condemns the trend toward stifling of information attempted by government at all levels by whatever pretext employed.

The CWA Executive Board urges the Congress to enact legislation for unqualified privilege in terms sufficiently clear that the declarations of the nation's founders in 1787 may be fully honored in the 1970's and beyond.

SHIP SUBSIDY UP 20 PERCENT

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 6, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, while social programs are faced with massive budget cutbacks, certain special interest subsidies are alive and prospering.

The President's budget proposes that we subsidize ship construction by \$213 million—an increase of more than 20 percent in 1 year.

An increase in special-interest subsidies at a time when programs that help people are being closed down every day is a tragic example of our Nation's badly misaligned priorities.

As Congress works this year to reshape our national priorities, let us find a better use for the proposed \$36 million increase in the ship construction subsidy.

SENATE—Thursday, March 8, 1973

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by Hon. ROBERT T. STAFFORD, a Senator from the State of Vermont.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Creator and Redeemer, before Thee we acknowledge that Thou art holy and we are unholy, Thou art perfect and we are imperfect, Thou art pure and we are impure. In these Lenten days of penitence and renewal, may a new spirit be born in us and in all the people of this good land. Deliver us from all that obstructs the way of righteousness and truth. Deliver us from pride and prejudice, from the clash of class with class, or race with race, from hostility or mistreatment of our fellow citizens, from distrust of one another, from intemperate speech, the hot invective, the cruel epithet. Set our minds upon the vision of Thy kingdom and a better people in a more righteous land, that we may set forward the fulfillment of that kingdom, the law of which is love and the Ruler of which is the Lord of Life.

In His name who forgives and renews the humble and contrite of heart. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1973.  
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. ROBERT T. STAFFORD, a Senator from the State of Vermont, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. STAFFORD thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to Public Law 301 of the 78th Congress, the chairman of the Commit-

tee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has appointed Mr. DOWNING, Mr. ECKHARDT, and Mr. MOSHER as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, for the year 1973, and Mrs. SULLIVAN has been appointed to serve as an ex officio member.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 6, 1973, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NUNN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

CAMBODIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the latest issue of U.S. News & World