

as "Battle of North Point Memorial Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland (for himself, Mr. HELSTOSKI, and Mr. HENDERSON):

H.J. Res. 451. Joint resolution prohibiting U.S. rehabilitation and reconstruction aid to the Republic of Vietnam, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, or any other country in Indochina until certain conditions have been met, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCLOREY:

H.J. Res. 452. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April as "National Arbor Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARAZITI:

H.J. Res. 453. Joint resolution to improve mail services in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. MILFORD):

H.J. Res. 454. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit certain congressional appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H. Con. Res. 159. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives objecting to the eligibility of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic for membership in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ZION, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. FISHER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. SHRIVER, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, and Mr. MOAKLEY):

H. Con. Res. 160. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Federal Government should increase the amount of timber offered for sale for domestic use; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GUBSER (for himself, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. FROELICH, Mr. STEELE, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. HICKS, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, and Mr. LOTY):

H. Con. Res. 161. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Federal Government should increase the amount of timber offered for sale for domestic use; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONES of Oklahoma:

H. Res. 318. Resolution for the creation of congressional senior citizen internships; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FULTON, and Mrs. GRASSO):

H. Res. 319. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation of matters affecting, influencing, and pertaining to the cost and availability of food to the American consumer; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. GUDE, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LENT, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. PIKE, Mr. POCELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROE, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SARBANES, and Mrs. SCHROEDER):

H. Res. 320. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation of matters affecting, influencing, and pertaining to the cost and availability of food to the American consumer; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. YATES, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. ADAMS):

H. Res. 321. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation of matters affecting, influencing, and pertaining to the cost and availability of food to the American consumer; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

100. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho relative to overtime payment for overtime work during harvesting periods; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 6006. A bill for the relief of Mirosława J. Wierszoch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Texas:

H.R. 6007. A bill for the relief of Swift-Train Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

71. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Taecho Land Development Association, Kyongnam, Korea, relative to the settlement of a claim by the Taecho Irrigation Association against the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

72. Also, petition of Milton Mayer, New York, N.Y., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REAP AND FISCAL RESPONSIBILITIES

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the rural environmental assistance program seems to have survived the administration's valiant struggle to achieve economy in Government. REAP may have survived for another year unless this Congress faces some clear fiscal facts and sustains the expected Presidential veto.

Many of my colleagues seem to be laboring under the misconception that REAP is universally popular. It is incumbent upon each of us in this chamber to weigh seriously the need for subsidies which accrue to the recipients of REAP. Several fundamental questions should be resolved: First, Does REAP still address the problems at which the original legislation was intended? Second, Do the recipients themselves deem

the legislation worthy of continuation? Third, Is the legislation fiscally responsible?

In answering these questions, let me recommend for your education some enlightening material. Bill Anderson, writing in the March 8 Chicago Tribune, revealed one of the more flagrant uses of Federal subsidies which are presently available under REAP. As neighbors of nearby Fauquier County, Va., no doubt we are all particularly intrigued by subsidies accruing to "poor" farmers in that "underprivileged" area.

Second, I wish to call to your attention a letter from the New York Farm Bureau, which represents 15,000 farm families in New York State. Lastly, I recommend, for your edification, a letter from a dairy farmer in my district who understands better than some Members of this body what best contributes to the well-being of Americans in the agricultural sector of our economy:

U.S. BOUNTY AID 252 "RICH" FARMS

(By Bill Anderson)

WARRENTON, Va.—This is where people come for the Gold Cup, an annual horse

race on a huge estate in Fauquier County, a place near the Appalachian Trail and National Forests set in the rolling hills of the Blue Ridge Mountains.

There are about 600 farms in this large county, and most of them are larger than Chicago's Loop. The air is clean and fresh, and there is nothing here that remotely resembles poverty or the old dust bowl farming portrayed in "The Grapes of Wrath."

Yet, there are 252 farms in Fauquier County that will be greener this spring because the federal government spent \$65,000 on them last year in a program that grew out of the plight of farmers during the dust bowl days. The federal dollars were part of a spending program of the Rural Environmental Assistance Program [REAP], currently the object of what amounts to a pilot fight between the executive and the legislative branches of the government.

The father of REAP was born in 1936 as a conservation program funded at \$374 million. In the early days, the money went for soil saving projects of small farmers, water development, and tree planting. There are literally thousands of acres of land in the United States that are green today as a result of the program.

By 1944, as times changed, the program became strictly conservation. Spending con-

tinued at the rate of about 200 million dollars a year until 1970, when the executive branch began to run into budget problems. On Dec. 22, 1972, the Nixon administration terminated the funding [except for prior commitments] after it dropped to the \$140 million level.

In essence, a large number of congressmen said: "You can't do this to us." The Washington Post, a newspaper highly critical of the Nixon administration, has given extensive coverage to the REAP issue. One story was headlined, "As Ye Sow, So Shall Ye REAP."

Since Fauquier County is only an hour and a half by auto from Washington, the Post has considerable influence in the county—as well as among prominent, politically-connected residents who live here. About 50 of the 252 farms receiving money from REAP last year are owned by people who live in Washington.

One of these places is owned by Mrs. Joseph W. Barr, wife of the former secretary of the treasury. Since 1968, Mrs. Barr has received \$1,408 from the federal treasury to spend on her estate. The money spent on the 364-acre holding was for fertilizing, applying lime, and planting blue grass.

Mrs. Katharine Graham, publisher of the Post and owner of a 347-acre estate near Rectortown, has also been a federal recipient. Records provided to Jim Coates, a reporter for this column, showed that Mrs. Graham received \$976 since 1968, a figure somewhat less than the average payment.

Mrs. Francis Gilbert, executive director of the Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service, which administers the program on a local level, said that the money for Mrs. Graham's estate was used for a variety of projects. In 1968, there was a federal allotment of \$158 for the Graham estate for vegetation cover on 18 acres. Other money over the years went for thistle spraying and additional ground-covering projects.

"Whether you're rich or poor," Mrs. Gilbert said, "you'll still get rained on—and, no matter how prominent you are, your soil will wash away if there is no grass." The local director said the establishment of permanent vegetative cover was one of the most popular in the county. All together, REAP offers 16 grant categories ranging from animal-waste storage and diversion facilities to strip-cropping—a term used in connection with land contouring to avoid erosion.

Mrs. Gilbert explained, as did officials of REAP, that the programs are traditionally handled at the local levels in order to insure maximum benefits. The federal tax dollars are distributed first to the states and then down to the county levels. At the county level, three farmers are elected by the other farmers of the county to make the final disposition of the money.

The largest amount which was spent on a farm in Fauquier County last year was about \$2,500. The average amount here last year was \$260, slightly lower than the national average per grant. Next year there will be no money unless Congress is successful in overriding the administration's cut-back.

NEW YORK FARM BUREAU

DEAR MR. KEMP: We appreciate your vote of February 6 in support of Farm Bureau policy and in opposition to H.R. 2107 which would mandate expenditures for the Rural Environmental Assistance Program.

We are certainly not in opposition to extension of the R.E.A.P. program as it applies to cost-sharing expenditures for conservation and environmental improvement practices. A much needed re-appraisal of the program in line with federal spending control, reduction of inflation and avoidance of tax increases would probably result in

discard of the practices classed as income producing and which farmers would carry out regardless of the existence of the former R.E.A.P. benefits.

We are aware that you have been lobbied extensively by special interests, other than farmers, to override an expected veto of H.R. 2107 or similar proposal.

Representing 15,000 farm families in New York State, the New York Farm Bureau respectfully requests you maintain your original position and vote so as to sustain the expected veto.

We must control inflation. We must cut government spending across the board—not just agriculture. We are not in favor of new taxes. A sustained veto would be a step in this direction. We believe it would also result in an overdue re-appraisal of the R.E.A.P. program.

Our sincere appreciation for your consideration of our position in this matter.

Yours truly,

LELAND BEEBE,
Public Affairs Director.

REAP

DEAR MR. KEMP: Regarding H.R. Bill 2107, which has wide ranging implications, but basically requires the Sec. of Ag. to carry out the REAP program as it now stands.

This legislation does not offer constructive review and revision much needed with the present REAP program, if Federal spending is to be kept in check. The future of this nation is in need of a balanced budget for economic stability.

We believe farmers should NOT receive payments annually for merely observing common sense conservation practices and programs which have as a primary objective, increased production.

Rather, we would suggest Federal cost-sharing programs which would contribute to the attainment of pollution prevention, enduring conservation, and environmental enhancement of our country.

Please sustain the President's vote of H.R. Bill 2107.

Sincerely,

BRUCE C. LUNE,
Dairy Farmer.

CRISIS IN THE LUMBER INDUSTRY

HON. GUNN McKAY

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

MR. McKAY. Mr. Speaker, the price of lumber has soared beyond reason or comprehension this past year. Even though inflation is eating away at the value of the dollar, lumber prices have rapidly outstripped the increases in the cost of living. Last year in Utah, according to a report from one of my constituents, lumber prices rose by 32 percent.

Rocketing lumber costs can be attributed to many things, none more critical than the tremendous increase in housing construction. In the last 2 years, housing starts have been 50 to 70 percent higher than previous years. The lumber industry, geared to a lower level, simply was unprepared for the surge in wood usage.

Other factors affecting the lumber supply include the export of lumber—3 billion board feet to Japan alone in 1972—

a shortage of freight cars to move lumber to the East, and a strike of woodworkers in Canada, the source for roughly 20 percent of lumber used in the United States.

In addition to the current demand for lumber, and the impediments in meeting this demand, the Forest Service must contend with administrative burdens imposed and actual board footage tied up because of injunctions brought by some environmental groups. Because of the injunctions rendered last year, the Forest Service now must file between 1,200 and 1,500 environmental impact statements. This alone has delayed routine timber sales by 6 months. The Forest Service estimates that over 2 billion board feet of lumber are tied up because of legal actions.

Mr. Speaker, in light of these problems, I would have expected the administration to support the Forest Service efforts whenever possible. Instead, the Forest Service has been further burdened in their management efforts by reduced budgets. In the President's budget for 1974, Forest Service funds for roads and trails are less than half of last year's appropriation, and reforestation funds would be cut by \$8 million. Operating expenses have also been subjected to budget pressures.

Clearly, if we are to respond to the crisis in the lumber industry, we must give the Forest Service the support it requires, and be realistic about the management of our forests.

REGIONAL MEDICAL PROGRAMS

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

MR. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, twice before I have shared with my colleagues the letters which I have received telling of the successfulness of some of the regional medical programs in Arkansas. Once again I would like to bring an example of the benefits of this program to your attention. With the cooperation and assistance of the University of Arkansas School of Medicine and the Arkansas regional medical program, the Harris Hospital and Clinic in Newport, Ark., has been able to offer substantial medical care to citizens of five counties while limiting the rising cost of hospital expenses to 43 cents per day. I include here a copy of a recent letter I received from the Harris Hospital and Clinic:

HARRIS HOSPITAL AND CLINIC,
Newport, Ark., March 15, 1973.

HON. BILL ALEXANDER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ALEXANDER: The President's recent cut-back in federal funding for the Regional Medical Program and the effective cut-off of July 1st is of great concern to all of us here at Harris Hospital and Clinic. Although as a proprietary hospital, we have not participated in any federal

health programs other than Medicare until recently when the University of Arkansas Medical Center made available to our Medical Staff through the Arkansas Regional Medical Program the Dial Access system and consulting program, which has been of immense value to the Medical Staff in their efforts in Continuing Education.

Through the assistance of the University of Arkansas School of Medicine and the Regional Medical Program, we have been able to supply a much better quality of medical care to the citizens of Newport, Jackson County, and a large portion of Polk, Lawrence, Independence, and White Counties. We will continue to participate in Continuing Education programs entirely at our own expense if necessary. However, with today's emphasis upon controlling medical care costs, the elimination of the above programs will make it difficult for this institution, and all other health care providers, to continue to control costs. We feel that our efforts in 1972 were successful in this endeavor since the cost per patient day in our hospital increased a mere 43 cents per day over 1971, and we will make every effort to assure that this trend continues.

Since we pay considerable corporate income taxes, we fully agree that some programs are unnecessary and wasteful, but the Arkansas Regional Medical Program is not among those. We urge your support in funding Regional Medical Program projects beyond July 1, 1973. Your help is urgently needed.

Very truly yours,

JOHN C. WRIGHT, M.D.,
Chief of Staff.
M. H. HARRIS, M.D.,
Chief of Surgery.
J. F. JACKSON, M.D.,
Secretary.
G. M. DUDLEY, M.D.,
Chief of Medicine.
L. V. JOHNSTON,
Administrator.

BUDGET SITUATION

HON. SAMUEL H. YOUNG

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 14, 1973

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the great majority of the new Congressmen and Congresswomen elected for the first time to this House of Representatives in emphasizing the danger posed to the United States—from big spending, big taxing, and big inflation. We have a threatened fiscal crisis.

One of the ingredients of this fiscal crisis has been the basic change in the prevailing congressional attitude toward Federal spending. Not so many years ago Congress acted as a restraining force with respect to spending. In the 1950's, a typical Congressman would rather be called almost anything than a big spender. Then the prevailing fiscal wisdom was that the budget of the Federal Government should be handled on the principles that guided a business or a household.

Since the advent of the Great Society there has been a marked change in the attitude of our Congress. Congress has abandoned its restraining role and has engaged in inflationary spending programs by increasing old ones and by inventing new ones. The increased Federal spending then generates additional spending pressures. The flood of benefits and grants and subsidies and guarantees flowing into every congressional district in the United States has enormously swelled the ranks of beneficiaries and has created new pressure groups for additional spending. This broadened area of support and pressure has greatly affected the attitude of the Congress.

Big spending. In 1960, the United States spent approximately \$92 billion on a unified budget basis. In 1965, budget spending was \$118 billion. In 1970, it was \$196 billion. In 1973, through the impounding efforts by the President of the United States spending should be held down to approximately \$250 billion. In 1974, the Presidential budget proposes the spending of \$268 billion.

Big deficits. In the last 10 years we have financed spending by borrowing in 9 out of 10 years to a total of \$130 billion of deficit spending.

Big debt. In 1960, the Federal debt was \$290 billion. In 1965 it had climbed to \$323 billion. In 1970, it had risen to \$382 billion.

In 1973 it was up to \$473 billion and it is expected to reach \$505 billion in the 1974 fiscal year.

Next, I would like to review big inflation. We have suffered in recent years annual inflationary rates of 6 and 7 percent. We have had to impose wage and price controls on a free economy. We have had to do this to cut inflation down to a rate of approximately 3 percent. With the expanding economy, we may have to reimpose wage and price controls.

During the last 3 years, we have had two devaluations of the U.S. dollar, because of the internationally recognized weakness caused by the inflationary problems of the U.S. dollar.

There have been many proposals for reform of congressional budgeting procedures. Some of the national magazines have written about the subject of congressional reform of budget control procedures. One of the recent articles in a national publication stated that it was the general thinking that nothing will come of the efforts now being made in Congress to get a control on spending. We in the 93d Congress must not let this happen.

It is absolutely imperative that Congress draw a line on spending and reestablish its role as the guardian of the fiscal integrity of the United States.

The Chief Executive has indicated his desire to work in this direction. It is now up to the Members of this Chamber, with the Members of the Senate, to affirm their commitment to the future of this country by setting a ceiling on Federal expenditures and by creating the procedures in this congressional body to appropriately review expenditures and allocate priorities.

AMERICAN TAXPAYERS FOOT BILL FOR DISPLAY OF ART FROM RUSSIA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Rarick and I, like the other Members, have received an invitation from the Director of the National Gallery of Art here in Washington to attend "a private preview of the paintings from the U.S.S.R." Since some newsreports have referred to it as the "Russian art" exhibit, I am happy that the invitation properly identified the paintings as being from the U.S.S.R. and not the product of Soviets.

Certainly names like Renoir, Monet, Rousseau, Van Gogh, Cezanne, Picasso, Matisse, Gauguin, Pissarro, Sisley, Braque—are not Russian names and are from countries never occupied by the Bolsheviks. In fact, most of these artists lived and worked at a time preceding the 1917 Russian Revolution, so that any efforts to call this exhibit Soviet art would not only be a misnomer but would be a hoax.

One can only assume how the Communist Party came into possession and control of these priceless masterpieces—some probably were stolen by the Nazis and later "liberated" by the Soviet troops. In reality, the showing of these paintings from the U.S.S.R. is reminiscent of a convict placing his stolen merchandise on public display.

But despite the play in semantics; that is, "from" as against "by," the innocent would be unwary and the gullible will go to see the exhibit and leave to tell others what great artists the Soviets have produced—not that they and their system are exploiting the work of others.

According to reports, a portion of the cost of the exhibit will be borne by U.S. taxpayers through a grant of \$100,000 from the National Endowment for the Humanities. Apparently the balance of the cost of the exhibit is to be borne by the arranger, Dr. Armand Hammer, of Occidental Petroleum fame, and a long-time Soviet apologist and entrepreneur. No doubt as a tax exempt donation "in the public interest." The Russians are paying nothing except the loan of the "liberated" art.

Related clippings follow:

[From the Washington Star and Daily News, Feb. 6, 1973]

SOVIETS SENDING MAJOR EXHIBIT

(By Benjamin Forgey)

An extraordinary assortment of 41 Impressionist and Post-Impressionist paintings from two Soviet museums will go on view at the National Gallery of Art next month.

The special loan exhibition will mark the first time Western paintings from Soviet collections have visited the United States.

The show was arranged by a private citizen, Dr. Armand Hammer, a businessman and art collector who has visited Moscow frequently in recent months in an attempt to complete negotiations on a large-scale business deal with the Soviet government.

Hammer is chairman of the Occidental Petroleum Corp. which last summer announced a draft agreement on a five-point, five-year

arrangement whereby the American company would provide technological skills and receive in return Soviet oil, gas and other natural resources.

The paintings will be loaned from the Hermitage State Museum in Leningrad and the Pushkin Museum in Moscow, where Hammer's own art collection is currently being shown. The Soviet loans will be on view at the National Gallery from March 31 through April 29 and then, in May, will be shown at the Knoedler Gallery in New York City. Hammer purchased controlling interest in Knoedler's in 1971.

The loan show will include seven paintings by Matisse, seven by Gauguin, six by Picasso, five by Cezanne, three by Van Gogh, two each by Monet, Renoir, Rousseau and Derain, and one painting each by Pissarro, Sisley, Braque, Vlaminck and Leger.

Knoedler's and the National Gallery will share the costs of the exhibition. The National's share will come from a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, which will make up to \$100,000 available for the show and related educational programs.

[From the Evening Star-Daily News,
Feb. 26, 1973]

FEDERAL FUNDING OF ARTS QUADRUPLIES IN 2 YEARS

Federal support of the arts quadrupled during the past two fiscal years to \$15 million, the National Endowment for the Arts reported yesterday.

The endowment, which administers such assistance, said its grant-giving capacity doubled in 1971 and again in 1972 and, during the same period, it entered into such forgotten outposts as Indian folklore and the inner cities.

Created late in the Kennedy administration, the endowment is one of five divisions under the umbrella National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities established in 1965.

In a report titled "New Dimensions for the Arts 1971-1972," the endowment said its grants were made available under 12 programs to help symphony orchestras, museums, theaters, dance companies, educational projects, "expansion" or grass-roots arts, writers, public media and various other programs.

Counseled by Duke Ellington, Helen Hayes and other famous artists during the two-year boom, the endowment paid out \$750,000 to send visiting artists into the public schools in 1971 and more than \$2 million in 1972.

No individual dancers were granted endowment funds, but \$25,000 went to last year's New York City Ballet Stravinsky Festival. During the two years, more than \$250,000 went to choreographers and more to companies producing new works.

Ethnic and rural minorities received \$307,600 in 1971 and \$1.1 million in 1972.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1973]
PICKING RUSSIAN ART
(By Paul Richard)

When Dr. Armand Hammer offered to let the National Gallery of Art show 37 paintings he picked from Soviet museums, the gallery suggested he go back and ask for more.

Hammer complied. "Impressionists and Post-Impressionists from the U.S.S.R.," the unprecedented exhibition that will open here March 31, will include four additional works chosen by Carter Brown, the gallery's director.

Those four: two Picassos, an 1891 Gauguin, and an early Claude Monet, are the only pictures in the show selected by the gallery. Hammer and his brother, Victor, made all the other choices. In a highly unusual gesture of generosity and trust, the Soviets had let them wander through the Hermitage in Leningrad and the Pushkin Museum in Mos-

cow picking the school of Paris pictures they liked.

"When Carter saw our choices, he said, 'Gosh, we'd like some more,'" Hammer told a press conference here yesterday.

The selection process reflects the most peculiar aspect of this remarkable exhibition. The whole show was privately arranged, though the paintings all belong to the Soviet government, though Ekaterina Furtseva, the Soviet minister of culture will attend the opening and the pictures will be shown here at a federal museum.

The original loan contract between the U.S.S.R. and Knoedler's (Hammer's commercial gallery in New York) did not even mention the National Gallery of Art.

Hammer, who has described himself as a billionaire, now runs the Occidental Petroleum Corporation. A non-practicing physician who both sells and collects art, he ran a pencil factory while an American businessman in Russia in the 1920s.

His friendship with the Soviet government could hardly be much closer. He strikes multi-million-dollar business deals with the Russians and lets them show his pictures. When he generously gave them a million-dollar Goya portrait, they surprised him by responding with a present of their own, a rare 1918 abstraction by Kasimir Malevich.

It is in part because Hammer's relations with the National Gallery are also close that the Soviet paintings will be shown here.

His own collections have improved greatly in recent years, in part because he has been following the gallery's advice. He has purchased, for example, exquisite drawings by Leonardo, Raphael, Rembrandt, Durer and other major masters that were brought to his attention by Konrad Oberhuber and Christopher White of the gallery's staff. Hammer, in turn, has willed these works to the National Gallery of Art.

"My feelings towards the gallery are such. I felt it would be the right place for the Soviet paintings to be shown," he said yesterday.

The paintings will be flown to New York in three separate planes. The Soviets have insured them for "about \$25 million." Security will be tight. The pictures—many of them purchased between 1870 and 1920 by Ivan Morozov and Serge Shchukin, two Russian collectors who were quick to appreciate the experimental artists working then in Paris—will be displayed behind thick shields of non-shattering plastic.

The show will include seven pictures by Matisse, five by Paul Cezanne, seven by Gauguin, three van Goghs, two Rousseaus and six paintings by Picasso. The National Endowment for the Humanities has provided \$100,000 for expenses, a free brochure to be distributed and an hour film on the exhibition that will be shown on public TV.

"Impressionists and Post-Impressionists from the U.S.S.R." will be in view here from March 31 to April 29.

MUST WE HAVE BLOOD BATHS TO CURE HUMAN RELATIONS?

HON. JAMES P. (JIM) JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, since the conduct of the news media has been subject to criticism from time to time as it has related to the reporting of man's relationship to his fellow man, I think it is equally important to cite the many instances where the balanced view is demonstrated and,

hopefully, has led to better understanding among those who take the time to read and think. One such example of the balanced view was a recent editorial in the Eaton Herald newspaper published in Eaton, Colo. I recommend it to my colleagues.

MUST WE HAVE BLOOD BATHS TO CURE HUMAN RELATIONS

For the past ten or 12 years various groups have claimed discrimination or unfair treatment by others. The trend has been to destroy property, destroy lives and in general cause havoc in the world. It has not only been in foreign countries, but, in ours as well. May I ask this week, are blood baths necessary to cure the problems of human relations. I don't believe they are.

God handed to Moses the Ten Commandments, and one was "Thou shalt not kill."

Arab Terrorists have been going strong for several years and the most devastating raid they made was on the Olympic Village when they abducted Jewish people and killed them. Now they have captured several diplomats and the last report was that they had killed three. One was described as a fine American citizen.

In our own country has been the latest event, the hostage episode of the Indians in the Dakotas. Luckily, they have not killed any person, and they now express a desire to smoke the peace pipe.

I have never been able to understand such violence, even to gain a cause of any one individual. It would seem that the laws of a good Christian world would come first.

Neither can I understand why the American Indian was ever confined to a reservation and denied the rights of citizenship. Neither should the blacks have been confined to the ghettos, or the Mexicans to shanty towns. We of the dominant races should have been making efforts long ago to help them improve their standards of living. It is not as much yours and my fault as it is the fault of our ancestors. The Indian was considered a savage and upon the white taking over the country they were given the poor land called reservations. The black were brought here for slaves and the Mexicans brought here for labor purposes. They did not come on their own. So, it would seem that our ancestors should have begun right after the Civil War improving the standards of these people.

By the same token, these minorities should NOT be taking the lives and freedoms of the majority to gain their purposes.

Every one of these problems should be settled at the peace table, not with guns!

LIZZADRO MUSEUM OF LAPIDARY ARTS

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article that appeared in the Chicago Tribune on Thursday, March 8, 1973, with reference to the Lizzadro Museum of Lapidary Arts in Elmhurst, Ill.

It was my privilege to be at the ribbon-cutting ceremony when the museum was first established in 1962 by the late Joseph F. Lizzadro, who served before his death last year as chairman of the board of the Meade Electric Co., 5401 West Harrison Street, Chicago.

The museum exhibits precious and semiprecious stones, minerals, fossils, carvings of jade and ivory, and other items relating to stone. It is believed to be the only museum in America solely devoted to the display of lapidary art, and the late Mr. Lizzadro's extensive private collection of this art form can be viewed there.

I was pleased that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration cooperated with my request last year that a lunar sample from the Apollo 11 flight be exhibited at the Lizzadro Museum. The moon rock went on display at the museum from June 11 to June 25, 1972, and was viewed by thousands of Illinoisans during that period.

The late Joseph Lizzadro was associated with me also in the development of Villa Scalabrini, the Italian Old Peoples Home in Melrose Park, Ill., which is a private institution built without public funds, but solely with private funds. Two hundred old people receive the finest of care in this outstanding home because of the dedicated work of men like the late Joe Lizzadro.

I am proud of this son of immigrant parents who contributed so much to his community and to his fellow citizens during his lifetime. I am proud that he made America his home, that he loved his adopted country so well, and that he has left a living memorial for many Americans to enjoy—the vast collection of precious and semiprecious stones and oriental works of art valued at more than \$2 million—which are housed in the Lizzadro Museum of Lapidary Art.

The article follows:

IMMIGRANT'S HOBBY BECOMES LIZZADRO MUSEUM

(By Donald Yabush)

Because the son of an Italian immigrant shoemaker found an agate on a Lake Superior beach 35 years ago, Elmhurst today has a gem of a museum.

The Lizzadro Museum of Lapidary Arts in Elmhurst's Wilder Park is a \$2.5 million monument to the man who admired that agate on the lonely beach long ago. The museum is a repository for a vast collection of precious and semiprecious stones, and oriental art objects, valued at more than \$2 million.

Founder of the museum was Joseph F. Lizzadro who left Naples with his father as a nine-year-old and came to Chicago to make a new life for the Lizzadro family.

When the father and son had earned enough money, they sent for the rest of the family who joined the millions of other turn-of-the-century immigrants.

Young Joseph Lizzadro started as an electrician's helper with the Meade Electric Co. of Chicago and worked his way up to becoming board chairman.

During his climb to success, Lizzadro found that agate on the beach of his Lake Superior summer home. That pretty stone turned him to lapidary arts [stone polishing and cutting] and eventually to collecting exotic and rare gems and carvings from all over the world.

"Our home here in Elmhurst used to be jammed with dad's collections; the house was a museum of sorts when I was a kid," recalled John Lizzadro, 32, curator of his late father's collection. The elder Lizzadro died last year at age 74.

"He expressed a desire [10 years ago] to establish a museum in his will, but we urged him to do it while he was alive so he could have everything the way he wanted," the son said.

Ten years ago the father and the Elmhurst Park District agreed on the construc-

tion of his museum in Wilder Park, and the \$300,000 modern, air conditioned structure was built. It was paid for by Lizzadro.

One of the elder Lizzadro's outstanding acquisitions is a five piece set of carved jade altar pieces which stood for centuries in the Imperial Palace in Peking, China. The set is valued at more than \$250,000.

Behind the altar pieces stands a 10-panel Imperial Chinese screen of carved cinnabar, framed in rosewood, measuring 7 feet high and 13 feet long.

The museum displays an array of ivories, diamonds, rubies, emeralds, topazes, sapphires, and a large display of all types of pieces and hues of jade.

Lizzadro turned over ownership of the museum to the park district, but retained possession of the collection.

"Only about 60 per cent of my father's collection is ever on display at one time because we don't have enough room," Lizzadro said. "Besides, we like to change the exhibits occasionally so the museum doesn't become static."

The museum, located at 220 Cottage Hill Ave., Elmhurst, is directed by Mrs. Mary Lizzadro, the founder's widow, and her two sons, John and Joseph. Four Lizzadro daughters are officers of the museum. Joseph Lizzadro currently heads the Meade Electric Co.

The museum is closed on Monday, open from 1 to 5 p.m. Sunday through Friday and from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Saturday.

McCLORY BILL FOR METRIC CONVERSION HIGHLIGHTS NATIONAL LEADERSHIP

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from Illinois (Mr. McClory) has been a principal sponsor in the House of Representatives of legislation to convert our nation to the metric system of weights and measurements. The Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development of the Committee on Science and Astronautics chaired by our colleague from Georgia (Mr. Davis) and on which I am privileged to serve, is conducting hearings on the subject of metric conversion.

In his testimony yesterday before the committee, Mr. McClory provided an illuminating and forthright statement outlining the role which the Congress of the United States and the Department of Commerce should take in directing an effective and orderly metric conversion program intended to be carried out over a 10-year period.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be a co-sponsor of the McClory proposal, H.R. 2351. More than 20 of our colleagues have joined us in support of a metric conversion program which would provide a workable and practical response to the urgent need for national leadership and direction.

I am pleased to attach a copy of Mr. McClory's testimony, to the end that all of our colleagues may have the benefit of this constructive statement:

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT McCLORY

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to testify on the subject of the proposed conversion of our nation to the metric system of

weights and measures. In this statement, I propose to emphasize the kind of legislative action which I feel that the Congress should take in order to minimize costs and disruptions in our social and economic system, while achieving the vital result of a Metric Conversion Program targeted at a date approximately ten years hence.

A. STRONG NATIONAL LEADERSHIP NEEDED

In facing the task which lies before us, we should not assume that there is any easy or obvious road which can lead to the result which you, Mr. Chairman, and I are seeking. Indeed, it will be my position that strong and determined leadership in the Congress, and within the social, economic, professional, and educational segments of our system are vital, if we are to succeed.

Mr. Chairman, I have been working with this subject for many years—even before enactment of the 1968 legislation authorizing the three-year study which was completed in July, 1971, under the direction of the National Bureau of Standards of our Department of Commerce.

Some argued that the Metric Study itself was not needed—because the facts which the study was able to reveal, were already known. I must agree with that. On the other hand, without the prestige and the powerful influence which this illuminating and persuasive Metric Study Report represents, we would not have today the overwhelming recognition of the fact that our nation is on the road to a Metric Conversion Program. Before addressing myself to the specific provisions which I believe a Metric Conversion Bill should contain, let me reiterate the recommendation of the Secretary of Commerce based on that report; namely, that the United States change to the international metric system *deliberately and carefully*, and that this be done through a *coordinated national program*.

I think it might be well for us to recall at this point that substantial efforts in the Congress to adopt the metric system of weights and measures have been made in the past. A measure passed the House in 1896 which would have required all governmental departments and agencies to employ the metric system—exclusively. But, ultimately, the bill failed.

The mere fact that we may seem close at this time to a Metric Conversion Program should not delude us into believing that just any type of legislative pronouncement will be sufficient to carry us to the goal of a metric America at the end of a ten-year period. In my opinion, the advice of the Secretary of Commerce is directly applicable. There must be "a firm government commitment to this goal."

B. A METRIC CONVERSION COORDINATING COMMISSION SHOULD BE EMPOWERED TO DIRECT THE 10-YEAR CHANGEOVER

In the measure which I have presented to the House (H.R. 724 and H.R. 2351), it was my purpose to establish a relatively small working Metric Conversion Coordinating Commission broadly representative of the most vitally involved segments of our society which, under the auspices of the Department of Commerce and with the assistance of an adequate staff, could develop a coordinated national program for conversion to the international metric system over a ten-year period.

This coordinating Commission would be capable of receiving the effective support and assistance voluntarily provided by every interested sector and group in the United States.

While I have suggested in my bill a nine-member Commission composed of representatives from (a) business, (b) labor, (c) education, (d) science, and (e) technology it is possible that some essential group may have been omitted. On the other hand, I feel that a much larger Commission would be both unwieldy and undesirable. I see no reason

whatever for selecting these persons on the basis of their political affiliation. Of all of the many persons whom I've met who appear to be most knowledgeable on this subject—and who would make most valuable members of such a commission—I don't know the political preferences of a single one of them. And while I may have as broad or broader experience in the subject of conversion to the metric system as any other person in public life, I do not feel I or any other Member of Congress should be burdened or made responsible for developing the kind of national coordinating program which is vital if we are to meet the objective of a ten-year conversion program.

C. THE GOAL SHOULD BE "FULL CONVERSION"—WITH A FEW EXCEPTIONS—AND EXTENSIONS

In the bill which some 20 of my colleagues and I have presented, the measure recommends "that the target date for full conversion be January 1, 1984." It has been suggested that instead of the expression "full conversion" we should recommend that by the time the ten-year target date is reached, the United States would be "predominately though not exclusively metric."

In other words, it is recommended that in place of the word "full" on page 3, line 13 of my bill, the word "predominant" would be substituted.

I have no fault to find with this possibility except if it is interpreted as an invitation to every group and sector of our society as a reason and excuse for not becoming involved in the conversion program. In my opinion, it might be preferable to retain the expression "full conversion" and to add a further proviso that with respect to various subjects such as land measurements, sporting events, standards subject to international agreement and other possible categories that an exemption or extension of time might be granted.

D. ADVISORY GROUPS COULD ASSIST

This further suggestion has come to me that the Commission might well be assisted by one or a number of advisory commissions which the President or the Secretary of Commerce might establish. Indeed, this type of advisory group participation was contemplated by the language contained in Section 2 of the bill which I presented.

E. CONVERSION PROGRAM SHOULD FOCUS ON BASIC SI UNITS

Another question may relate to the precise definition of the international metric system. I note in the letter of transmittal from the Secretary of Commerce, he refers to the "international metric system." Within the past few days, I have had delivered to me a draft of the international standards approved in June, 1972 by the International Organization for Standardization, a worldwide federation of national standards institutes of which the United States is a member.

This report of so-called S.I. units refers to seven basic units, which I would expect to be encompassed in the metric conversion program, including (1) length, (2) mass, (3) time, (4) electric current, (5) thermodynamic temperature, (6) amount of substance and (7) luminous intensity. However, most persons would come in contact only with the metric units of (a) length, (b) weight, and (c) temperature.

F. WE CAN BENEFIT FROM OTHER NATION'S EXPERIENCES

It is my feeling that the joint resolution approach as presented in the last Congress as a so-called Administration proposal and as embodied in the various joint resolution proposals pending before this Committee is too weak an approach. These proposed joint resolutions appear to contain potential escape routes, which we must avoid if we are to fulfill our commitment to *deliberately* and *carefully* consummate a Metric Conversion Program.

I am wary that the provisions of Section 6 of these various proposals could give rise to excuses which might delay any comprehensive plan for conversion for many years. Indeed, it seems to me that the establishment of some type of overall plan which might or might not fit the needs of various segments of our society has inherent weaknesses. As the metric study report indicates, each separate category of manufacturing, marketing and other business needs to be treated separately. In other words, I envision the Metric Conversion Commission as approving and adopting 50 or 100 separate Metric Conversion Programs applicable to the separate categories and groups involved throughout our nation. I believe the British timetable has been established with respect to four broad industrial categories and some 69 separate groups of products and materials.

We should be certain that priority is given to an educational program both in the elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher learning as well as with the public at large. This principle appears to be contained in all of the measures which are pending before this Committee.

Let me call the Committee's attention to the Congressional Research Service study dated May 30, 1972, commenting on the experiences of various nations with regard to Metric Conversion Programs and to those portions of the metric study report commenting on the British and Japanese experiences with respect to metric conversion. The Japanese changeover lacked strong leadership and direction from the Japanese government, and the program was stalled for a number of years. There appears to be general agreement that this also added to the expense and burden of the conversion program, which—at long last—has been achieved.

The more recent British experience—while relatively successful—has met with some disruptions and delays largely because of a lack of public information and inadequate communication between the Metrication Board and segments of British society affected by the Metric Conversion Program. These appear to be largely overcome by the so-called British White Paper, which has supplied many answers where uncertainty, suspicion and doubt previously prevailed.

G. METRIC CONVERSION IS WELL UNDERWAY—BUT IT COULD FOUNDER

Mr. Chairman, I was disturbed last year when testimony and statements flatly and bluntly adverse to any Metric Conversion Program were presented to the Senate Committee on Commerce. I fear that some of this opposition persists and that efforts may be made to water down provisions in my bill or to induce this Committee to report out a measure that is far removed from a "firm government commitment." If this occurs, it seems quite certain that many opponents of the conversion program will fail or refuse to take the meaningful steps necessary to a successful changeover to the metric system.

However, if we capitalize on the momentum which has been established by the metric study report itself and, if we respond to those forward looking elements in our society which recognize the inevitability as well as the desirability of an effective, prompt and orderly conversion program, then it seems to me we will be able to realize the great advantages which a nationally directed conversion program can produce.

I am aware that large numbers of groups representative of many parts of our economic community are moving forward with a voluntary and coordinated conversion program without awaiting action by the Congress. The Tool and Die Institute, the Wire Association, and many other industrial and manufacturing associations have established their own metric conversion committees. Recently, a new Ford Pinto Engine Plant was built in Lima, Ohio, where the entire operation is ac-

cording to metric measurements. In my home County of Lake County, Illinois, International Harvester Company is converting its Hough Company Plant (which manufactures the popular Payloader and other heavy-duty earthmoving machinery) consistent with metric standards and measurements. I am sure that there are literally hundreds of other examples of metric conversions taking place today—under purely private auspices.

In a recent issue of "Factory Magazine," the lead article was entitled, "There is No Doubt that the USA Will Go Metric. The Question is WHEN?" Mr. Chairman, the answer to that question is largely in our hands. We can muddle along for a period of 40 or 50 years at great expense and with substantial losses in trade and understanding. Or, we can seize this present opportunity as we move forward—on the crest of great industrial expansion and in a world of fast-growing international trade to an international standard of weights and measures in which our nation finally will be in step with virtually every other nation in the world.

Mr. Chairman, while this statement is longer than has been intended, I have endeavored to outline the salient elements which I believe a Metric Conversion Program must contain. At the same time, I have felt impelled to anticipate some obstacles which I feel this Committee will have to meet head-on and overcome in developing a workable and practical response to the urgent need for leadership and direction consistent with the recommendations of the United States Metric Study Report.

THE PEOPLE'S CONFIDENCE AND OUR TAX SYSTEM

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on the ABC radio and television program "Issues and Answers," on March 11, Mr. John D. Ehrlichman, President Nixon's Assistant for Domestic Affairs and frequent spokesman on tax policy, was the featured guest.

In response to a question by Mr. Kaplow of ABC News, Mr. Ehrlichman contended that there is no combination of loopholes that could be closed that would bring in a significant amount of Federal revenue except by closing loopholes that "don't let the average householder deduct the interest on his mortgage any more—and don't let him deduct charitable contributions to his church or to the Boy Scouts—or don't let him take personal exemptions."

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ehrlichman is right. We can raise a lot of money by closing such loopholes. We can, however, Mr. Speaker, also raise a lot of money by eliminating disparities in capital gains taxes for corporations and wealthy taxpayers, by taxing capital gains at death, by repealing the asset depreciation range system, by taxing foreign income of U.S. subsidiaries on a current basis, by tightening the oil depreciation allowance, and by tightening the minimum tax on preference income as is provided in the tax reform bill of which I am a cosponsor.

Conservative estimates indicate that some \$8 billion annually would be raised by the closing of such tax loopholes

thereby making a general tax increase unnecessary in 1973.

More significantly, though, it would make the system fairer and increase the taxpayers' confidence that he is being treated equitably by his Government.

Enactment of H.R. 969, the tax reform bill, will still allow the average taxpayer to deduct the interest on his mortgage, to deduct charitable contributions to his church or to the Boy Scouts, and to claim his personal exemptions.

Mr. Speaker, the people and the Democratic Congress are properly calling for needed tax reform and equality. I strongly urge the administration to do likewise.

CONGRESS MUST REGAIN ITS STATURE

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, there are few members of this body who do not perceive the crisis in our Government brought about by the growing imbalance in power between the President and the Congress. In situation after situation—impoundment of funds directed by Congress to be spent, budgetary destruction of programs created and supported by the Congress, refusal to provide Government information to the Congress—let alone the public—and so forth—this crisis becomes increasingly evident.

The crisis did not come about simply because the President sought to exercise powers not properly the President's under the constitutional form of Government of which we have been so proud. The Congress for its part has not exercised the leadership of which it is capable and has not asserted its proper role in Government. That failure caused a vacuum into which presidential power has naturally flowed until the delicate balance of our Government is threatened. Now, we must have a more dynamic Congress, moving forward with the legislation necessary for it to reestablish its proper role. A dynamic Congress would naturally increase the tension between it and the President. But that would be a healthy development, increasing the self-respect of each branch of Government and therefore their mutual respect for each other.

At this point, I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Prof. William Goldsmith, which appeared recently in the Boston Globe under the title "Congress must regain its stature." I have not seen a better analysis of the present crisis, nor a clearer statement of the need for effective action by this body.

The article follows:

CONGRESS MUST REGAIN ITS STATURE

(By William M. Goldsmith)

The end of the Vietnam War does not eliminate or seriously affect the Constitutional crisis in this country. Although the war and particularly the bombings of Hanoi and Haiphong dramatized the urgency of this crisis,

it was by no means limited to these events and it was not resolved by the cease-fire. The President has aggravated the problem by impounding funds appropriated by Congress, and then ignored its protests.

The source of the crisis lies deep in the foundations of Constitutional government and nothing short of a fundamental redress of the present imbalance of power between the Executive and Legislative branches of government will resolve it.

The men who drew up the Constitution created a government not of separate powers, but a complex system where power and responsibility are divided between the three branches of government, and yet at the same time are shared among them. This would apply even to the responsibilities which appear to fall primarily upon one branch, such as legislation, for although Congress is responsible for passing laws, the President has the power to veto them, and also the prescribed invitation to propose legislative policy. Indeed today the Executive branch introduces close to 90 percent of the measures that eventually become law.

Not even the Supreme Court is immune from this divided but shared concept of responsibility. The Constitution spells out the original jurisdiction of the Court, but assigns to Congress the responsibility of determining the exceptions and regulations of its appellate jurisdiction, and of course the Executive and the Congress are involved in appointing its members. Every article and section of the document further defines and requires such a concept of shared responsibility.

Richard Nixon is not the first President to have violated both the spirit and letter of the Constitution to require such a shared responsibility, but the problem has become critical in this century and particularly urgent in his Administration. Although powerful Presidents dominated early days of the Republic, the Presidency after Andrew Jackson declined dramatically, and, with the exception of the war Presidents, Polk and Lincoln, a series of quite ineffective Chief Executives were subordinated to powerful and dominating Congresses.

The result of this decline of the Presidency in the 19th Century was a disaster for the American people, opening up the Treasury and other resources of government to the worst forms of corruption and exploitation by the so-called "Robber Barons." During this period, Woodrow Wilson described the President as nothing more than a glorified clerk.

It was not until the arrival of Theodore Roosevelt that the Presidency was restored to a more assertive and policy-making role in the government. Since then the power of the Congress has regressed gradually to the point where it has finally been eclipsed by the present inhabitant of the White House.

This crippling erosion of the Constitutional balance of power at the center of government has been destructive to the interests of the American people. Their power and welfare are best represented when they receive maximum expression in the balanced form of government drawn up by the founding fathers. Each branch of this system has its unique contribution to make to the interests of the people and each branch brings to the crucible of public policymaking its own unique strengths and creative resources. Congress frequently reflects a healthy clash of sectional and minority views and interests which are absent from the more narrow partisan perspective of the White House.

This is not to indicate that the Presidency does not have a forceful and necessary role to play in the American system. A return to the Presidential impotence of the late 19th Century would be unthinkable. Without dynamic Presidential leadership, the country tends to flounder or be too vulnerable to the exploitation of self-serving special in-

terests which are usually more successful in influencing the Legislative branch than the Executive.

The dynamic tension between two energetic and resourceful centers of power—a strong and purposeful President and a representative and cautious Legislature—produces at its best the ideal chemistry of democratic government. When this dynamic tension is short-circuited by the overbearing influence and power of either branch, the public interest suffers, the voice of the people is not heard, and representative institutions atrophy.

We are caught up at present in an historical crisis where the imbalance of power at the center of our government is rooted not only in the improper and arrogant expansion of Executive power, but also in the inertia of the Congress. Congress has sat by and accepted the rebukes of the President in recent years without doing much more than mouth empty rhetorical protests against the invasion of its prerogatives.

Congress has the power virtually to immobilize the Presidency if it has the will to act. It can harass him at every step of the legislative process. It can demand an accounting of impounded funds. It can refuse "to consent" to any of his appointments and cut off all appropriations until the President is willing to deal with it in a reasonable manner. But the public must support Congress in such a struggle or it cannot win.

The use of these ultimate weapons by Congress could paralyze the effective processes of government and lead to an inevitable showdown. The public interest would be jeopardized by such a crisis and public opinion would then demand a resolution of the conflict, hopefully before it led to the undermining of our Constitutional system of government. But to ignore the problem or to gloss over it could eventually lead to the same result without any real potential for its solution.

Of course there are risks in such a strategy. One tempts fate by showing such determination to reverse the trend or drift of events. On the other hand, President Nixon has given every indication in his political career that he is a reasonable man, and once convinced that Congress intends to fight back and recover its lost power, he will come to terms with the Legislative branch and permit the Constitutional balance of power to be restored. The alternatives are too dangerous for any President to consider seriously.

But Congress must fight this battle through to a decisive conclusion. Too much hangs in the balance for it to back off at this critical moment of history. The public interest is not served by either Presidential or Congressional supremacy, but rather by the balance of a dialectical tension at the center of our government, as the founding fathers planned.

TRIBUTE TO LATE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, Lyndon Baines Johnson, the man, is gone from us, but his great achievements remain a living monument of dedicated service to the Nation and people he loved.

He had great gifts and a vision of what the Nation and world should be. His powers of persuasion, his shrewdness, and

skill at engaging compromise which long ago became legendary made him one of the great leaders and legislators of his day. As Congressman, Senator, majority leader, Vice President, and President, he proved himself to be a dedicated public servant.

Lyndon Johnson was a towering physical presence. That presence was still more towering when measured by his vitality and dynamism, courage, and spirit. And let us not forget his abiding compassion that encompassed the world. Lyndon Johnson was a man who was committed to the emancipation of the downtrodden and the freedom of the oppressed.

In 1964, the President said that he wanted "a happy nation, not an harassed people—a people who are fearless instead of fearful—men . . . concerned always with the wants and needs of their fellow human beings." He showed that this was his credo as he pressed for the 1964 Civil Rights Act which made public accommodations truly public by opening them to all Americans regardless of color. "We have talked long enough in this country about equal rights," he said in his first speech to Congress as President. "We have talked for 100 years or more. It is time now to write it in the books of law."

Again, his devotion and drive played a significant role in achieving the 1965 Voting Rights Act which assured every citizen the right to vote for the candidate of his choice, and the 1968 Fair Housing Act which gave every individual, regardless of color, the right to live in any house he could afford. Communications established between the White House and Congress paved the way for landmark legislation in the fields of education and housing for the poor, help for the disadvantaged and the elderly. Medicare has been a godsend to millions of our older citizens. Also, it was President Johnson who began the present urgent drive to clean up the country's water and air.

Lyndon Johnson has returned to the banks of his beloved Pedernales where he began a remarkable life rich in achievement. Indeed, the catalog of his domestic accomplishments is proof positive that under his leadership visions did not remain dreams; they became concrete realities bringing Americans closer to true freedom than ever before.

TAYLOR WINE OFFERS BICENTENNIAL CHAMPAGNE

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, it has become traditional that monumental occasions be toasted with champagne. Nations solemnize treaties, families mark matrimonial mergers, athletes hail Olympian victories, and parents welcome their newborn, all with a raising of a goblet given with champagne.

In 1976, the United States will mark a monumental occasion—the 200th anni-

versary of its birth. It is altogether fitting that this moment in our history should also be honored by the traditional champagne toast. In this connection, the Taylor Wine Co., of Hammondsport, N.Y., has produced a special Bicentennial Champagne to be offered as a limited edition of the beverages available for highlighting our Nation's two centuries of progress.

It is especially proper that the Taylor Wine Co. offer this champagne. For in the picture postcard setting of New York State's Keuka Lake, home of Taylor Wine, was born the Nation's domestic winemaking industry in 1826 not too many years after the Thirteen Original Colonies became a fledgling nation.

The late Fred C. Taylor, chairman of the board and son of the winery's founder, envisioned this bicentennial wine some years ago and laid down 400 cases in the company wine cellars.

He stipulated that it be used only for a very extraordinary event. Because the wine's mellowing period is due to end in the year 1976, executives of Taylor Wine were in accord that the wishes of their late chairman could best be carried out by dedicating the sparkling wine to the 200th birthday of the Nation.

It is most appropriate that this champagne whose product lineage had its roots in American soil and whose development was in the best tradition of American dedication to quality, should be set aside for America's 200th birthday celebration.

THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF LYNDON JOHNSON

HON. WILLIAM R. ROY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, Lyndon Johnson loved this land with a fierce Texas passion.

This love led him into public life and motivated him to achieve great things for his fellow countrymen.

His place in American history is secure. Often through sheer force of will, he rewrote the domestic programs of our Government and provided millions of Americans with better health care, better education, better housing, better nutrition, better recreation, and a better life than they had ever had before.

In health care, for example, much of the work that we in Congress do today is but an elaboration and enlargement on basic programs enacted during the Johnson years.

He was a President from the South, but he fought vigorously on behalf of equal rights for all the citizens of this Nation.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act, Federal aid to education and Medicare are fitting memorials to his Presidency.

He was a great American. And if he did not achieve the Great Society that he so diligently sought, he brought the United States closer to that dream than we have ever been.

THE SECONDARY BOYCOTT OF LETTUCE—"WHAT'S IT ALL ABOUT?"

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it will soon be lettuce harvest time in the central coast of California. Those who can attract attention or protest by the exploitation of the farmworkers will be "taking to the streets" and seeking every opportunity to promote their special interests.

Demonstrations, strikes, boycotts, prayer sessions, television documentaries, and newspaper columns will undoubtedly be tried again and again this year as was popular in prior years.

If anyone is interested in factual information from a neutral party who is as knowledgeable as any other party, I suggest they read the article from the February-March 1973 Safeway News which I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD.

It is an excellent exposition of the facts. It tells what the so-called lettuce boycott is all about.

Unfortunately, the Chavez union, formerly known as UFWOC, has never held an election. Strikes have never been effective because the farmworker needs to work and prefers to work. "Collective bargaining" by the Chavez union has not been successful because the Teamsters Union has long represented most of the agricultural workers.

Because elections, strikes, and collective bargaining have not been successful, the Chavez union wants to develop the secondary boycott, which is considered evil and illegal, under most legal systems.

Secondary boycotts by Chavez become violent, destructive of property, injurious to people, and deprive consumers of freedom of choice in the marketplace.

Boycotting lettuce from California is depriving the farmworker of a job and the consumer of nutritious food.

I recommend that every consumer read the Safeway story "What's It All About?"

WHAT'S IT ALL ABOUT?

For some time, Safeway has been in the unenviable middle, like it or not, of the disputes over unionization of field workers on the farms of America—particularly Western and Southwestern U.S. If you haven't experienced it, chances are you've read about it or been asked about it. A couple of years ago, the disputes centered around grapes; now lettuce is on center stage.

Many aspects of agriculture have been unionized for years—equipment operators, haulers, cannery workers are almost all covered by grower-union contracts set up mostly by the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. But unionization of field hands and pickers was only a dream until Cesar Chavez came along. Almost single-handedly he set up the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee (UFWOC), secured some charter members, and made his presence felt among the growers by a series of headlining tactics (impassioned speeches, hunger strikes) that caught the earnest attention of all concerned.

Then, to secure a solid pressure point and to insure that broad public support could be tapped, he and UFWOC mounted a secondary product boycott. (A secondary boycott

is not against a producer, but against someone who uses or sells the producer's product. A product boycott is not against a single producer but against the product itself—hence against all producers.)

They chose Safeway as one of their original prime targets because in the geographical area of contention, we are unquestionably the largest distributor of agricultural products. The pressure point was their apparent belief that as the growers' largest customer, we would use our influence to get them to accommodate the UFWOC demands to remove disturbances from our own business. The broad public support was to have come from Safeway customers, the largest identifiable group of fruit and vegetable consumers in the area. They chose table grapes as a prime product, because table grapes for the entire United States are almost all grown in California.

As the grape boycott began to spread, we at Safeway took it in stride, pointing out that we chose not to interfere between unions and growers; that we were even then the largest buyers of union-picked produce; that the fundamental issue was one totally unpublicized (for different reasons) by the parties to the disputes. This was the fact that neither Federal nor State law governed the employment of field workers. They were not guaranteed one of the simplest rights of any U.S. worker: the right to indicate in a secret election whether he wants a union to represent him, no union to represent him, or in the case of rival unions, which union.

While most of our people and our customers recognized the fairness of our position, the boycott went on and gained strength. As it became more important, and as Mr. Chavez came closer to affiliating his movement with the powerful AFL-CIO, the Teamsters got busy and used their years of experience in the agricultural field to secure major, and progressive, contracts with important growers covering the pay and working conditions of field workers. By the time grape pickers were largely organized, UFWOC became United Farm Workers (AFL-CIO), and iceberg lettuce pickers were mostly covered by legal Teamster-grower contracts governing wages, hours and working conditions.

As it stands at this writing, about 90% of all lettuce (the current boycott target) is union-picked. About 81% is under Teamster contract, about 9% is under UFW contract, and the remaining 10% comes from small family-operated farms that don't hire picking crews.

This leads to one of the most unfair aspects of a "product" boycott. It's not directed against a particular grower's lettuce, but against all lettuce. It lumps all growers together, regardless of their size or their labor practices, and the good suffer equally with the bad. Even the family farms, bystanders just as Safeway is, suffer.

Remember as you read this that Safeway is not a party to the dispute. Mr. Chavez isn't trying to organize Safeway, and Safeway doesn't hire farm workers. And our attitude toward unions can best be indicated by the fact that we have well over a thousand labor contracts in the U.S. alone and that we are solidly behind the objectives of organized labor as expressed by both the AFL-CIO and the Teamsters. We are very sympathetic toward Chavez' goals too. But we are not, and should not be, in a position of arbitrating between our suppliers and the rival labor groups organizing them.

Not that we won't help. We have and we will. And, as an outside party, that's exactly where we stand.

We have long been aware of the social importance of the conflict. The economic plight of the farm workers (particularly the migrant workers) and the difficulties this creates, has been apparent to those willing to make their own investigations, and Safeway people have done this for themselves and for the Company. We have pledged our support (and

have given it) to groups seeking to give farm workers and their employers similar legal recourse to secure the rights and protections afforded the industrial and commercial segments of the national economy under the National Labor Relations Act. The workers' rights to decent living conditions, to healthy working conditions, is a right Safeway would support for anyone; their right to join a union of their choice through properly supervised elections by secret ballot is another we have consistently supported.

For this reason, our position is that legislation on a federal level is the only practical solution to the problem. Growers and workers alike deserve the protection offered by law to the vast majority of the basic parts of our economy—manufacture, transportation, retailing, etc. We have indirectly and directly worked with state and federal agencies to bring such legislation about. We will continue to do so in the firm belief that a legislative solution is the only one that protects the interests of both sides of the dispute and still protects the interest of the public at large.

The total public interest is omitted, probably purposely, by the barrage of propaganda. All parties strive for an advantage. None points out what they well know: that in keeping with our long-standing (in fact, unchanged since incorporation) policy of providing customers with the highest quality merchandise at the lowest possible cost, Safeway continues to buy solely on the basis of quality, availability and price. None points out that Safeway is, far and away, the largest buyer of union picked produce in the United States. None points out that Safeway has been a prime influence in interesting both farm and urban legislators in the economic dilemma posed by farm unionization.

The economic problems of farm unionization are not simply ones of wages, hours, benefits. They are at the heart of the basic dilemma—the problem no one has yet solved: strikes during harvest.

It's pretty obvious that historically the strength of a union lay in its ability to strike. This concept was accepted in most segments of our society. (Society gets pretty well upset when basic services are struck—municipalities, hospitals, garbage disposal, commuter services, fire departments and the like.)

It's pretty obvious also that in agriculture, the right to strike is loaded on the side of the striker. Growers, small farmers and agribusiness alike, are at harvest-time almost completely dependent on the services of pickers and harvesters. Should the latter choose the week (or three or ten) of harvest of a particular crop, the grower is simply out of business for the year, and perhaps forever. His investment in land, seeding, planting, irrigation and cultivation is wiped out. A manufacturer of safety pins can keep his raw materials on side tracks or in a warehouse if his crew refuses to work; the "manufacturer" of lettuce or strawberries has no such option. He has to let them rot.

Until a solution to this basic problem can be found, the way to farm unionization will be long and thorny, and Safeway will no doubt still be on the receiving end of demonstrations, leaflets, attempted intimidations and the like.

We shall, during this period, continue:

To support all legitimate efforts to secure for agricultural field workers and growers the legal rights enjoyed by the vast majority of American workers and employers.

To preserve freedom of choice for our customers in determining whether or not they wish to buy any product normally stocked in our stores. (Remember, if it isn't there, they can't choose *not* to buy them.)

To work toward removing an essentially complex and difficult problem from the level of temporary local confrontations for public support purposes to the level of deliberate, serious legislative debate for the purpose of reasonable solution.

BECAUSE OF "MISS HATTIE"

HON. THAD COCHRAN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, 1973, an era will come to a close in Walthall County, Miss. Mrs. P. H. Pittman, affectionately known as "Miss Hattie," will retire as Walthall County librarian. She has held the post for nearly 25 years and she has served with great distinction.

Hundreds of Walthall County young people and adults have benefited from her counsel and intellectual guidance. Singlehandedly, "Miss Hattie" saved the library from extinction in September 1948, when public support for the library was withdrawn. She agreed to serve as librarian, without pay, until a substitute could be found. Without funds or salary, "Miss Hattie" kept the library going until 1950, when the library was granted the sum of \$25 per month with which to buy books. Later, a small salary was added. She has been there ever since, every Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday, filling the needs of the county.

Mr. Speaker, I wish this lady well as she takes a much deserved rest. The citizens of Walthall County can take just pride in having had her for their librarian.

As a part of my remarks, I include herewith an excellent article which appeared in the Tylertown Times of March 15, 1973. The article was written by Mrs. John Barrett, who will replace Mrs. Pittman as librarian for Walthall County:

[From the Tylertown (Miss.) Times, Mar. 15, 1973]

BOOKS ARE BEST FRIEND OF COUNTIANS

(By Dawn D. Barrett)

Somebody once said that man's best friend is the dog, but whoever said it could not have been a reader.

Man's best friend has always been and will continue to be the printed word.

In the dawn of time, when the first homo sapiens realized that he could navigate on two legs instead of four, he felt the urge to leave something of himself behind, so he began to tell stories by drawing symbols on the walls of his cave.

Then he found that he could use fire to harden tablets of clay upon which to leave his message, and when, centuries later in Egypt, paper was made from the papyrus reed, the first book was born.

When the New World was settled, education was made available to the masses, and more and more people began to read for pleasure as well as information. The very rich began to build libraries in their homes, but this was not possible for the average family, and so the concept of the public lending library came into being.

In 1933, during the days of the big depression, the people of Walthall county realized the need for a local library. Since no county funds were available for such a project, President Roosevelt's "New Deal," through provisions of the Emergency Reconstruction Act, came to the rescue.

There have been several county librarians since 1933, but the name that has come to be synonymous with the Walthall County Library is that of Mrs. P. H. Pittman.

Mrs. Pittman, the former Hattie Dean, is a native of the Darbun community. She took

over the local library in October, 1948, and in March 1971, she compiled a Walthall County library history, from which much of the material for this article was taken.

In her history, Mrs. Pittman states that the help and encouragement of local citizens and civic clubs was responsible for the foundation of the first library.

She recalls that the first librarian was Mrs. Catherine Baillo Futch and that the library, located in the mayor's office, consisted of one shelf of 25 books. She quotes Mrs. Futch, "The first day we let out eight books and thought we were off to a great start."

Mrs. Futch went to work on a salary of \$40 a month. The WPA and NYA (National Youth Administration) provided workers for the library, and "Tylertown Times" editor Lester Williams donated supplies.

Strong supporters included former mayors, Earl Ginn and Dr. Sylverstein, Mrs. Ivan Conerly, the Woman's Club, Cosmopolitan Club, and the town board.

Simp Wilkinson built the first book shelves from what scrap lumber he could salvage, while assistance in other areas was received from Carl Ball, Bird Martin, Homer Alexander and many others.

In the late 1930's, the library was moved to the second floor of the old post office building just west of the town square. At this time the county schools began to take an interest in the circulation of books and donated \$250 for their purchase.

Then, in the early 1940's, Mrs. Futch moved away, and her position was filled by Mrs. Ella Colquhoun, and later Mrs. Alvin Sullivan.

By September, 1948, despite the concern of local citizens, the support of the county board of supervisors was withdrawn, and the library was allowed to die.

Mrs. Pittman remembers that this was quite a blow to the readers of Walthall County. "So," she says, "I told them I would take over as librarian until they could find someone."

As of October, 1973, she will have been there 25 years.

Tylertown civic clubs took the library as a project and began paying rent for a room above the Tylertown drug Store. Mrs. Pittman served without any pay until 1950 when the board of supervisors decided to give a small donation of \$25 a month to buy books.

At the time, the books in the library were donated by people of the county or loaned from the Mississippi Library Commission.

The town of Tylertown voted to contribute \$40 a month for the librarian's salary, and again the library was moved, this time to an old garage building on the site of the present courthouse annex.

"About the hardest job I ever experienced," recalls Mrs. Pittman, "is moving a library. I had separated all the books into cartons alphabetically, and when I got to the building, all the books were in a pile in the middle of the floor."

Numbers of county women came into help sort and rearrange the books, and the county library once more a functioning institution, with the civic clubs continuing to pay rent on the building.

The library has been moved once more since then. In 1954 a building was constructed to house the Welfare Department with the library on the second floor.

And, once again, the library is too small. From a handful of books, with no supplies, no files, and, for a long time, no salary, "Miss Hattie" Pittman has almost single-handedly created a functioning library containing over 7,000 books with around 1,000 being in circulation each month.

There are books for children; there are many of the newest bestsellers; there are books on medicine, law, psychology, ecology, whatever-ology one might want.

There is a whole row of shelves containing nothing but Mississippi writers, a feature of which Mrs. Pittman is justly proud. There is a memorial shelf where books are donated

in memory of a loved one, and Mrs. Pittman endeavors to select each book to represent both the donor and the one who is being remembered.

She was also instrumental in setting up a "Friends of the Library" committee with the supervisors selecting a member from each district. The committee includes Mrs. Ivan Conerly, who serves as library treasurer, Mrs. Jerry Conerly, J. D. Herring, Mrs. W. H. McCallum and Mrs. Overland Harvey.

In 1965, the county chamber of commerce recognized Mrs. Pittman's contribution to Walthall county by awarding her the "Elene Jaubert Award" for civic endeavor.

The Walthall County Library has become more than a place to get books. It is where one goes to chat, or to get a little mothering, or just to find someone who cares. It is warmth and light and humor and compassion. It is, in fact, "Miss Hattie."

And it is this woman, who, perhaps more than anyone in Walthall county has been responsible for enabling little boys to become "Knights of the Round Table," little girls to be princesses or the mysterious "Nancy Drew."

It is Miss Hattie who has made it possible for men and women the county over to forget for just a little while the frequently monotonous humdrum of daily existence and to know the wonder of living, even briefly, in a dream.

IN HONOR OF LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, as one who was privileged not only to know President Lyndon Johnson for many years but also to work with and for him for a considerable period of time, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing great sorrow at his loss and great thanks for his life.

There is little that I can add to the outpouring of reminiscences and proud recollections of his titanic public career. There is so much that each of us has to be grateful for that he gave to his State, his country and the world.

So I would like to share simply one vivid memory of the man at his best. We were bidding farewell to President Cemal Gursel of Turkey who had been here for treatment in 1966. President Gursel was unconscious and suffering from a terminal illness. It was the desire of his government and his family that he should die on Turkish soil. President Johnson learning of this immediately authorized the use of Air Force One for this purpose. The President attended the subdued ceremonies at the airport and noticed President Gursel's adopted child weeping to one side of the plane and untended. He went to her side and conduced her gently to the plane with his arm around her, giving consoling words of comfort.

When all the captains and the kings have departed and the memory of their great works begins to recede this is the man I feel should be remembered by us all as indeed I know he forever will be by those who knew and loved him the most, his incomparable widow and devoted and loving children.

THE FUEL SHORTAGE AND AGRICULTURE

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the first day of spring, but it will not solve many of the problems created by this winter's fuel shortage. Recently, the executive vice president of Illinois Petroleum Marketers Association, Bill Deutsch, sent me a copy of his letter to the Illinois Governor's office concerning the diesel and gasoline shortage and its far-reaching affect upon the agricultural community.

The letter follows:

ILLINOIS PETROLEUM
MARKETERS ASSOCIATION,

Springfield, Ill., February 14, 1973.

Mr. BILL HOLZMAN,
Assistant to the Governor,
Office of the Governor,
Springfield, Ill.

DEAR BILL: As per your request, this is what I have been able to find out regarding agricultural needs for petroleum products. Please bear in mind that the Illinois Agricultural Association states that approximately 45% of the total products used by farmers takes place during a 90-day period starting March 1 through May 31 (the northern part of the state sometimes will extend its planting season into the first ten days of June).

According to facts gathered in 1971, diesel purchases were on a 10% increase. Although all figures are not yet in, it is safe to estimate that approximately 93,000,000 gallons were used in 1972. With the additional tillable acres to comply with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's recent decision to sharply reduce set-aside acreage, this figure for 1973 could easily reach another five to seven million additional gallons. In other words, this is in the neighborhood of 100,000,000 gallons of diesel fuel for 1973 (this takes into consideration very little fall plowing that was accomplished in the fall of 1972 and that will have to be done in the spring of 1973).

The latest fairly accurate figures on gasoline usage on farms for agricultural needs show a total of 332,600,000 gallons purchased in 1971. It is estimated that between 1971 and 1973, approximately a 35% increase in need has taken place. Again taking into consideration the set-aside acreage and the need for additional plowing in the spring of 1973, this would add approximately 1,175,000 gallons to the 1971 figure. The knowledgeable people in the agricultural field say that it takes between 12 and 14 gallons of gasoline or diesel fuel per tillable acre during an entire farming season.

It has come to my attention just this morning, that one of the major suppliers of diesel fuel to the State of Illinois has announced that they will only be able to supply 75% of what was purchased in 1972 for the month of February, 1973, and that this allotment will have to be even more severe in March. Another major oil company announced yesterday that they were basing their allotments for 1973 upon 1971 figures and that even then, they would only guarantee 70% of what was used in 1971 but that they hope to be able to deliver 100% of what was used that year. This is approximately one-third reduction.

Sincerely,

WM. R. DEUTSCH,
Executive Vice President.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY: A
CONGRESSIONAL DUTY**HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me it is time Congress recognized that as a legislative body we have been incompetent in an area of major constitutional responsibility—matching our revenue-raising and appropriations processes.

For 3 years now we have happily appropriated an average of \$47 billion per year more than we knew the Government would receive in tax revenues.

This year, fiscal year 1973, ending June 30, 1973, it was \$55 billion—\$280 billion appropriated, against \$225 billion received in revenues. In 1972 it was \$40 billion—\$248 billion appropriated against \$208 billion in revenues; in 1971, \$47 billion—\$235 billion appropriated against \$188 billion in revenues.

In outlay deficits, money actually spent, a \$25 billion deficit is estimated this year, even with the President's heavy impoundments. It was \$23 billion in 1972 and the same figure in 1971.

We know this to be irresponsible. Inflation and devaluation of the dollar have been the inevitable result. The dollar has lost 30 percent of its purchasing power since 1966. Our goods are no longer competitive in world markets. Inflation has cruelly penalized our old people and our poor. We owe the Nation a higher standard of performance in our procedures.

We know that in a year of prosperity and peace such as we now enjoy, we should at least balance the budget. Self-discipline is mandatory.

Yet we have no procedure to do so.

Each of us votes for his own favorite priorities. I join with a majority of my colleagues to vote for more money for education and health, justifying such vote by the expectancy of voting for cuts in defense and agriculture subsidies. When votes for defense and agriculture come up, different coalitions join to increase those funds as well.

We desperately need a procedure to set priorities, to balance the budget from a congressional determination of priorities. We have no right under the congressional determination of priorities. We have no right under the Constitution, to leave the determination of priorities to the President.

I suggest the following:

Let us move to the calendar year as the fiscal year.

During the first 3 months of each year, let us have the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, our Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee along with the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation recommend tentative figures for both appropriations and revenues.

The House Ways and Means Committee should be charged during the same 3-month period with considering the alternative tax rate changes and revisions to raise revenues equal to an amount 10

percent higher than the expenditure ceiling recommended.

During the month of April, the House and Senate should debate both total appropriation figures and the methods of taxation proposed by the House Ways and Means Committee, with a final vote set for the first week in May.

During the same 4-month period the House and Senate Appropriations Committees should be reviewing their priorities—with a goal of setting percentages of the total budget to be allocated in each area.

When the House and Senate can agree on both total revenues and expenditures in early May, the balance of May and June can be spent in reaching final approval of the various appropriation bills, seeking to allocate the 10-percent excess in revenues among those programs where Congress feels the national goals require priority expenditures.

The end result will be that Congress determines priorities as we are constitutionally required to do, as well as balance the budget. The executive departments will be advising us on priorities, but not dictating them. Then, and then only, can Congress stand up to the executive branch and require that the President actually spend the moneys we appropriate. We owe the country this much. Our very oath of office requires it.

CURB FEDERAL JUDGES?

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the text of an editorial from the Elkhart, Ind., Truth of March 3, 1973, entitled "Curb Federal Judges?"

I believe the editorial to be a most perceptive commentary on a proposal to amend the U.S. Constitution to require that all Federal judges be reconfirmed by the Senate every 8 years.

The editorial follows:

CURB FEDERAL JUDGES?

A constitutional amendment as proposed in Congress last week would require that all federal judges be reconfirmed by the U.S. Senate every eight years.

Rep. Stanford E. Parris, R-Va., introduced a joint resolution asking such an amendment. He believes his measure would "achieve a reasonable degree of judicial accountability for federal judges, without endangering the concept of the independent judiciary."

No such amendment should be considered in our view.

Parris complains that some federal judges think they have "a mandate to remake the world according to their own moral and philosophical beliefs."

He says that "their decisions smack of judicial legislation; they infringe on the rightful authority of the elected representatives of the people . . ."

Trouble is, two wrongs don't make a right. If some judges infringe upon legislative rights, surely the cure is not for lawmakers to infringe upon judicial rights.

That's what would happen with the Parris

amendment. Every time a judge's eight years were about to expire, the Senate would have a political field day, with charges and counter-charges.

The indirect influences upon judges' opinions—based upon what they routinely read, hear and observe—are inevitable.

No one, including judges, seals himself in an ivory tower.

Some judges actually do change their views after they have been on the bench awhile, based upon what they perceive as new insights. Some become more conservative, some more liberal.

But judges at least should be insulated from the most direct and crass partisan pressures which an eight-year-Senate review would bring.

The good functioning of our American system depends upon a careful balancing of the legislative, executive and judicial powers.

We are not without remedy, should the courts reach out for more than their share of power. Should that happen, the Constitution already provides that Congress can, if it chooses, restrict or abolish the appellate jurisdiction of federal courts.

We don't recommend any such action by Congress. There is no serious imbalance among the branches at this time. We point out only that a constitutional remedy for excess court power already is available; none other is needed.

THE CLOSED BOOTH

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to note the interest that enlightened newspapers such as the New York Times and Washington Post have taken in promoting the cause of an improved voter registration system. Indeed, there has been much interest shown by citizens across the country. The time has clearly come for Congress to act to renovate our system of registering eligible voters. In this light, I have introduced the National Voter Registration Rights Act of 1973, H.R. 4846, along with 34 of my colleagues. It represents an attempt to open the electoral process to those who have been denied entrance for too long.

I now submit for your attention and the attention of my colleagues, a recent New York Times editorial entitled "The Closed Booth":

THE CLOSED BOOTH

For millions of Americans, the voting booth is closed on Election Day. These are the people who failed to get their names on the registration lists. It is possible to criticize them for apathy or inattentiveness. But it is also possible to inquire why local governments make it so difficult to register.

The United States is the only major country in the world that places the responsibility of registration entirely on the citizen. In most free countries the government seeks out citizens as soon as they reach voting age and lists their names on the voting rolls as it does on the tax rolls. But most towns, cities and counties in this country make no such effort. Three-quarters of them have no Saturday or evening registration during most of the year. According to a League of Women Voters' study last year, many election districts do not keep their registration offices open for additional hours even in the immediate pre-election period when interest is high.

Senator Gale McGee of Wyoming is the principal sponsor of a bill which would remedy this defect by introducing registration by postcard for Federal elections. A card would be delivered to every mailing address, and those wishing to register could do so by filling out the card and returning it. To encourage the states to adopt the same system for state and local elections, the bill would provide them with a small subsidy to defray their registration expenses if they complied with the Federal plan.

The Senate a year ago narrowly defeated the original version of the McGee bill. By coincidence, the Supreme Court a week later achieved one of the purposes of that bill. It struck down state laws which required residency of six months or a year before a person was eligible to register. Despite that gain, there is still need to adopt a simple, uniform registration procedure.

The only argument against registration by mail is the danger of fraud. But the real sources of fraud are corrupt election officials and politically motivated voter registrars. Where they exist, they have long shown that they can subvert the present cumbersome systems. Making life easier for the would-be voter would not affect the potential for fraud one way or the other. The McGee bill, which is expected to reach the floor later this month, deserves approval.

HON. LYNDON JOHNSON

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a great leader, the 36th President of the United States, Lyndon Baines Johnson. As a Congressman, Senator, majority leader of the Senate, Vice President, and President, everything he did was based on his feeling of what was best for the Nation. He was a totally dedicated American.

The tragedy of his Presidency was that he wanted to be a great peacetime President and the architect of a Great Society. But fate and history made him a wartime President. And the final irony was that he died 1 day before the settlement of the terrible war that defeated him.

I met briefly with Lyndon Johnson just 2 weeks before his death. We were attending the memorial service for Hale Boggs in New Orleans. Despite differences we had over the war and whether we could have guns and butter, I will always remember his tremendous capacity for compassion and his ability to get along with and lead his peers.

Lyndon Johnson will, of course, be remembered for many great achievements. As a Southern Senator, he negotiated the compromises necessary to achieve enactment of the 1957 Civil Rights Act. As President, he signed four landmark civil rights bills into law—the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the Voting Rights Act of 1955, the Jury Selection Act of 1968, and the Open Housing Act of 1968. His leadership helped bring Medicare in 1965, aid to elementary education, Federal anti-pollution laws, and many other major pieces of domestic reform.

History will list his achievements, but his accomplishments are best expressed in the changes he brought to the lives of

so many—the aged who may live out their lives a little more comfortably, the disadvantaged children who may receive a better education, black citizens who may exercise their right to vote. Though many may enjoy these benefits unaware of the man who engineered them, his influence, nevertheless, cannot really die.

RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE
ON THE U.N. MEETING IN PANAMA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, today I reported to the people of my district on the United Nations Security Council Session in Panama. I insert the following text of that report:

The special United Nations Security Council session recently held in Panama, amid a tense anti-American atmosphere, is regarded by authorities as a carefully manipulated propaganda forum to attack the United States.

Panamanian strongman, General Omar Torrijos, used the U.N. meeting in his country to denounce so-called "colonialist policies" of the United States toward Panama, and to demand that the U.S. relinquish sovereignty over the Canal Zone. Coming as it does during treaty negotiations with Panama, the U.N. meeting can produce at most only embarrassment for the U.S. This is regarded as one of its primary objectives.

When the Panamanian Foreign Minister suggested that the Security Council meeting be held in Panama City, it was hailed by ambassadors of Russia and Red China as a break-through in international goodwill.

Over verbal objections of the U.S., Britain and Australia, the session has been opened. Advance warnings were announced by radicals in Panama that if their Canal take over demands were not met, violence against the U.S. would result during the U.N. meeting.

Panamanian radicals have received support in this country from one world internationalists who bemoan the so-called "colonial nature" of U.S. enterprises in Panama. They overlook the 1903 convention signed by the U.S. and Panama granting the U.S. full sovereign rights to the Canal Zone in perpetuity—that is, forever. Since then, the Canal has represented an investment of more than \$5.6 in U.S. taxpayers' money. The Panama Canal is the most expensive single territorial possession of the United States. The purchase of this mile-wide strip of land cost more money than the combined prices of the Louisiana Purchase, Florida Purchase, California, Gadsden Purchase, and the Alaskan Purchase.

The United States acquired the title to all land and property in the Zone through purchase from individual owners—not from the government of Panama. This is a point often mistakenly overlooked: that the United States bought and paid for this piece of property, just as we bought Louisiana from the French and Alaska from the Russians. To suggest, as many apologists have, that we negotiate the return of the Canal Zone to Panama, compares to suggesting the return of Louisiana to France, or Alaska to the Russians, or New York City to the Indians.

President Theodore Roosevelt recognized the vital importance of U.S. ownership and control of this property as early as 1903, when the historic policy of "an American canal, on American property, for the American people" was first established.

Today the entire economy of Panama re-

volves around the U.S. presence in the Zone. More than \$160 million goes into the Panamanian economy annually as a direct result of Canal operations. One-third of the national employment of the country is a result of the U.S. being there. Panama enjoys the highest per capita income in Central America, and boasts close to 80 percent literacy. The presence of U.S. forces not only protects the Canal, but guarantees the entire country's security against external aggression.

Panama's history is one of continual revolution, insurrection and political instability. The present leader, General Torrijos, came to power in 1968 through a military coup d'etat that ousted the eleven-day old constitutionally elected government. He promptly abolished the country's National Assembly, established himself head of the National Guard, and rewrote the constitution to allow himself to remain in power indefinitely. Torrijos established close relations with Cuba and the Soviet Union. His demands for U.S. surrender of the Canal Zone began soon after his dramatic rise to power. Besides total surrender of the Canal Zone to Panama, Torrijos has demanded immediate departure of the U.S. forces, the expiration of American police functions within the next five years, a politically neutral canal and a treaty to run only until 1994.

In light of the security threat to the U.S. posed by any surrender of sovereignty over the canal, it is unlikely that Congress would agree to anything resembling a giveaway of our rights in Panama—especially with the Soviets, Red China, and Cuba looking on and helping manipulate the U.N. comic opera.

Panama's U.N. ambassador has taken full advantage of his position as chairman of the Security Council to move the proceedings of that body to Panama City. This was an unprecedented move by the U.N.—the first such session to be held in a geographic area of controversy. And it was called not to lessen the controversy, but to heighten it. While matters of general Latin American concern were supposed to be discussed, the overriding intention of the meeting was to bring Panama's demands on the U.S. over the Canal Zone before the U.N. on its own home ground.

For the United Nations to even consider, much less take action upon, matters completely within the domestic affairs of two of its members is contrary to the Charter of the U.N. According to Chapter One, Article Two of the Charter: "Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require Members to submit such matters to settlement. . . ." By no stretch of the imagination can our operations of the Canal, nor the treaty negotiations between the U.S. and Panama be considered a threat to world peace. The United Nations clearly has no business discussing the canal. To put domestic issues of the United States before the world debating body obviously brings the sovereignty of this country into question. Control of this strategic waterway is of vital concern to the security of the United States. Internationalization of the discussion of the canal issue can easily move toward internationalization of the canal itself.

American sovereign rights in the Canal Zone have steadily drifted away since the early 1960's. The clamor of Panamanian mobs caused President Eisenhower to yield the right to fly the Panamanian flag over the Zone. In 1967 the Johnson Administration made further concessions, weakening the formerly undisputed American control.

The 1903 treaty that began the Panama Canal chapter of U.S. history is clear in its intent. It vested in the U.S. "all the rights, power and authority which the U.S. would possess as if it were sovereign of the territory." The same treaty specifically excluded Panama from the exercise of such rights.

The treaty negotiations begun by President Johnson further fanned the flames of Panamanian nationalism. Both the Communists and General Torrijos have exploited this anti-American political issue to use for their advantage—to put the United States into a position of submission to gun point political blackmail.

The 1967 draft treaties envisioned eventual transfer of our control over the Canal area to Panama. The present Panama Canal Company would be replaced by a joint Panamanian-American administration, free of control by the U.S. Congress. American-owned commercial enterprises within the Canal Zone would be transferred to Panama. Finally, complete control over the Canal would be ceded to Panama. Under a joint operation there would be no limit on how high the tolls imposed on ships using the Canal could go. Existing rates under U.S. administration, supplemented by other sources, have been adequate to meet legal obligations to maintain, operate and improve the Canal. Our operations of the Canal have served as an international utility for the benefit of the world. Many authorities close to the situation, fear a crisis similar to the Suez crisis following the British pull-out of that area. We don't need an American Suez.

Our strategic interests would be impaired by entrusting defense to any projected binational commission.

Sixty other Congressmen and I wrote the President recently expressing our concern over the grave consequences to our national security that would result from our abandonment of the Canal Zone. We urged the President to use his office to guarantee the sovereign right this country bought and has maintained over the Canal for the past 70 years.

Last week I received a machine copy of a form type letter from the Deputy Assistant to the President saying: "The President appreciates your bringing to his attention your concern about . . . the American position in the Canal Zone." He went on to say: that the United States is now seeking a treaty "responsive to Panama's aspirations."

Panama's chief negotiator summed it up last December: "We, the Panamanians, are going to assume full responsibility for that canal. This means a Panamanian Canal, which is what Panama wants, a Panamanian Canal, operated by Panamanians, for Panamanians, for the benefit of Panamanians." Even if the government of Panama could keep the canal in operation, free of interference from the Soviet Union or Cuba, the nations using the canal would be subjected to Panamanian blackmail.

A full understanding of how the United Nations is being misused, should be brought home to many Americans as a result of the Panama City meeting. The U.S. taxpayer pays the U.N. bills and supplies the expensive clubhouse in New York, while the U.S. is made the whipping boy at every available occasion. Perhaps if the President would see fit to impound our U.N. contributions, as he has done to a number of programs for U.S. citizens, the U.N. crowd would move to Panama City permanently. The Security Council may as well be in Panama or Havana, Peking or Moscow, for that matter—since the U.N. doesn't accomplish anything in New York but stir up humbug anyway.

Let's hope that surrender of the Canal Zone isn't a concession to "Peace With Honor."

HEARINGS ON H.R. 77

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to my col-

leagues that the Special Subcommittee on Labor will begin a series of hearings on March 22 on H.R. 77, a bill which I hope will encourage the growth of prepaid legal services plans for workers. The witnesses scheduled for March 22 are: Thomas E. Harris, associate general counsel, AFL-CIO; F. William McCalpin, chairman, special committee on prepaid legal services of the American Bar Association, and Dr. Lee R. Morris, vice president, Insurance Co. of North America, accompanied by James A. Faber, secretary to the company.

H.R. 77 will remove a legal obstacle to the negotiation by labor and management of jointly administered legal services plans, by permitting employer contributions to trust funds established to finance such plans.

Section 302 of the Labor-Management Relations Act prohibits all payments by employers to employee representatives for purposes other than those specifically excepted in that section. This section was enacted to prevent bribery, extortion, and other corrupt practices, and to protect the beneficiaries of lawful employer-supported funds. Section 302(c) contains seven exceptions to this general prohibition, and thus permits employer contributions to trust funds to finance medical care programs, retirement pension plans, apprenticeship programs, and other specific programs. This bill would add an eighth exception to section 302(c)—jointly administered trust funds for the purpose of defraying the costs of legal services—and thus legalize such jointly administered programs.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, holidays—how easily they penetrate the daily activities of our lives and cut across nations, languages, political doctrines, and local customs to unite, in a single event, men, women, and children from all walks of life. The celebration of St. Patrick's Day on March 17 of every year is one such special occasion. The shamrock, the bagpipe, the speeches, the grand parades, the traditional dinners, the ever-present color green, are all an intricate part of the spirit, the religiosity and the excitement of the day. And, each family, each individual can take the fabric of these traditions and weave a section of the pattern which builds upon the foundations of the past to create a sense of renewed understanding of the life of the saint we honor this day. For St. Patrick, patron saint of Ireland, in addition to the myths and legends which have grown around his early teachings, first and foremost was a human being—a man who felt inside him a mission and who had the courage, the tenacity and the belief to pursue his goal despite all obstacles. Let us imagine the tremendous task of converting an entire people to Christianity, of teaching them the mores

of civilization, the values of human dignity and love.

Each of us in this country possesses a wealth of rich ancestral traditions and each of us has the freedom to practice our customs and celebrate our holidays according to our own choosing. And, because these traditions help us to better understand and know ourselves, we appreciate and share, in some small way, in the customs and festivities of our friends and fellow citizens. It has been said during this time of year, "Everybody's a little bit Irish" and I myself, very much look forward to participating every year in my city's St. Patrick's Day parade, to reviewing the procession as it travels from Ivy Hill Park to Mount Vernon Avenue, to Sanford Avenue and down South Orange Avenue. And so I say to all my friends, from one who is just a "little bit Irish," a very happy St. Patrick's Day to you.

THE OUTSTANDING F-111'S

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I submit a newsstory from the February 25, 1973, San Diego Union concerning the outstanding performance of the F-111's in Southeast Asia.

There has been all too little public recognition of the part played by the F-111's in the latter days of air combat operations in Vietnam. The story by military affairs correspondent L. Edgar Prina of the Copley News Service does a very substantial job in rectifying this situation. Mr. Prina points out that—

The F-111's of the 474th were deployed with the idea they would fly missions around the Demilitarized Zone during the rainy season, when other aircraft would be grounded. The supersonic F-111 is a foul weather, day and night performer.

The story goes on to say that—

While the much bigger eight-jet B-52 bombers dropped most of the bombs and got most of the headlines, the F-111s were carrying out their strikes in a highly professional and successful way.

"The work they did in the north was flat outstanding—the birds and the men were magnificent," a senior Air Force officer at the Pentagon said. "Without exception, these aircraft did one helluva job."

He said they "flew low, alone, at night and in bad weather against heavily defended and hard-to-get-at targets," such as MIG airfields.

The entire story follows:

[From the San Diego Union, Feb. 25, 1973]

VIETNAM F-111'S: RATED OUTSTANDING

(By L. Edgar Prina)

WASHINGTON.—The swingwing F-111 fighter, born and bred in controversy and matured in some of the toughest air warfare in Vietnam, is beginning to win the high respect its charter-member advocates have always insisted it deserved.

When two squadrons of the 474th Tactical Fighter Wing from Nellis Air Force Base, Nev., were sent to Southeast Asia late last September, no one could foresee the test of fire these 48 aircraft would face. Nor how well they would do the job.

The F-111's of the 474th were deployed

with the idea they would fly missions around the Demilitarized Zone during the rainy season, when other aircraft would be grounded. The supersonic F-111 is a foul weather, day and night performer.

Hours after the squadron reached Takhli Royal Thai Airbase in west central Thailand Sept. 28, the first F-111s were in combat.

But when the North Vietnamese began serious truce talks on Oct. 8, it appeared that the big effort to get the one-of-a-kind aircraft to the battle area wasn't (happily) going to pay off.

Peace was not "at hand," however. A snag developed in the Paris negotiations and President Nixon gave the signal in December for an air blitz against North Vietnam. Heavily defended targets around Hanoi and the port city of Haiphong were high on the attack list.

While the much bigger eight-jet B-52 bombers dropped most of the bombs and got most of the headlines, the F-111s were carrying out their strikes in a highly professional and successful way.

"The work they did in the north was flat outstanding—the birds and the men were magnificent," a senior Air Force officer at the Pentagon said. "Without exception, these aircraft did one helluva job."

He said they "flew low, alone, at night and in bad weather against heavily defended and hard-to-get-at targets," such as MIG airfields.

With their terrain following radar, which permits them to fly as low as 200 feet above the ground, their plan was to get over the target without warning and away before the enemy could bring his anti-aircraft and missile fire to bear.

Six of the 48 F-111s were lost. One of the two-man crews was taken prisoner. The other 10 airmen are listed as missing in action.

According to the official communique issued by the U.S. command in Saigon, the F-111s, in the period Dec. 18 to 25, blasted the Phuc Yen, Kep, Bac Mai and Yen Bai MIG airfields; two transshipment areas; the Bac Giang thermal power plant; the Hanoi port facility and Gia Thuong storage area; the Hanoi radar communications transmitter field and the Kep railroad yards.

No further communiqués were issued on the blitz, as the enemy signalled his willingness to resume serious truce talks in Paris.

The Pentagon officers said the usual F-111 method of operation—single plane missions at night—precluded such immediate bomb damage assessment.

"Nobody sees what you did—you don't either," he said. "You have no wingmen observing and you sure don't stick around to find out once the ordnance goes."

The damage assessment comes later, he said, adding that "we have been very impressed with the photos."

The "Lone Eagle" method of operation is, of course, the reason the Air Force is not certain how the half dozen F-111s were lost.

Writing in the Takhli base newspaper, the Cobra, Jan. 26, Col. William R. Nelson, the 474th Wing Commander, said with excusable pride:

"We've flown over 3,000 combat missions, expended tons of ordnance, and kept countless Takhli sleepers awake with one of the most ambitious—and successful—combat schedules in the TAC air business.

"We have unequivocally demonstrated the versatility of our 'Aardvark' (the plane looks something like an anteater) . . . We've used it in endless tactical configurations, in weather, day or night. It kept flying and did it effectively. You might be interested to know that troops have labeled our F-111 'whispering death.'"

The colonel told his men he had received complimentary messages from a list of high-ranking leaders, including Mr. Nixon.

"These gentlemen don't mince phrases; they are extremely pleased with the con-

tributions of the 474th Tactical Fighter Wing."

The war in Vietnam hopefully is ended, but the U.S. will maintain airpower in Southeast Asia. Navy carriers, with their F-4 Phantoms and A-7 Corsairs, will be deployed in the South China Sea and Air Force fighter squadrons and perhaps B-52s will remain in Thailand to keep the enemy honest.

The Air Force is not permitted to talk about future deployments, but on the basis of its December performance, it is a good bet that at least one F-111 squadron will be designated as part of that residual force.

POSTAL WOES

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the Dayton Journal Herald which discusses the U.S. Postal Service.

While this commentary recognizes the problems the Service has been experiencing, as we all do, it also is optimistic with respect to the chances for improvement:

Whatever the genius of the U.S. Congress, managerial aptitude does not seem to be a component of it. The suggestion, therefore, that Congress might return the U.S. postal service to direct government control is ludicrous. It was Congress' role as the sugar daddy of the postal unions and special users of the mails that started the toboggan years ago.

Anyone now using the mails does not need testimony before a congressional committee to document the claim that postal service is poor, although we think current hearings can be helpful in getting some aspects of the problems out into public view. But a good part of the current problem is the withdrawal symptoms that have afflicted the service since it was turned over to a public corporation.

Morale problems are difficult enough with a mere change in management. When they are compounded by cost-cutting and technological change, they can have quite a staggering effect. And so they have. But the personnel throughout the service are competent and hard-working and have, we think, the pride and the potential to make a more businesslike postal service a going concern once the initial problems have been dealt with.

In assessing the performance of the corporate operation, critics must be aware that the post office still lacks latitude to summarily cut off unprofitable operations. It is a governmental service, not a private industry. Comparisons with the performance of United Parcel Service, for instance, are numerous these days, but United Parcel Service is not a comparable case. In fact, the growth of private parcel services has hurt the potential of the government service by skimming off some of the profitable small-parcel business, leaving the government corporation with the less-profitable, more trying dregs of the business which it cannot shirk.

The first 20 months of the new postal service haven't been happy ones for anyone. But the task of the new service has been to undo before it can start doing. And much of what it is undoing is traceable to the congressional largesse of pre-corporation days. Congress would therefore do well to keep its distance and give the management several more years to get things turned around.

MORE FICTION THAN FACT ABOUT OSHA

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, an article titled "OSHACRATS" was published in December in "American Opinion," the monthly magazine of the John Birch Society. The article was highly critical of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration—OSHA—and the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970.

During the past several weeks, various parts of the article have been publicized. Some have used the material for what appears to be an organized John Birch Society campaign to discredit Federal efforts to reduce the carnage in our Nation's workplaces.

Mr. Speaker, I have caused an investigation to be made into those instances of alleged misuse of the act which "American Opinion" editor Alan Stang attempted to document. For the benefit of my colleagues, I wish to present for the RECORD the results of that investigation. None of the cases he cites stands up under close scrutiny.

Among others, the Stang article referred to two inspections performed by OSHA compliance officers in the Department of Labor's region X covering Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington.

In the two region X cases, there had, in fact, been OSHA inspections. However, the "American Opinion" report of those inspections was more fiction than fact. In the case of Agnew Plywood, Grants Pass, Oreg., I will list the fiction and provide the facts as I learned them:

Fiction: The OSHA compliance officer—inspector—was a retired master sergeant.

Fact: The OSHA compliance officer was a retired U.S. Army colonel.

Fiction: The compliance officer knew "nothing about plywood."

Fact: The compliance officer had been inspecting plywood mills for more than 10 years as a State safety inspector.

Fiction: State regulations say that guardrails must be at least 36 inches high, and OSHA says the same thing in the Federal Register.

Fact: The Federal Register says that guardrails shall be 42 inches high.

Fiction: The compliance officer discovered two serious violations involving guards around chains.

Fact: He discovered one serious violation.

Fiction: The compliance officer gave Agnew 14 violations for ladders.

Fact: Agnew was cited for one alleged violation for ladders.

Fiction: The compliance inspector cited a broken pane of glass in an out of the way place.

Fact: The employer was not cited for any broken pane of glass.

Fiction: When it was all over, Agnew had 37 violations.

Fact: Agnew was cited for one serious violation and seven non-serious violations totaling 27 instances for the eight violations cited.

Fiction: At any time there is veneer on the floor—a violation.

Fact: The employer was not cited for a violation regarding veneer on the floor.

Fiction: A millwright will lay a torch down for a moment without turning it off—another violation.

Fact: The employer was not cited for a violation of this item. The compliance officer commented that he did not know a better way to burn down a plywood mill.

Fiction: OSHA denies ever receiving a notice of contest of the findings of the inspection within the 15 days specified in the act.

Fact: OSHA received the letter of contest, forwarded it to the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission July 7, 1972. At a hearing in Grants Pass December 12, 1972, the employer did not contest the citations—only the penalty. The Review Commission judge reduced the \$720 penalty by \$260.

In the P.M.F. Inc., Twin Falls, Idaho, inspection, I will again list the fiction as published by "American Opinion" and provide the fact as I learned it from the Region X Administrator:

Fiction: P.M.F. was at work on a job which OSHA suddenly closed down while a compliance officer conducted an inspection.

Fact: The compliance officer did not shut the job down. The employer immediately abated the imminent danger condition of an unshored trench.

Fiction: OSHA ordered that roll bars be put on a crawler tractor.

Fact: The employer was not cited for this requirement.

Fiction: P.M.F. contested the proposed penalties with a registered letter but OSHA later claimed that the company had not contested and the penalties were final.

Fact: OSHA received letter of contest June 28, 1972, and forwarded a letter to the Review Commission the same day. A hearing is to be scheduled.

The article refers to an inspection involving a Conshohocken, Pa., painting contractor identified as Dan Callahan.

David H. Rhone, OSHA Regional Administrator, Region III in Philadelphia states that a thorough check of his files has produced no evidence of Callahan's name either as an employer or employee.

More fiction and fact from the "American Opinion" article:

Fiction: OSHA has ordered Brokaw Motorcycles, Colorado Springs, to use acid-proof goggles and plastic guards on grinding machines. The owner accuses OSHA of "harassment."

Fact: Brokaw Motorcycles of Colorado Springs has not been inspected by OSHA.

Fiction: Fountain Foundry Co., Pueblo, Colo., was cited for lack of personal protective equipment in the foundry and cleaning room.

Fact: Fountain Foundry Co., was cited

for silica bearing dust from foundry operations.

Fiction: Goehring Meat Co., Lodi, Calif., was cited 35 times.

Fact: Four items were cited at Goehring, but only one received a proposed penalty, \$30, which the company paid.

Fiction: An OSHA compliance officer with a "superior attitude" inspected Ace Cabinet Co., Yuma, Ariz.

Fact: No OSHA compliance officer has ever inspected Ace Cabinet Co., although it was determined that a State safety inspector had once visited the plant.

Fiction: OSHA activity in connection with Sedona Roofing Co., Sedona Sheet Metal, and Cambell Glass, Sedona, Ariz., was described by "American Opinion."

Fact: No OSHA employee has ever been in Sedona, Ariz., in an official OSHA capacity.

The 92d Congress of the United States passed the job safety and health legislation in 1970 because business and industry had failed to abate voluntarily hazards in the workplace. In 1971, the year OSHA began administering the act, on-the-job deaths were occurring at a rate of more than 14,000 a year; disabling injuries amounted to 2.3 million of the workforce; 400,000 persons succumbed to on-the-job illnesses. Other National Safety Council figures show that there were 245 million man-days lost due to on-the-job accidents.

Mr. Speaker, the objective of the Occupational Safety and Health Act is not to "harass" employers, as some continue to claim, but to reduce this workplace carnage. In the long run, I am convinced employers will save a large portion of the estimated \$9.3 billion that work accidents cost each year. It may be hard to persuade some that this is true, but my colleagues in the House, looking objectively at the problem, surely must see that safer workplaces can only lead to savings in workmen's compensation payments, insurance costs, lost time and injury payments, legal fees, hospital costs, and thus to a more efficient, dollar-producing operation.

As one who objects to journalistic bias from either the left or the right, I hope that editors will check the accuracy of their material before passing on rumors and misinformation. Given the size, scope and complexity of OSHA, some problems are probably inevitable in its implementation. Where proven to be legitimate, corrective actions have been and should continue to be taken. My colleagues know that as coauthor of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, I have felt a particular responsibility to closely follow its impact. I was joined by 19 other Members in a bipartisan effort to constructively ease the burden of OSHA on small employers through on-site consultation that received the endorsement of the National Federation of Independent Business and the National Small Business Association. I will be reintroducing this legislation in the immediate future. Shoddy and irresponsible attacks, however, from either the left or the right only serve to undermine the effectiveness of those who would seek to make OSHA workable.

BLACK LUNG PROFITEERS

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, Congress passed the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act in 1969, and included a special provision for miners who are victims of pneumoconiosis, better known as black lung disease.

Inasmuch as this is an occupational ailment, it normally would be covered by State workmen's compensation laws. Congress decided in 1969, however, that a sudden rash of claims, resulting from the new regulations, would cause financial hardship for some States. To avert this, the Federal Government assumed the liability for the first 3 years, that is, through 1972.

The States were supposed to set up their workmen's compensation accounts during those 3 years, but not many of them did; and so the Congress voted last year to extend the Federal liability for 1 more year; and one of the early bills in the current session asks for an extension of 2 more years.

By extending these Federal payments, we are not doing the ailing miners any favors. They are entitled to their payments, whether from the State or the Federal Government.

The real beneficiaries of this Federal unselfishness are the coal mine owners, who are saving several million dollars a year in workmen's compensation premiums while the taxpayers strive to contribute enough to make our budgetary ends meet.

In Kentucky, this has had an interesting side effect. Kentucky does provide limited compensation for victims of black lung disease. Permit me to quote the lead paragraphs of a story by Kyle Vance, which appeared in the Louisville Courier-Journal for March 4, 1973:

About \$6 million in Federal money was used last year to pay Kentucky attorneys for collecting State workmen's compensation benefits for black lung clients.

Eleven attorneys received \$3.8 million of the total, with State Senator Kelsey Friend, Pikeville Democrat, receiving \$1,008,950.

Since the Kentucky black lung program was started in 1960, State officials estimate that attorneys have received \$10 million to \$12 million, most of it from Federal tax money...

Mr. Vance listed the 11 attorneys who have an obvious interest in continuing the Federal payments for black lung disease. The three leaders among these lawyers, according to Mr. Vance's story, are State Senator Friend, \$1,008,950 in fees in 1972; G. C. Perry, \$810,058; and W. W. Burchett, \$585,118.

They come from respectively, Pikeville, Paintsville, and Prestonsburg; all of which are in Kentucky's Seventh Congressional District. It is only by coincidence, I am sure, that the sponsor of the bill to extend the Federal beneficence, first, for 1 year and now for 2 more, is the Representative from the Seventh District, Chairman CARL PERKINS of the Education and Labor Committee.

Mr. Vance's complete story follows:

BLACK LUNG: KENTUCKY ATTORNEYS PAID MILLIONS FOR COLLECTING BENEFITS FOR THEIR CLIENTS

(By Kyle Vance)

FRANKFORT, KY.—About \$6 million in federal money was used last year to pay Kentucky attorneys for collecting state workmen's compensation benefits for black lung clients.

Eleven attorneys received \$3.8 million of the total, with State Sen. Kelsey Friend, Pikeville Democrat, receiving \$1,008,950.

Since the Kentucky black lung program was started in 1960, state officials estimate that attorneys have received \$10 million to \$12 million, most of it from federal tax money authorized by regulations administered under the Social Security program.

Actually, the federal money is used to repay a black lung client for money deducted from an award by the state to compensate his attorney. The attorney fee generally runs from \$4,760 to \$5,100 for each claim.

"We treat the attorney fee and other expenses as money the miner didn't receive," said an official of the Atlanta regional office of the Social Security Administration (SSA), which administers the federal black lung program.

Specifically, the lawyer subsidy works like this:

Through the attorney's work, a claimant may be awarded the maximum \$60 a week for 425 weeks under the state's black lung program.

The attorney is entitled to as much as 20 per cent of the award, and it is deducted from the last 113 weeks of the recipient's 425-week benefit period, leaving the recipient 312 weeks of state benefits.

Since a federal black lung program allows a maximum \$81 a week for life, it adds \$21 a week during the 312 weeks the state is paying \$60 a week. Then the federal government takes over the full payment of \$81 a week.

Thus, instead of waiting 425 weeks, the benefit period is awarded by the state and shortened by the attorney fees, the federal program begins payments at the end of 312 weeks and the claimant is reimbursed for money already awarded the attorney.

FEDERAL SUBSIDY TO END

Federal money isn't paid directly to the attorney, but the effect is the same as if it were.

Friend emphasized this in a recent interview by saying:

"Every penny has come or will come, in a round-about way, from federal money. The miners who won claims won't be out a cent for legal services and other expenses."

The federal subsidy will end when a new Kentucky law becomes effective, probably July 1 unless added time is needed to implement it. The new law upgrades the Kentucky program to meet federal standards, including a maximum award of \$81 a week for life.

"There will be no way we can participate in the Kentucky program when they get their new law started," Don Skaggs, assistant SSA regional representative from Atlanta, said. "No federal money will be involved."

He was speaking of new claims. Skaggs and others said federal commitments made in older cases will be kept until all are phased out by death of claimants and their widows and until their dependents become of age. Full state payments will be made only on claims approved after the new law becomes effective.

Payments for older claims will remain at the present levels and time periods, and the federal program will continue to supplement the awards.

Yet to be determined is how or how much attorneys will be paid under the new state law. They remain eligible for 12 to 20 per cent of the claimant's award, a provision

that could skyrocket their black lung income to even greater heights, but there has been some indication the percentage might be changed.

Statisticians concerned with the program already have figured that in some cases an attorney awarded the full 20 per cent award for serving a claimant with long life expectancy could be eligible for more than \$21,000 for one case.

PROGRAM HAS BEEN ESCALATED

The state's black lung program has been escalated, both in awards to claimants and in attorney fees, since 1969, maximum awards jumped from \$49 a week in 1969 to \$52 in 1970, to \$56 in 1971, and on up to \$60 in 1972. Attracted by the income potential, a larger number of attorneys have been filing a greater number of claims.

Robert D. Hawkins, chief counsel for the Labor Department's Special Fund—clearing house for all money paid in workmen's compensation benefits for occupational diseases—said no projection has been made on "how high we will go" when payments are started under the higher, longer rates of the new law.

"It should be reasonable to assume that an attorney who made \$1 million last year from black lung cases will make \$2 million next year," he said.

Friend was not alone in collecting high fees last year. G. C. Perry III, of Paintsville, received more than \$800,000. W. W. Burchett, of Prestonsburg, was third among Kentucky attorneys with about \$585,000 in black lung fees. Eight other attorneys went over \$100,000.

Friend's total fee award of \$1,008,950, as compiled from Workmen's Compensation Board meeting minutes of 1972 compares with \$500,741 he was awarded in 1971 for handling black lung claims.

Perry's jump was from \$550,000 in 1971 to \$810,058. Burchett gained from \$350,000 in 1971 to \$585,118 in 1972.

HIGH PAID ATTORNEYS LISTED

Here is a list of other attorneys who received more than \$100,000 for their services in 1972, all of it presumably involving black lung claims since a coal company and the Special Fund were named defendants in each case:

Cawood Smith, Harlan, \$298,500.
Lester Burns, Somerset, \$233,000.
Eugene Goss and Karl Forester, Harlan, \$217,000.
Earl Cole, Barbourville, \$198,000.
Neville Smith, Manchester, \$145,000.
Denver Adams, Hyden, \$130,000.
Grant Knuckles, Pineville, \$127,000.
Cletus Maricle, Manchester, \$119,500.

State records do not indicate instances in which an attorney shared his fees with others. Some have partners and others employ attorney helpers on a salaried basis.

The Board, which ordinarily meets in closed session, permitted this reporter to sit in on a recent meeting. It was, board members said, a routine meeting in which the five members read their findings and conclusions reached in an examination of case files in their home law offices.

Unless there was a question from Chairman Shelby Denton of Owensboro or by J. Keller Whitaker, director of the board, the findings and conclusions were accepted.

Members of the board, besides Denton, are: Glenn L. Schilling, Louisville; Alfred Naff, Hopkinsville; Clyde Mullins, Elkhorn City, and George Simpson, Sturgis.

The members, as a group, said they would like to have corrected an impression that they automatically award attorney fees of 20 percent in contested black lung cases. They said they do not.

Schilling said he recently considered a claim that involved 17 medical examinations and doctors' depositions, and that a balancing of the testimony convinced him the claim should be disallowed. The evidence in-

dicated to him, he said, that the claimant's disability was a heart condition and not black lung.

Naff said that he had a case that included 26 depositions from doctors, nine supporting the black lung claim and 17 not supporting it. The claim was denied, he said.

In cases such as those, Chairman Denton said, all money and time used to seek the benefits are lost, both to the claimant and his attorney. The attorney may be the biggest loser, because many reportedly stand good for claimants' expenses and expect repayment when the claimants are later reimbursed by the state. The state awards expenses, attorney fees and benefits only in cases that are won.

BROWN LEADS EFFORT TO PROTECT STEELWORKERS' JOBS

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments today to speak about the effort which a colleague is making to protect the jobs of his constituents.

How can the United States protect the jobs of California's steelworkers from the threat posed by increasing imports of foreign steel products on the west coast, without imposing restrictive import duties?

This was one of the first problems facing Congressman GEORGE BROWN when he came to Washington this year. Many citizens of the 38th Congressional District work for Kaiser Steel in Fontana, which has been particularly hard hit by the rising percentage of the domestic steel market penetrated by foreign manufacturers; 36 percent of all steel products sold in the Far West are now imported, as compared with the national average of 16 percent.

Brown did not see restrictive import duties as the answer, since such tariffs tend to provoke retaliatory tariffs by foreign governments against American products, endangering the jobs of other U.S. workers.

Congressman BROWN sent a letter—co-signed by Congressman JERRY PETTIS, who shared his concern—to each of the 79 other western Congressmen, explaining the problem and inviting them to join in an effort to find a solution. He began to insert material about the problem into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And when enough interest had developed, a luncheon meeting was scheduled for April 3, at which GEORGE BROWN, JERRY PETTIS, and several other Members of Congress will get together in the Capitol with key administration officials to explore various possible means of correcting the present geographic imbalance in imports.

Congressman BROWN feels that modifying the voluntary restraint program, first worked out between the United States and some foreign manufacturers in 1969, offers the best hope for protecting our domestic steelworkers' jobs. The April meeting will reveal whether Congressman BROWN can gain support for his proposals.

LAST CHANCE FOR THE AMERICAN WOLF

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, on February 26, Jethro, a full-grown Canadian wolf, visited Capitol Hill with his owner, Mr. John Harris, to help publicize the plight of endangered species. A number of my colleagues had the opportunity to meet Jethro, and several are planning to cosponsor the bills I have introduced for the protection of such animals, House Joint Resolution 119, H.R. 1271, and H.R. 1272.

In the February 1973, issue of Environmental Quality, there was an excellent article by Mr. Lewis Regenstein, Washington director of the Fund for Animals, Inc. I am taking this opportunity to share Mr. Regenstein's thoughts with my colleagues:

LAST CHANCE FOR THE AMERICAN WOLF

(By Lewis Regenstein)

The wolf—one of nature's most interesting creatures—may be facing its final struggle. If the wolf is to be saved in North America, it will have to be done quickly; for many of the remaining population stocks are being rapidly and intentionally extirpated. Only a sustained and effective public outcry can save the few that remain on this continent.

It is difficult to understand why man has waged such a remorseless war on these unique and valuable creatures. Wolves play a vital role in maintaining nature's balance and in keeping herds of deer, elk, and moose at desirable population levels. By preying mainly on the very old and young, the sick, and the lame, they eliminate excess animals from the herd. This insures that the forage and food supply is not exhausted, which could result in the death of the entire herd. Wolves also help prevent large scale die-offs from starvation by keeping ungulates (hooved animals) on the move in winter; and by removing diseased animals wolves keep the herds healthy and prevent epidemics. Another important function is in removing the unwary and less intelligent animals. By culling out these biologically inferior individuals, wolves are thought to be a significant factor in the evolution of a healthy ungulate population.

Moreover, wolves are highly evolved animals with a complex and orderly social structure. The famous "howl" of the wolf consists of intricate rhythmic sounds that can accurately be described as musical. Naturalist Aldo Leopold has described this eerie cry as:

A deep chesty bawl that echoes from rimrock to rimrock, rolls down the mountain, and fades into the far blackness of the night. It is an outburst of wild defiant sorrow, and of contempt for all the adversities of the world. Studies of wolf packs in Canada's Algonquin Park, Ontario, indicates that wolves howl when they are separated from the herd, when they want to reconvene the pack, and when their pups die. They also howl in "loneliness" when left alone in a cage.

According to Gordon Heber, who has studied wolves in Alaska, a pack of wolves is "a highly organized, well disciplined group of related individuals or family units, all working together in a remarkably amiable, efficient manner." Each member of the pack knows and accepts its rank in this strict dominance hierarchy. The pack leader, or "alpha" male, is usually the strongest, smartest, and most experienced member of the herd; and he exercises unquestioned author-

ity over it. It is the alpha male that generally sires the young, thus perpetuating nature's law of natural selection and survival of the fittest.

The second-ranking, or "beta" male, directs most of the herd's routine activities. The beta male also acts as a "husband and father" to a breeding female, helping her with "whelping duties" and in rearing the young. After the pups are weaned, they are occasionally turned over to others of the pack for pup-tending duties. According to Haber, the mother will even "leave the pups with a babysitter and light-heartedly trot off with the other adults for a fling on the nightly hunt." He concludes,

"In many ways, the social organization of wolves is almost identical to what anthropologists have pieced together as the social organization of early man, or even that of some primitive hunter-gatherer societies of today: the well-defined dominance order and disciplined manner in which duties are assigned and carried out; the presence of different generations of the same family living together; the prolonged dependency of the young; the group effort in raising and training them; the cooperative effort of many individuals in hunting large prey . . ."

The social life of wolves has an additional relevance to man. It is theorized that most dogs are the evolutionary product of a small variety of wolf probably domesticated about 12,000 years ago in the Near East. Submission is a basic part of wolf behavior, with each member of the herd, except the alpha male and female, frequently exhibiting it. It is thus conceivable that this submission instinct has made it possible for man to domesticate the wolf, with the dog's master replacing the alpha male.

WOLVES DO NOT ATTACK MAN

Moreover, contrary to legends perpetuated by such fairy tales as "Little Red Riding Hood" and "The Three Little Pigs," wolves do not attack humans, but avoid them whenever possible. There does not appear to be a single documented case of a healthy wolf ever attacking a human without provocation in North America.

Yet, probably no animal has been so universally persecuted, so intensely, for so long a period of time, and with less justification, as the wolf. According to Elmer Shaw of the Library of Congress, bounties on wolves have been in existence for at least 27 centuries. The early Greeks paid bounties on wolves; and *Plutarch's Lives* refers to drachmas paid by the ancient Romans for dead wolves (5 drachmas for a male, 1 for a female).

When the first American colonists began settling in New England, wolf bounties were quickly instituted. Massachusetts apparently adopted the first bounty system in the New World in 1630, and two years later Virginia followed suit.

In Europe, the wolf fared no better. It was killed off in Great Britain by the 18th century, and is now extinct throughout most of Europe.

Today, in the United States, probably less than 100 grey wolves remain in the wild outside of Minnesota and Alaska: 20-30 on Isle Royale, Michigan; perhaps one or two dozen in the northern peninsula of Michigan; and an undetermined number in Yellowstone Park, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming. All of the wolf populations in the United States are threatened to some degree.

HUNTING BY AIRPLANE

Alaska, with a wolf population of from 2500-5000, contains by far the largest number of wolves in the United States. But Alaska's attitude towards wildlife does not bode well for these rapidly disappearing animals.

The wolves of Alaska face a constant threat from hunters and fur traders. The traditional way of hunting wolves in Alaska has been by airplane. Airborne hunters with shotguns fire into the herds indiscriminately, killing some and wounding many others which are cripp-

pled for life or die a slow and agonizing death. Between 1967-69, approximately 3500 wolves were killed in Alaska. In one fiscal year—1967-68—Alaska paid bounties on 1711 wolves, 718 of which were killed from airplanes. Some areas still pay bounties on wolves, but most bounties have been eliminated.

Although Congress in 1971 passed a bill ostensibly prohibiting the hunting of animals by airplane, loopholes in the act, combined with the state's intransigence, permitted aerial hunting of wolves to continue as usual. Recently, however, conservationists have been encouraged by the appointment of Jim Brooks as Alaska's new Commissioner of Fish and Game. Brooks has indicated that the issuance of airplane hunting permits will be curtailed or eliminated; but the situation remains unclear, since the Governor, William A. Egan, and a Departmental board can overrule Brooks' decision. Moreover, illegal airplane hunting will undoubtedly persist, as well as the legal hunting by snowmobile and conventional "sporting" methods.

The wolves of Minnesota constitute the last viable population stock of gray wolves in the lower 48 states. But these critically threatened animals are facing mounting pressure from hunters, trappers, cattle ranchers, and state and Federal "game managers." Most estimates place Minnesota's wolf population at a maximum of about 300, although the state game authorities place it considerably higher, at between 500-1000. Even so, the state is currently working to implement a Federally approved "management" plan, the goal of which is to provide "an annual take of 150-200 wolves." Under this plan, there would be a 6 month season for hunting and trapping, with a limit of 10 wolves for residents, 3 for non-residents, in the "open" areas. In other areas, wolves may be taken without limit, seemingly because of pressure from livestock raisers. Needless to say, "a continuing program of directed predator control" will be in effect, and farmers "may take wolves doing damage to domestic animals on such lands without license at any time." The hunting regulations apply to all persons 16 years or older; and allowed methods will include dog teams, rifles, shotguns, and even bows and arrows. Under the heading "Harvest Goals," the plan states that "emphasis in harvesting wolves should be upon their trophy value for sport hunting and trapping."

SLOW ROAD TO EXTINCTION

This plan has been defended on the grounds that it would establish a 2,350 square mile wolf sanctuary in northeastern Minnesota. Moreover, in some ways it does represent an improvement over the present situation, in which wolves may be killed year around without limit except in the Superior National Forest. Nevertheless, the proposal would not provide adequate protection to these wolves, and appears to represent merely a slower road to extinction for most of these unfortunate creatures.

The proposed plan is signed and endorsed by Robert L. Herbst, Commissioner of the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, St. Paul, Minnesota; Travis S. Roberts, Regional Director, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, U.S. Department of Interior; and Harold E. Anderson, Forest Supervisor, Superior National Forest, U.S. Forest Service. In a 12 September 1972 press release, Herbst announced that the plan would be recommended to the 1973 Minnesota legislature, with the hope that it could be "activated as soon as possible following legislative approval." Roberts, speaking for the Interior Department, described himself as "fully satisfied with the outcome;" and the Forest Service's Anderson characterized the plan as "in the best interests of everyone." He apparently was not including the wolves.

The American wolf with the least chance of survival seems to be the red wolf (*Canis*

rufus, or *Canis niger*), which is an ancient and distinct canine species different in many ways from the gray or timber wolf (*Canis lupus*). Red wolves are midway in size between the gray wolf and the coyote, for which it is often mistaken. The red wolf is native to the southeastern United States from Texas to Florida, and at one time ranged throughout the Ozark Mountains and as far north as the Ohio Valley. By the turn of the century, it still inhabited about 14 states, and was concentrated in Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Arkansas. But around 1920, an aggressive poisoning and trapping program began, and by the 1950's it had been extirpated from most of its range. Federal predator control programs continued to take a heavy toll of the remaining wolves; and from 1955-64, the Interior Department's Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife claimed credit for killing 27,646 red wolves. In one year alone, 1960, 3,830 wolves were "removed," and as late as 1964, 2,617 were killed.

The Interior Department has succeeded in its goal of bringing this animal to the very edge of extinction. Today, the red wolf exists almost exclusively in several counties in Texas and Louisiana, with perhaps 200-300 animals surviving in the wild. Because predator control programs have seriously disrupted the wolf's territorial system and broken down its social organization, remnant wolves have in recent years begun to mate with coyotes, creating hybrid animals. Coyotes and hybrids are now considered a threat to the species at least equal to that of human molestation.

Ironically, another branch of Interior—the Office of Endangered Species—after having been prodded by conservation groups, is now showing an interest in the plight of the red wolf. According to Tom Garrett of Friends of the Earth, the Office has agreed to a recovery plan but, as usual, has been slow to implement it or take any substantive action. There is suspicion that the Department's predator control branch—the Division of Wildlife Services—may be exerting pressure on behalf of its client ranchers.

"VARMINTS"

In Canada, wolves survive in sizeable numbers in some areas. Although feelings seem to be gradually changing, the Canadian attitude, like that of the U.S. several decades ago, generally considers wolves to be "varmints."

The Province of Quebec is one area where wolves are still relatively abundant. Unfortunately, the Provincial game authorities, under the direction of the Minister of Tourism, Fish, and Game, Claude Simard, have decided to kill off a large number of Quebec's wolves, in the mistaken belief that this will generate more deer and moose for hunters. While it is true that the province's deer and moose have declined in numbers in recent years, the reason is the past severe winters combined with widespread over-hunting, for which Quebec is notorious. Although the wolves have co-existed in balance with their prey for centuries, they are, as usual, getting the blame rather than the real culprits, the "sportsmen."

Officials of the Fish and Game Department in Quebec show a remarkable lack of understanding of wolf ecology and predator-prey relationships. Michel Renaud, Simard's assistant, stated in a recent letter that:

"Man tends to seek out certain animals by preference . . . The proliferation of the wolf is a natural consequence of this unbalance which creates a need, according to biologists, to control it in certain parts of Quebec."

Gaston Moisan, Director of the Department's Fish and Game Branch, also wrote that "the control program is planned to reduce the wolf populations in certain known spots where white-tailed deer concentrate

year and after year." Yet, the authorities have not even closed the hunting season on deer and moose, which would be a logical first step if they were sincere in their stated desire to protect these ungulates.

From September to November 1972, hunters were enticed into Quebec with the offer of a prize for killing wolves, the trophy consisting of the jaw of the wolf set in an acrylic block with the hunter's name inscribed on it. The above officials now claim that the open season on wolves did not result in any significant number being killed. However, this contest was only phase one of the wolf-elimination campaign. Phase two began in November and will last throughout the winter, the objective being, according to the *Montreal Gazette*, to wipe out two out of every five wolf packs. During the winter period, hundreds of traps will also be spread throughout the area to finish the job of "thinning out" the wolf herds. Reportedly, poison bait may be used as well.

Although this is now being denied by the provincial authorities, the result of this "control operation" will be to further jeopardize the future survival of these hard-pressed animals, while failing in any way to benefit the herds of deer and moose. Prompted by pleas from television host Dick Cavett, and Canadian-American Wolf Defenders' President Araby Colton, letters of protest have poured into Quebec. This appears to have at least reduced or slowed down the killing; but as of this writing, the final status of the operation remains uncertain.

WILT CHAMBERLAIN'S WOLF BEDSPREAD

Finally, a continuing threat to wolves everywhere is the U.S. and international fur industries, whose demands create a tremendous economic incentive for the killing of these threatened animals. This season, such chic fashion boutiques as Saks Fifth Avenue, Lord & Taylor, Bloomingdale's, Jacques and Georges Kaplan (who gained national publicity by renouncing the use of "endangered species"), and even Gimbel's have been pushing wolf-trimmed fur coats, through an aggressive advertising campaign in *Esquire*, the *New York Times*, and other leading publications. Basketball star Wilt Chamberlain bought up a full year's crop of wolf pelts collected by bounty hunters in Alaska. He uses them to cover two couches, and as a rug and bedspread.

Even the Defense Department got into the act this year when its Defense Supply Agency (DSA) issued orders for 368,782 winter parkas trimmed with wolf fur. It was estimated that to fill such an order would have required at least 25,000 dead wolves, and news of this incredible blunder caused a considerable public outcry, including appearances on national television by Cleveland Amory, President of the Fund for Animals; and John Harris, President of the North American Association for the Preservation of Predatory Animals, accompanied by his two wolves, Clem and Jethro.

Eventually, DSA announced that it was reducing its requirements to 91,280 winter jackets and would use coyote pelts instead of wolf. DSA proudly stated in its fact sheet that this course of action had the approval of—you guessed it—the U.S. Department of Interior's Office of Endangered Species. A letter was also produced from Joseph Linduska, Associate Director of Interior's Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, stating that—"The impact on wild coyote populations would be negligible and temporary . . . Removal of 18,000 coyotes from the wild might constitute a 2 or 3-year harvest of prime pelts, but recovery would be rapid."

SOME SOLUTIONS

A partial solution to the fur industry's exploitation of wolves would be for the Interior Department to fulfill its responsibilities under the Endangered Species Conserva-

tion Act of 1969 and add the wolf to its endangered list. This would ban the import into the U.S. of foreign wolf pelts (most of which come from Canada) used in fur coats and fur-trimmed items, thus removing much of the market for such products. But the Interior Department's policy has traditionally been to add an animal to its endangered list only after its future survival has become doubtful.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS ASSOCIATION IS COMMENDED FOR ITS "BEAM" PROCUREMENT PROGRAM

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Procurement Subcommittee of the House Select Committee on Small Business, I wish to invite the attention of my colleagues to a certain program operated by the National Small Business Association which is designed to encourage its members to participate in Government procurement.

This project called BEAM standing for "Bidders Early Alert Message," enables many NSBA members to obtain timely notice and detailed information regarding opportunities to bid on Government contracts for goods and services.

We are advised that since the inception of BEAM in August 1971, thousands of bid notices have been delivered to more than 100 locations in the United States, and that the program results in Government contracts to BEAM participants now averaging in value between \$400,000 and \$500,000 a month.

The Honorable Thomas S. Kleppe, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, recently acknowledged the effectiveness of this BEAM project. In awarding a special citation to NSBA for its efforts Administrator Kleppe said:

With the availability of BEAM, small businessmen throughout the nation now have an opportunity to know rapidly and economically what our government is seeking in the way of goods and services at over 2,500 buying offices with contract authority.

In this connection, I insert in the RECORD the following account of SBA's award appearing in a recent issue of NSBA's publication, the Voice of Small Business.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION HONORS NSBA

WASHINGTON, D.C., January 31, 1973.—The National Small Business Association (NSB) has been awarded a Special Citation for its efforts in promoting the growth and progress of small business through its Bidders Early Alert Message (BEAM) Program by the U.S. Small Business Administration.

SBA Administrator Thomas S. Kleppe presented the award to John Lewis, NSB Executive Vice President, at SBA's National Headquarters in Washington, D.C. Marshall Parker, SBA Associate Administrator for Procurement and Management Assistance, and Herman Director, who heads BEAM, also participated in the award ceremony.

The BEAM Program, a nationwide computerized network which is financed without government funds, informs participants of

available government contracts. It was inaugurated by NSB in August 1971 because its members were interested in a low-cost system that would alert them to such contracts and provide in capsule form information on how to bid on them.

With the availability of BEAM, small businessmen throughout the nation now have an opportunity to know rapidly and economically what their government is seeking in the way of goods and services at over 2,500 buying offices with contract authority.

BEAM has removed a great financial and personnel burden from the shoulders of hundreds of small businessmen. Most firms do not have the resources, the personnel to sift through the mass of daily bid notices, nor the thousands of dollars necessary to retain an individual Washington representative who could alert them to available government procurement contracts.

Since the inception of the program only 18 months ago, BEAM participants have received over \$13 million in government contracts totalling between \$400,000 and \$500,000 per month.

NSB represents over 500 different types of commerce and industry, including the professional man. After receipt of a BEAM message, the selling, manufacturing, and service capabilities of NSB's thousands of members enable them to bid on the entire gamut of federal and federally-funded state procurement contracts. These encompass foods, clothing, machinery, research and development, laundry, dry cleaning, transportation, decorating, security, maintenance, and literally thousands of other items.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

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

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

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

We must make every effort to alleviate their anguish by redoubling our search for the missing servicemen. Of the incalculable debt owed to them and their families, we can at least pay that minimum. Until I am satisfied, therefore, that we are meeting our obligation, I will continue to ask, "How long?"

CXIX—565—Part 7

FREE SPEECH AND THE SUPREME COURT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, while the American people have had enough of promiscuousness, licentiousness, and a complete breakdown in morality, the Supreme Court continues its immoral efforts to prove that ours is a society without law.

The latest decision, which affects the University of Missouri, is a classic example of the Supreme Court shenanigans. Six political judges have now misused the first amendment so as to license as free speech language which was so foul and offensive that the judges would not even allow the printing of the utterances in their written decision. Instead they substituted two initials and 10 dashes. Apparently, the Highest Court of our land still abides by a higher code of conduct in its speech than it licenses for the public under the "free speech" misnomer.

The decision goes further than guaranteeing the right to use repulsive language as free speech. The decision must be regarded as a complete attack against discipline and decency so important to education. The Supreme Court has now ruled that a college or university cannot establish norms of conduct which the educators feel are necessary to create an environment conducive to study and learning. The majority of the students seeking to improve themselves by education have lost so that one student can run her dirty mouth and upset any semblance of respect and dignity.

A news report follows:

[From the New York Times, March 20, 1973]

COURT BARS STUDENT'S EXPULSION OVER CAMPUS PRESS OBSCENITY (By Warren Weaver, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 19.—State university officials cannot shut off the dissemination of offensive ideas by expelling a student who circulates them in print, the Supreme Court ruled today.

By a 6-to-3 vote, the Court ordered the University of Missouri to reinstate Barbara Susan Papish, a 32-year-old graduate student in journalism, who was expelled in 1969 on the ground that she had not observed "generally accepted standards of conduct."

Miss Papish had distributed on campus copies of a newspaper called Free Press Underground that included a cartoon portraying the rape of justice and liberty by policemen and a headline with an obscenity.

Neither the cartoon nor the article, the Supreme Court majority held, were "constitutionally obscene," and Miss Papish could not be expelled because "the First Amendment leaves no room for the operation of a dual standards in the academic community with respect to the content of speech."

JUDGES IN MAJORITY

Voting to reverse decisions reached by a Federal District Court and the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth District were Justices William O. Douglas, William J. Brennan Jr., Potter Stewart, Byron R. White, Thurgood Marshall and Lewis F. Powell Jr. Dissenting were Chief Justice Warren E. Burger and Justices Harry A. Blackmun and William H. Rehnquist.

Mr. Burger charged that the majority had proved its inconsistency by using two initials and 10 dashes in its opinion as a substitute for "the petitioner's foul language."

The majority quoted from a 1972 Supreme Court ruling that "state colleges and universities are not enclaves immune from the sweep of the First Amendment" and denied that the university's action was "a nondiscriminatory application of reasonable rules to govern conduct."

In his dissent, Mr. Rehnquist said that Miss Papish had spent six years as a graduate student with little progress, and was on disciplinary probation for distributing obscene publications and academic probation for "submarginal academic progress."

Just because the first amendment would have prevented any criminal prosecution of the student, Justice Rehnquist wrote, does not necessarily mean that the university could not exercise control over its operations by expelling anyone who circulates offensive material.

SOCIAL SERVICES

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 21, the Democratic Caucus will consider a resolution requesting the Committee on Ways and Means to report out legislation which will enable State and local governments to continue existing programs providing social services.

The need for this resolution stems from proposed regulations issued by HEW on February 16. These regulations, if implemented, will all but destroy countless programs for the poor, the aged, and the disabled—programs designed to combat welfare dependency.

I am enclosing for the RECORD a copy of the resolution and commend my colleagues in the House who have registered their support. I hope that all my Democratic colleagues will attend the caucus and support this resolution.

The resolution follows:

PROPOSED RESOLUTION ON SOCIAL SERVICES FUNDING FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS, MARCH 21, 1973

Whereas, pursuant to the authority contained in Titles I, X, XIV, XVI and IVa of the Social Security Act, programs of social services have been initiated by state and local governments which have provided substantial assistance to the disadvantaged and have enabled large numbers of citizens to successfully remain off the public assistance roles and,

Whereas, in the 92nd Congress a ceiling of \$2.5 billion was imposed upon federal reimbursement to the states and territories for such social service programs and,

Whereas, at the same time a formula for apportionment of said sum among the states and territories was established which fixes the sums to which each state is entitled, and

Whereas, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has now proposed new, restrictive regulations which would destroy many useful programs of social services and would sharply reduce the effectiveness of others, and would shift substantial financial burdens to state and local governments, and

Whereas, the President has urged that Congress provide greater decision-making to state and local governments in the expenditure of federal funds.

Now therefore, be it resolved by the Democratic Caucus of the House of Representatives that the Committee on Ways and Means is respectfully requested to promptly report to the floor legislation necessary to enable state and local governments to continue existing programs of social services subject only to the limitations expressly enacted in the 92nd Congress.

**SIGNERS OF THE NOTICE TO THE
DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS**

Ogden R. Reid, Bella Abzug, Joseph P. Addabbo, Glen M. Anderson, Thomas L. Ashley, Herman Badillo, Jonathan B. Bingham, John Brademas, George E. Brown, Yvonne Brathwaite Burke, Phillip Burton, Shirley Chisholm, William Clay, John Conyers, James C. Corman, John C. Culver, and Ronald V. Dellums.

Ron de Lugo, John Dent, Charles C. Diggs, Robert F. Drinan, Don Edwards, Joshua Ellberg, Dante B. Fascell, Walter E. Fauntroy, William D. Ford, Lee H. Hamilton, Julia Butler Hansen, Michael Harrington, Augustus F. Hawkins, Ken Hechler, Henry Helstoski, Elizabeth Holtzman, James J. Howard, and Robert W. Kastenmeier.

Donald M. Fraser, Edward I. Koch, Robert L. Leggett, Torbert H. Macdonald, Spark M. Matsunaga, Lloyd Meeds, Ralph H. Metcalfe, Parren J. Mitchell, Joe Moakley, William S. Moorhead, John E. Moss, Morgan F. Murphy, Lucien N. Nedzi, Claude Pepper, Bertram L. Podell, and Melvin Price.

Charles B. Rangel, Thomas M. Rees, Donald W. Riegle, Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Fred B. Rooney, Edward R. Roybal, Paul S. Sarbanes, Patricia Schroeder, John F. Seiberling, B. F. Sisk, Fortney H. Stark, Louis Stokes, W. S. Stuckey, Jr., James W. Symington, Frank Thompson, Jr., Robert O. Tiersan, Lionel Van Deerlin, Jerome R. Waldie, Lester L. Wolff, Antonio Borja Won Pat, and Andrew Young.

**BLACK SUPPORT FOR OEO
DISMANTLEMENT**

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. CRANE, Mr. Speaker, by any objective standard the programs instituted by the Office of Economic Opportunity, with certain minor exceptions, have failed to perform the tasks assigned to them. Rather than assisting the poor to gain skills, employment, and improved living conditions, OEO has instead created a huge governmental bureaucracy designed primarily to stir political turmoil and unrest.

The experience we have had with OEO proves once again that serious and complex situations are most often made worse by the intervention of government. Bureaucrats, once assigned to the job of alleviating poverty, quickly develop a vested interest in not alleviating it. If poverty were eliminated, for example, so would the jobs of poverty fighters.

Recently, the city of Washington witnessed a demonstration of opposition to the administration's proposals to dismantle the Office of Economic Opportunity and eliminate some of its more flagrantly abusive programs, such as those relating to community action agencies. Those who demonstrated claimed to represent the poor, and more particularly the majority of black Ameri-

cans. This claim, however, is totally unsubstantiated. Those black Americans who are desperately concerned with the deteriorating situation in our inner cities seek real solutions, not expensive Government bureaucracies.

One black voice which has been vocal in its support for the dismantlement of OEO is that of the Reverend Henry Mitchell of Chicago. In the newsletter published by his North Star Mission, the Reverend Mitchell invites any person or groups of persons, black or white, to come into the Lawndale area, knock on any door—and ask the question, "What has the so-called antipoverty program done to help you?"

He declares that—

Ninety five per cent of the people wouldn't even know what you are talking about.

On the other hand, if you knock on the door of any precinct captain, ward committeeman, or alderman and ask them the question—they would say, "It has created patronage jobs for certain people who are used by the crooked political machines to steal votes by misusing the rights of the voters—and have lined their pockets."

In April 1971, the North Star Mission and other black groups in Chicago identified many people employed by Government programs who were "out on the streets hustling votes for the existing political machine in Chicago at the taxpayers' expense."

Declares the Reverend Mitchell:

OEO programs, were supposed to have been designed to teach people how to help themselves, so far they have taught people how to become slaves to the city plantation, especially the blacks. We encourage President Nixon and Congress to wipe out all programs that have enslaved the poor, robbed the taxpayers, and turned many people into thieves.

We have heard the voices of black militants urging more and more bureaucratic intervention on their own behalf. Now let us listen to a black voice which is truly concerned with improving conditions of the poor.

I wish to share with my colleagues the Star News, published by the North Star Mission, of February 1973 and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

BETTER LATE THAN NEVER

(By Rev. Henry Mitchell)

A handful of Americans are up in arms over the cut-backs in some Government programs.

Far too long have city officials been depending upon Federal Government to solve the problems of the cities. Good leadership is indicated by economical handling of finances. Getting the most out of every dollar you spend.

Finding jobs for the unemployed does not necessarily mean you must have elaborate, air conditioned, wall-to-wall carpeted offices and a large staff of over-paid, under-worked individuals.

Billions of dollars spent on research and paper programs could have been spent more wisely on educating every man, woman and child to become responsible individuals.

Responsible to their job.

Responsible to their home.

Responsible to their country.

This handful of people who are crying about the cut-backs are crying about the education of the people in the poverty areas.

This handful of dudes who are crying to keep the programs going should answer these questions. If the programs have been so successful why do we have more slums? Why do we have more crime? Why do we have more boarded up buildings and vacant lots? Why do we have more people today who rather go on welfare than work? Why do we have many people working just a few months then quitting good paying jobs?

These dudes are crying that the country is headed for a depression. It won't be the country going into a depression it will be the over-paid, under-worked employees of these programs.

These dudes have organized an Anti-Poverty factory in the name of helping the poor by robbing the tax-payers.

Quite naturally they will do everything in their power to keep their Anti-Poverty Factory U.S.A. in action.

I live, eat and sleep in the ghetto, I'm raising my family in the ghetto, I pastor a church in the ghetto, the North Star Mission is in the ghetto, and I will call any man or woman a liar and prove they are lying if they say these programs have helped the poverty stricken American.

The North Star Mission has been trying to educate the public to the fraud of Anti-Poverty Factory U.S.A. even before Nixon was elected President in 1968.

The North Star Mission invites any person or groups of persons, black or white to come into the Lawndale area, knock on any door they so please and ask the question, "What has the so-called Anti-Poverty program done to help you?"

Ninety-five percent of the people wouldn't even know what you are talking about. They would stare at you as if you had asked them, "How many spits in a dip of snuff?"

But, if you knock on the door of any Precinct Captain, Ward Committeeman or Alderman and ask them the question, "What has the Anti-Poverty program done for you?", if they would be truthful they would say, "It has created patronage jobs for certain people who are used by the crooked political machines to steal votes by misusing the rights of the voters and the programs have lined their pockets with 'In God We Trust' and stripped their hearts of honesty."

In April of 1971 the North Star Mission along with many other organizations identified many people who worked in the so-called Model Cities program who were out on the street hustling votes for the existing political machine in Chicago at the taxpayers expense.

One thing the mass of Chicago citizens have experienced since Model Cities came into being is that ninety-eight percent of the Model Cities program has been Model destruction.

We ask no one to take our word for it, but we invite all to come and see for themselves.

The programs were supposed to have been designed to teach people how to help themselves, so far they have taught people how to become slaves to the city plantation, especially the blacks.

I constantly see my Black people being used and misused at the expense of the taxpayer by that black and white nigger.

The average black person can show respect for President Nixon by encouraging local responsibility in the home, in the school, in the community and in the State.

I feel that every home should have home government as long as that home government is not infringing on the rights of others.

For hundreds of years the black home, the black school and the black community has been run by irresponsible people in city halls throughout the nation.

Every Mayor and Governor should be proud of President Nixon's Revenue Sharing Program. It will teach them something they have never been taught since they have been

in office. It will teach them how to be responsible for their office as Governor or Mayor without crying on the shoulders of Congress when they fail to handle their responsibilities as they should.

How can there be responsible followers when they fail to provide responsible leadership.

Those officials who are crying about the cut-backs in wasteful programs are proving to the people they are supposed to be representing that they are incapable of assuming responsibility, like a two day old baby that cries to be fed and changed.

One old saying that is very true is, "If you throw a bone into a pack of dogs, the dog it hits is the one that barks".

When President Nixon threw a bone into the wasteful Anti-Poverty Factory U.S.A. the ones that were hit started all the barking, pretending that they are so concerned about the poor. None of them that barked are poor.

If they are so concerned about the welfare of the poor we ask them to answer these questions. "What have they ever done as an individual, completely on their own, to help the poor?"

Have they given one child, other than their own a scholarship to college? Have they gone into the poor communities and paid one family's rent or bought them food? Have they bought paint, lumber or tools for one family to fix up their property? Have they loaned one family money to help renovate their building? Have they moved into the poor community to offer their physical labor, talents or skills where ever they are needed? Have they taken one poor Black or Appalachian child to an Art or Science Museum or to a Historical monument.

President Nixon has been receiving information from the North Star Mission about these wasteful programs since he was first elected in 1968. If he would have done something then about these programs the economy of our country would have been in much better shape and there would have been less thieves today.

It's better late than never.

I'm sure you know this is not a political endorsement but the facts regarding the Anti-Poverty Factory U.S.A.

We hope President Nixon will establish programs to train people to become responsible for the Government instead of programs that train Government to be responsible for the people.

If people are trained to become responsible for their Government they will automatically become responsible for their jobs, their homes and their community.

If there were programs that taught people to be responsible for the Government, in the next twenty years ninety-five percent of the problems, that are destroying America today would be solved.

Since 1934 the Government has been responsible for the people. One thing many Americans fail to understand is that the Government is the people. If the American people were taught responsibility we definitely would have a responsible Government.

In our schools, our children, regardless of race, creed or color must be taught the responsibility of love, regardless to race, creed or color.

God teaches us in His Holy word that man must make one step and He will make two.

The have-nots must be taught to make that one step and the haves must be willing to help the have-nots who take the one step to help themselves.

If big Government spending and big Unions were the answer to America's problems then why do we have more problems in America today than ever before?

The only thing big Government spending does is to make big thieves.

Billions of dollars have left Washington D.C. in the name of helping the poor. Those billions have been side-tracked into shoe

boxes, gambling casinos, Swiss bank accounts and used to help finance political campaigns.

The reward to the poor, of the money that has been allocated to help them, has been to enslave more of the poor and caused the slum conditions to grow and consume more of our cities.

We encourage President Nixon and Congress to wipe out all programs that have enslaved the poor, robbed the tax-payers and turned many people into thieves.

We encourage President Nixon and Congress to set up programs that will encourage people that they are somebody, not because they are black, white, yellow or green but because they are made in God's image after His own likeness.

We encourage every American to support any man in Congress who will set up programs to instill dignity and pride in the American people so they can hold their heads high and say, "I am somebody because I have a job and can support my family. My community is clean and not littered. My wife, mother, son, daughter and father can walk the streets without being robbed, raped or beaten up by some hoodlums".

The North Star Mission believes that those who need help should get it, also the Government should continue to provide pre-school programs for children. We also believe jobs should be available to those who are able to work for themselves, they should not receive welfare.

To all those who have been employed by the Anti-Poverty Factory U.S.A., if you are willing to give a company eight hours of work for eight hours of pay, we will seek employment for you. Call the North Star Mission at 522-7610 for an interview.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FAVORS JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, we are all interested in an excellent statement that affects college students. Arch Booth, executive vice president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, spoke out with sound logic on the effect of minimum wage on college student employment. As I had an opportunity to work my way through college, I hope that many of our present generation will have the same opportunity.

Five million individuals in the chamber of commerce received the message of Arch Booth. I would like for my colleagues to also read this expression from the representative voice of the chamber as it also affects your own community. The following is Booth's statement:

STATEMENT BY ARCH BOOTH

I notice that some outfit calling itself "the National Student Lobby" is reported to have proposed a boycott of McDonald's. Why? Because the president of that company has supported legislation to set a lower federal minimum wage for young people.

Sounds logical, right? If you want to help students, you demand that they get the same rate of pay as anyone else, right? No, wrong. With friends like that, students don't need any enemies.

The fact is, raising the minimum wage to \$2, as is being discussed in Congress—with-out an exemption, or lower rate for students

and the young—would have these effects: 1. Wholesale elimination of student jobs. 2. Increases in college tuition costs. 3. Reduction or elimination of many campus services.

SOME EXAMPLES

Take Michigan State University as an example. For the 1971-72 school year, Michigan employed 7,000 students at a minimum wage rate of \$1.60 an hour. If the minimum were hiked to \$2 an hour, with no exemption for students, the University's costs would increase by \$2,475,000. Some other examples: Brigham Young University, \$1,378,000; Oklahoma State, \$2,121,600; Illinois State, \$1,308,320; University of Iowa, \$1,591,200, and so on.

Where would a hard-pressed school get this kind of money? The answer is, it wouldn't. Tuition might be raised a little. Some money might be squeezed out of the state or federal governments. But most of that potential increase would have to be absorbed by a reduction of student jobs.

Obviously, the students who need the jobs would suffer. So would other students, because many of the services that were made possible by the use of part-time student help would have to be eliminated. Cafeteria and dorm service would decrease, libraries and snack shops would cut their hours of operation, maintenance of grounds and buildings would decline, secretarial service and research assistance would be cut back.

How do we know these things would come to pass? Because they have already happened at educational institutions in major metropolitan areas, where competition—not legislation—keeps wage rates well above the minimum.

In a big metropolitan area there is at least a good possibility that students who need jobs will be able to find them somewhere. But what about small towns, where the college is the major employer?

The outlook would be even more grim for the high school student or the school dropout. This group already suffers a very high rate of unemployment. Things would get worse without a "youth differential" in any new minimum wage legislation.

A POLITICAL GESTURE

Raising the pay of those at the bottom of the income ladder by Congressional decree always sounds so warm hearted that it's difficult for people to see the real danger in it. If the new minimum wage is below the rate already prevailing in the marketplace, then it does no harm—it's just a gesture. But if the legal minimum is substantially higher than the prevailing wage rate; if, in other words, the rate is set higher than the labor is worth to an employer, then the inevitable result is the elimination of jobs.

Congress may establish a minimum wage rate, but it does not provide the money to pay it. Seldom are the pernicious effects of this political gambit as clear as they are in the case of student jobs at our colleges and universities.

FREEDOM FOR IRAQI JEWS

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. Speaker, the plight of Soviet Jewish people has become a grave concern to millions of Americans in recent years. However, the persecution of Jews living in Iraq is also alarming and distressing. The Jewish Community of Iraq, estimated to be in the area of 500 persons, lives in an

atmosphere of fear. Frequent political executions and imprisonments are gradually killing Iraqi Jews.

The Iraqi Government has recently reversed an earlier position, allowing Jews to emigrate, and has severely tightened emigration restrictions. Those few allowed to leave are permitted to take minimal possessions with them.

The emigration of the Iraqi Jewish Community will obviously not harm the country's economy. There are no logical reasons for the Iraqi Government to prevent these people from emigrating. The Jews of Iraq are not asking for their rights back; they do not want their confiscated property back. All they ask is permission to leave the country which has persecuted them.

I urge the Iraqi Government to grant two reasonable requests to its Jewish people. First, those Jews wishing to emigrate should be allowed to do so immediately, with an adequate amount of personal property; and second, those Jews who choose to stay in Iraq should be permitted to live in peace and be treated in the same manner, with the same rights and privileges which other Iraqi citizens presently enjoy.

I have sent a letter to the President of Iraq, His Excellency Maj. Gen. Hasa al-Bakr, asking him to describe the present situation of the Jews in Iraq, and to respond to allegations concerning the mistreatment of Jewish Iraqis. The following is the text of that letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
February 26, 1973.

His Excellency Major General AHMED HASAN AL-BAKR,
President, The Republic of Iraq, Baghdad, Iraq.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Over the past several weeks, certain allegations concerning the mistreatment of Jews in Iraq have come to my attention, and I find them most disturbing. Therefore, I would appreciate your response to the following questions:

1. What are the present circumstances of the below listed individuals? Are they alive? If not, what caused their deaths? Are any of these people under arrest? If yes, what charges have been brought, and what are the dates of trial? Have any of these individuals been convicted of a criminal offense? If so, what offense?

Yaacov Abdul Aziz.
Ezra Khazam.
Azuri Shamash.
Shaul Shamash.
Shaul Rejwan.
Yaacov Rejwan.
Ezra Abu Daud.
Selim Sadka.
Maji Sittat.
Ezra Shemtov.

2. What provisions have been made for the naming of a new Grand Rabbi of Iraq? When will this occur?

3. The names, locations and presiding Rabbis of any synagogues holding services on at least a weekly basis in Iraq.

4. The names of all persons held in jail in Iraq who are Jews, the charges against these people and their scheduled trial dates.

5. The names of all Jews convicted of crimes and presently held in Iraqi jails, the crimes of which these individuals were convicted, the transcripts of their trials, and the length of sentence to be served.

6. The names and crimes of all persons executed under Iraqi law during the past four years.

7. A description of the type of identifica-

tion that an Iraqi Jew must carry, and how it differs from that which other Iraqis must carry, either in regulations stipulating the need for such identification, or the color size, or prominence of religious identification of the papers themselves.

8. The nature of emigration restrictions imposed on Iraqi Jews, the difficulty involved in obtaining emigration papers, and the exact cash amount that an emigrating Jew may take with him upon departure.

It is my hope that the problems raised above will be settled in such a manner that relations between the United States and the government of Iraq will be both friendly and cooperative. Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Yours sincerely,

MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON.

TRIBUTES PAID TO COPERNICUS ON 500TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are special programs, exhibits, concerts, and other events being arranged throughout the world this year in tribute to the 500th anniversary of the birth of Nicolaus Copernicus.

The birthdate of this renowned Polish scientist is February 19 and a number of events were scheduled for that day, including my own extended remarks in the House.

But, we in the United States encountered a "Monday holiday law" conflict with the official national observance of George Washington's birthday.

Because of that conflict and because it lends itself to even greater scientific emphasis and recognition in honor of the great Polish astronomer who defied strict teachings of his day, accent now is being focused upon the week of April 23.

During that week, the Smithsonian Institution, in cooperation with the National Academy of Sciences, has arranged a major scientific seminar here in Washington which will give prime attention to the Copernican theory.

On the opening day, April 23, the U.S. Postal Service will issue its 8-cent commemorative stamp in honor of Copernicus. The first-day ceremony will be at the Smithsonian where extensive exhibits are being developed for public viewing in this peak tourist period.

Mr. Speaker, Editor Henry J. Dende of the Pol-Am Journal, published monthly in Scranton, Pa., has compiled an impressive summary of the tributes being arranged in honor of Copernicus.

As part of my remarks, I include the text of his summary:

U.S. TRIBUTE TO COPERNICUS (KOPERNIK)

The celebrations of Nicolaus Copernicus (Mikolaj Kopernik) 500th anniversary have officially been launched on the eve of the great Polish astronomer's birth, Feb. 18, in the United States, and will continue throughout the year 1973.

The Copernicus Exhibition at ESS/N is part of an international celebration. UNESCO and the International Council of Scientific (ICSU) have declared 1973 to be

"Copernicus Year." The first international observance was a UNESCO program in Paris on Feb. 19. The U.S. Postmaster General will issue a special commemorative stamp, which is expected to be repeated by many countries of the world, on April 23.

The year 1973 in Poland has been proclaimed "The Year of Polish Science," in honor of Kopernik. The aim is to have these observances leave a lasting imprint on the achievements of Polish science, to popularize them throughout the world and to enrich Poland's scientific community with new and permanent facilities.

CHICAGO CENTER PLANNED

Philadelphia plans to unveil a monument to the Polish astronomer. Chicago Pol-Am Congress has spearheaded a drive to build a multi-million dollar "Copernicus Cultural-Civic Center." The scientific institutions of Europe are sponsoring activities during a number of national and international ceremonies to the founder of modern astronomy.

During the month of April, the Smithsonian Institution in Washington will devote its Fifth International Symposium "The Nature of Scientific Discovery" in cooperation with the National Academy of Science to the origin of modern science for which Copernicus is given credit.

In the United States, committees have been formed in nearly every city, to pay homage to the author of the heliocentric theory. A brief rundown of the Kopernik celebrations in numerous cities follow:

Copernicus activities at Alliance College, Cambridge Springs, Pa., began with a banquet on Feb. 17, followed by a week-long series of lectures on topics as "Copernicus and Galileo," "The Art and Architecture of the Copernican Era" and "The Heliocentric Theory of Copernicus." A Renaissance setting dominated the banquet atmosphere.

MIAMI, FLA.

Throughout Feb., the Copernicus Committee of Florida, sponsored exhibits at Miami Public Library, with a "Copernicus Night" on Feb. 22, at the Library having Dr. Donald Duke, prof. of astronomy at U of Miami as speaker. In March, a display will be held at Barry College in Miami Shores. An essay contest is being sponsored for all 8th grade children, titled "Copernicus and His Country—Poland."

The Kosciuszko Foundation's Copernican exhibit entitled "Cracow in the Time of Copernicus" is on its American tour. The exhibit features pictures, documents connected with Copernicus' student days at Cracow U, illustrations of Cracovian life during the Renaissance. Parties interested in sponsoring the exhibit write: Stanley Cuba, Kosciuszko Foundation, 15 E. 65th St., New York City (Phone: 212-734-2130).

Copernicus Committee in Milwaukee, Wisc. area, held a lecture at the Univ. of Wisconsin Planetarium on Jan. 31; a mini convention on Pol-Am matters by Wisconsin Educators of Polish Heritage at the Int'l Institute; a gala Copernicus banquet on Feb. 25, at Hotel Pfister; on April 2, a lecture by Prof. Karol Estreicher, at Marquette U, Todd Wehr Chemistry Bldg., on "Krawow at the time of Kopernik"; June 2-27, an exhibit of original Copernicus instruments at Milwaukee Public Museum.

MICHIGAN

The Engineering Society of Detroit, together with the local Copernicus Committee held a banquet entitled "The Past, Present and Future of Space."

Pledge of \$50,000 for a room in the Detroit Science Center was made, where a \$50,000 bust of Copernicus will be located.

The Detroit Public Library opened an exhibit on Feb. 19, called "Copernicus the Great Humanist." A 1566 Basel printing of Copernicus "De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium"

tum" is one of the featured documents. A bronze bust of Copernicus was presented to the City of Detroit in ceremonies at the main Detroit Public Library . . . A "Copernicus Commemorative Concert" auspices of Pol-Am Congress will be held April 15 at the Music Hall in Detroit.

In Hamtramck, Mich., the Liberty State Bank, 9301 Jos. Campau Ave., is the depository for Copernicus Silver Medallions. This treasured special limited issue of 500 sterling silver coins are engraved with a portrait of Copernicus, the reverse side pictures Copernicus Orbiting Astronomical Observatory launched Aug. 21, 1972 at Kennedy Space Center. Each coin costs \$15.00.

BUFFALO, N.Y.

The State University of New York at Buffalo, N.Y., in cooperation with other universities, scientific associations and citizens groups, have coordinated a series of lectures, concert, exhibit and films in celebration of the Copernican year, which began Feb. 23 and continues through April 2 . . . The Western N.Y. Chapter of the Polish American Congress in cooperation with the Felician Sisters and the Copernicus Educational Aid Assn., presented a Copernicus program at Villa Maria College, March 4. The program featured the Chopin Singing Society and the Buffalo Civic Orchestra, plus exhibits in the college library and at the main Buffalo and Erie County Public Library during the month of March.

Adler Planetarium throughout March is presenting a sky show titled "Captives of the Sun" which shows the contributions of Copernicus to Astronomy . . . The Natural Sciences and useful Arts Dept. of Chicago Library has portrayed "The Life, Work and Times of Copernicus." The exhibit was loaned by the Society of Polish Arts & Letters . . . The Polish American Congress, Illinois Division is coordinating the Copernicus activities.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Polonia of Washington, D.C. in conjunction with the U.S. Park Service will sponsor "Copernicus Day On The Mall" on the grounds of the Sylvan Theatre complex on April 28, ending a week-long events paying tribute to the Polish astronomer.

A year-long Copernicus celebration is planned by Orchard Lake, (Mich.) Schools which consists of: a Founders Day Historical Symposium; a drama on the life of Copernicus is being prepared by students of the Prep school; the Sodalis-Polonia magazine, devoted its current issue (in the Polish language) to Copernicus and his work; Rev. Z. Peszkowski of OLS, will author three pamphlets on the works of the Polish genius.

Arizona State University year-long observance includes a Copernicus display in Hayden Library, ASU; the Arizona Academy of Science will organize programs; Education TV, Cha. 8, will produce a program on Copernicus (Kopernik); the planetarium at ASU will have a public three-lecture series; a bust of Copernicus will be presented to Arizona State by the state chapter of the Polish American Congress.

City Hall in Jersey City was the scene of a Copernicus program; freeholders of Hudson County issued a proclamation; three Bayonne, N.J. high schools prepared an exhibit honoring the Polish astronomer; the Pol-Am Congress, South Jersey Div., is sponsoring an essay contest on Kopernik, among high school students in Camden (N.J.) county; Women's Auxiliary of Polish University Club of N.J.P. fashion show will be dedicated to Copernicus on March 14, in West Orange, N.J.; Pulaski Citizens Club of Perth Amboy is planning a number of Copernicus events; an adult education program in tribute to Kopernik, at Seton Hall Univ., S. Orange, N.J., on May 6 under auspices of local Pol-Am cultural groups.

OTHER CITIES

Minneapolis, Minn.—Pol Am Congress, Minn. Div., has urged city officials to change the name of Central Ave., in Minneapolis, to "Copernicus Ave."

Cleveland, O.—This city launched its Copernicus activities with a banquet, on Feb. 18, with NASA Director Bruce T. Ludin as guest speaker.

Cupertino, Calif.—A public unveiling of a 4x4-ft. painting of Mikolaj Kopernik, at Minolta Planetarium at DeAnza College, (one of the newest and largest planetariums) held Feb. 18.

Wilkes-Barre, Pa.—Premiere showing of film strip on life of Copernicus held at dinner at the Treadway Inn, sponsored by the Polish Union. The film strips will be distributed to all local schools. Ernest Cuneo, noted writer, journalist, was the principal speaker.

Hartford, Conn.—Polish University Club presented a lecture by Dr. Karol Estreicher of Poland, noted scholar, who spoke on "Cracow and Copernicus. Local Pol-Am Congress is planning many other educational activities in colleges, museums, libraries, etc.

Youngstown, O.—The 39th annual Polish Arts Club Exhibition at Butler Institute of American Art, was dedicated to Copernicus from Feb. 4-25.

Winona, Minn.—Copernicus 500th anniversary observed by the Mathematics-Physics Dept. of College of St. Teresa at Regent Bacon Planetarium, Feb. 19. Featured were fantastic displays and Polish refreshments.

Poughkeepsie, N.Y.—A "Copernicus Weekend" held here Feb. 17-19 auspices of Pol-Am Citizens Club, which included a dinner, dance, scientific exhibits, illustrated slide talks, arts & crafts, etc.

Lynn, Mass.—A joint effort of local Pol-Am civic groups, educators from local high schools and colleges, arts clubs, have formulated plans honoring the Polish astronomer with a long-list of activities for the coming months.

Springfield, Mass.—Dinner held by Pol-Am Congress, West, Mass. Division, which included proclamation by Gov. Sargent, and a talk by Dr. Frank D. Korkosz, director of the Springfield Museum of Science on "The Impact of Copernicus." A Mass was held at Our Lady of the Rosary Church paying religious tribute to Kopernik.

New York—Programs commemorating Kopernik are being planned by the Nassau County (N.Y.) Pulaski Parade Committee, Inc. . . . The Copernicus Show arranged by I.B.M. at its Exhibit Center at 57th & Madison Ave., New York City, will continue to run thru the Easter season.

CONTESTS—PROMOTIONS

Edward Pliszek, Philadelphia industrialist, purchased the Polish film portraying Copernicus' life between the ages of 20 and 70, to be shown in U.S. Theatres and will be viewed on national TV. . . . WMAQ-TV, Channel 5 in Chicago, aired a series of brief, intermittent episodes on life of Copernicus last month.

ACFCC (American Council of Polish Cultural Clubs) sponsoring an essay contest on Copernicus. First prize is a round-trip ticket to Poland plus other prizes. For application blanks write: Mrs. Josepha Kontoski, 1810 5th St., Minneapolis, Minn. 55418.

B. Michael Wisniewski, a sculptor, designed a model for a plaque of Copernicus. Only 10-inch diameter, it may be hung with pride in a classroom, library, clubroom, etc. For details write: B. W. Wisniewski, 4849 W. Addison St., Chicago, Ill. 60644.

Mikolaj Kopernik Monograph, beautifully written, illustrated, size: 8½x11, 32pp., for only \$1.00, can be acquired for \$1.00 from: Wisconsin Kopernik Committee, 3552 E. Layton Ave., Cudahy, Wisc., 53110.

DETROIT'S REPOSSESSED HOMES

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit News has come out editorially in opposition to the appointment of John E. Kane as director of the Detroit area office of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Mr. Kane until last summer was Deputy Director of the Detroit-HUD office, in charge of programs to rehabilitate and sell homes repossessed by HUD after foreclosures on FHA-insured mortgages. HUD now owns some 10,500 of these homes and the waste and tragedy involved have been pinpointed and publicized in an excellent series of articles written by News staff writer, Don Ball. I personally could not agree more with Mr. Ball's concern as to the continued misallocation of our vital housing resources. At this time, I would like to insert into the RECORD, the editorial from the March 16 Detroit News and several recent news articles on the Detroit-HUD problem:

THE NEW HUD DIRECTOR—ANOTHER ALBATROSS

Thanks to HUD, Detroit is "on the map" as the city with the nation's biggest housing scandals. The Department of Housing and Urban Development has been an albatross around the neck of decent housing in this city for years. And proof of it has been published over and over again in stories by Detroit News writer Don Ball.

Now, to add the ultimate insult to irreparable injury, HUD has named John E. Kane as the new director of the Detroit-area office. Kane is the man who, as deputy director in Detroit, was in charge of programs to rehabilitate and sell homes repossessed by HUD at the height of the scandals. Those programs are prime examples of incompetency, fraud and waste of taxpayer dollars and housing resources.

Every one of them, from the miserable failure of "vest-pocket" rehabilitation to the cozy deals with certain rehabilitators and "nonprofit" organizations, can be laid at Kane's doorstep. Last summer, when a HUD task force arrived to salvage the wreckage of Detroit's housing disaster, Kane was off to Milwaukee where, we suppose, he couldn't do too much harm in a short time since that city had the nation's best HUD program under its former directors.

Now the Detroit task force is gone, having spent \$2 million and accomplishing nothing. In its wake, former Detroit HUD Director William C. Whitbeck politely bows out and manages to land a post with the Michigan Public Service Commission. And John Kane is brought back to Detroit, where all those miserable mistakes were made under his direct responsibility. And this time he is director of the whole operation. One can only shudder at the thought of spreading incompetency over a wider area of authority.

Detroit homeowner groups, fighting desperately against HUD's neighborhood cancer, should be up in arms over the appointment. So should Mayor Gribbs and all city and state officials concerned with housing. In Washington, our senators should object strenuously to the appointment and Martha Griffiths, Democratic representative from the northwest Detroit area now succumbing to HUD cancer, should lead the battle.

Why should Detroit, already victimized by HUD policies, with thousands of homes wasting away, with millions of dollars down the drain, have to sit back and take even one

more week of Kane's "direction"? Is Washington determined to scuttle any hope of a decent housing program in Detroit?

That's what will happen unless Detroit gets superior government managers, more resources to correct the existing foul-ups and new programs that have a chance of working.

ALL IN DETROIT AND OWNED BY HUD—10,500 HOMES WASTING AWAY (By Don Ball)

There are some 10,500 of them in the city of Detroit.

Practically all were once good solid homes where families lived happily, and could again. But all of them are now vacant.

And many that are sound today will be wrecks before long.

They are houses now owned by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) after owners defaulted on FHA-insured mortgages.

One such house, which sold for \$27,500 on Sept. 18, 1970, stands rotting on Muirland in northwest Detroit's university district, North of McNichols and West of Livernois.

Once a beautiful five-bedroom home with a tile roof and a pegged-wood floor in its plush game room, it has suffered more than \$15,000 in damages caused by standing neglected and unheated for eight months.

Waterpipes froze and burst, flooding the basement. Water from a roof leak seriously damaged floors, ceilings and walls from attics to ground level. Hardwood floors buckled, and creak threateningly at each footstep.

The house has been owned by HUD since last August. It was repossessed after a default on the FHA-insured mortgage. The owners had paid \$3,000 down and another \$1,000 in closing costs to buy the home in September, 1970.

The house probably will be torn down now because it would be "uneconomical" to repair the damages caused by the neglect of the property.

In the St. Mary's of Redford area in northwest Detroit, another HUD-owned home has stood vacant since October, 1970, when it was repossessed by HUD.

Again, it was not a "speculator's deal" and the family which bought it wasn't poor. There was a \$3,000 down payment and more than \$1,000 in closing costs.

Since repossessing it, HUD has poured more than \$12,000 into repairs on the house—some of the work was done twice, according to neighbors—but HUD has yet to sell it.

In North Rosedale Park, a few blocks west of Southfield and just south of McNichols, a \$32,000 HUD-owned home has remained vacant and deteriorating since December 1971.

In each case, there have been buyers who wanted to purchase the homes but couldn't get through HUD red tape.

Taken alone, the three homes could be explained as isolated cases.

But they are only four of hundreds of prime northwest Detroit homes which HUD owns and seems unable to market.

Other examples are four brick homes in one block on Lesure near Puritan which have been standing vacant for months, and three neighboring empty homes on Prest near Fenkell.

There are five vacant brick homes in the 15000 block of Pinehurst, and another four vacant brick homes within doors of each other in the 15400 block of Monte Vista.

Similar groups of homes can be found throughout northwest Detroit.

All sound and comparatively young structures, the houses should have been snapped up by families seeking good buys in the handsome northwest Detroit neighborhood.

Instead, they've stood vacant and neglected for anywhere from six months to more than two years.

Neighborhood associations see them as cancers which threaten the health of entire blocks of otherwise sound homes.

"First there's one HUD home, then two and the next you know there are four or five in your block," one community spokesman said.

"At times, HUD seems so mixed up that it doesn't even know that it owns the houses.

"We've had families wanting to buy the homes in our neighborhood and they get nothing but the run-around from HUD."

The Detroit News reviewed HUD records of all repossessed homes in the area bounded roughly by Woodward, West McNichols, Livernois; Schoolcraft, Telegraph and West Eight Mile.

HUD owns more than 1,300 empty houses in the 31-square-mile area—many of them repossessed as long ago as 1970-71, according to HUD records.

In a two-day tour of the area, The News found that most of the HUD properties were brick homes in the \$17,000-\$35,000 value range.

With few exceptions, the houses were sound structures in otherwise thriving neighborhoods.

Most of the houses were last sold by owners who lived in them, rather than by speculators. Many of the homes had been bought with "conventional" FHA mortgages, those which require a substantial downpayment and hefty closing costs.

HUD repossessed most of the homes after the buyers defaulted for traditional reasons—divorce, financial reverses and death.

Before 1970, the houses probably would have been resold by HUD within months after being repossessed.

That was before fraud, corruption and mismanagement in FHA programs generated a tidal wave of foreclosures which deluged the Detroit HUD office with thousands of repossessed homes.

The increase in repossessed homes in Detroit—from about 900 in January, 1970, to nearly 5,000 in January, 1972—swamped HUD's machinery for disposing of such properties.

As a result, thousands of Detroit homes have stood empty and apparently forgotten by HUD since then, even when buyers sought to purchase them.

New approaches by HUD to marketing the properties seem only to have added to the problem.

In 1971, HUD gave a number of nonprofit firms the exclusive rights to rehabilitate and market more than 600 of the HUD homes in Detroit along with a \$3,200 bonus for each home sold.

Some of the firms were founded simply to get into the HUD program. Their owners had little or no experience in the building field.

The nonprofit firms rehabilitated few homes and sold less. Of those which were sold, many turned out to have shoddy workmanship and incomplete repairs.

And hundreds of homes were kept off the market for many months because they were tied up in the nonprofit program. Several have since been demolished because they deteriorated so badly during that time in limbo.

Early last year, HUD set up 10 "vest pocket rehabilitation areas" and selected a "building firm" to rehabilitate and sell the repossessed homes in each area.

The program collapsed when only three of the 10 firms were able to produce financial backing and state licenses required by HUD.

Months elapsed between conception of the program and its failure—again a time when nothing was done about nearly 1,000 repossessed homes involved in the project.

Last summer, a special task force of experts recruited from Washington and other HUD offices across the nation was sent to Detroit at a cost of \$2 million to straighten out the problem of repossessed homes.

Ben T. Austin, director of the task force, left Detroit last October with assurances that within four months the problem would be well in hand as a result of new procedures he had instituted.

That has not been the case.

Spokesmen for the real estate industry and mortgage firms agree with homeowner organizations that the problem is even worse than before the task force came to Detroit.

Last year, HUD repossessed 5,700 Detroit homes while selling only about 1,000 of those on hand.

At the end of the year, HUD estimated it would take nearly eight years to dispose of all the properties it owns if not another house was repossessed.

At that time, HUD owned more than 9,000 Detroit homes.

In the first two months of this year, HUD repossessed approximately 1,200 homes in the city while selling only 165.

Several eastside Detroit neighborhoods also provide graphic examples of the problem.

Some east side streets are virtual "ghost towns" of boarded-up houses, many charred by fires or gutted by vandals.

Occasionally there are HUD homes newly rehabilitated but vacant—buyers don't want empty HUD houses as neighbors.

HUD's demolition of hundreds of east side homes has left wastelands of weed-grown lots.

Some 2,800 houses have been torn down in Detroit by HUD and another 1,800 are scheduled for demolition.

And an increasing number of the demolitions are now in northwest Detroit.

HUD'S HOUSING COMEDY ISN'T FUNNY IN DETROIT (By Don Ball)

The FHA fiasco in Detroit would be a real belly laugh if it wasn't a crying shame.

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) administers the FHA program. As a result, it owns more than 10,500 residential properties in the Detroit area, all repossessed after owners defaulted on FHA-insured mortgages.

HUD's bumbling efforts to rehabilitate and sell the homes, including thousands of the finest houses in the city, provide the comedy.

For instance, look what happened to a \$25,000 house at 15308 Lindsay in St. Mary's of Redford parish in northwest Detroit.

HUD repossessed the home on May 13, 1971. A neighbor recently wrote The Detroit News the following account of what happened. Details of the letter have been checked for accuracy by The News.

"A man came out to measure windows in the house in order to bid on the HUD contract to provide storms and screens," the neighbor wrote.

"We asked him what would happen to the house.

"First," he said, HUD would put in a new furnace. We told him it didn't need a new furnace: one had been installed in 1970.

"He said that didn't make any difference, HUD would tear out that furnace and put in a new one.

"He was right. A HUD contractor showed up one day, ripped out the furnace and carted it away in pieces.

"Now HUD has put in a new furnace.

"The man also told us HUD would tear down the garage because it would cost \$500 to put in a ratwall and only \$150 to tear it down.

"The garage was in excellent shape but the man was right again. HUD tore down the garage.

"Next, a flock of workmen descended on the home but very few of them seemed to know their jobs.

"I have worked around professional car-

penters, painters, glaziers and cement men long enough to know a professional.

"These men were strictly a pickup team.

"Finally, I wrote to my congressman who sent the letter to William C. Whitbeck, Detroit HUD director, for answers.

"In time I got his reply.

"Whitbeck said in his letter, dated June 2, 1972, that the property had been sold.

"The house is still empty."

HUD records show thousands of dollars were spent repairing the house in 1971, but the work had to be done all over again at a cost of additional thousands of dollars in 1972.

The house still has not been listed for sale by HUD.

Even when a buyer is found for a HUD home, it is not the end of the situation.

For example, a house at 19660 Stratford in Sherwood Forest was repossessed by HUD on April 4, 1970. More than \$15,000 worth of repairs have been made to it since then.

HUD has "sold" the house three different times for prices ranging from \$35,000 to \$38,000.

Each buyer, however, has been unable to pass FHA financial requirements for FHA mortgage insurance. So the "sales" have fallen through.

The house is still empty.

HUD regulations require that if more than one buyer bids on a repossessed home, there must be a drawing of lots. The winner gets to buy the house.

Many of the "winners" subsequently proved to be financially unqualified to buy the houses and they had to be advertised all over again. Months elapsed before new drawings were conducted.

Now, a "backup" buyer is selected for each HUD house, but there still are instances when both the buyer and the backup buyer fail to qualify, forcing the readvertising of houses.

HUD's efforts to rehabilitate and market some of its houses have also been tragic.

A house at 14826 Stansbury was repossessed in 1970, and HUD spent \$12,000 rehabilitating it—then tore it down, according to HUD records.

A house at 14401 Stansbury suffered the same fate, but HUD spent only \$9,000 in repairs before calling in a wrecking crew.

These are two of scores of houses on which HUD has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars for rehabilitation only to end up tearing them down.

This had caused a problem for both potential buyers and real estate brokers handling the sales.

In several cases, a buyer has made an offer on a HUD home through a broker but when the time came to closing the deal—the house had been torn down.

HUD then offered the buyer another house—there are thousands to choose from—but it often is many months before the buyer's choice will be ready for occupancy.

As a result, the real estate broker also suffers.

If the buyer had been able to purchase the house on which he had made an offer to the broker, the broker would have received a 5 percent sales commission.

But when the house is torn down and the buyer purchases another HUD home, HUD refuses to pay a commission to the broker because "he didn't sell the house," a broker told The News.

"Obviously, we are not going to spend much time trying to sell HUD homes under those terms," the broker said.

But the real problem with the houses is not finding buyers.

There are plenty of buyers but HUD has insisted, at least until now, that the homes have to be rehabilitated before they can be sold.

Unfortunately, it may take years for HUD to get around to rehabilitating the particular home a buyer wants.

And—as has happened in the past—when HUD does decide to start rehabilitation on the home it may have deteriorated so badly it has to be demolished.

So far, HUD has torn down some 2,600 homes in the city and has scheduled another 2,000 for demolition.

It is willing to sell the empty lots, however.

LORADO TAFT SCULPTURE

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the city of Chicago received the last great work of the sculptor Lorado Taft as a gift in 1941. This sculpture was of George Washington, Robert Morris, and Haym Salomon. On September 15, 1971, the Chicago City Council declared the monument to be Chicago's first-named sculptural landmark.

The Senate of the State of Illinois and the Cook County Board of Commissioners have adopted a resolution urging the U.S. Postal Service to issue a commemorative postage stamp picturing the monument.

The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, on December 15, 1941, the City of Chicago accepted as a gift the heroic George Washington, Robert Morris, Haym Salomon Monument, standing in Heald Square, the last great work of the internationally known and renowned Chicago sculptor, Lorado Taft; and

Whereas, on September 15, 1971, the City Council of Chicago, by ordinance, declared the monument to be Chicago's first-named sculptural landmark; and

Whereas, the Senate of the State of Illinois on November 4, 1971 adopted a Resolution urging the United States Postal Service to issue a commemorative postage stamp picturing the monument; and

Whereas, the City Council of Chicago on February 9, 1972, unanimously adopted a resolution joining in the action urged by the Senate of Illinois that such a commemorative stamp be issued by the Postmaster General of the United States; and

Whereas, this statue is a monument of civic interest and patriotic significance which has become part of the development, heritage and cultural characteristics of Chicago, and represents the central theme that people of all origins and creeds participated in the building of the United States from the beginning.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Board of Commissioners of Cook County, Illinois, joins in the action of the Senate of the State of Illinois and the City Council of Chicago, and cooperatively supports the proposal urging the issuance by the Postmaster General of the United States of a commemorative postage stamp picturing George Washington, Robert Morris, and Haym Salomon Monument and its great patriotic significance, emphasizing that America "... gives to bigotry no sanction. . . ."

Be it further resolved, that a copy of this Resolution be sent to the Postmaster General of the United States Postal Service.

I would urge the Postal Service to comply with this request as soon as possible.

This is truly a national landmark which deserves recognition.

JAYCEES ESTABLISH CENTER FOR IMPROVED CHILD NUTRITION

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Jaycees have established a center headquartered in Minnesota to get a lunch program into every school in the country.

The 350,000 members of the jaycees, organized in 6,600 local chapters will be gearing up to marshal the local support which is essential to help to bring "no-program schools" into the program. In Minneapolis there are 19 schools without a lunch program.

I think the effort is tremendously important and I commend the jaycees:

THE PRESENT SITUATION AND U.S. JAYCEE REQUESTS

Presently, 4 million poverty school children and 23,000 schools are unable to obtain access to the National School Lunch Program. For FY 1972, Congress allotted \$33 million dollars in non-food assistance to provide facilities for those 23,000 schools, and intended to resolve the situation by 1974. The Department of Agriculture requested only \$16.1 million, however, and the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs estimates that at that rate it will be 1980 before the situation is resolved.¹

The U.S. Jaycees therefore request:

I. A directive from the President to the Department of Agriculture stating that the equipment applications of these 23,000 schools be given the utmost priority and consideration in time and budget.

Since the Department of Agriculture claims that this is the status quo, it shouldn't be much of a problem, but it could be extremely helpful in the following manner:

A. To alert these 23,000 schools to the fact that they can contact a U.S. Jaycees staff member at the national office, who can accompany their application with a letter of support, pointing to the President's Directive, and letting them know that the Jaycees will be contacting their Congressman and two Senators to help passage along.

B. In January we can mail out to the new Congress the approved Jaycees Resolution and the President's Directive. With conservative backing like that, the School Food programs won't seem quite so liberal.

Special Note—The Department of Agriculture contends that it is the local school boards who are to blame for not allowing the institution of lunch equipment in the schools. Upon examination, we discovered the following:

1. In many schools this was true. While questioning as to why, the answers were varied, but one thread was certain throughout. They could not or would not afford the 25% matching funds.

Let us examine this closely. A survey by the USDA indicated that while 80% of schools with more than 500 pupils had a food program, only 55% of those schools with less than 250 participated.² It also indicated

¹ All facts are taken from the January 1972 report "Hunger in the Classroom, Then and Now," submitted by the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, p. 55.

² School Food Journal, February 1971, p. 52.

that the huge bulk of these were elementary schools—where the program is needed most. In these little schools, the communities just can't afford much.

The USDA turned away almost \$17 million dollars during FY 1972 that should have gone to those schools that couldn't afford the 25% matching funds. These are the areas and the time in children's lives when malnutrition can wreak such havoc. Still, the USDA turned back \$17 million. WHY? In the long run, our failure to make this investment will cost this nation dearly.

A number of Jaycee chapters are going to try to finance the 25% matching funds, but you can be sure that we will be dogged and unrelenting in our desire to see the 25% matching funds eliminated as a requirement. We believe this must be an integral part of the President's directive.

2. Another frequent answer of the local board was the excess of red tape and the discouragement of having their applications returned for minor form mistakes on the application itself. Many boards just gave up.

II. The establishment of ten pilot projects to study the Universally Guaranteed School Lunch Program.

While at first this proposal seemed a bit wild-eyed, further analysis and testimony revealed a program that could eliminate a good deal of administrative waste, increase participation, and in the long run save this nation a considerable amount of money.

Let's first examine the possibility of eliminating administrative waste. The school district of St. Paul, Minnesota, tabulates its actual "out-of-pocket" expenses for clerks, printing, tickets, postage, envelopes, etc. used in trying to determine the needy child—at \$26,000 per year (administrative expenses are not included). According to Dr. John Perryman, Executive Director of the ASFSA:

"This amount would purchase approximately 48,000 meals for the school children of St. Paul. But suppose we say this figure is more or less a median with many districts larger and smaller. With something over 17,500 school districts in the nation . . . we could come up with a startling figure of roughly \$445 million dollars a year—the cost of economic segregation—a total waste—or enough money to pay for nearly a billion meals per year."³

Dr. Perryman's reference to economic discrimination brought out a number of questions. First, we do not discriminate against a child economically when he asks for the school's educational program, textbooks, or transportation—Why do we discriminate when he asks for the school's meals? Secondly, is that really constitutional? Finally, can this nation afford to needlessly waste \$445 million dollars annually (equivalent of one billion meals) in perpetuating this economic discrimination against American school children?

Regarding increased participation, Miss Josephine Martin of the Georgia School Food Program, stated the following:

"For 25 years, we've been exploiting the paying child, neglecting the poor child, and short-changing all children regarding nutritional education."

Let's examine each part of Miss Martin's statement:

A. Exploiting the paying child—

1. With an arbitrary cutoff point of \$3,700 annual income, a small businessman or working man making \$4,000–\$10,000 is bearing a tremendous burden. If he can't qualify for the free lunch program and can't afford to pay for it, who suffers? The child and, ultimately, the nation.

2. Just because the parent has money doesn't necessarily mean the child gets it.

³ Presented in testimony before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor, regarding H.R. 13452.

And just because the child gets it doesn't mean he spends it on lunch. The Universal Program would guarantee that.

3. Malnutrition is apparent in "affluent" families as well as impoverished. While a number of USDA findings point to the same conclusion, a survey by the University of Iowa stated it most clearly:

"Results of a nutritional study by the University of Iowa College of Medicine among some 2,000 healthy-appearing Iowa teen agers indicate that children of middle and high income families can also be ill nourished. Breakfast was commonly skipped, because of lack of time or family habit. Lunch often provided the most balanced meal of the day if it was eaten in the cafeteria. For many students, lunch away from the school premises was french fried potatoes, a soft drink, and a candy bar."⁴

B. Neglecting the poor child—Even in schools with the food program, over 3 million poverty children are unable to obtain access to the School Lunch Program. Why?

1. The parents are too proud to accept charity or too embarrassed to sign the means statement. So who suffers? The child and, ultimately, the nation.

2. The child is too emotionally upset at being segregated into "poor lines" or wearing a "red tag". The National School Act requires that schools "protect the anonymity of children receiving free or reduced price lunches." But "PIC", published by the Public Information Center, a nonprofit organization in Washington, D.C., reports these practices:

(a) Those receiving free or reduced price lunches have a black star on their food card.

(b) Officials use red tags in the lunch lines to brand poor children.

(c) Children receiving free lunches are segregated in line.

(d) Separate lunch lines or lunch periods are used, depending on the schools.

(e) Poor children line up in front of the principal's office once a week to get their food cards.⁵

3. Local officials are reluctant to grant many free lunches, and having the power to deny a child or family access to the program, can and do play politics with the physical, mental, and emotional lives of American children.

The Universally Guaranteed would almost immediately bring these poverty children into the program, which we see as being a huge long-range saving.

Still, we are not asking for the establishment of the program, but merely study of it by means of the pilot projects. We believe it is imperative to see just how the grades, attendance, and overall health and participation are affected—and how much is saved by eliminating the bureaucracy. We believe that, overall, it will prove a far more efficient, humane, and in the long run, far less costly program.

THE DAILY NEWS LOOKS AT OEO

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, for the perusal of my colleagues, I am inserting a recent editorial from the New York Daily News entitled "The Case Against OEO."

THE CASE AGAINST OEO

Was summed up in a nutshell recently by Howard Phillips, acting director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. He spoke out to demolish claims made in a self-serving report compiled by anti-poverty bureaucrats to trumpet the glorious achievements of Community Action Programs.

After picking apart the survey figures, Phillips noted that among the 900 existing CAP agencies outlays for payroll and administrative costs commonly run to 85% of allotted funds. That leaves precious little to filter down to the needy.

Top-heavy bureaucracy has been the bane of the entire OEO operation since it began. It is the main reason President Richard M. Nixon wants to abolish the outfit.

Professional anti-poverty fighters and their friends squawk that if OEO dies billions in federal aid will be snatched from the hands of the poor. It's a false alarm.

Salvageable anti-poverty activities will be shuffled into existing government departments. Outlays also will be maintained near present levels, but the money will pass through regular federal channels or—if Congress approves—directly to states and cities.

All the sound and fury is not over whether the poor should be aided, but over how best to do it.

Mr. Nixon's approach is by far the more sensible—and more likely to give a lift to the great mass of poor people, most of whom have reaped disappointment.

DON EDWARDS RECEIVES TWO AWARDS FOR ROLE IN EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT PASSAGE

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, our colleague DON EDWARDS, who had the major responsibility for securing passage of the equal rights amendment in the House as chairman of Judiciary Subcommittee No. 4, was honored for his efforts on two recent occasions.

In his congressional district in California, the South Bay and San Jose chapters of the National Organization for Women—NOW—presented their first annual Susan B. Anthony Award to DON EDWARDS, citing his indispensable role in obtaining House action on the proposal which had been throttled in the House Judiciary Committee for 40 successive years. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I am familiar with the legislative history of the equal rights amendment, and when it was facing its darkest hour and possible death, endangered by well meaning but destructive qualifying language, it was DON EDWARDS who stood fast and persevered in his efforts to obtain House passage for a pure amendment which is now the subject of ratification pending before the States.

Mr. Speaker, I am including at this point in the Record an article describing this presentation:

EDWARDS GETS ANTHONY AWARD

Rep. Don Edwards, D-San Jose, has been given the Susan B. Anthony Award for his efforts in the congressional passage of the Equal Rights Amendment.

⁴ School Lunch Journal, February, 1971.

⁵ School Lunch Journal, January, 1971.

The award was given to Edwards by the South Bay and San Jose chapters of the National Organization for Women (NOW).

Presenting Edwards the award were Christin Klemmer, president of the South Bay chapter; Yvonne Aguillar, vice president of the San Jose chapter, and Rhoda Freier, National Women's Political Caucus chairwoman of the Santa Clara County chapter. "Without your contribution the Equal Rights Amendment might never have been passed by Congress," the women told Edwards.

Edwards, as chairman of the House Judiciary subcommittee on civil rights oversights, helped push the Equal Rights Amendment through the Judiciary Committee despite the strong opposition to its chairman, Rep. Emanuel Celler, D-N.Y.

Edwards later said "I don't think I have done anything more important in my 10 years in Congress. This amendment will improve the quality of life throughout America."

Susan B. Anthony was an early fighter for women's rights. She was arrested, fined and convicted for casting a ballot at a time when it was illegal for women to vote.

More recently, Women's Lobby sponsored a luncheon here in Washington to honor DON EDWARDS for his leadership in the legislative struggle for equal rights for women and men. The text of the plaque presented to him on this occasion reads:

With much appreciation, to Hon. Don Edwards, Chairperson, Subcommittee No. 4 When our forefathers said all men are created equal . . . all men is exactly what they meant!

If you're a woman—you're not equal! The Equal Rights Amendment: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any state on account of sex."

Passed by the House of Representatives October 12, 1971.

Passed by the U.S. Senate (84-8) March 22, 1972.

Crater's Raiders.

Mr. Speaker, an article from the San Jose Mercury describes the event:

WOMEN ACTIVISTS HONOR EDWARDS
(By Gil Galley)

(NOTE.—"Equality of rights under the laws shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any state on account of sex," says a constitutional amendment approved by Congress and now before the state legislatures.")

WASHINGTON.—The father, or perhaps more accurately the congressional mid-wife of the women's equal rights amendment, Rep. Don Edwards, (D-San Jose) was honored Wednesday by an activist women's rights organization.

The award came at the end of a series of women's protests and political meetings in Washington and throughout the country.

Officially, the Women's Lobby, Inc. presented its plaque to "Chairperson" Edwards as the head of the House Judiciary subcommittee, which finally pushed the amendment through Congress after 40 years of failure.

Edwards, a trim and youthful 58, accepted the plaque in a banquet room, usually crowded with middle-aged and male politicians hidden by their own cigar smoke. Instead the room held two dozen women and only three males, including Edwards, with the only smoke coming from a male reporter's cigaret.

Rep. Martha Griffiths, (D-Mich) the author of the amendment gave Edwards the credit for steering the equal rights measure through the Congress.

"If it weren't for Don Edwards, it wouldn't have passed," she said as she announced that the state of Vermont had just approved the amendment.

"I was merely one of the troops in your army," Edwards told the women.

He then outlined how his subcommittee on civil rights approved the amendment only to have it amended in the full House Judiciary Committee in a manner unacceptable to women's rights groups by an 18-to-17 vote.

Edwards explained women's groups throughout the nation pressured House members finally to approve the constitutional amendment without any crippling new clauses.

He then proposed that the women put the pressure on the White House to back the amendment in the States.

"Perhaps the President will send Henry Kissinger to the states to explain the need for the amendment," Edwards suggested.

For Edwards, the passage of the amendment was a personal victory. The former chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, New York's Emanuel Celler, opposed the amendment with all of his considerable power.

Edwards was the new chairman of the newly created civil rights oversight subcommittee when he grabbed hold of the amendment and helped push it through. In part, Edwards believed the amendment was assigned to his group in the hope it would die there.

"There is a machismo here on Congress and throughout the country that is not healthy," he added. "If a third or half of the Congress were women, then I don't think we would have gotten so deep into Vietnam."

Edwards paused for a moment and then added, "I think we will be much better off to make love with equals, to share our companionship with equals."

FOOD PRICES CURBS OF 1950'S— "A HORROR"

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the not-so-distant past provided a lesson which few appear willing to heed in the current controversy over rising food prices. Last evening's Evening Star and Daily News contained a sensible commentary on the subject by Richard Wilson. At this point in the RECORD, I wish to commend the article to the attention of my colleagues:

FOOD PRICES CURBS OF 1950'S—"A HORROR" (By Richard Wilson)

President Nixon's obstinacy under pressure against doing something drastic about food prices will probably have a flare-back. It is hard for housewives to understand, miffs labor leaders and makes politicians nervous.

The President's advisers have told him that food price controls might work for a while but would end in disaster with even higher prices and he would be better off to try various ways of increasing supplies so that prices would come down naturally.

Nixon's advisers are on sound economic grounds even if their political underpinnings are shaky. The story of price controls in the name of economic stabilization is a horror. Of all the "messes" claimed to have been left behind from the Truman administration, economic

stabilization was one of the worst and when the Eisenhower-Nixon administration came in it was liquidated within a few weeks.

Memories are very short, so what happened before that is worth a brief review. Panic buying sent prices skyrocketing in the Korean war and controls were imposed. A series of five government orders cut meat prices 10 percent. Henceforth there was nothing but trouble. In a few weeks there was a cattleman's revolt which closed down big meat packing plants for lack of supplies. Feed lots emptied and black markets developed in Omaha and Chicago.

The Army ordered meat but the packers refused to bid because they could not buy cattle at ceiling prices. Federally inspected slaughterers were ordered to give the government priority. There was a horse meat scandal in Chicago. Wholesale ceilings were suspended on some meats. Pork price curbs were ended. All controls were ended. Beef prices led a decline of most food items.

This short history of a disaster is probably unconsoling to meat-hungry people but it should be a convincing lesson that the meat business is so complex that nothing short of absolute government authority over it would be even temporarily effective. Rationing, production control, packer control, retailer control doesn't even work well in a Communist dictatorship.

Here is an example where Nixon's sermon in his second inaugural—ask not what your country can do for you but what you can do for yourselves—has a precise application. Housewives can do for themselves in this case. They can cut down the price of meat by buying less of it, as Nixon has the temerity himself to suggest.

The full range of President Nixon's economic policy is under intense pressure, and he is being once again exhorted to change it, but this time he is under less political pressure. Congressional pressure descends on Treasury Secretary George Shultz, the economic czar if there is one. How much better, it is argued, to have a politically responsive John Connally as the prime mover in economic policy.

Dollar devaluation, a nervous stock market, threatening price inflation give the President ammunition for the spending hold-back he is trying to impose on Congress. The underlying condition that the federal government cannot keep its house in order, that the imbalance of U.S. payments in international accounts causes uneasiness all over the world are major factors in the unsettled economic situation.

But on the home front there is no solution to be found in clamping federal controls on food prices, however much Nixon may be accused of "protecting" the farmers and the food processors. No solution, that is, unless Nixon wants a repetition of previous fiascos, which he obviously does not.

TRIBUTE TO ROY E. TRACEY

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, too often we take some of our finest community leaders for granted. The citizens of Gardena are not making that mistake with Gardena Police Chief Roy E. Tracey.

Chief Tracey is ending 43 years of out-

standing service to the city of Gardena with his retirement this month.

Gardena is honoring Roy's retirement with a dinner on March 31 at the Proud Bird Restaurant.

Chief Tracey is most deserving of such an elaborate event.

Service to Gardena began with 8 years working for the city fire department for Roy.

He transferred to the police department in 1939. In just 4 years, he was appointed sergeant, beginning his string of promotions which culminated in Roy's appointment as chief of police in July 1960.

Chief Tracey's learning did not end with graduation from Gardena High School and attendance of Compton Junior College.

He has attended many police schools, including ones at the University of Southern California and El Camino College, and, in 1958, attended the FBI National Academy.

Roy's interest in law enforcement has carried over into active participation in the Los Angeles County Peace Officers Shrine Club, the Los Angeles County Peace Officers Association, and the California Chapter of the FBI National Academy Association. He has been elected president of all three organizations. Chief Tracey was also a 3-year member of the California State Peace Officers Association executive committee.

But all of Roy's time has not been spent on law enforcement activities. Instead, he has worked diligently in many civic organizations as well as police work.

He has served as president of the Gardena Valley Kiwanis Club, and chairman of the board of managers of the Gardenas Valley YMCA.

Gardena recognized Chief Tracey's many contributions to the community by selecting him as Gardena's Outstanding Citizen in 1966.

Away from his civic activities, Roy has been a fine husband of his lovely wife, Madoline; and an exemplary father to Roger Tracey and Coleen Kay (Tracey) Nielsen. His three grandchildren are a source of much pride to Roy.

Chief Tracey is as much a source of pride to Gardena's citizens as his grandchildren are to him.

About 1,500 persons are expected to attend Chief Tracey's retirement dinner. A fun evening with lively entertainment is planned. Gardena's own Bill Gerber and Don Davidson will share emcee duties during the gala event.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the people of Gardena are honoring Roy with such a fine tribute dinner. I am pleased to join with Gardena's citizens in saluting Police Chief Roy E. Tracey.

WHITHER PUBLIC BROADCASTING?

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, at times the ongoing debate over the future

of noncommercial television seems to generate more heat than light, and be heavier on breast-beating than soul-searching.

A thoughtful editorial on where public broadcasting stands now and the options open to its managers appeared last Saturday, March 17, in the Washington Post.

I think we can all agree with the conclusion of the editorial that public broadcasting will never really get off the ground without more generous financing than we have been willing to provide so far. But we should also be continually wary of attempts to influence program content, particularly on the part of those who may feel that through large contributions they have bought a piece of the action.

So that this well-balanced editorial will enjoy the widest possible readership I include it at this point with my remarks: [From The Washington Post, Mar. 17, 1973]

THE DEBATE OVER PUBLIC BROADCASTING

There is a soap-opera air about the almost daily news reports on what's happening inside public broadcasting lately. Somehow, the extremely important and sensitive questions of how the government should help underwrite radio and television programming have been overshadowed by a series of confusing announcements about next fall's program schedule, with each installment serving up new mystery. Has the White House really been trying to get rid of Bill Buckley, Bill Moyers and Elizabeth Drew? Was "Zoom," the children's program, threatened because it had political overtones? And what about those secret meetings between members of the presidentially appointed Corporation for Public Broadcasting board and officials of the Public Broadcasting Service, the network?

Certainly the Nixon administration has voiced displeasure at the way public television has been operating. Back in October 1971, the head of the Office of Telecommunications Policy, Clay Whitehead, argued that public TV wasn't paying enough attention to local programming because too much control had been left to PBS, the network. Furthermore, said Mr. Whitehead, the public affairs programs had a left-wing slant. Finally, he allowed as how any system of long-range federal financing for public broadcasting would have to await evidence that the system was improving.

Sure enough, when Congress passed a measure last year that would have authorized \$155 million for CPB over a two-year period, President Nixon vetoed the bill, calling for more program emphasis on "localism" and urging a one-year, \$45-million authorization. Meanwhile, changes in the makeup of the bipartisan CPB board eventually gave the President a majority—and eyes began to focus on the public affairs programs. Initial list of programs failed to include many of these shows, despite word that they had the approval of the network and its station-manager board members. Early this year, CPB officials explained that the corporation was moving to consolidate the decision-making process, rather than let PBS handle it.

With the new season's program approvals still in doubt, there ensued some understandable concern that the administration was indeed pulling strings to gain control over what would go out over public TV channels; local and network officials entered into secret meeting with CPB to try to agree on a plan for deciding which programs should receive federal funds; and viewers waited to see which programs finally would get the nod for next season.

When the CPB list was completed last

week, it looked at first glance as if the government had succeeded in bumping off all the public affairs programs that might bother the administration, while finding funds to reinstate the children's "Zoom" program. Yet behind all the political innuendo—and lost in the speculation over which shows had been renewed or dropped by CPB, and why—are some fundamental questions having to do with the mission and limitations of public broadcasting under any administration.

For example, CPB officials point out that financial pressures—the limited amount of money likely to be appropriated—force difficult choices. If one function of government-sponsored broadcasting is to develop new programming, that means turning over the financing of established shows to other sources of support, such as foundations, corporations and individual contributors. (The CPB currently supplies only about one-third of the money for national programming.)

Furthermore, if public broadcasting must lead the industry in the development of good children's shows, will this mean taking money away from the public affairs budget? Or if the government is to continue underwriting television journalism, how can such programming be critical, influential, controversial—and "balanced" in its total offering? Can Congress, the White House and local station managers ante up the money and then refrain from exerting pressures on the direction or content of programs?

These problems are difficult, for public broadcasting is still new to the United States. Serious, nonpartisan students of public TV are still wrestling with ways to develop a system different from commercial TV, yet draw enough of an audience to be "worth" the taxpayers' money; a system that can tackle public affairs or controversy without fear of political censorship or without straining to "balance" every sentence uttered.

So we are not prepared to assume—yet, at least—that the administration is hell-bent to control public broadcasting, or that the Corporation for Public Broadcasting is a partisan puppet of the White House. At this point, hard negotiations are under way to try to develop new policymaking machinery for public broadcasting, and if this effort succeeds in any way, the job of refining objectives and guidelines can begin in earnest.

The immediate need is for more adequate financing, with enough lead time for public broadcasting to develop its plans and programs realistically. Sens. John O. Pastore and Warren G. Magnuson have introduced a bill that would authorize \$140 million for CPB over the next two fiscal years—an amount also sought by CPB itself. It is a reasonable measure that deserves congressional passage. Without this kind of financial commitment from the government, the hope of retaining talented, imaginative professionals will be lost—and the suspicions of political pressures will be fed once again.

INCREASED SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS CAUSED REDUCED INCOME FOR SOME OF OUR ELDERLY

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when the last Congress authorized an increase of 20 percent in social security benefits, few of us suspected that the net result would be a reduction in benefits for thousands upon thousands of our Nation's elderly.

Thanks to a tragic oversight in the law, many senior citizens who were receiving Federal assistance in the form of veterans benefits and pensions, food stamps, low-income housing, and Medicaid have been excluded from these programs because their income has been pushed above the legal limit for participation. For these elderly Americans, the 20-percent increase in social security is a cruel hoax which has reduced rather than supplemented their monthly income.

I have introduced H.R. 4570 as a solution to the dilemma which older Americans now face. My measure would simply state that income derived from the social security increase would not be considered as "income" for the purpose of determining eligibility for these Federal-aid programs.

Mr. Speaker, there are 20,000 veterans alone, most of them from World War I, who have lost their veteran pensions because the 20-percent increase has nudged their total income over the allowable maximum. Others have seen their pensions drastically reduced.

At a time when this country is welcoming home our Vietnam veterans and at a time when we are committing ourselves anew to the proposition that our veterans have earned the gratitude and assistance of their country, our treatment of World War I and II veterans in this regard is a matter of shame and embarrassment. They, too, deserve the full benefit of the 20-percent increase and my legislation will make certain that they get it.

Mr. Speaker, when the social security increase was passed, it was generally hailed as a major victory for our senior citizens who were struggling on a fixed income against the pressures of inflation. We now know that for many this was a hollow victory.

It is time for us to deliver on the promise which we made to our veterans and other senior citizens. If Congress made a mistake, and I think it did, it is time for us to admit it and to rectify it. Each month that we delay is another month that our elderly must continue to struggle with reduced incomes. My legislation is the vehicle which will deliver upon that promise and I urge the Congress to give it immediate and careful study.

SOCIAL SECURITY WORK PENALTIES

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, continued inflation is an unpleasant reality for everyone today and is a top priority problem facing the Congress and the administration. Rising costs are an especially grim reality for persons on fixed incomes, and my mail continues to reflect the growing concern of those caught in this bind.

I was glad to support H.R. 1 when it passed the 92d Congress. Among other things, it liberalized the retirement test

which determines how much one can earn without loss of social security benefits, raising the limit from \$1,600 to \$2,100 for those under age 72. Beyond age 73 earnings would not affect benefits. I submit that the 93d Congress should examine the feasibility of further liberalizing the earnings test requirement.

It is interesting to note that benefits are not reduced as a result of investment income. One may have an income from stocks and bonds of \$20,000 and still receive full social security benefits, but a beneficiary between the age of 65 to 72 is penalized by loss of benefits if he or she earns more than \$2,100.

The Commissioner of the U.S. Administration on Aging, John B. Martin, states that he receives protests from older Americans about this treatment more often than any other complaint. Like Commissioner Martin, I sympathize with this complaint, and can appreciate how frustrating it must be to want to work and supplement a limited income in inflationary times only to be discouraged from doing so by loss of social security benefits.

Commissioner Martin has some interesting comments on this situation and on the use of older workers in the field of public service which I believe deserve careful consideration. Therefore, at this time I insert in the RECORD the following article by Mr. Martin which appeared in the Washington Post March 7, 1973:

SOCIAL SECURITY WORK PENALTIES

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 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 as 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 someone 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.

THE RETURNING POW'S EXPRESS AMERICA'S GIFT TO US AND OTHERS—FREEDOM

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the thrill of observing our POW's returning home seems almost universal. The families, of course, were excited and grateful beyond our comprehension. But, I noticed that even many of those who opposed Presi-

dent Nixon's plans for peace, and two actually contributed by word, resolution, and demonstration to extended confinement for our POW's, also shared the gratified and euphoria of our men returning home.

Why this extraordinary universal thrill? Why did each of us share such a strong emotional experience and such an intimate personal empathy with these POW's, who are mostly strangers? For me, there were two basic reasons.

Each returning serviceman seemed to express a new and refreshing belief in God or divine providence. Each one also expressly or implicitly expressed his appreciation of, and gratitude for freedom. These men, better and more than any of us, know what freedom really means. One has to lose freedom to appreciate it. But all human beings seem to innately covet freedom.

Washington and Jefferson expressed this yearning for freedom eloquently. Freedom was what our new Nation and Constitution was all about. The quintessence of our form of government is freedom for ourselves; from oppression of others, all others; from oppression of government, all governments.

Freedom was what their war was all about. They know it; they say it. In many different ways they say it. Although we cannot completely understand because we have always taken our unique freedom for granted, we sense that they have gained an extraordinary appreciation for freedom.

I noticed that blacks seem to empathize with the POW's expressions of gratitude for their new-found freedom. Obviously it is akin to what Dr. Martin Luther King was expressing when he said:

Free at last, Lord God Almighty, free at last.

I have noticed that the Yugoslavians, the Czechs, and the captive nationalities, also seem to understand and appreciate what our POW's are feeling when they say in their various individual ways, how great it is to be free.

The euphoria expressed by our POW's relates more to freedom than anything else. We should not be surprised when we hear them say that their service, their separation from their families, their torture, their injuries were worth it. Incredible? Perhaps not if we understood freedom like they know and cherish it now.

"Peace with honor" is commendable to be sure; but "peace with freedom" is what oppressed people want. Peace with freedom is what this war was all about. Peace with freedom is what people in other nations understand. Freedom and honor are inextricably mixed perhaps.

President Johnson once proposed a trilegged program which supposedly encompassed all human needs. It sounded great. Peace, prosperity, and security—but it did not sell. Something was missing. You can have peace and security in jail. But, human beings yearn for freedom because it is basic to our other personal desires, and needs. The POW's appreciate it; and we, because we are human beings, share an empathetic thrill.

One editor seemed to grasp the essence of what the returning POW's were so simply, yet profoundly, expressing by

their remarks when they first arrived back on U.S. soil.

I insert the editorial of the *Salinas Californian*, of February 27, 1973, and I recommend it to every Member for reading to remember.

THE POW'S SOUGHT AMERICA'S GIFT

Coming home for American prisoners of war wasn't just eating steak or seeing a miniskirt.

Coming home for the POW's wasn't just the first fruit of a "peace with honor" for President Richard Nixon.

With the flurry and joy of homecoming a lot of words have been repeated by both the POW's, officials and relatives.

But the one word, which somehow got lost in the home shuffle is a simple word, *freedom*.

Salinas Congressman Burt L. Talcott, who, himself, can remember being a POW in World War II, said the thing no POW would ever forget was something we all take for granted, freedom.

This was the "light at the end of the tunnel" referred to by good-humored Maj. Norman McDaniel when he arrived at Travis Air Force Base. "We looked at that light (America) a long time," he said.

This feeling of freedom can be seen on the faces of immigrants at naturalization ceremonies, of the enslaved like the Hungarians who remain so close to Radio Free Europe, but so far from freedom.

These people know, as Thomas Jefferson did, "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time."

Although the spark of freedom, or liberty, may not burn as brightly as it once did in some hearts, it still burns in many, and we pray the majority of this nation and the world.

It gives breadth to the individual spirit and cement to the mutual bond in freedom's fight. As Jefferson said, "We mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honour."

So when you hear a returning POW say, "God bless America," remember he means God Bless Freedom. That is what the Statute of Liberty is all about in 1973, as it was in 1773.

THE NATIONAL OIL RECYCLING ACT OF 1973

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks last Thursday, March 15, I outlined the many environmental and energy problems that arise from our Nation's failure to recycle its waste oil. Each year in this country roughly 1.1 billion gallons of used oil is disposed of in ways that represent a threat to our environment. Road oiling, incineration, even the burning of used oil as fuel, all present unreasonable risks when the technology is available to recycle this waste oil for more productive uses.

In light of these environmental and energy problems, I am today introducing new legislation which I hope will go far to reduce the waste and environmental degradation caused by our failure to recycle used oil in significant quantities. This bill, rather than proposing new Federal laws making the dumping and incineration of used oils illegal, creates

positive incentives which will lead to the recycling of a much greater proportion of the used oils now being wasted. Dumping and incineration of used oils, of course, which violates existing Federal and State statutes, remains illegal, and water pollution, air pollution, and solid waste control laws of the future may well result in tightened controls over used oil disposal. Meaningful enforcement of any of these statutes will be difficult and expensive, requiring elaborate administrative control mechanisms.

My bill, therefore, seeks to minimize the need to expand the size of existing administrative police forces. Several short amendments to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 will simplify the tax treatment given lubricating oils, increasing Federal revenues by as much as \$75 million. Changes in Federal Trade Commission labeling requirements for recycled oil will not increase that agency's burdens. Requirements that retailers provide return and handling services for used oils can easily be enforced by spot checking conducted at the local government level. Provisions requiring the maintenance of records indicating the fate of used lubricating oils may increase the administrative burden somewhat, but such information is already required under existing laws and regulations of the Departments of the Treasury, Commerce, and the Environmental Protection Agency, as well as those of State agencies.

The bill contains several provisions which would amend existing tax laws covering lubricating oils. Basically, these amendments will result in a return to the uniform tax treatment accorded the entire lubricating oil industry prior to 1965, when the refiners were much healthier and when more than twice as much used oil was being recycled than is the case today.

The bill, if adopted, will equalize and simplify the tax on lubricating oil, requiring all producers of new lubricating oils, including hydraulic and cutting oils, to pay a 6-cent-per-gallon excise tax. In addition, no tax refunds or rebates will be granted to any users of lubricating oils. Recycled oil will continue to be exempt from any such tax.

By resubjecting cutting and hydraulic oils to the 6-cent-per-gallon excise tax under section 4091, and by removing the tax rebate currently given off-highway users of lubricating oil under section 6424, the bill will raise approximately \$75 million in additional tax revenue each year. These additional revenues will more than cover the cost of the other provisions of this bill. But more importantly, these amended tax provisions will serve to stimulate the purchase of recycled oil by industrial users. The removal of the 6-cent-per-gallon competitive edge now given to virgin oil refiners will once again enable recyclers of used oils to compete on the equal footing which existed prior to 1965.

The FTC labeling requirement will be changed by this bill so that the word "recycled" will be placed prominently on the face of all recycled oil containers. This is clearly preferable to the current FTC ruling requiring all recycled oils to bear the words "previously used" on their labels. Once the public is educated

on the relative merits of recycled oil, and methods for quickly and economically comparing it with new oil are developed—the use of recycled oil should increase significantly.

Another provision of this bill makes it illegal for oil companies to prohibit their service stations or other lubricating oil retailers from stocking recycled oil products or selling the used oil that they collect.

Adoption of this legislation will also enable purchasers of automobile oils to return their used oil to the marketer in returnable, leakproof containers, thus further insuring that used oils are recycled. The bill also provides that all purchasers of automotive oil must pay a 10-cent deposit on all oil purchased in these returnable containers, regardless of their size. This deposit will be refunded when the container is returned to any marketer regardless of whether or not it contains used oil. All marketers are required to provide ample disposal facilities on their premises for all used oil returned by consumers, and are encouraged to deliver or sell this collected used oil to the oil recyclers.

Other key provisions of the bill require all Federal Government officials to act within their respective authorities to encourage the use of recycled oils. When such oil is available at prices competitive with new oil, the bill requires that it be purchased and used by all agencies of the Federal Government, including the military, and by all private interests which are party to Government contracts. By conditioning Federal grants to the States on compliance with the provisions of this bill, the States are also encouraged to use recycled oil in a similar fashion.

Mr. Speaker, through enactment of the National Oil Recycling Act of 1973, we will be taking concrete steps in the direction of conserving our irreplaceable national resources and preserving our environment.

RENT CONTROLS SHOULD BE REINSTATED

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I helped sponsor legislation that would reinstate Federal rent controls that were terminated by the administration's phase III program.

I cosponsored the U.S. rent control measure, because of hundreds of complaints I have received from constituents who claim they have been forced to pay substantial rent increases since controls ended with phase II. I believe them.

Inadequate housing exists in many communities and tenants suffer because of the shortage of facilities. I do not think the President was wise in removing rent controls. He should have retained such controls until the housing shortage is really alleviated.

My bill calls for a rent control program

to operate in any State in which the vacancy level is less than 6.5 percent. It also provides for retroactive controls to the end of phase II and for refunds of overcharges made.

Whenever I complain to the U.S. Government about unreasonable rent increases made by some landlords, I am invariably told that restraint is supposed to be used by those who rent their facilities. Unfortunately, very little restraint is being used and some of the increases are outrageous, with some as high as 40 percent.

Under phase III, workers are still expected to receive no more than an average wage increase of 5.5 percent, yet tenants are forced to pay rent increases that are much higher. This is not only unfair—it is shocking and ridiculous. The solution is to reinstate Federal rent controls—controls that provide tenants with real protection.

METRICS: CONFUSION ON THE WAY TO CLARITY

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the study which the Congress asked the Commerce Department to conduct 5 years ago on the metric system concluded that within 50 years, whether we ordered it or not, this Nation would be a metric nation.

It is my hope that we will accomplish this change in an orderly and fair way under a coordinated strong national program. Such a program clearly would save considerable confusion and a good portion of the costs that would be incurred in a more haphazard changeover.

Along with Congressman Bob McCLOY, I have introduced a bill to order such a changeover in the next 10 years and to declare the metric system our official system of measurement at the end of that time.

The Steering Wheel, a publication of the Texas Motor Transportation Association, recently carried an article concerning the future and scope of a changeover to the metric system. I would like to reprint that article at this time in the RECORD:

METRICS CONFUSION ON THE WAY TO CLARITY (By Richard L. Sine)

The work will be the same, but most—if not all—of your ways of measuring it will change if the U.S. House of Representatives is true to predictions this session and approves a measure to begin the United States changeover to the metric system of measurement. Already passed by the Senate, the joint, bi-partisan bill would establish a national commission that will be given a year to organize, and then ten years to oversee, the change in systems.

For the over-the-road driver, perhaps the most obvious change that will occur during the next 11 years will be in the measurement of distance. The term "mileage" will become slang as the mile is replaced by the kilometer. And miles per hour will give way to kilometers per hour. Of course, the distance involved will not be different—just the means of measuring it.

Such a change from miles to kilometres may appear meaningless by itself. But coupled with the totality of the changeover, the single move is more understandable. With the changeover, the United States will join most of the remainder of the world in adopting the international metric system (SI). Among world powers, the United States stands alone as one who neither is a "metric country" nor who has begun to change. There are about a dozen other nations of the world in the same situation as we are: Trinidad, Malawi, Burma and Nauru.

Even with Senate approval of the changeover and hope that the House will follow, the issue of changing our nation's system of measurement is not a one-sided one.

Proponents of the change believe that the international metric system is a more logical, easier-to-use system and one that will bring our country more in concert with world manufacturing. Sen. Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island, one of the sponsors of the bill in Congress, estimates that the United States loses between \$10 billion and \$25 billion annually in foreign trade because of its failure to go metric.

Those in favor of the change cite other advantages:

That SI is a coherent system based on seven basic units. All derived units within the system are established from the product or quotient of two or more other SI units.

The units which describe the quantities remain the same, eliminating the need to remember such uneven numbers as the number or ounce in a pound or the number of feet in a mile.

Names of units, regardless of the technology involved, remain the same. Thus, for example, power—whatever form it takes—always is measured in watts.

SI is a decimal system based on the powers of ten.

All basic SI units, with the exception of the kilogram, are based on a natural phenomenon which can be duplicated under laboratory conditions.

Anti-metric forces are equally outspoken. They believe that conversion to the metric system in the United States would put the nation at a trade disadvantage. They say that the cost of conversion would have to be added to all US-produced goods, while foreign producers could take advantage of broadened markets at lower production costs.

Others believe that the total price tag of conversion would reach \$100-\$300 billion and that the conversion period may reach as much as 50 years. And they note there is every possibility that the conversion program would be abandoned before completion because of massive public indignation. Proponents counter those arguments with estimates of the cost of conversion at between \$6.2 billion and \$14.3 billion.

Arguments aside, if the House approves the measure, we quickly will see the initial program of the decade-long changeover. First and foremost will be education. US schools will be expected to intensify their treatment of metrics. And school children who have for so many years labored in their study of fractions will be relieved to know that with metrics much of their work with fractions will come to an end.

And before any extensive changeover will take place in industry, there must be metric training at all levels.

Some American industries already have made the change: pharmaceutical, photographic, optometric and roller bearing. More than 20 per cent of the automobiles on US highways are made to metric specifications, including Ford's Pinto. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration uses the metric system, and the *Journal of the American Medical Association* now uses SI in all its scientific reports.

A study through the US Department of Commerce shows that the effect of change-

over on specific industries will range from negligible to severe. At the lesser end of the scale are those which now deal in both systems, those who have made the change already, and those such as agriculture, forestry and fishing. All that the latter must do is convert billing procedures to the new system. At the other extreme are industries such as oil field machinery and aircraft, which will have the greatest degree of change and perhaps will be the final ones to convert.

For a few businesses, the changeover may be a windfall. Included in this group are those that manufacture measuring devices—the changeover will require at least recalibration of the devices to metric standards—and printers.

Because the metric system is decimal—based on units of ten—it simplifies mathematics. The customary English system, not a logical one, has us moving to larger and smaller units through the use of uneven multipliers and divisors: from inches to feet by three, pounds to tons by 2,000, quarts to gallons by four, and so on.

In the English customary system are such terms as horsepower, hands, rods, acres, pints, quarts, gallons, pecks, bushels, cubits and fathoms. All of these standards grew up quite haphazardly. Three barleycorns—from the center of the stalk—equaled one inch, for example. And a yard was the distance between the tip of a king's nose and the tip of his fingers.

The metric system, on the other hand, progresses logically in units of ten, and prefixes have the same meaning whether measuring length, area, volume or mass.

The most basic SI units are metres for length, liters for volume and grams for mass (weight). SI and customary are similar in the use of records for time and amperes for electric current. Perhaps the most confusing SI units, to the man in the street, will be temperature. Gone will be fahrenheit and in will be Celsius (formerly known as centigrade). So, when your doctor measures your body temperature at 36.9 degrees Celsius, you will know that you are normal.

Another reason for the 10-year period of changeover is to enable industry to absorb the cost of conversion over a longer time span. It then is hoped that the cost will be kept to a minimum because much of the conversion will take place as factories replace worn out and obsolete equipment.

Further hopes are that conversion will enable industry to take additional advantage of modern technology and to reduce inventories. International metric standards have made it possible to reduce unnecessary variety in the manufacture of such items as nuts, bolts and rivets.

This progress cannot be speeded—at least not in this country—until changeover is formalized. The United States inches—or centimeters—toward SI.

H.R. 5880: PROTECTS FOREST ENVIRONMENT THREATENED BY IMPOUNDMENT OF FIRE PROTECTION FUNDS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the recent withdrawal of \$4 million from the cooperative forest fire protection program by the Secretary of Agriculture seriously threatens the safety of our forest environment nationwide. It puts our State foresters in a difficult situation and reduces the effectiveness of a

program designed to protect valuable forest lands.

Earlier in the fiscal year our State foresters were informed that \$5 million of the \$25,027,000 appropriated for fiscal 1973 had been impounded by the Office of Management and Budget. They accepted this reduction with the understanding that it was necessary to stay within the President's spending limitation. Funds are allocated to States on a cost-sharing arrangement, and the Federal Government by withdrawing its commitment to the States jeopardizes the total national fire protection program. The States then set their budgets accordingly, in consultation with the Forest Service. But State budget readjustments cannot be made to compensate for the latest reductions, coming as late into the fiscal year as they have.

Fiscal responsibility is one thing, but reductions of this proportion in a program of this vital importance so late in the year are untenable. One forest fire resulting from a lack of proper fire protection could easily cost the taxpayer more money than the \$4 million the cuts supposedly saved.

Virtually every State has suffered some loss of funds. Louisiana, for instance, has been placed in the position of trying to find \$131,500 to maintain its fire protection programs at the level planned for the year. Our neighboring State of Texas lost \$90,100, while the State of Washington lost \$138,000 in Federal funds.

For these reasons, I have, along with seven cosponsors, today introduced H.R. 5880. This bill provides for mandatory expenditures of funds appropriated by Congress for use in State-Federal cooperative forest fire control program. The bill also requires an expenditure of the \$20,027,000 allocated by the administration to the States for the present fiscal year. Further, it prevents the fire protection program from being weakened in the future through reductions or impoundment of funds originally appropriated by Congress.

I include here the text of my bill, H.R. 5880, along with a chart listing the amount of funds cut from allocations to the various States for the Forest Fire Protection program to be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

H.R. 5880

A bill to provide that amounts appropriated by the Congress for the State-Federal Cooperative Forest Fire Control Program shall be expended for that purpose

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act of June 7, 1924, relating to the protection of forest lands (16 U.S.C. 565), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In the case of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and each fiscal year thereafter, the amount allocated by the Secretary to the States under this section shall in no case be less than the amount appropriated for such year for such purpose by the Congress."

SEC. 2. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, the Secretary of Agriculture shall make payments to the States for the purposes set forth in section 2 of said Act of June 7, 1924, out of funds heretofore appropriated, on the basis of the commitment of the Federal Government contained in the allocation to the States for these purposes of \$20,027,000.

FISCAL YEAR 1973: CM-2 ALLOTMENTS

Region or area	Original payment to State	Reduction amounts	New reduced payment to States
Alabama.....	\$582,500	\$114,500	\$468,000
Alaska.....	359,200	50,200	309,000
Arizona.....	65,200	12,900	52,300
Arkansas.....	536,800	110,100	426,700
California.....	1,284,500	263,300	1,021,200
Colorado.....	246,600	38,000	208,600
Connecticut.....	144,300	29,200	115,100
Delaware.....	50,600	9,200	41,400
Florida.....	720,500	147,700	572,800
Georgia.....	760,100	155,900	604,200
Hawaii.....	66,300	13,700	52,600
Idaho.....	399,200	80,100	319,100
Illinois.....	144,800	27,700	117,100
Indiana.....	98,900	20,300	78,600
Iowa.....	71,500	14,800	56,700
Kansas.....	228,800	45,800	183,000
Kentucky.....	434,400	86,400	348,000
Louisiana.....	645,400	131,500	513,900
Maine.....	507,100	104,100	403,000
Maryland.....	277,800	55,400	222,400
Massachusetts.....	250,500	51,300	199,200
Michigan.....	638,900	131,100	507,800
Minnesota.....	410,100	84,200	325,900
Mississippi.....	623,300	124,500	498,800
Missouri.....	522,200	103,400	418,800
Montana.....	221,000	43,600	177,400
Nebraska.....	199,500	38,000	161,500
Nevada.....	220,500	43,200	177,300
New Hampshire.....	137,800	27,700	110,100
New Jersey.....	290,500	56,900	233,600
New Mexico.....	89,600	18,500	71,100
New York.....	537,200	106,000	431,200
North Carolina.....	672,000	136,600	535,400
North Dakota.....	38,700	7,400	31,300
Ohio.....	234,400	46,900	187,500
Oklahoma.....	277,000	52,100	224,900
Oregon.....	676,500	138,100	538,400
Pennsylvania.....	503,500	101,200	402,300
Rhode Island.....	78,400	15,900	62,500
South Carolina.....	611,500	123,000	488,500
South Dakota.....	94,400	18,100	76,300
Tennessee.....	613,200	124,500	488,700
Texas.....	439,700	90,100	349,600
Utah.....	156,700	31,000	125,700
Vermont.....	78,900	16,200	62,700
Virginia.....	566,000	114,900	451,100
Washington.....	677,400	138,900	538,500
West Virginia.....	259,300	51,300	208,000
Wisconsin.....	615,400	123,400	492,000
Wyoming.....	132,900	24,400	108,500
Amounts to States.....	18,491,500	3,693,200	14,798,300
Administration Inspector, etc.....	1,508,500	306,800	1,201,700
Total.....	20,000,000	4,000,000	16,000,000

PRISONER OF WAR RETURNS

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Sixth District rejoice that Marine Capt. James P. Walsh, Jr., of Winsted, has returned home after 4½ months of captivity in a North Vietnam prison camp.

The courage shown by all of our returning POWs is tribute to their determined spirit and strength of character which have sustained them under the most difficult of circumstances. James Walsh, Jr., has displayed that same spirit and strength of character.

His parents, Mr. and Mrs. James Walsh, also deserve special praise and admiration. They had to endure those trying, unhappy days of their son's imprisonment in constant, fearful anticipation of his condition as a prisoner in a hostile land far away.

Fortunately, James Walsh seems very fit, and residents of the district join in wishing him well for the future. The joy and thanksgiving of every American is without expression as more and more of our brave men are released from their

North Vietnamese and Vietcong captors. When among those arriving back home is a neighbor who lives in the Sixth District, the occasion is an especially meaningful and personal one.

FRANK SIEVERTS: FRIEND, SERVANT TO POW/MIA'S AND FAMILIES

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in the depersonalized world in which we live the dedicated efforts of many individuals too often go unrecognized and unappreciated. It was therefore gratifying to read in this morning's Washington Post a story by Marilyn Berger recounting the quiet but effective work over the years of Mr. Frank Sieverts, the State Department official in charge of POW/MIA affairs.

Trained as a Foreign Service officer in the delicate art of diplomacy, Mr. Sieverts has exercised that art under the most challenging of circumstances on the very personal level of human relations. He has carried out that often difficult assignment with distinction, aided and complemented in that assignment by an able secretary and personal assistant, Catherine L. Wilde.

I am pleased to place the article in the RECORD at this point and recommend it to the reading of my colleagues.

The article follows:

GRATITUDE OF POW FAMILIES WON BY STATE AIDE SIEVERTS

(By Marilyn Berger)

The POWs are coming home and the letters are coming to the State Department.

"May I please have the name of the State Department official in this picture. . . . I would very much like to drop this wonderful kind man a note," wrote a woman from Lebanon, Ind. "My eyes were on him more than those brave men who were returning."

Another from Walnut Creek, Calif., said: "Never have we seen a more warm, compassionate human being. He is to be much commended. I would like to have his name so I could write to tell him so."

The name of the man in the unaccustomed limelight is Frank A. Sieverts, and underneath that "warm, compassionate" surface he is by all accounts a "warm, compassionate human being."

Frank Sieverts was the man with the movie-star handsome face and trim physique who emerged on the home screen, greeting some of the civilian prisoners of war with a warm bear hug.

Frank Sieverts was the State Department's man in the advance party who went to Glam airport on Feb. 12 to straighten out last-minute details of the release. He rode back to Clark Air Base with the last group of the day, not the first. It was then that people across the country started asking about him.

For more than six years Sieverts worked quietly in a small office on the State Department's seventh floor, his one mission to get the prisoners of war back from Vietnam or to improve their treatment during their detention.

It was not exactly the kind of job antici-

pated for a young graduate of Swarthmore who had spent four years at Oxford studying international relations. For the abstruse world of diplomacy of the relations between states and of laws and treaties is scant preparation for dealing with the very personal, often excruciating anguish of a mother whose son has been taken captive, or a wife whose husband may never return.

Sieverts, as the major point of contact within the government for the families of the POWs, became the shoulder, the placator, the sounding board for complaints, sometimes the target for emotional outbursts. At the same time he was the envoy to the International Red Cross, to foreign diplomats who might provide help and to the peace groups who sought to get prisoners released in their own way.

One POW wife, a critic of the administration who has of late refused to be quoted by name, had this to say about Sieverts, whom she dealt with for several years:

"He's the only one I've run into representing any part of the government . . . who's been completely honest. . . . He never lied; he never misled. He's the only one who has dealt with us as a representative in an official capacity I've had any use for. . . . He was always friendly, gracious and charming, but always with an air of professionalism. The only real moment of warmth when the civilian POWs came back from South Vietnam was when Frank embraced them. It was real, spontaneous."

Said this woman, whose husband has not yet returned: "Frank's gone gray in the four years I've known him. His hair used to be darkish blond, he looked like a Kennedy type."

Sieverts at 39, is quite gray. In rueful almost self-mocking moments now he will attribute each gray hair to an individual POW, but he tries not to be dramatic.

Sieverts, often accompanied by Roger Shields, a civilian in the Pentagon, traveled around the country to meet with the families of the POWs. "I'd describe our efforts to achieve an honorable, negotiated settlement. I'd bring to them information . . . commonly available to people who read carefully in the press but which might not be available to families in the Midwest and Far West."

Speaking precisely, with perfect syntax, never straying from his topic, Sieverts acknowledged that "some families would get very emotional and express strong emotions face-to-face and on the telephone. Often there were different points of view on the war, often urging rather stronger action to bring the war to an end. This view was more common than the other."

Sieverts said: "Our responses, as government representatives, sought above all to be accurate, even at the expense of being reassuring. The temptation was always to say they'll be home for Christmas, but I took pains to be accurate and to emphasize the other side's responsibility for the POW's. It became evident very early on that the POW's were hostages being used for bargaining purposes, namely to gain control of South Vietnam. The families understood this. More important it's now clear that the men themselves were fully aware of this. Their first questions made clear their own sense of commitment."

There is a stuffed white bird on one of Sieverts' bookshelves, a sign that he opposed U.S. actions in Vietnam. But, he insists: I'm not a dove. I've always supported the rightness of what we were trying to do in Vietnam, our commitment to South Vietnam." Then he adds with characteristic understatement: "I may have disagreed at times with some of the actions taken in support of that commitment."

Sieverts was born in Germany in 1933 and left with his family four years later, victims of Nazi persecution. His mother was

Jewish and has since become a Quaker. He grew up in Wisconsin, the eldest of five, and later went on to Swarthmore—where he met his wife—and then to Oxford as a Rhodes scholar. He has promised his wife and their two children some skiing and other vacations—when all the POWs are home.

Before devoting all his time to the POWs Sieverts worked with the State Department's senior interdepartmental group, and then in 1967 joined the staff of Ambassador-at-Large Averell Harriman. He remained close to the negotiations because they so intimately involved POWs. He also maintained contacts with other governments and with the International Red Cross.

At first, said Sieverts, an effort was made "to use diplomatic efforts . . . to bring pressure on the North Vietnamese not to carry out their threat of [war crimes] trials against captured pilots . . . and to bring North Vietnam into compliance with the Geneva convention by allowing international inspection of the camps, free exchange of mail and so forth."

He said in a recent interview: "I never thought I didn't expect I'd become this involved in this kind of subject, or involved in this way with the POWs. No one thought it would take this long. In 1964 and 1965 we believed it would end in a year. It was the same in 1966 and 1967, even 1968. The length of time was unpredictable. It made sense to stay on."

It has clearly had its satisfactions. "After I got back to Clark [from Hanoi], he recalled, "as the men came out of the plane I said I know his mother, I know his parents, I know his wife. As they came out I recognized faces, a case of putting a husband with a wife, a son with a mother. I was able to tell them that I knew their families. The men were startled and pleased to hear this. They were not aware that efforts had been made to know their families, pleased that their families had a place to go in government."

Sieverts manages to get off lines that sound old-fashioned-apple-pie patriotic American without sounding phony. "It defames the sacrifice of the POWs to say they were prompted," he said of the remarks the prisoners made on their returns. He described how the POWs took command the moment they were released.

"To see the men get off the battered camouflaged buses, shaped like old American school buses . . . it was a very dramatic moment. The men we thought about and worked so long for were there."

When they were ordered off the bus, says Sieverts, "the senior officer in each group of 20 shaped them into lines and marched them to the release point 30 yards away, in some cases slowing down the pace so those on crutches could catch up . . . They shouted out loud commands with American voices at the Hanoi airport. . . . They saluted."

On the plane he says he saw the men plan what they would say on arrival, giving a thumbs up to the suggestion of the senior officer. . . . A loud cheer went up as they closed the door, another cheer when we took off, another when we were over water and no longer over North Vietnam. . . ."

Sieverts never wore a POW or MIA bracelet and seemed to have some doubts about the practice. But he had no doubt of their effect on the POWs who returned. "People would come to the airport and give the men the bracelet they'd been wearing," he recalled. "The men had not been aware of it. They were stunned and pleased to know how much people were thinking of them."

Sieverts seems to have known them all. But, he says, "when you speak of close and warm relations with the POW families it was my secretary and personal assistant, Catherine L. Wilde, who more than anyone was on a first-name basis with them."

MORE INFORMATION FOR THE CONSUMER

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, lack of adequate information on labeling of processed foods is an increasing concern of consumers. Whereas packaged and frozen foods once constituted a very small part of our diet—the luxury items—a large proportion of an average American's diet today is prepared in a manufacturing plant. This situation presents the housewife with increasing difficulties not only in shopping wisely but in preparing nutritious, well-balanced meals. She is not always able to tell what the ingredients of a particular item are, whether processing has destroyed the nutritional value of the food, or how much of the food the package actually contains.

The bill I have cosponsored, H.R. 1652, would provide a solution to this dilemma of today's consumer. It would require the label of processed foods to bear information regarding nutritional contents, packaging and weight, and percentage of ingredients.

The White House Conference on Food and Nutrition emphasized the lack of nutritional information available on today's foods. This lack of information contributes to the fact that poor diets are not limited to those of low incomes but are found among persons of all socioeconomic levels, particularly in the case of children. The Conference recommended that—

Information about nutritional properties which are significant to consumers in relation to the use of a given food in the daily diet should be required to be made available to consumers.

My bill would require foods to bear an analysis of nutritional contents including fat content, vitamin and protein value, fats and fatty acids, calories, and other nutritional information deemed appropriate. Certain requirements would assure the conspicuous and uniform display of such information so as to be of the most use to consumers.

Every shopper has had the experience of buying a food item with the expectation of serving a certain number of persons only to find the packaging or the labeling was misleading as to the amount of the contents. This is particularly true of items such as shrimp cocktail which are packaged in some kind of medium. If H.R. 1652 is enacted into law, such misrepresentation would be prohibited. Regulations would be promulgated requiring labels to bear certain information in the case of any canned or frozen product whose packing medium constitutes a substantial proportion of its total weight, the net weight, and drained weight of the product.

The White House Conference on Food and Nutrition also considered the problem of labels which do not indicate the amount of ingredients in packaged foods. They recommended:

The amount of a characterizing ingredient, if any, should be shown on the label on a percent basis or other accepted uniform method

meaningful to the consumer. . . . Failure to label the amount of any characterizing ingredients in a food should constitute misbranding.

My bill would make percentage listing of the major ingredients of combination food mandatory.

H.R. 1652 would provide several badly needed reforms in food labeling requirements—reforms that have been discussed and agreed upon for quite a while. It is now time to enact these requirements and to give the consumer the tools he needs to get the best buy and the most nutritious food for his money.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that my colleagues will join together in order to insure the early enactment of this important legislation.

NIXON CONSUMER POLICY: BENIGN NEGLECT

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the Consumer Price Index released today by the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows the retail price of meat rose 5.3 percent last month. That adds up to an incredible annual rate in excess of 63 percent.

This unconscionable outrage can only be viewed as part of the Nixon administration's conscious policy of benign neglect of the American consumer. Administration indifference to the plight of the consumer and its refusal to put a lid on meat prices are directly responsible for this latest increase.

A typical middle-income family of four spends 35 percent of its food budget on meat, poultry and fish, or about \$68 a month. At the February rate of inflation for this category—5 percent—the price of those products is going up \$3.40 a month or \$40.80 a year. In other words, if food prices don't start coming down—and the Cost of Living Council says they will keep going up for the rest of the year—that \$68 bill will hit \$108.80 by next February.

Outraged consumers will respond to this latest piece of news with the most massive meat boycott in the Nation's history, starting April 1. Consumer and housewife groups in more than two dozen cities across the country already have joined in the buyer boycott, demanding a freeze or even a rollback in meat prices.

The Nixon administration's dire predictions about the effects of a price freeze—even if they come to pass—couldn't possibly be worse than the dilemma which now confronts the food buyer.

Just yesterday, Agriculture Secretary Butz, who publicly rejoices over high meat prices, said anyone who wants to put a ceiling on the increase is a "damn fool." This kind of "sock it to 'em" contempt for the American consumer must be stopped. I am today renewing my call for Secretary Butz' resignation as the first step toward lowering food prices and restoring the American consumer's faith in the willingness and ability of government to combat inflation.

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS IN McCREARY COUNTY, KY.

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter indirectly from Mr. Ralph W. Nevils, superintendent of the McCreary County Schools in the Fifth District of Kentucky.

In this letter, he evaluates the Neighborhood Youth Corps Program which has helped many impoverished youngsters throughout the area I represent to attend high school. Many of these students, after their high school work, are enabled to attend college. This would not have been possible except for the Neighborhood Youth Corps program.

I enclose the letter from Mr. Nevils for consideration by the Members:

WHITLEY CITY, Ky.,
March 16, 1973.

Mr. N. B. PERKINS,
Whitley City, Ky.

DEAR MR. PERKINS: While you are in Washington, I would greatly appreciate your help in informing Representative Carter of the facts about McCreary County's Neighborhood Youth Corps program. As you know, McCreary County Schools' was one of the first NYC programs funded and we feel that it has been one of the most successful.

Approximately sixteen hundred boys and girls have participated in the NYC program since its beginning. Over one thousand of these enrollees could never have remained in school. Thirty-eight per cent of the enrollment have received their high school diplomas. Annually about thirty-five per cent of the contract number are listed on the schools' honor rolls. One enrollee has received the highest scholastic honor of the senior class. Several enrollees have and are able to attend college only through the help and assistance of the NYC program. Four have returned to McCreary County as teachers. Two boys who worked in conservation are studying forestry.

Most of our young people must leave our county to search for employment. Several former NYC enrollees have used the NYC training as clerks, teacher aides, secretaries and painters and have secured positions at home. A great deal of the NYC training has helped these young people to become more employable.

Since the NYC program has provided a way for these high school boys and girls to earn a small amount of money, they are developing a sense of self-dependence. They are able to pay class fees and dues, purchase greatly needed clothing and meet other obligations that they were formerly unable to do. A sense of pride in themselves and their work is evident.

These students receive such indirect benefits as the budgeting of earnings, development of good work habits and attitudes, and counseling on career planning.

According to a recent survey the dropout rate of NYC enrollees is below the dropout rate of the combined high schools and the percentage of attendance is above the high schools' average. The staff knows that this particular program is doing its job. Adequate supervision and counseling have made this program one of our schools' and McCreary County's greatest assets.

Many of our boys and girls have their hopes for the next school year depending on a summer's work. How can we prevent these students from losing the interest that they have developed, and how are we going to keep them from being next year's dropouts?

Many inquiries have been made from prospective enrollees and present enrollees as to the status of the Summer NYC program. We have approximately 300 boys and girls who can qualify for summer work. We understand that under revenue sharing there will be a program, at least on a limited scale, available for the In-School programs; however, no provisions have been made for the Summer programs. It is our hope that money from other programs can be diverted to the NYC programs. In the event that this is done we would appreciate any information that you could get for us as to the procedure for applying for those funds.

Now, my questions are: How are these two hundred boys and girls who need financial help and training going to be able to remain in school and meet their obligations? What effect will the loss of this program have upon the local school program? Who will see that these boys and girls get counseling that this particular age group needs? The majority of these young people come from welfare, social security, and disabled families. What program will be started to keep these children from becoming a part of the same family type?

Please see Representative Carter and tell him of our program and find out if anything can be done for our situation.

Respectfully,

RALPH W. NEVELS,
Superintendent, McCreary County School System.

AID TO HANOI: A MATTER OF MORALITY?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, aid to Hanoi is being urged as a matter of morality because we Americans had helped rebuild Western Germany and Japan following World War II. For some reason the absence of any aid to North Korea is being overlooked probably because we did not win nor effectively stop that war.

On the issue of morality should our people not be reminded that both Germany and Japan were defeated on the field of battle and each signed an unconditional surrender. The German leader, Hitler, was killed and many of his captured generals and admirals, even down to field grade officers were tried by war crimes tribunals and many were executed and others served time in prison. Even prison guards who had mistreated POW's or failed to comply with the Geneva Convention dealing with POW's were brought to trial and some imprisoned. Rudolf Hess, the political heir of Hitler and national socialism, remains a prisoner in Spandau to this day.

Similar trials, executions, and imprisonments followed the Japanese surrender, including even the imprisonment of Tokyo Rose who was an American who had turned propaganda agent for the Japanese Government.

No similar occurrences arise from the police action out of the North Vietnam war. None of the North Vietnamese officials nor the Viet Cong rebel leaders have been captured nor taken as prisoners. No trials for war crimes are sug-

gested or appear eminent. To the contrary, the leaders of North Vietnam have been made national heroes as they are allowed freedom to boast that ending the Vietnam conflict was a victory for their cause. In fact, these same leaders, according to all reports, are continuing to send arms, men, and materiel into South Vietnam to continue their aggression against the government and the people of our ally.

Certainly one who researches the facts of World War II and the Vietnam peace action can readily distinguish between any so-called moral duties of the victor or the loser.

And, by the way, who has heard of the Russians or Red Chinese indicating that they have a moral duty to impose taxes on their people to give aid to South Vietnam?

WHAT IS THE PRICE OF FREEDOM

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, it is often a good idea, in our headlong dash into oblivion, to pause and reflect upon a commodity we too often take for granted—freedom. One such opportunity arose while I was reading the Encino Trumpeter, a publication of the Encino Republican Women's Club Federated of Encino, Calif. The article is entitled, "What Is the Price of Freedom?" and it is a bit of wisdom that is a prolog to the history we are about to write. This message by Maj. Eugene H. Bickley, USA, is commended to my colleagues for their reflection:

WHAT IS THE PRICE OF FREEDOM?

(By Maj. Eugene H. Bickley)

An ounce of blood in a rice paddy in Vietnam?
A drop of sweat from a trainee at Fort Ord?
A splintered bone from a copter crash in Korea?
A cold chill from a missile scare at Guantanamo Bay?
A swollen ankle from a forced march on Bataan?
A lungful of seawater in a ship's bowels in Pearl Harbor?
A lacerated knee from barbed wire near Chateau Thierry?
A mouthful of dust from running up a hill called San Juan?
A nostrilful of stench from the carnage at Bull Run?
A handful of sand to cover a corpse at the Alamo?
A scorched eyebrow from power burns at New Orleans?
A frozen toe at Valley Forge?
Listen—there is no cut-rate price tag on freedom!
No discount house in which to shop.
No flea market in which to bargain.
No credit card on which to charge.
It is not an inalienable right, nor a God-given prize.
And yet—it is more precious than the most glittering gold,
Or rarest jewel;
More elusive than a beam of sunlight,
Or a baby's smile.
And once lost it is seldom regained.
It is not a game of fender keeper; rather, always, loser weeper.

How then does one hold fast this "elusive as sunlight" thing?
With a frozen toe at Valley Forge!
With a scorched eyebrow at New Orleans!
With a handful of sand at the Alamo. . .

LEAD INGESTION—A SPORTSMAN'S PROBLEM

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce legislation designed to protect our Nation's waterfowl from death and chronic illness resulting from the ingestion of lead shot used in hunting. Two to three percent of the waterfowl population of the United States—as many as 3 million ducks, geese, and swans—are estimated to die annually from lead poisoning. These birds consume lead shot which lodge in the gizzard and are eroded through physical and chemical abrasion.

Lead released in this way is assimilated into the bloodstream and results in acute or chronic poisoning. Acute toxicity, resulting in death within a few days, occurs when a large number of pellets are present or when assimilation is unusually rapid. Birds afflicted by chronic toxicity become emaciated and partially paralyzed. Some, in their weakened state, may fall prey to natural predators or to man, but most die a slow, agonizing death over a period of several weeks or months.

Over the years hundreds of thousands of tons of spent lead shotgun pellets have been scattered throughout the Nation's wetlands. Each hunting season another 6,000 tons, or some 30 billion additional pellets, are deposited. Many traditional waterfowl habitat areas are thought to average 30,000 pellets per acre in the top few inches of soil. Sampling indicates that some heavily hunted marshes and ponds may have densities of up to 100,000 pellets per acre. Pellets tend to sink slowly over a period of years into the bottoms, and eventually become unavailable to birds.

The fact that waterfowl and marsh birds succumb to poisoning from consuming lead shot has been recognized since 1842. Hard scientific evidence identifying lead shot as the culprit in poisoning deaths in the field has been available since 1901. Massive localized "die offs," such as the loss of 12,000 ducks in Minnesota during the winter of 1939-40, have occasionally dramatized the problem.

As densities of pellets in marshes continue to build up; as waterfowl habitat is increasingly constricted by development and afflicted with other forms of pollution, the problem has intensified. In April 1972 the largest die offs ever observed occurred in the Mississippi Valley. Earlier in the winter 4,500 geese were found dead from lead shot poisoning, with thousands more ill. Canvasback ducks, among the species most susceptible to poisoning, have dwindled from an estimated 2½ million in the late 1950's

to less than a million today. Redheads, mallards, and black ducks have also declined alarmingly.

In the State of Maryland, wintering populations of canvasbacks have decreased from an estimated 173,300 in 1955 to 63,000 today; the redhead population is down from over 160,600 to only 10,600. The population of Maryland black ducks has gone from 173,000 to 40,000 in this 17-year period. National Wildlife Federation President Thomas Kimball, has suggested that lead poisoning may prove, with these hard pressed species, "the straw that broke, in this case, the ducks back."

Nontoxic soft iron shot has been proposed as a substitute for lead shot. It is ballistically comparable to lead, deteriorates rapidly in contact with water and soil, and constitutes no environmental hazard. Extensive tests have been conducted, both by the firearms companies and the Department of the Interior in recent years. Crippling losses have been found to be no greater than with lead shot and in some tests only about one-third as great. No serious damage to gun barrels has resulted from thousands of rounds fired with the type of shot currently being proposed. The manufacturing process involved in producing the shot are comparatively simple, and no significant unsolved technical problems remain. Production facilities to supply the entire needs of the firearms industry can be placed in operation within a matter of months.

Over the past decade practically all of the major conservation and hunting groups in the country have gone on record in demanding that lead shot be replaced by soft iron, or other nontoxic pellets. These include groups as diverse as the National Rifle Association, the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, the National Wildlife Federation, Friends of the Earth, the Sierra Club, the National Parks and Conservation Association and the Humane Society of the United States. Most of these groups feel that the Interior Department has been unconscionably slow in responding to these demands, and has been entirely too sensitive to pressure applied by the lead industry, and some segments of the firearms industry, to go slow. Most will agree with President Kimball of the NWF and Dr. Grandy of NPCA that there is no reason at all why the industry cannot effect the transition to iron shot with a years notice or less.

My bill accomplishes this by banning the use or possession of lead shot following the 1973 season on any land which constitutes a habitat for waterfowl covered under the migratory bird treaty act. This will bring the long period of administrative foot dragging on this matter to an end. My bill also provides the Secretary with authority to ban from interstate commerce classes of lead shot which are environmentally harmful. A research program is established to assist him in determining how and when to act under this subsection. It seems obvious that problems in enforcing the ban on lead shot used mainly in this type of hunting can be solved, once it is clear

that adequate substitutes can be made available.

The tragic depletion of many species of waterfowl in recent years must be acknowledged, and action must be taken to preserve and restore them. Lead poisoning is, beyond doubt, a major factor in their decline. Some marshes and ponds are now hardly better than death traps. Even if prompt action is taken to halt further deposits, it will be many years before waterfowl can use this habitat without being subject to the effects of lead poisoning.

My bill provides the Secretary with firm instructions, and a firm legislative base, to eliminate the lead poisoning problem in the shortest time possible. I hope that Congress will act on this legislation and thereby erase a severe blot on our national waterfowl management record and arrest the tragic wastage of this magnificent resource.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 5986

A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, to protect game and wildlife resources by prohibiting the use of lead shot for hunting in marshes and other aquatic areas, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 is amended by adding a section 8, after section 7, and renumbering the remaining sections accordingly:

SECTION 8. (a) The Congress finds and declares that lead ballistic pellets are manufactured, sold, and transported in interstate commerce; that overwhelming quantities of such pellets are deposited annually in the environment as a result of hunting; that such pellets are ingested by waterfowl and other marsh birds in aquatic and semi-aquatic areas; that such ingestion results in the assimilation of lead into the blood stream which causes poisoning; and that such poisoning results in the death of a significant number annually of such waterfowl and other marsh birds. It is therefore the policy of Congress to protect the game and wildlife resources of the Nation and to eliminate such undue and unnecessary losses to population stocks.

(b) (1) After the 1973 hunting season it shall be unlawful for any person to use or possess any lead shot on any land which constitutes a habitat for waterfowl or other migratory marsh birds covered under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 703, et seq.)

(2) The Secretary is authorized to ban the manufacture, sale, or transportation in interstate commerce of lead shot, or any other type of shot if it is found, under the research program established in subsection (c), that the toxicity of such shot constitutes a hazard to wildlife, and that nontoxic substitutes are, or can be, made available. The Secretary shall publish notice in the *Federal Register* of intention to act under this paragraph.

(3) Within six months from the date of enactment of this Act the shot type shall be clearly and legibly printed on all shells manufactured for sale or use in interstate commerce.

(4) For the purposes of this section the 1973 hunting season shall be that determined by the Secretary as published in the *Federal Register* under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, as amended.

(c) A research program shall be established by the Secretary to be administered by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, which shall assess all available data concern-

ing the impact of lead and other shot on wildlife, and on the environment generally. The information accumulated under such program shall be available to the public. The Bureau shall make findings and regulations regarding sizes of lead shot which are to be banned under subsection b(2), and other limitations on the use of lead or other shot which can be imposed by administrative or legislative action and which are necessary to eliminate toxic environmental effects. Such findings shall be published in the *Federal Register*, shall be distributed to State fish and wildlife agencies, and shall be open for public comment for 60 days before finalizing.

(d) The Secretary shall issue such regulations as he determines are necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

(e) (1) Violation of this section or regulations which may be adopted and identified by the Secretary for the purpose of its implementation shall be punishable by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

(2) The Secretary is instructed to enter into cooperative agreements with appropriate State and territorial agencies for enforcement of this section on lands which are habitat for waterfowl and migratory marsh birds covered by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act as amended.

(3) Any employee or officer authorized to make arrests or serve citations under this Act is authorized to make a thorough investigation of the arms and ammunition carried by any individual in an area which constitutes a habitat for waterfowl or other migratory marsh birds, including the authority to investigate re-loaded shells.

THE WAR OVER THE WAR ON POVERTY

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following commentary by David Brinkley on the NBC Nightly News which examines the current controversy regarding the Office of Economic Opportunity:

NBC NIGHTLY NEWS BY DAVID BRINKLEY,
FEBRUARY 27, 1973

What has happened is what often happens in Washington: the substance of a problem gets lost somewhere in controversy about politics, money and power.

The substance in this case is the poor people themselves . . . and what should (or can) be done by some level of government to help them . . . whether it's OEO or something else.

The state governors, knowing how Federal programs work, believe if OEO is cut back by President Nixon . . . there will be pressures on them to continue it and pay for it, and they don't have the money.

Members of Congress are irritated because they think the President is defying them, usurping their power, and cutting back programs they voted and without asking them. The President's position is that however attractive are the names of these agencies, many of them do very little more than spend money.

One part of OEO (for example) spends over a billion dollars a year . . . has 180 thousand employees . . . and just how much of the money reaches the poor and how much goes for administration is hard to find out.

So . . . it's one more Washington controversy, coming to be heated.

The President doing what he says needs to be done . . . members of Congress saying if it needs to be done at all it should not be done that way, and they should do it . . . and the Governors afraid another huge financial burden is about to be transferred to them, but not the money to pay for it.

CONGRESSIONAL INTERN PROGRAM

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, this week a group of 57 high school seniors representing high schools in the First and Second Congressional Districts of Ohio are visiting Washington for a week of seminars.

Among the speakers addressing the group will be Congressman CHARLES RANGEL, Congressman JOHN ASHBROOK, Congressman LEE HAMILTON, Speaker of the House CARL ALBERT, and Minority Leader GERALD FORD.

The group will hear about the Senate from Ohio Senator ROBERT TAFT and Senator ROBERT STAFFORD of Vermont.

There will also be seminars on the Supreme Court with Justice Potter Stewart, a discussion with Bill Monroe of NBC News, Robert Webb of the Cincinnati Enquirer, and James Groel of the Cincinnati Post and Times Star, on the role of the press in Washington.

Speakers from several Washington lobbyist groups will address the students on the role of the lobbyist in the legislative process. Other discussions on the operation of the House and the workings of a congressional office will also be held.

After a seminar at the White House, the group will head back to Cincinnati.

Each high school chose its outstanding senior to participate in the program. I am attaching the names of those students who came up to Washington this year.

CONGRESSIONAL INTERN PROGRAM

Anderson High School—Drew Horter, Robert Weber.

College Preparatory School—Elizabeth Beach.

Deer Park High School—Evelyn Altherr.

Forest Park High School—Rick Proud.

Indian Hill High School—Bob Porter.

Lockland High School—John Whitworth.

Loveland Senior High School—Scott Shoemaker.

Marian High School—Sheila Healy.

Marlborough High School—Robert Pfeiffer.

McNicholas High School—Kathy Castellan.

Moeller High School—William Robert MacEachen.

Norwood High School—Ellen Little.

Our Lady of Angels High School—Linda Niesen.

Princeton High School—Joseph Mack

Wathen; Hendrik Van Driel.

Purcell High School—Larry Staubach.

Reading High School—Sally Lackman.

Roger Bacon High School—Robert Den-

terlein.

St. Bernard High School—Salene Bass.

St. Ursula Academy—Teresa Maurer.

St. Xavier High School—T. Jeff Davis.

Summit Country Day—Debra McCabe.
Sycamore High School—David Weinberg.
Ursuline Academy—Kathy Broderick.
Walnut Hills High School—Hermia A. Shogor; Mark D. Hornstein.
Withrow High School—Charles McDougald; Michael Kokofer.
Woodward High School—Barry Stregevsy; Phillip Osborne.
Regina High School—Michelle Boisseau.
Chaperones—Jim Jurgens, Bob Wagner, Steve Baker, Joe Suhre, Sue Suhre, and Major McNeil. John Morley, travel agent.

A BILL FOR THE REFORM OF FEDERAL LICENSING PROCEDURES FOR RADIO AND TV STATIONS

HON. DAVID C. TREEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. TREEN. Mr. Speaker, I have co-sponsored with several of my colleagues a bill for the reform of Federal licensing procedures for radio and television stations.

The bill would amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to restore to thousands of businessmen in the broadcast industry the independence and security they need to survive. It would reverse the trend toward discounting past service to the community as a criterion for license renewal; and it would provide relief to many broadcasters who are in danger of suffocating under mounds of Federal paperwork.

The bill has two principal provisions. It would extend to 5 years the period for which a station's license is valid. Currently licenses must be renewed after 3 years. Second, it would require the Federal Communications Commission to renew licenses to stations who can show that their past performance has reflected a good-faith effort to serve the needs and interests of their communities.

Mr. Speaker, there are three principal factors which indicate that these reforms are long overdue.

First, a recent Federal court decision would dictate that groups who challenge a station's license renewal in an effort to take over the license for themselves must be considered on a virtually equal basis with the current management of the station. This would result in a great deal of instability for the broadcaster; he could not take out long-term bank loans, invest in real estate or expensive equipment, or make capital improvements. The prospect of undergoing such an ordeal every 3 years, with its attendant paperwork and legal fees, is likely to discourage independent and creative individuals from becoming involved in the radio and television business.

Another implication of increased scrutiny of station programming by the Federal bureaucracy is the risk that licenses will become political plums, subject to the whims of numerous politicians and pressure groups. This would tend to make our electronic media little more than an arm of Government.

Finally, the broadcast industry is already highly competitive. Stations which do not satisfy the needs and interests

of their communities cannot survive for long in the fight for high ratings and advertising revenues. There is a real danger that the opinion of the FCC, or of a Federal judge, as to what constitutes the public interest may not coincide at all with the views of the public. The current trend is to substitute increased bureaucracy and Government regulation for the workings of the free market and the judgment of the people. Our bill seeks to reverse that trend.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Record the full text of this very important bill:

H.R. 5077

A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 307(d) shall be amended by striking the first two sentences and inserting the following: "No license granted for the operation of any class of station shall be for a longer term than five years and any license granted may be revoked as hereinafter provided. Upon the expiration of any license, upon application therefor, a renewal of such license may be granted from time to time for a term of not to exceed five years if the Commission finds that public interest, convenience, and necessity would be served thereby: *Provided, however,* That in any hearing for the renewal of a broadcast license an applicant for renewal who is legally financially, and technically qualified shall be awarded the grant if such applicant shows that its broadcast service during the preceding license period has reflected a good-faith effort to serve the needs and interests of its area as represented in its immediately preceding and pending license renewal applications and if it has not demonstrated a callous disregard for law or the Commission's regulations: *Provided further,* That if the renewal applicant fails to make such a showing or has demonstrated a callous disregard for law or the Commission's regulations, such failure or demonstration shall be weighed against the renewal applicant."

PRESIDENT LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have expressed their sorrow at the passing of Lyndon Johnson.

To those of my persuasion, who opposed him on many issues while supporting him on others, President Johnson will be remembered as a superb legislative tactician. His breadth of experience and intimate knowledge of the legislative process, gained through his many years of service in both the House of Representatives and the Senate, served him effectively when he became Chief Executive.

Political life is not without its ironies, and no better example of this in recent years can be found than in the pressures of events surrounding President Johnson's latter days in office.

Despite resounding domestic legislative triumphs, it was his steadfast pursuit of what he conceived to be the best interests of the United States in the Vietnam conflict which led to his voluntary retirement from public life. How gratifying it must have been, shortly before his death, for him to have had the personal assurance of President Nixon that peace with honor was at hand.

I want to join all my colleagues in expressing my sincere sympathy to his widow, Lady Bird Johnson, and to his daughters and their families.

MANDATORY SENTENCING FOR CRIMINALS CARRYING FIREARMS WHILE COMMITTING A FEDERAL CRIME

HON. ROBIN L. BEARD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. BEARD. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today for appropriate referral legislation which increases mandatory sentencing for criminals who carry a firearm in the commission of a Federal crime.

My bill differs from existing law in two principal areas—first, it increases penalties for offenders in both cases of first and second convictions; and second, it gives the Nation's Federal prosecutors the right to have the trial courts' sentencing reviewed if the sentencing judge fails to exercise proper discretion in determining the terms of sentencing.

Under the provisions of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act Amendments of 1970, strict sentences are imposed upon felons using or possessing a firearm in the commission of Federal crimes. The 1970 amendments provided a separate and additional penalty for the mere act of carrying a firearm in committing a crime—specifically separate and in addition to the sentence for the underlying crime itself.

The legislation being offered here today would preserve some latitude in the case of first offenders. However, this discretion is intentionally restricted by the addition of language authorizing the United States the right to seek review of sentences received by first offenders if the trial court judge fails to exercise discretion in meting out penalties in such cases.

The need to maintain discretionary status in sentencing a first-time offender is not to imply that the individuals should be treated with leniency but in recognition of the state of this Nation's penal system. In too many cases our Federal penitentiaries are breeding grounds for the schooling and training of even more determined criminals. The conditions prevalent in many Federal prisons force the internee to react with bitterness and vengefulness on the society which interred him. Therefore to confine a first offender in every instance means there is little hope for rehabilitation.

However, there are many cases where first offender deserves imprisonment. While judges have the authority to mete

out a sentence to these individuals, they often do not. My legislation, if adopted, would offer remedy in the case where the Federal prosecutor determined that suspension, probation or terms of sentence were unreasonable. This added tool would operate in both first and second offenses. Yet, in the case of the second offense the additional penalty is truly a mandatory sentence which may not be suspended by the court, nor may probation be granted.

My bill provides for new terms of sentence. In the case of a first offense, the penalty can be up to 10 years. For second offenders the term of imprisonment cannot be less than 5 years and up to 25 years. In both cases, the sentence is in addition to the penalty for the underlying crime.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Justice Department to make a thorough investigation of the Government's experience with the type of sentencing enacted in 1970. Unfortunately, the mandatory sentencing provisions are not widely known by the general public and therefore, by the criminal as well. Of course, in order to be an effective deterrent to the potential criminal, these provisions must be publicized. If and when my bill is enacted, I will seek widespread publication of its effect and intent, and I will work to see that its use by the court is closely monitored.

With the passage of my legislation, the criminal who thinks to use a firearm in perpetrating a crime will have final notice that this society will not have even the slightest sympathy in the case where a firearm is used.

KEVIN MORRISSEY

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to pay tribute to a fine Irish-American citizen, Mr. Kevin Morrissey, in honor of his installation as president of the United Irish Counties Association of New York. An article in the New York News on March 18, 1973 said this about Mr. Morrissey:

FLUSHING MAN HEADS IRISH COUNTY GROUP

Kevin Morrissey, 38, of Flushing, is the new president of the United Irish Counties Association of New York. He and 27 other UICA officers were installed during a formal ceremony at the Hotel Commodore, Manhattan.

A past president of the Galway Men's Association, he has been a delegate to the UICA from Galway for 10 years. He rose to the presidency from third to second to first vice president during the last six years.

THE 26TH PRESIDENT

Morrissey is the 26th president and the second Galway man to serve in this office.

The UICA is a closed-delegate body, drawing its membership of 262 persons from the 32 Irish county societies and two other Irish fraternal groups active in the metropolitan area.

The organization is spokesman for the Irish-Americans in New York, and maintains a midtown Manhattan meeting center and office which supplies employment immigration and educational services to the Irish-American community.

Morrissey came to this country from Ireland in 1957. From 1958 to 1960 he served with the United States Army in Germany. He is in the insurance business in Woodside. He and his wife Elizabeth have three children, Shelia Ann, 10; Kevin, 8, and Tracey, 7.

LEGAL SERVICES—ILLEGAL PRACTICES

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, last August four boys walked into a market in a deteriorating section of Boston, allegedly pulled a gun on the proprietor and began to empty the cash register. The proprietor pulled out a .38-caliber pistol, which he had a license for, and fired three times. Two boys were hospitalized and all four were arrested. The proprietor was unhurt. I might add that all four boys were known heroin users.

The parents of one of the boys, whose son happened to be one of those severely injured, contacted an OEO legal services lawyer. The following day the legal services lawyer charged the proprietor with assault with intent to murder and assault and battery with a dangerous weapon.

This case may be very typical of the situations which have convinced the administration that the legal services program of OEO has in many cases lost sight of its function.

In the case just mentioned, it would appear logical that the OEO lawyer would prepare a defense for the boys arrested, since they came from a family which qualified for such legal services.

With the large amount of work in most legal services offices and the large number of cases backed up in the courts, it does not appear logical for an OEO lawyer to charge a proprietor of a market with attempted murder after he defended himself from four drug addicts who pulled a gun on him.

Such activity by OEO-funded legal service lawyers has occurred often in the past, and over the last few days I have cited other examples.

Today I submit the following article for the RECORD:

HUB STORE OWNER BITTER

(By Bob Creamer)

John J. Sturniolo stood quietly in a corner of his Roxbury store Saturday, apparently angered and confused over the sudden and drastic change in his life.

A small and rather meek looking man of 49 years, Sturniolo refused to talk about what happened Wednesday when four boys allegedly tried to rob his store, Clifton's Market at 18 Clifton st.

But other people working in the market Saturday, a man and two women apparently relatives of Sturniolo, talked bitterly about the alleged attempted robbery that ended with Sturniolo shooting two of the boys.

"How can they call it a prank," the man asked, "They stuck a gun in him and opened up the cash register."

Sturniolo has told police that when one of the boys poked a gun into him, he pulled out his own .38 caliber pistol, which he has a license for, and fired three times.

One bullet hit 13-year-old George McNeil in the head, lodging at the base of his brain

and leaving him in poor condition at City Hospital.

A second boy, Douglas McGauley, 15, of Savin st., Roxbury, was wounded in the right arm and right leg.

"It all happened so fast," Sturniolo said after the shooting. "I didn't realize how young they were but what difference does that make? The one with the gun was obviously high as a kite and I figured I was a dead man."

The parents of the McNeil boy, Mr. and Mrs. Willie James McNeill, of 73 Willowood st., Roxbury, believe Sturniolo "overreacted" and are attempting to charge him with serious crimes.

Their attorney, Benjamin Jones, of the Boston Legal Assistance Project, has applied in Roxbury District Court for complaints charging Sturniolo with assault with intent to murder and assault and battery with a dangerous weapon.

"We feel the store owner over-reacted," Jones said, "and in doing so turned a childish prank into a disaster."

"What kind of a prank was it," one of the woman said angrily. "They came here in a stolen car with a gun and went into the cash register."

No gun has been recovered yet but reportedly it was a toy. Police have said all four of the boys were known heroin-users and may have been seeking money to pay for their habit.

"He did what anybody would have done," said the man in the store. "And now look what's happening. Even his wife is getting threatening phone calls at home and yesterday some guy from Rhode Island was here trying to get people to picket the store."

The market, located in a deteriorating neighborhood of whites, blacks and Puerto Ricans, has the letters "KKK" painted in white on an outside wall.

"Somebody did that two years ago here and other places," she said, pointing across the street to tenements with the same "KKK" painted on them.

Asked if they planned to stay in business, the same woman, who steadfastly refused to give her name, replied: "Why should we leave. I own this building."

There are two tenements over the store and apparently some members of the Sturniolo family live there although the owner, John, lives in Newton.

"How come," the man in the store wanted to know, "nobody said anything about me stopping the bleeding and putting a compress on." He was talking about returning to the store after the shooting and finding the McNeil boy lying in the street and bleeding from the bullet wound in his head.

"You know what happened here last January?" the man said. "A guy came in with a gun and robbed us. They caught him later and he's been indicted for armed robbery."

While the man and two women talked, Sturniolo stood in the background. Customers came in and out—two little black girls, a black woman, a Puerto Rican man, and several white men. They ordered, paid and left without saying anything.

The case is still under investigation. Two boys are hospitalized and two others are under arrest. There will be a hearing Aug. 23 on the complaints sought by the McNeill's against Sturniolo.

rebuilding of North Vietnam, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a unanimous decision reached by the contemporary issues class at Paris High School in my congressional district:

THIRD HOUR CONTEMPORARY ISSUES,
February 23, 1973.

HON. WILLIAM HUNGATE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: We, the undersigned, are students in the Contemporary Issues class at Paris High School. The class is composed of twenty-eight seventeen- and eighteen-year olds. It is very seldom that our class decides unanimously on a controversial issue. However, on (industrial) aid to North Vietnam we stand united. After thorough discussion we feel we are well informed and it seems that any argument in favor of aid is very weak. We take this stand for several reasons. They are as follows:

1. North Vietnam is not a defeated enemy as were Germany and Japan.
2. The money could be used at home for rebuilding our own slums.
3. North Vietnam still adheres to the idea of one Vietnam and making Indo-China communist.
4. We evidently will not be allowed to administer this aid.

Please take our views and arguments into consideration when you vote on this matter.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. Janet DeLaney, Teacher; Maysel K. Nolan, Robert H. Fields, Ladoris A. Stuckey, Dorothy M. Gregg, Janie L. Meckley, Glenna J. Armstrong, Rick Heitmeyer, Tommy Puls, Douglas Thomas, Roxie Morgan, Mark Rowe; Ronald Millard, Jackie Vanlandingham, Barbara E. Warren, Bill Darnell, Brad Dodge, Elizabeth Stamp, Linda Forbis, Ted Harrison, David Willingham, Tracy Morgan, Wesley Menefee; Nancy Van Praag, Ronnie Fields, David Thomas, Richard Foley, Paul Beamer, and Donald Simpson.

COMMISSIONER ROBERT BALL

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn that the resignation of Commissioner Robert Ball, of the Social Security Administration, was accepted. Commissioner Ball has been a truly remarkable public servant, and I am sure that he will be missed by all of us.

I am proud to have this opportunity to pay tribute to Mr. Ball for the many years of service he has given his country and the American people. He has managed this vast agency of the Federal Government with exceptional competence and efficiency.

The following Washington Post editorial, "A Superb Public Servant," aptly expresses my sentiments to the retirement of Commissioner Ball. I wish him many, many years of health and happiness in his retirement.

A SUPERB PUBLIC SERVANT STEPS DOWN

This is the last week of duty for Robert M. Ball, the remarkable Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, who has been in office for 11 years and who served in lesser jobs with the Social Security Administration for 21 years before that. To the disappointment of many—ourselves included—the White House picked up Mr. Ball's pro forma resignation this winter after the election. But we do not feel that Mr.

Ball's leaving office should be the occasion for expressing more gloom. Rather, it seems a moment briefly to recount the career of this extraordinary public official. For Mr. Ball's 34 years in government constitute a genuine good news story—and, not incidentally, they challenge some of the absolutes you hear tossed around these days concerning the capacity of the federal government to govern and the capacity of the bureaucracy to do well by the rest of us.

Mr. Ball, who began his career in 1939 in the field organization of the Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance, worked his way up through the career service to become Social Security Commissioner. In the course of so doing he threatened, by his performance, to give the bureaucracy a good name. For, in his particular way, Mr. Ball has been the ideal public official: fair-minded, energetic, committed to the success of the statutes he administered and—above all—apolitical. In the 11 years since he came to preside over the Social Security Administration, all these attributes were put to the test as coverage (and complexity) expanded at a geometric rate during the 1960s.

Lyndon Johnson was fond of describing the actions required to put Medicare into effect after its enactment in 1965 as the most complicated and arduous government operation undertaken since the military planning operations of World War II. He didn't exaggerate much. Mr. Ball and his associates had 11 months' time to arrange for such diverse and intricate matters as medical standards, hospital care regulations, insurance coverage, accounting procedures, reimbursement techniques and the rest for some 19 million Americans who came under Medicare's provisions as of July 1, 1966. To look back over the news clippings of the period is to read a wealth of public statements from all manner of concerned persons predicting certain disaster on D-Day. It didn't happen—and the reason it didn't lies largely with the man who is now leaving his government post. That particular exercise in competence and success would of itself have been enough to distinguish Mr. Ball's career. But as many people in this town know it was typical—not atypical—of his performance. Robert Ball's 34 years in government were devoted to showing what *could* be done.

TOWARD A DEFINITION OF ATOMIC PEACE: CULTURAL IMPLICATIONS

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest blessings of a free society is the opportunity—indeed, obligation—to be precise—not to mince words nor to compromise the truth. Words, especially important words and the realities they symbolize, too often elude us. Because of careless overuse or shoddy misuse, the true meaning of words often slip through our mental fingers. Words such as "civilization," "culture," and "peace" are particularly susceptible to such pitfalls.

To fill such semantic voids the intellectuals in our free society can exercise their responsibility by calling things by their right name. Such is the reassuring case of an article by Dr. Edmund Zawacki of the department of Slavic languages at the University of Wisconsin. What he attempts in his notable effort is to define peace in the atomic age in concrete feasible forms of diplomatic and grassroots action.

AID TO NORTH VIETNAM A WEAK ISSUE

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, as we are facing the issue of possible aid to the

Because of the important message it carries for all of us who must make judgments on the issues of peace and war, and civilization and culture, I recommend it to the attention of my colleagues:

TOWARD A DEFINITION OF ATOMIC PEACE—
CULTURAL IMPLICATIONS

(By Edmund Zawacki)

Among the memorable passages in Boris Pasternak's novel, *Dr. Zhivago*, there is one where Lara is beautifully described as pursuing truth:

"For a moment she rediscovered the purpose of her life. She was here on earth to grasp the meaning of its wild enchantment and to call each thing by its right name, or, if this were not within her power, to give birth out of love of life to successors who would do it for her."

Like Lara's, my purpose in this discursive think-piece about "civilization and culture" will be to call a number of things by their right names—after all, an adequate definition of atomic peace can hardly be made otherwise. In words no less memorable than Pasternak's, the nature of the problem was stated by Abraham Lincoln in an American context over a hundred years ago:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must think anew, and act anew . . . We cannot escape history . . . We shall nobly save, or meanly lose, the last best hope of earth."

The American context of Lincoln's message to Congress of December 1, 1862, is, of course, past history now, but the wisdom of the words themselves is even more poignant in the new context of December, 1972, a full century later. Today, the whole world is in the midst of a moral, social and political storm. Moreover, by the brilliant scientific achievement of thermonuclear atomic fusion in 1951, we Americans made the cosmic glare of the hydrogen fireball into the light on this small planet, by which political decisions among nations (including our own) must make moral sense—not just for the next year or the next century, but from now to eternity. Atomic fusion on earth is the process that goes on inside the sun.

What happened on the frontiers of knowledge in 1951 was that political science was pushed willy-nilly by nuclear physics into a direct confrontation with eternity as a political dimension to be reckoned with. Thermonuclear power on earth cannot be compressed back into scientific non-existence; it will be with mankind to all eternity as a blessing—or to Doomsday as a curse.

Regardless of whether governments are aware of anachronisms in their political "dogmas of the quiet past" or not, changes in human habits of thought are already under way even greater than those 500 years ago when a modest Polish churchman-astronomer, in pious pursuit of truth, stopped the sun and hurled the earth spinning on its axis around it. (1973 marks the 500th anniversary of his birth.)

What changed in Nature when Nikolaj Kopernik (in Polish, pron. Mee-kos-wigh Koh-pehr-nik; in Latin, Copernicus) performed that tremendously simple feat and revealed the order prevailing in the cosmos? Nothing changed in Nature. The change was in men's minds, in man's new understanding of himself, of Nature, and Nature's God. The startling new world of modern science was born.

Distance in time perhaps obscures the curious truth that it was Nikolaj Kopernik who gave to the cosmos of his age the basic structure and dynamism that we recognize today also in the atom. In our young atomic and space age the cosmos and the microcosmos are thus scientifically interlocked by the continuity of Kopernik's tremendously simple concept.

It is perhaps not entirely unkind to say

that, among political scientists, it is bad form to worry any more about nuclear holocaust now that ecological apocalypse is fashionable. But the thermonuclear bombs have not gone away; the stock-piles are high and still there—as are the means of delivering instantaneous apocalypse anywhere on the planet. And men wielding political power still think in pre-atomic categories about peace.

Bad form or not, the prime fact in our transient 20th-century modernity is that the orderliness and energy of the microcosmos has been revealed and demonstrated. The atom is no longer a philosophical fancy as it was in ancient Greek philosophy. Nor is it a chemical particle as it used to be in our recent pre-atomic physics. It is now a knot of energy in space—like our solar system and our whole galaxy. Being so, the atom is immeasurably more significant for the future of man on this planet than just a new form of gunpowder.

Man suddenly finds himself standing midway between the atom and the universe, interlocked with both. Some of us stand somewhat aghast at the destructive power of the atom—as well we should. The implications—technological, ecological, economic, political, social, moral, philosophical, religious—are, of course, shattering to our previous 20th-century scientific wisdom.

But—as in 1543 when Kopernik published *De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium*—what has changed in Nature?

In the atom as in the universe, nothing. The change is again taking place inside the minds of men, in man's new convulsive reassessment of Nature, himself and God.

With the formula $E=mc^2$, our whole concept of matter has changed, and, by the same token, our concepts of materialism, realism, idealism must also change—particularly and most urgently in political science or political ideology, or whatever else one chooses to call our human fallibility in political habits of thought. What used to be called *Realpolitik* is turning into anachronistic folly, while what used to be political idealism is beginning to look like a deeper more genuine realism. In philosophy and religion, the Naturalistic approach (i.e. on the scientific premise that "there is no God the Creator") is finding itself hamstrung intellectually by self-contradiction, a truth demonstrated with remarkable simplicity by J. B. S. Haldane in his book, *Possible Worlds*:

"If my mental processes are determined wholly by the motions of atoms in my brain, I have no reason to suppose that my beliefs are true . . . and hence I have no reason for supposing my brain to be composed of atoms."

Obviously, Haldane's own position is that human reason is the pinpoint on which the image of God the Creator is focused in man, for unless this is true, no genuine insight into the universe is possible. Even in a 500-year retrospect it is much harder now to regard Mikolaj Kopernik, for example, as benighted with religious superstition when he exclaimed in pious scientific wonder: "How perfect in very truth is the divine work of the Best and Supreme Maker!" (*De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium*, Book I, end of chapter 10)

It bears reminding ourselves—from time to time, at least—that the cosmic glare of the man-made hydrogen fireball is not the divinely made and warmly luminous Copernican sun by which all life on this tiny planet is sustained. Still, it is the man-made $E=mc^2$, however, which is inexorably the light by which peoples and their governments must make moral sense from now on in their behavior toward fellow-peoples and fellow-creatures (Nature) on the planet; such, *sub specie aeternitatis*, is our new modernity.

In more mundane political phraseology, the frame of reference in which every country's national and international behavior must now—and from now on—make moral

sense, contains at least three inescapable truths:

1. No spot on the planet is more than 15 minutes warning time away from hostile thermonuclear explosions.

2. Nuclear deterrence as a policy—that is, treating the atom as if it were gunpowder—is psychologically unsound and self-defeating. It is the side with the weaker nerves and the more benighted vision that will precipitate the holocaust.

3. The doctrine of coexistence, with or without euphemistic adjectives, is only a euphemistic name for the iron curtain principle among nations. It presupposes two nuclear-armed but ideologically hostile camps with a wall of hate and fear between and, by the same token, it is the sufficient condition for continuing the frictions of what we complacently call a cold war. The cumulative heat of friction in recurrent confrontations and crises must eventually set off the first hostile thermonuclear explosion, for it is thinking as wishful as it is fatuous to believe that the cold war can be ended by maintaining the sufficient condition of its continuation. Coexistence as practiced up to now has been drift toward nuclear war. It should be called by its right name.

Dismaying as these truths may be, they do not mean that security has been banished from the earth. Security never was a physical state. It always was a state of mind. In more precise terms, security, national and international, is nothing more—but also nothing less—than confidence among the peoples of the world that the actions of their governments and their own actions, too, as individuals, are contributing to a dynamically stable and, therefore, genuine peace at home and abroad.

Obviously, the validity of the definition of security that I have just made depends on what is meant by a dynamically stable peace. And now I must ask you to stretch your minds, if you care to try, around a tremendously simple but unaccustomed concept.

Only at our peril may we conceive peace any longer as an inert state. Atomic peace has got to be conceived dynamically as the opposite of war, not its mere absence. In no other way can it be psychologically or morally commensurable with war. Two axioms underlie this definition:

Axiom number 1: When the immediate progenitor of *homo sapiens* first invited his neighbor to his cave, that was the beginning of civilized human life on this planet.

Axiom number 2: When his neighbor accepted and reciprocated the invitation, that was the beginning of peace between them.

Peace is the opposite of war just as hospitality is the opposite of hostility. If my axioms are unacceptable as self-evident truths, then perhaps a wiser man will come forward soon with better ones. In any case, since the truth of $E=mc^2$ is pretty basic in nuclear physics, political science had better start from bedrock, too.

Actually, peace identified with massive, reciprocal, international hospitality at the grassroots of societies does not at all suggest an unattainable ideal. On the contrary, what peace turns out to be is a familiar habit of individual and collective human behavior as common as it is universal. Being so, it is as attractive to the most primitive societies as to the most sophisticated, and is capable of being revved up by resolute political initiatives into a tremendous momentum in a direction opposed to war—capable too, of depositing governments that stand in its way. A legitimate name for it would be, perhaps, "power politics with moral force." Obviously, a resolute exertion of moral force in international relations is something quite different from alacrity in passing moral judgments about others at home or abroad.

It should not escape notice that even worldwide atomic peace is no different in kind from the peace of any city or village

anywhere. We need but the wit to see it. After all, the nature of a city's peace is a positive momentum much more powerful than mere deterrence of, or coexistence with, crime in the streets. Nor does stating a big concept like peace in these unpretentious terms diminish or oversimplify it. What is properly simplified is its translation into feasible diplomatic and grassroots action.

To this end I should perhaps first clarify what is involved in what I called a "dynamically stable" peace. Stability in international relations, whether between states with similar or with different social systems—specifically in U.S.-Soviet relations as an example of the latter—can be conceived in at least two forms.

1. THERE IS THE STATE EQUILIBRIUM OF THE SCALE-BALANCE

The precarious "balance-of-military power" equilibrium achieved through the doctrines of nuclear deterrence and coexistence, is of this kind. It is quite easily upset by technical factors like increased potentials for mass destruction of human life with non-nuclear means, or by psychological factors like jittery suspicions. Cases in point are Cuba (1962) and the current situation in Vietnam, which is only the hot focal point of friction (what Henry Kissinger calls "limited war") of a much larger continuing "cold" war. Internationally nasty and brutal as the fighting is for all concerned, it is only the top of the iceberg.

2. THERE IS THE DYNAMIC AND POWERFUL EQUILIBRIUM OF THE FLYWHEEL—OR OF THE STABLE ATOM ITSELF

This kind of equilibrium has never yet been translated into non-military human activity on a massive international scale. To say that its translation would be futile, or that it would be a super-human objective for American or Russian policy to achieve, would quite obviously be not a statement of fact but a mere confession of poverty or timidity in ideas. The principle of the flywheel is quite simple and well known: its effectiveness as a stabilizer depends on the massivity of its momentum. Massive political application of this principle in U.S. relations with any Communist-ruled country is certainly feasible without threatening a single life anywhere. What it would threaten would be pre-atomic habits of thought at policy-making levels at home and abroad, nothing more, nothing less.

A translation in concrete terms is not difficult to make.

In the United States there are some 30,000 cities and villages in a broad range of sizes. It so happens that there are just about as many in the USSR, with which they can be paired up according to size and distribution. A specific proposal by the U.S. government to the present Soviet government (or vice-versa) for an annual swap of a plain, ordinary, social visit of, say, ten days duration by representative delegations locally chosen (5 to 25 members depending on the size of the paired communities) between 10,000 pairs of communities (100,000 people annually)—all expenses, travel and per diem, outside the native country to be paid by the host national governments, could foreseeably, if pursued resolutely as U.S. (and/or USSR) atomic-age policy, generate the requisite moral force at home and abroad to reach implementation and, thereby, achieve the stabilizing effect of a flywheel in U.S.-USSR relations at the grassroots of both countries.

The stipulation that the U.S. government pay the expenses of the 10,000 Soviet delegations and the Soviet government pay the expenses of ours, is, of course, an uncompromisable one; it is the lever for exerting moral force, for it marks the moral difference between hospitality and the hotel industry. No individual visitor-delegate to either country need be rich to participate.

A socially massive and morally sound policy move of this kind pursued to the observable result that the actual practice of massive, reciprocal, international, grassroots hospitality has superseded the iron curtain principle of restriction in the intercourse of plain ordinary people and ideas at home and abroad, would be a strong step in the direction of an active self-enforcing peace in atomic times. Dynamism of this kind, moreover, would signal a victory in the cold war at the bottom of the iceberg; no victory in the cold war is possible unless the peoples of both sides win. Reciprocal visiting at the grassroots would enhance life in both countries, not threaten it.

Simultaneously, similar reciprocal "open cities" programs on a proportional scale could be activated between the United States and Poland, Hungary, Roumania, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and between the USSR and China. The countries of NATO and the Warsaw Pact could and should undertake them, too, and thus these two international organizations would acquire a cultural function justifying their existence far better than their current anachronistic militarization.

What a hopeful perspective! What a remarkable new world! Perhaps.

Actually, it is only a beginning of what must of necessity become reality in our atomic age if all mankind is not—as Lincoln put it, to "meanly lose the last best hope of earth." Realism in international policy adequate to the reality of $E=mc^2$ is not impossible to attain. But it requires a resolute recognition that the pre-atomic dogmas of pre-atomic political science are pre-atomic, and I submit that the choice before U.S. policy is not now—if it ever has been—between coexistence and atomic war with the USSR or any other country. The American choice ever since 1951 has been between coexistence and atomic peace adequately defined.

As to the feasibility of the "open cities" programs already described, since 1958 a total of about 1000 American cities and villages in five states (Wisconsin, Iowa, Massachusetts, Minnesota and North Dakota)—some, individually through formal resolutions by their city councils and village boards, others through bi-partisan resolutions by their League of Municipalities (N. Dakota) and their state Legislature (Wisconsin)—have gone on record in the Department of State and the White House, offering active participation and urging the federal government to "take resolute steps to the end that the American 'open cities' idea of nationwide, reciprocal, city-to-city and village-to-village hospitality and plain social visiting at the grassroots shall prevail over the iron curtain principle of rigid restriction and control in the relations between the American people and the peoples of the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries."

After the horrible "coexistential" experience of Vietnam, perhaps it is high time these far-sighted American cities and villages were taken seriously in Washington. The administrations of three presidents have treated them with levity. Between now and 1976, we all in America will be celebrating the 200th anniversary of our national life as a free country in what President Nixon designated on July 4, 1972, as "Festival USA". In the words of the President, Festival USA is to be characterized by "travel, discovery and hospitality." These three words, rightly understood, are capable of adding up to a dynamically stable atomic peace only if the last one, "hospitality", is endowed with moral force. It is in the power of the President to so endow it. I pray he will. Festival USA could then, indeed, be identified with a genuine peace and be celebrated sincerely not only in the United States but by all peace-loving peoples everywhere.

I need hardly add that teachers of foreign

languages, like ourselves, would have a great cultural function to perform, too.

DRUGSTORE PROFILE

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, we live in an age where drug abuse is running rampant throughout our Nation. Much of this drug abuse results from individuals specifically seeking the effects drugs produce. Others unknowingly abuse drugs in their desire to cure an illness or illnesses.

It is this latter group I refer to today. What safeguards do we have in this country to prevent this kind of unwanted drug abuse, which often produces harmful effects? The answer, of course, is that we have virtually no safeguards.

We do have the prescription drug system which requires doctors to certify the need for certain drugs, but what about nonprescription drugs and what about the circumstance when several doctors are prescribing different drugs for the same patient, and perhaps at the same time?

A possible solution to this problem appeared in the March 5, 1973, issue of Time magazine.

Mr. Speaker, I include the article in the RECORD:

DRUGSTORE PROFILE

In an age of medical specialization it is not unusual for a patient to visit within a short time a family doctor who prescribes an antibiotic for a strep throat, a psychiatrist who prescribes a tranquilizer, and a dentist who prescribes a painkiller. Some of these medications are compatible with each other and can be taken concurrently. But there are notable and alarming exceptions. For example, certain of the anticoagulant drugs used after a heart attack, in combination with aspirin, may increase the tendency toward internal bleeding. Some antihistamines, taken along with tranquilizers, may produce dangerously soporific effects.

The physician knows the dangers of drug antagonism, but is not always aware of all the medications that a patient may be taking, especially those bought without prescription. The patient knows what he is taking, but is rarely aware of the dangers. But there is someone in a position to know both the drugs being taken and the harm that wrong combinations can cause: the pharmacist. By keeping a medication profile of each steady customer and referring to it each time he fills that customer's prescriptions or sells him over-the-counter drugs, he can prevent the possibility of a harmful reaction.

GROWING RISK

Some pharmacies have kept such records of prescription drugs for decades. But instruction in the use of medication profiles has only in recent years become standard in most schools of pharmacy, and the profiles are only now coming into widespread use for both prescription and proprietary drugs. In fact, some New York City pharmacists dispensing prescriptions under Medicaid are required to keep these profiles on Medicaid patients. The New Jersey board of pharmacy has issued a regulation, now un-

der court challenge, requiring all pharmacists to keep such records. In these and many other states, a customer who hands a prescription to the pharmacist is likely to be asked: "Do we have your individual medication profile?" If not, the pharmacist may try to start one, and add to it with successive prescriptions or purchases of proprietary drugs. When he spots a potentially dangerous combination, his responsibility is clear.

Says Ronald May, pharmacist of a mid-Manhattan drugstore who has accumulated more than 3,000 individual profiles in five months: "We don't decide anything, but when we get a new prescription we advise the physician if ill effects are possible. Then he decides."

BANQUET TO HONOR 35 RETIRING PERSONNEL OF TORRANCE, CALIF., UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, how many of us here today recall a specific teacher who had a great impact on our lives? Perhaps the patient lady who finally made the breakthrough that allowed us to understand long division at last, or the distinguished instructor who made American government so vivid and vital a subject that we resolved to make it our life's work? I'm certain each of us has similar memories.

Yet, few of us have ever bothered to express our appreciation to those dedicated people who had so powerful an influence in shaping our lives and characters. The Torrance Unified School District has determined that such a situation should not be allowed to continue and has scheduled a banquet on April 12 at which it will honor 35 retiring personnel—not only the teachers and administrators, but the janitors and secretaries who make their work possible.

We often stare across the generation gap and regret that the youth are finding new paths to follow other than those we have worn for them through our own experience. Unfortunately, one of the few paths we have made that they will follow is that of ingratitude—the path that leads us hurriedly into our own pursuits without a pause to thank those who have helped us on our way. For the children of the Torrance schools, I would like to offer a word of thanks now to those people who have given so much of themselves to aid the youngsters.

Those retiring are:

Mrs. Marion D. Benike, Mrs. Adelia S. Boal, Mrs. Inez J. Brown, Mrs. Blrtrel Carbutt, Mrs. Marian I. Chambers, Mr. Robert W. Cosby, Mrs. Margaret Collins, Mrs. Ruth A. Cox, Miss Marylin Cravens, and Mrs. A. Claire Dansby. Mrs. Mamie J. Dowling, Mr. Ted T. Dye, Mr. Franklin H. Gornick, Mr. Harold D. Harbourn, Mr. Raymond K. Jansen, Mrs. Juanita Jones, Mr. Frederick C. Klingbiel, Mrs. Dorothy Knudson, Mrs. Mina Lewis, and Mr. Milton K. Marcus.

Mr. Louis B. Mathers, Mrs. M. Irene Morgan, Mrs. Ernest Oliver, Mrs. Kathleen M. Owens, Mr. Ariand Palmer, Mr. Steve C. Pasich, Mr. W. George Rankin, and Mr. Michael E. Reposky.

Mr. Stanley C. Roberts, Mr. Floyd R. Scrivens, Mr. Paul Smith, Mrs. Blanche L. Spiller, Mrs. Freida I. Waterman, Mrs. Edna E. Wright, and Mr. George A. Zavislan.

EMPLOYMENT IN THE MACHINE TOOL INDUSTRY

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be of great interest to my colleagues to bring to their attention a recent study of employment in the machine tool industry since Congress passed the investment tax credit—job development credit.

The machine tool industry in the Greater Cincinnati area is one of our major industries and is vital to our economy.

The tax credits in the Revenue Act of 1971, and the broader depreciation guidelines have in fact been quite instrumental in the current recovery within the machine tool and capital goods industries. It is important to our industry, our labor force, the productivity of our Nation and the capability to compete in foreign markets and improve our balance of trade.

To those critics who argue that the ITC has not favorably affected employment within the machine tool and capital goods industries, I would again cite a study that I brought to your attention in 1971.

On June 30, 1971, a survey was made of the management of the eight largest tool companies in the Cincinnati area. These included, American Tool Works, Carlton, Cincinnati Gilbert, Cincinnati Inc., Cincinnati Milacron, G. A. Gray, LeBlond Inc., and Lodge & Shipley.

The total employment figures for this group as of January 1, 1970, was 11,718. The employment figure for those same companies as of June 30, 1971, was 7,810. This indicated a reduction of 3,908, or a reduction of 33.4 percent.

Comparative total figures in the Nation for the metal cutting segment of the machine tool industry were as follows: Total employment as of January 1, 1970, was 79,800. On June 30, 1971, the figure was 52,000. This represented a decrease of 34.7 percent.

In addition to this large reduction in work force, most of these companies have reduced the number of hours per week that their shops were operating. It is important that those who were laid off in the Cincinnati area during the January 1970 to June 1971 time period were for the most part highly skilled machine tool operators, assemblers, and other specially trained people.

When the recovery did begin in the third quarter of 1971, it was not possible to recall many of these highly skilled employees who had moved on in search of other employment.

A followup study was made in June 1972 to determine the employment level within the Cincinnati machine tool companies. Figures as of June 15, 1972, indicated that total employment for the same eight companies had increased from 7,810 as of June 30, 1971, to 8,663 as of

June 15, 1972, representing an increase of 853 jobs or an increase of 11 percent.

Each of the eight companies indicated that the level of incoming business was up over that of 1971. As a result, they expected employment to increase further if incoming business maintained its current level or improved further. All companies were working a full 40-hour workweek, which was not the case in 1971.

The investment tax credit and the general improvement of the economy have had their effect on improved new business levels. How much each has helped individually, we do not know. However, it is clear that the reinstatement of the ITC and liberalization of the ADR did help business and labor at a time when employment was lagging and they helped to provide the initiative for expenditures in the capital equipment area.

THANKS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a poem written by one of my constituents, Mr. Walter J. Kaiser, Jr., entitled, "Thanks." Mr. Kaiser eloquently offers his and his country's appreciation for a job well done to those dedicated service men and women who have so ably served their country. I would like to share this very touching poem with my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, the poem reads as follows:

HOLLIS-BELLAIRE-MARK POST No. 980,
THE AMERICAN LEGION, INC.

Department of New York

"THANKS"

I speak for the men in the Air Force,
The Army, the Navy, Marines,
The Coast Guard and all of our Allies,
And for those in the Submarines.

I speak for all those in Service
Who are stationed all over this world,
Fighting for the Honor and Glory
Of keeping Our Flag unfurled.

You at home have prayed for our safety,
And for the hope we could surely return
With the Flag of Victory flying,
On our ships from the bow to the stern.

In our hearts we will ever be thankful
For the time which we know that you spent,
Praying in church every Sunday
And praying each day during Lent.

We know that you prayed every morning,
We know that you prayed every night,
We know that your prayers had injected
The courage that helped win the fight.

The prayers that you said weren't wasted,
For each moment, each hour, each day,
Found some wounded patiently waiting
For the moment you started to pray.

Your prayers saved the lives of many,
And the souls of those who are dead,
Who fought and died like the heroes they
were,

To bring peace in the world ahead.

Now, we may be your Sweetheart, your
Brother,

Your Father, or maybe your Son,
But, whoever we are, we just want to say,
"Thanks" for a job well done.

WALTER J. KAISER, JR.,
Americanism Chairman.

ONE RULE FOR ATHENS, ANOTHER FOR ROME

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, 1973, an article appeared in *Variety* discussing one of the most precious rights we hold—the freedom of expression. I would like to insert it into the RECORD at this point:

ONE RULE FOR ATHENS, ANOTHER FOR ROME: OR WHY UNITED STATES REQUIRES NATIONAL CRITERIA

(By Irwin Karp)

If the U.S. Supreme Court were barred from resolving conflicting decisions of State courts, Justice William H. Rehnquist recently noted, "that would lay down 'one Rule in Athens and another Rule in Rome' with a vengeance." The Court is now in the process of deciding whether the First Amendment requires one rule for the entire country, or allow "one rule in Alabama and another rule in Wyoming," and 48 other rules, for determining whether the same book or motion picture is obscene.

This basic question was raised in some of the obscenity appeals recently argued before the Court, and now awaiting decision. Whether or not the Court heeds Mr. Justice Rehnquist's warning will have grave First Amendment consequences for authors, publishers and motion picture producers. At issue is the "community standard" employed in two parts of the three-part test for obscenity. Does the dominant theme of a suspect book or film—"applying contemporary community standards"—appeal to prurient interest? And does the work affront that standard in its portrayal of sex? (The third part of the test requires that the material be "utterly without redeeming social value.")

In various opinions some of the Justices have said that the "community standard" is a national standard, and most courts have followed that principle. But a California decision now before the Supreme Court held that the "community standard" of California be applied. If that decision is upheld, each of the 50 Romes and Athens can apply its own "standard."

Of course, there is no literal "standard" accepted by every community in California from Orange County to Sacramento and Santa Barbara to Berkeley. The "community standard" is really a legal concept much like the hypothetical "prudent man." The crucial issue is whether it could be conceived as a single national standard, or whether each state is free to establish its own standard.

The Athens and Rome approach would inflict heavy damage on the freedoms of expression and communications protected by the First Amendment. To begin with, it would allow every state to determine how much protection its citizens could have under the First Amendment of the United States Constitution. The construction of the standard determines the definition of "obscenity"; and the definition of "obscenity" determines whether a work is, or is not, entitled to First Amendment protection against restraint.

The Athens and Rome approach is much like allowing each state to create its own definition of "treason," and requiring the U.S. Supreme Court to accept it in deciding whether a state has violated the First Amendment when it punishes unpopular political or social writings.

Individual states should not have the power to determine, in this fashion, the scope of First Amendment protection within their borders. The Amendment protects

the rights of every U.S. citizen, anywhere in the country, to create, distribute and read books, films, magazines and other works. It does not say he has a lesser right in one state than in another. Yet the Athens and Rome approach would mean that adults in one state could be prevented from reading and seeing works that were legally available to adults, and perhaps even children; in another state.

It would mean that California could jail librarians, booksellers and theatre owners who distribute books and films that the Supreme Court had held non-obscene in New York or Wisconsin, because the same works might be "obscene" under a differing "California standard."

This would also open the door to a crazy-quilt of censorship that would drastically restrict the publication and production of books, films and magazines that are not "obscene" under even the most conservative "test." If each state can apply its own standard, a publisher or producer faces the threat of a greater number of prosecutions—or threats to local stores and exhibitors—for a "Tropic of Cancer," or "A Clockwork Orange." One appeal decided in its favor by the Supreme Court would not decide a book's fate. Each state could mount its own attack, relying on its own "standard."

The inevitable result would be a "chilling effect" on publishers and producers of books, films and magazines that are distributed nationally. They will steer away from works likely to attract this grass-roots censorship. They cannot afford to defend a multiplicity of suits, nor to risk loss of important markets for their works. Paperback books for example, can be sold at low prices because they are mass produced because they are distributed to a large national audience. At the other end of the economic scale, many fine books and films appeal to a limited audience which is spread throughout the United States. If a portion of this audience can be locked out by the crazy-quilt censorship of an Athens and Rome approach, it becomes economically impossible to publish or produce these works.

Should the Court reject a single, national standard, the principal victims would be the many adults whose precious First Amendment freedom to read, hear and see would be seriously threatened.

VETERANS AT GRAND ISLAND RECEIVE FINE CARE

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am aware, as I am sure are many Members of this House, of the many newspaper articles that have appeared alleging poor treatment of our veterans in the various Veterans' Administration hospitals.

I was very pleased to read a statement that appeared in the *Grand Island Daily Independent* of March 10, relative to the fine care received by our veterans at the Grand Island Veterans' Administration Hospital.

I would recommend that Members of this House read this statement which shows the care being given at this station:

LYONS SAYS NO PATIENTS "NEGLECTED"

Accusations of patterns of neglect to patients in the nation's veterans hospitals "does not apply to the Grand Island hospital," according to Charles Lyons, director at the Veterans Hospital.

"I can only speak for the Grand Island hospital," Lyons said.

The accusations came from a confidential report prepared for the House Appropriations Committee in Washington, and released to the Associated Press Wednesday.

Lyons feels that the hospital here has had no problems of neglect and he has heard no complaints from any of the patients.

Now up to full staff personnel, Lyons said that there are more people employed at the facility than in the last three years. They are also treating more patients than in the last eight years, according to Lyons.

Of 172 beds available at the hospital, there is an average daily census of 165 general medical and surgical beds being used.

WICHITA'S VA HOSPITAL ABOVE NATIONAL AVERAGE

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recommend to the attention of my colleagues, an article which appeared in the *Wichita Beacon* on March 9 concerning the treatment of our veterans at the Wichita, Kans., Veterans' Administration hospital.

We in Kansas are most proud of this station, and I feel that this article from the *Wichita Beacon* should be brought to the attention of my colleagues to show that, in the case of Wichita, the criticism of our Veterans' Administration hospitals is unwarranted.

The article follows:

WICHITA'S VA HOSPITAL ABOVE NATIONAL AVERAGE

Wichita's Veterans' Administration Hospital has an approximate ratio of 1.8 nurses to every patient in the 200-bed facility, director George Lappan said Thursday.

Overall, Lappan added, there is a ratio of 1.6 employees for each patient in the sprawling facility on the city's near east side.

Lappan answered questions concerning patient-employee ratios in light of an investigative report released Wednesday by the Associated Press. The report says thousands of ailing patients suffer from a dangerous lack of care in VA hospitals, because of a lack of adequate staffing.

A check with AP in Washington showed no Kansas hospitals were used in the study.

The study—prepared by the staff of a House appropriations subcommittee currently in the midst of hearings on the VA budget—said the number of VA employees per patient nationally rose from 1.17 in fiscal 1968 to 1.46 in fiscal 1972. Both Wichita ratios are above the national average.

The report alleges the Nixon administration, through its 1974 VA budget, will cause conditions to deteriorate and may even be moving to shut down VA hospitals.

Lappan said the budget figures for Wichita's station for the next fiscal year have not been released, but added he understands there will be a slight hike for normal cost increases.

He added the national VA budget of approximately \$159 million reflects national staffing will remain the same.

Commenting on an allegation that VA hospitals don't have enough nurses to provide even a safe level of care and fall far short of the number needed for the best medical treatment, Lappan said:

"Any hospital can use additional people. We provide excellent service to those we do serve because we try to plan work to get the most accomplished with what we have."

Wichita's VA facility received a little more than \$6 million last year for operation, Laplin said. The 200-bed facility has an average patient load of 170. As of Thursday, 168 patients were in the hospital, including 22 Vietnam veterans. Ten were on the hospital waiting list.

The director said there has been an increase of approximately 19 positions during the year, five of them nurses, for new programs at the hospital.

ARKANSAS REGIONAL MEDICAL PROGRAM

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, for the past few weeks, I have been sharing with my colleagues the various letters and comments I have had from Arkansans involved in the operation of the Arkansas regional medical program.

Recently I received from Dr. Winston K. Shorey, dean of the University of Arkansas School of Medicine, a summary of the history, activities, programs, and operations of the Arkansas regional medical program. So that my colleagues may more fully understand exactly what such a program can accomplish, I include his outline at this point:

ARKANSAS REGIONAL MEDICAL PROGRAM

1. History of Regional Medical Program.

A. Authorized by Congress as a result of recommendations of Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer and Stroke chaired by Dr. Michael DeBakey.

(1) Legislation was considered by House health committee chaired by Congressman Oren Harris of Arkansas.

(2) Legislation as initially introduced provided for a bricks and mortar development of satellite facilities affiliated with a medical center.

(a) In Congressman Harris' committee the legislation was completely rewritten into the form that was adopted.

(1) Testimony by people from Arkansas before Mr. Harris' committee had a great deal of input into the final legislation.

(3) Legislation that passed was oriented toward education of physicians and other health personnel in modern methods and techniques in patient care.

(a) Direct patient services limited to that required for teaching and demonstration.

(4) As time has gone on there has been increased emphasis on direct patient services.

2. History of Arkansas Regional Medical Program.

A. Legislation did not stipulate who should organize a regional medical program or what constituted a region.

(1) It did stipulate that a region must include a medical school and that a program should be affiliated with a medical school.

(2) It stipulated that there should be a Regional Advisory Board which would have responsibility for program.

(3) It stipulated that some responsible body should be the grantee institution with fiscal responsibility for the program.

B. Upon recommendation from UAMC, the President of the University of Arkansas appointed the initial Regional Advisory Group, requesting that it form an Arkansas Regional Medical Program.

(1) Initial Regional Advisory Group constituted the State of Arkansas as the region.

(2) Dean of the School of Medicine became initial coordinator.

(3) Application submitted for planning grant and this was approved.

C. Planning grant utilized to:

(1) Secure office space.

(2) Provide core personnel.

(3) Tour the State of Arkansas to discuss RMP with county medical societies, hospital staffs, nursing groups, and other health professionals.

(4) Prepare application for operational funds.

D. University of Arkansas Medical Center became grantee institution.

(1) RMP staff reports administratively to Dean, School of Medicine.

(2) Throughout operation of RMP the attempt has been made for it to stand by itself with as little image of it as a UAMC activity as possible.

(a) Objective as a state-wide activity relating to all health activities rather than limited to medical center.

E. Dr. Roger Bost became coordinator as program became truly operational.

F. Upon Dr. Bost's resignation, Dr. C. William Silberblatt became coordinator.

G. Regional Advisory Group has enlarged itself and has increased its representation through the years.

H. Emphasis has been upon supporting programs and projects that spring from the grassroots rather than formulating programs centrally and implementing them downward.

3. Relationship with Comprehensive Health Planning.

A. The two programs began at about the same time in Arkansas.

B. Initial decision to bring the two programs into as close a relationship as possible in Arkansas.

(1) This was not the attitude at the national level.

C. Offices for the two programs were provided in adjoining space.

D. The two programs have worked very closely together and have supported each other.

(1) RMP has had greater resources and been able to supply CHP with professional, technical, and clerical help.

(2) CHP has been an official agency of state government and able to bring about changes developed through RMP.

(3) The combined energies of the two programs have resulted in success in several situations where there has been competition among states and regions for funds.

(a) State-wide Comprehensive Kidney Disease Program, \$1,575,000.

(b) Experimental Health Service Delivery System (Arkansas Health Systems Foundation), \$1,690,000.

(c) State-wide Emergency Medical Services System, \$3,400,000.

(d) State Health Statistics Center, \$400,000.

(e) Four (4) Health Service/Education Activities (Fayetteville, Fort Smith, Batesville, Jonesboro), \$125,000.

(f) State-wide Family Planning Program, \$2,100,000.

4. Arkansas Regional Medical Program as a catalytic agency.

A. The staff of ARMP has served to bring together groups of health professionals to develop objectives that otherwise would not have occurred.

(1) Central Arkansas Radiation Therapy Agency.

(a) All hospitals in Little Rock will pool x-ray therapy in one institution. This will be the educational unit in x-ray therapy for the School of Medicine as well as patient care for all hospitals.

(b) ARMP served to get the initial organization started and is no longer a part of the organization.

(c) No direct RMP funds were involved, but ARMP staff devoted time to initial organization.

B. Has provided many meetings and workshops to acquaint professionals with new concepts and developments.

(1) Area Health Education Centers.

(a) Laid ground work which led to medical school's proposal for Area Health Education Centers throughout state.

(2) Physicians' Assistants.

(a) Meeting in Hot Springs introduced concept to physicians of Arkansas.

(3) Professional Service Review Organizations.

(a) Meeting in Hot Springs to introduce concept to physicians.

5. Direct Funding of Projects.

A. Major projects currently on-going.

(1) Training of nurses for activity in Coronary Care Units Baptist Medical Center, \$34,100.

(2) Stroke project at Mountain Home. Development of a Department of Rehabilitation and Physical Therapy, \$12,900.

(3) Stroke project at Harrison. Development of a Dept. of Rehabilitation and Physical Therapy, \$17,700.

(4) Medical technology training. A refresher program for medical technologists at Baptist Medical Center, \$27,500.

(5) Laboratory Quality Control. A program to upgrade quality of laboratory procedures in hospitals in Northeast Arkansas. Conducted by pathologist in St. Bernard's, Hospital, Jonesboro, \$40,700.

(6) Program for dietitians. Provides workshops for food services supervisors in hospitals and nursing homes, \$52,700.

(7) Nursing Home Program. Program to upgrade capability of nursing home aides and fosters work with families of patients. Conducted by Arkansas League for Nursing, \$105,800.

(8) Comprehensive Kidney Disease Program. UAMC, Baptist Medical Center, VA Hospital, Regional Hospitals through state, \$577,300.

(9) Rural Arkansas Medical Extension Services. Medical school faculty make consulting and teaching visits to hospitals throughout state. Approximately twenty communities each month. Telephone consultation services. Information regarding rural communities needing physicians transmitted to students and young physicians, \$160,300.

(10) Cardiac Rehabilitation Program. UAMC and State Hospital. Program to develop rehabilitation services for patients with heart disease, \$33,600.

(11) Consumer Education Program. Conducted as a collaborative effort between University Cooperative Extension Service and State Department of Health, \$132,200.

B. Developmental Projects.

(1) Partial funding of program of Department of Pediatrics, UAMC to train nurse clinicians, \$34,400.

(2) Partial funding of program to determine feasibility of utilizing physicians' assistants in Arkansas. Camden, Arkadelphia, Lavaca, \$16,500.

(3) School of Pharmacy. Continuing education program, \$6,000.

(4) Partial funding of program to train high school dropouts to be health aids. East End Clinic, Little Rock, \$5,900.

(5) Remote cardiac monitoring. Centralized monitoring of coronary care beds in hospitals with too few patients to efficiently do it themselves. Beds in Booneville, Danville, and Mena are monitored by St. Edwards Hospital in Ft. Smith. Beds in Osceola are monitored in Blytheville. (Plan to monitor beds in Murphreesboro, Nashville, Prescott, and Gurdon in Texarkana), \$26,000.

(6) Pediatric Oncology. A program providing consultation services by faculty member from UAMC to children with cancer in Texarkana, \$13,100.

(7) Blood Lipid Program. A program to provide both education and services to physicians in locating families with high risk for coronary heart disease due to high blood cholesterol and lipids, \$15,000.

(8) Provision of a physician for the Bear-den Clinic one day a week, \$6,000.

(9) First aid kits, thermal blankets, and

inflatable splints in every state police patrol car, \$7,000.

(10) Evaluation of library collections throughout state preparatory to making application for funds relative to allied health teaching program, \$7,000.

(11) Pilot program in speech therapy unit at UALR preparatory to making application for larger amount of funds, \$2,600.

(12) Speech training program for individuals who have had laryngectomy, \$10,000.

(13) Program for assisting in the repair and maintenance of electronic equipment used in health facilities throughout state, \$750.

(14) Development of training program in digestive diseases. St. Vincent Infirmary, \$13,000.

(15) Assistance to Sickle Cell Association in public education regarding sickle cell disease, \$300.

(16) Assistance to East End Clinic to provide physical examinations and screening of fifteen individuals each Monday evening with objective of accomplishing complete examination of all persons attending the clinic. Professional services furnished by 810th Station Hospital, Army Reserve, \$4,000.

(17) Assistance to program for instructing teachers of 5th and 6th grades in teaching health matters to children. Camden, Ft. Smith, Little Rock, \$600.

(18) Assistance to Central Arkansas CHP (b) agency in making it possible to merge and become part of State Economic Development District, \$3,500.

C. Discretionary expenditures of funds that have been available. Example below.

(1) Purchase of equipment from several clinics throughout state.

(2) Conduct of conferences, workshops, and seminars.

(3) Assistance to School for Allied Health Professions UAMC.

(4) Travel of medical student to rural health conference.

(5) Assistance to Arkansas Data Center in its development stage.

(6) Expenses of site visit when grant application for Arkansas Health System Foundation was being reviewed.

(7) Purchase of teaching tapes for nurses' continuing education.

D. Maintenance of the program staff of RMP.

A group of highly competent individuals has been brought together with expertise in analyzing health needs, stimulating appropriate people and agencies to take action to meet these needs, and reviewing proposals that are generated to accomplish this. Proposals are critically reviewed, assistance is provided in improving proposed programs, and final proposals are prepared for action by Regional Advisory Group and the national RMPS agency for funds.

Programs sponsored by RMP are constantly monitored and evaluated for effectiveness.

The RMP staff has made itself available to many individuals and agencies for health development. Example: An application for funds to provide family planning services had been disapproved. Assistance from RMP staff resulted in approval of grant for approximately \$750,000 to provide services in Southeast, Northwest, and Southwest Arkansas.

Annual funds for core staff, \$500,000.

6. Regional Medical Programs Service is among the health programs that President Nixon and his administration have decided to discontinue.

A. No funds requested in President's budget for RMP beyond June 30, 1973.

B. Telegram sent to each program on February 1, 1973 stating that programs are to be phased out by June 30, 1973 with the possibility of extending to February 15, 1974 some activities that cannot be discontinued by June 30th.

(1) Subsequent communications from RMPS of DHEW indicate that June 30th should be considered the realistic termination date of RMP activities.

7. The purposes of the presentation that has been made above are:

A. Information to responsible people in government regarding what will be lost with discontinuation of RMP.

B. Request for consideration of a longer and more orderly phase out period if, indeed, the program is not worthy of continuation.

C. Request for support encouraging Congress to give further consideration toward continuing the existence of Regional Medical Programs.

8. A draft letter dated February 27, 1973 from Dr. Harold Margulies, Director of Regional Medical Programs Service, has been received reviewing Arkansas Regional Medical Program as if it were to be continued. This letter results from the annual national review of the program as of October 26, 1972. The following is quoted from the letter.

"It was recommended that ARMP be funded at the November, 1971, NAC approved level of \$1,700,000 (direct costs). The recommendation includes a developmental component and maximum funding of \$375,000 (d.c.) for the kidney disease project. ARMP's overall progress during the last three years has been excellent, but does not warrant increased funding beyond the Council's previously recommended level."

VOLUNTEER ARMY ONE STEP CLOSER—PENTAGON SEEKS NO EXTENSION OF INDUCTION AUTHORITY

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the announcement today by Secretary of Defense Elliot Richardson that the administration will not request any extension of the President's authority to draft young men into military service is good news for the country, and a matter of personal satisfaction for me. Ever since assuming a leadership role and succeeding in the struggle to increase pay for low-ranking servicemen in 1971, I have been confident that an all-volunteer force is attainable.

It is important to note, I think, that the Armed Forces have been, in effect, an all-volunteer operation for the past several months. Not only are new recruits being attracted in sufficient numbers to maintain required strength levels, but the continuing high mental and physical standards of new personnel have reassured many who feared that an all-volunteer Army would become merely a refuge for the poor, the uneducated, and the black.

The administration is to be congratulated for deciding not to ask for an extension of induction authority beyond July 1, 1973. Of course, present plans still call for forced registration of young men with the Selective Service System, to be classified for possible induction. Now that there will be no occasion to select men to serve, there is no logical reason for retaining Selective Service. It merely serves as a rallying point for

those who do not yet accept the all-volunteer force concept, and as a further possible erosion of the constitutional power of the Congress to declare war and raise armies.

FREE FLOW OF NEWS ACT

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing on behalf of myself and my colleague from Illinois (Mr. MADIGAN) the Free Flow of News Act to provide professional newsmen with an absolute protection against Federal or State orders to reveal confidential sources or information.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include the full text of my testimony presented today to House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 3 in support of our bill, along with the text of the bill:

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE JOHN B. ANDERSON

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, I appreciate this opportunity to testify today on the difficult subject of newsmen's privilege legislation. Not only is the problem extremely complex and sticky, but the task of formulating a legislative solution to this problem will be, I am sure, especially formidable and challenging, and I don't envy you this task one bit. In checking with your committee staff yesterday, I was informed that there are currently some 49 newsmen's privilege bills pending before this subcommittee—a fact you must consider somewhat a mixed blessing since, on the one hand, you have such a wide variety of approaches from which to choose, but, on the other hand, these in turn present you with such a multiplicity of choices that sorting them all out and determining which merit serious consideration and approval will require an almost Herculean effort.

I speak with some small appreciation of what you are up against because in formulating my own bill, I carefully analyzed nearly a dozen major newsmen's privilege bills pending in either the House or Senate, and this process was perhaps more confusing than it was enlightening because each bill, in its own way, raises a unique problem or question about how best to legislate in this area. Nevertheless, I am today perhaps further complicating your deliberations by introducing my own "Free Flow of News Act" to provide professional newsmen with an absolute protection against Federal or State orders to reveal confidential sources or information. Perhaps I should take some pride in the fact that I am presenting you with bill number 50 because 50 is supposed to be "golden" and you may even conclude that "there's gold in that there bill."

Mr. Chairman, before I address myself to the specifics of my own bill, I would like to give you some idea as to my constitutional and philosophical observations on this issue, since these obviously have a direct bearing on the legislative conclusions I have reached. Let me begin by explaining that I think the Supreme Court decision in the *Caldwell* case last June was not only unfortunate and regrettable, but wrong, and that the closeness of that 5-4 decision is in itself testimony to the shaky grounds upon which the majority opinion is based. That decision that newsmen do not enjoy an absolute testimonial

privilege under the First Amendment has opened a Pandora's Box and its chilling effect is already being felt by the press as more and more newsmen are being subpoenaed and jailed for refusing to disclose their confidential sources.

The majority opinion written by Mr. Justice White in last June's decision held that reporters are no different from other citizens and are therefore obligated to respond to grand jury subpoenas and answer questions relevant to an investigation into the commission of crime. That opinion went on to reject the notion that the First Amendment protection extends to protecting the confidentiality of news sources or information obtained from those sources. To support its contention that the First Amendment guarantee of a free press would not be jeopardized by subjecting newsmen to such subpoenas, it was necessary for the Court to argue at several points in that opinion that such a policy would not constrict the free flow of news to the public. To quote from that opinion:

"The use of confidential source by the press is not forbidden or restricted; reporters remain free to seek news from any source by means within the law."

And again:

"The conclusion itself involves no restraint on what newspapers may publish or the type of quality of information reporters may seek to acquire, nor does it threaten the vast bulk of confidential relationships between reporters and their sources."

And again:

"The evidence fails to demonstrate that there would be a significant constriction of the flow of news to the public . . ."

And again:

"Reliance by the press on confidential informants does not mean that all such sources will in fact dry up because of the later possible appearance of the newsmen before a grand jury."

The Court thus asserts that confidential news sources will not dry up when faced with the possibility of future disclosure. This assertion is based on a fundamental assumption about the nature and idealistic courage of such sources:

"We doubt if the informer who prefers anonymity but is sincerely interested in furnishing evidence of crime will always or very often be deterred by the prospect of dealing with those public authorities charged with the duty to protect the public interest as well as his."

I am in basic disagreement with that assumption. I cannot believe that the vast majority of confidential news sources would confide in the press if they knew there was a good possibility that their identities would later be disclosed in court. The fact is that there is considerable evidence coming in that sources are drying up as a result of the threat posed by the recent Supreme Court ruling.

Testifying before the Senate Judiciary Committee last month, *Los Angeles Times* Editor William F. Thomas noted that in the last few years his newspaper has spent more than \$200,000 in resisting some 30 subpoenas and the threat of more than 50 others. He went on to say that both newspapers and their sources are becoming "gun-shy." And furthermore, in his words, "At least four times in the past few weeks potential sources in Los Angeles have specifically cited the danger of subpoena in refusing to provide information we both knew they possessed."

I think the Supreme Court, in its majority opinion, was sadly mistaken about the impact of its decision on the continued cooperation of news sources and consequently on the free flow of news. A more accurate assessment of that impact is contained in the dissenting view of Mr. Justice Stewart, and concurred in by Justices Brennan and Marshall. Quoting from that eloquent dissenting views:

"The reporter's constitutional right to a confidential relationship with his source stems from the broad societal interest in a full and free flow of information to the public. It is this basic concern that underlies the Constitution's protection of a free press."

And again:

"The full flow of information to the public protected by the free press guarantee would be severely curtailed if no protection whatever were afforded to the process by which news is assembled and disseminated."

And again:

"News must not be unnecessarily cut off at its source, for without freedom to acquire information the right to publish would be impermissibly compromised."

Mr. Justice Stewart has based this argument on three "factual predicates": (1) that newsmen require informants to gather news; (2) that confidentiality is essential to creating and maintaining this relationship; and (3) that unbridled subpoena power will either deter sources from divulging information or deter reporters from gathering and publishing information.

And to the Court's contention that news sources will not be deterred by the prospect of later disclosure, Mr. Justice Stewart responds:

"The impairment of the flow of news cannot, of course, be proven with scientific precision, as the Court seems to demand . . . But we have never before demanded that First Amendment rights rest on elaborate empirical studies demonstrating beyond any conceivable doubt that deterrent effects exist; we have never before required proof of the exact number of people potentially affected by governmental action who would actually be dissuaded from engaging in First Amendment activity."

Mr. Justice Stewart goes on to say that while this deterrence may not occur in every confidential relationship between a reporter and his source, it certainly will occur in certain types of relationships which involve sensitive and controversial matters, "and such relationships are vital to the free flow of information."

He concludes this section of his dissent by saying:

"Thus we cannot escape the conclusion that when neither the reporter nor his source can rely on the shield of confidentiality against unrestrained use of the grand jury's subpoena power, valuable information will not be published and the public dialogue will inevitably be impoverished."

I have taken the liberty of quoting those dissenting views at length because they accurately reflect my own views on this controversy. Some 50 years ago Walter Lippman wrote that the press's job "is to bring to light the hidden facts, to set them in relation to each other, and to make a picture of reality on which men may act." This same view is embodied in Mr. Justice Stewart's dissenting opinion when he writes:

"Enlightened choice by an informed citizenry is the basic ideal upon which an open society is premised, and a free press is thus indispensable to a free society. Not only does the press enhance personal self-fulfillment by providing the people with the widest possible range of fact and opinion, but it also is an incontestable precondition of self-government."

Mr. Chairman, I fully subscribe to the tenet that a free press is the touchstone of a free and democratic society. So we are not just talking today about granting newsmen a special privilege; we are talking about protecting the people's right to know. And if newsmen are constantly subjected to government harassment and intimidation in the form of subpoenas and other orders, not only will their news sources soon dry up, but our democracy will eventually wither away. While I can appreciate the need to balance the public's right to know with the government's

right to gather evidence for judicial proceedings, it is my firm conviction that in this particular instance First Amendment rights must take precedence because our entire democratic decisionmaking process depends on the free flow of information to the public.

Furthermore, I cannot agree with the majority opinion that these two rights are necessarily at odds here. As Mr. Justice Stewart put it in his dissenting opinion:

"The error in the Court's absolute rejection of First Amendment interests in these cases seems to me to be most profound. For in the name of advancing the administration of justice, the Court's decision, I think, will only impair the achievement of that goal. . . . The sad paradox of the Court's position is that when a grand jury may exercise an unbridled subpoena power, and sources involved in sensitive matters become fearful of disclosing information, the newsmen will not only cease to be a useful grand jury witness; he will cease to investigate and publish information about issue of public import."

Commenting on the Court's decision to require forced disclosure in the name of justice, the *Los Angeles Times* editorialized on March 4, 1973:

"Is justice served when an honest public official, in fear of losing his job, failed to reveal corruption in government? Is justice served when an honest businessman, vulnerable to retaliation, decides not to disclose his knowledge of corrupt practices. It is a fallacious view, and historically inaccurate, that the administration of justice requires testimony under any circumstances."

I would suspect that more justice has been done as a result of good investigative reporting than will ever be achieved once investigative reporters are denied access to those sources which have, in the past, provided information which has led to the conviction of corrupt officials and others.

For all these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I appear before you today to urge adoption of an absolute news shield law among the lines embodied in the "Free Flow of News Act" which I have today introduced.

My bill states quite simply that:

"No newsmen shall be compelled pursuant to subpoena or other legal process issued under the authority of the United States or of any State or territory to give any testimony or to produce any document, paper, recording, film, object or thing that would reveal or impair confidential associations, relations, sources, or confidential information received, developed, or maintained by him or by any other newsmen in the course of gathering, compiling, composing, reviewing, editing, publishing, or disseminating news through any news medium."

This is a shield law which would apply on both the Federal and State level; it is a shield law which protects both a confidential source and information procured from that source. Because this privilege is so absolute, I have taken care in my definition of "newsmen" to limit this protection to professional newsmen, that is, those persons who are regularly engaged in earning their principal income or as a principal vocation, on behalf of a publisher or operator of a news medium, in a course of activity the primary purpose of which is the gathering, compiling, composing, reviewing, editing, publishing or disseminating of news through any news medium.

While I can understand some of the apprehension about providing such an absolute shield, I have concluded, after giving this much thought, that if we are to legislate in this area we must reject various proposals for a qualified privilege. As well-intentioned as these qualified bills are in attempting to balance various interests, I fear their ultimate impact would be retrogressive and counterproductive in terms of insuring the continued free flow of news. The various qualifications only would, I am convinced, provide enterprising attorneys and judges

with loop-holes large enough to pilot boats through on fishing expeditions. So for once I am compelled to maintain that compromise is not the better part of political or constitutional wisdom in this instance, and I would rather see us pass no bill before we adopted a qualified shield law. In the interest of democracy, I think we must give the professional press the benefit of the doubt and assume that they will act responsibly and not abuse this privilege.

One of the few statements in the Court's majority opinion of last June with which I can agree is that:

"Congress has freedom to determine whether a statutory newsman's privilege is necessary and desirable, and to fashion standards and rules as narrow or broad as deemed necessary to address the evil discerned and, equally important, to re-fashion those rules as experience from time to time may dictate."

As I mentioned earlier, I think the Court's decision was most unfortunate and regrettable, but as a result of that decision and its chilling ramifications the issue is now in our laps and it is incumbent upon us to statutorily restore the First Amendment guarantee of a free press before it is too late. I therefore strongly urge this committee to give my absolute news shield bill its serious consideration and to report to the House legislation which will insure the free flow of news to the public which is central to the continued viability of our democracy.

H.R. 5908

A bill to preserve the free flow of news to the public through the news media

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Free Flow of News Act."

ABSOLUTE PROTECTION

Sec. 2. No newsman shall be compelled pursuant to subpoena or other legal process issued under the authority of the United States or of any State or territory to give any testimony or to produce any document, paper, recording, film, object or thing that would reveal or impair confidential associations, relations, sources, or confidential information received, developed, or maintained by him or by any other newsman in the course of gathering, compiling, composing, reviewing, editing, publishing, or disseminating news through any news medium.

SPECIAL LIMITATION

Sec. 3. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of the invalidated provision to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 4. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "newsman" means any person who is or was at the time of his exposure to the information or thing sought by subpoena or legal process, regularly engaged in earning his or her principal income, or regularly engaged as a principal vocation, on behalf of an operator or publisher of a news medium, in a course of activity the primary purpose of which was the gathering, compiling, composing, reviewing, editing, publishing, or disseminating of news through any news medium.

(2) The term "news medium" means any newspaper, magazine, radio or television broadcast, or other medium of communication by which information is disseminated on a regular or periodic basis to the public or to another news medium.

(3) The term "news" means any communication of information or opinion relating to events, situations, or ideas of public concern or public interest or which affect the public welfare.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS IN NORTHERN MINNESOTA

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I am certain my colleagues are receiving ever-increasing amounts of mail about the President's proposed cutbacks in the social services area. His contention that all these successful programs can be salvaged through special revenue sharing seems less and less valid with each letter we receive.

Recently, my office received a copy of a letter Mr. Richard E. Holm, vice president of the Minnesota Community Action Program Director's Association, sent to President Nixon about this problem. Mr. Holm has written a persuasive and moving account of the consequences of these cutbacks. I urge each of my colleagues to read this letter and keep Mr. Holm's comments in mind as they consider legislation to continue these valuable social programs:

KOOCHICHING-ITASCA

ACTION COUNCIL,

INTERNATIONAL FALLS, MINN.,

February 26, 1973.

President RICHARD M. NIXON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT NIXON: It is with deep sadness in my heart that I write to you. I am a director of a Community Action Agency serving low-income people in northern Minnesota. You may think that what I have to relay is of selfish interest, but I can reassure you that my economic well being at this time is the farthest thing on my mind.

I have no doubt that the recent decisions you arrived at concerning program reductions and/or eliminations were made with hard economic rationale. We too, in the field, have to make such decisions and our priorities are often hard to live with. In your case millions of dollars are involved as are millions of people.

The decision to terminate programs that aid low-income persons is very difficult for me to understand. To me, it signifies that our nation places a higher value on economic well-being than on human well-being. It is true that both are interrelated; however, one without the other can lead to severe problems for our country.

Perhaps your decision was based upon a perception that poverty programs lacked effectiveness. If so, I believe you were misled. Recent studies have shown the majority of these programs to be meeting many of the needs of poor people, in fact more efficiently and effectively than the traditional welfare programs which have been operational much longer than our programs.

I also understand the role Revenue Sharing is to play as related to your Reorganizational plans. Locally managed poverty programs were, in fact, the forerunner of the Revenue Sharing concept. One major problem of Revenue Sharing as I see it, is the fragmentation of funding particularly in rural areas. Even today rural areas lack the resources to overcome many of its social and physical problems, much more so than urban areas where employment is more readily available as are other financial resources.

It would be unrealistic to expect rural-local units of government to finance social programs with Revenue Sharing when so many other unmet needs are pressing as well. For example, a fire truck may be more important than job training to a small community.

One major premise upon which the decision was reached to scuttle OEO was inefficiency and high administrative costs. In our case there is no program administered by our agency where total administrative costs exceed 15% and, in fact, ours average under 10%. We have two professionals, myself and our Headstart Director. My salary is the only salary over \$10,000.00 per year and the \$11,400.00 I receive is down from the \$11,500.00 I received when I was hired over 3 years ago as Board approved annual raises were not accepted so that non-professional low-income staff might enjoy at least a 5% yearly salary increase. Our 1972-73 payroll of just over \$443,000.00 went to 684 enrollees and staff, hardly indicative of anyone getting "fat" off the poverty programs in our area.

The salary I receive is adequate to support two adults and six children in our family, but not excess. With my Masters degree in Public Administration and 5 years employment in the poverty program and 3 years plus in Welfare, I do not believe the salary to be exorbitant. In 1972 County Welfare Department in our county employed 13 staff members with a higher salary than myself.

Although it may be too late, I am taking the liberty of sending you four papers summarizing where we have been in the last year or so. These are not the sum total of our activities but will indicate, I hope, that low-income persons have been able to help themselves within the framework of our Democratic system.

To me your apparent conflict with Congress is immaterial. What is important is that low-income people in our prosperous nation are not neglected. It is my moral obligation to serve my fellow man, particularly those less fortunate than myself. I consider it my duty to write to you and our Congressman about my concerns and I sincerely hope I have not offended you.

With warmest regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

RICHARD E. HOLM,
Vice President of Minnesota CAP Directors' Association.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—
HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

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

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

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

We must make every effort to alleviate their anguish by redoubling our search for the missing servicemen. Of the incalculable debt owed to them and their families, we can at least pay that minimum. Until I am satisfied, therefore, that we are meeting our obligation, I will continue to ask, "How long?"

**ABDNOR REBUTS ARTICLE SAYING
FARMERS GET THE BULK OF
FOOD PRICE RISE**

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, as a farmer and cattleman, I take strong exception to the Washington Post article of today which gives the inference that the reason for today's high food prices are largely a result of the prices that farmers are getting for their produce.

While it is true that strong world demand in the face of relatively short supplies has increased produce prices, the farmer has not received the type of profits his white- and blue-collar counterparts have over the past 20 years. The profits that the farmer is getting today are long overdue. In light of this, the comparisons used by the Washington Post paint a very unfair picture of how the farmer has attained his profit, which was illustrated by slicing up a beefsteak into three parts: Eighty-two cents for the farmer, 32 cents for the retailer, and 7 cents for the processor, out of a pound of prime beef selling for \$1.22.

First of all, the article only briefly mentions that the farmer has had to pay higher prices for livestock feed, and equipment. The article made no mention of how dramatically these prices have risen. If you make the comparison fairly and compare it to a 230-percent jump in wages over the past 20 years, the farmer is far behind in comparable income gains over the same period. The value of farm products has risen less than 15 percent over the same period. The cost of farm equipment has risen 50 percent, on the average over the past 10 years.

Ten years ago you could buy a tractor for about \$6,000. Now a tractor costs around \$12,000. And the rise in the cost of feed ingredients for livestock is not much better. As recently as December 19 of last year, the U.S. Department of Agriculture reported that its index of the cost of all feed ingredients for cattle stood at 206.6 percent of the 1967 average, up from 107.2 percent in just 1 year.

Second, the comparison of 82 cents for the farmer to 32 cents for the retailer is not a fair one. To earn that 82 cents, the farmer put in about 2½ years raising that beef before he sold it, where the retailer for his 32 cents profit had that same beef not more than 48 hours. Talking in terms of volume, the retailer far outstrips the farmer in terms of profit. Also there is no real risk involved for the retailer as there is for the farmer, such as hard winters or calf losses.

Another factor which this article neglects to mention is that although the price of beef and other produce might be high right now, in a year from now the bottom could fall out of the agriculture market. Presently we are experiencing several factors which have driven the price of beef and grain up. This past winter was a rough one for cattle, there were high calf losses, and the weight of gain loss is down. Also, the supply of other meat products also plays an important part on the price of beef, because all meats compete to a certain extent with each other.

One major problem today—as it was last year—is that both beef and pork are in relatively short supply, and now poultry supplies are also off, because of producers' efforts to reduce the demand for increasingly expensive feed.

As for the high cost of grain, poor weather conditions in Russia, China, and India have caused all three countries to buy enormous quantities of grain from the United States and other exporting countries, forcing prices up. Domestically, an unusually wet winter in 1972, and the corn blight of 1970 have also played important parts in the prices of food. However, just because these unusual conditions exist today, it does not mean that they will exist tomorrow. Next year if China, Russia, and India have good crops, there will not be the international trade market agriculture now has, and the prices will drop. If farmers gamble and plant more acreage as is being allowed by the Department of Agriculture, he could well lose. Oversupply will force prices down.

Mr. Speaker, there is no guarantee of anything in farming. There is no minimum wage, no jump in fringe benefits that wageworkers have enjoyed at the rate of 700 percent over the past 20 years, and no increase in the farmer's share of the food dollar. Since 1952, the farmer's share of the food dollar has declined from 49 to 38 cents today—hardly the picture of profit that the Washington Post would lead the average reader to believe.

Mr. Speaker, part of the problem that the farmer faces is that he is too efficient for his own good. Each farmer today feeds 56 Americans, and one-fourth of our farm production now helps feed the rest of the world. If the middleman worked with the same efficiency as the farmer, food prices would be lower.

According to a recent article in the Reader's Digest, labor unions are responsible for many of the hidden costs at the supermarket. It cited that contracts often stipulate that a well paid journeyman butcher do relatively simple tasks such as filling display cases, washing knives, and sweeping back rooms. With butchers earning up to \$14,000 a year, the Digest continued, plus high paid overtime, most supermarkets today lost money on their beef sales—and compensate by raising prices on other items.

Before we go and try to pin the high cost of food prices on the farmer, Mr. Speaker, let us take a fair look at the picture over the past 5 years, and even the past 20, not just comparisons for the months of January over the past year.

Let us realize that on March 15 at the Lemmon, S. Dak., livestock market, Adolph Herman sold 619 pounds of beef on the hoof for \$56.20 per hundredweight. This comes to 56 cents a pound. That is not a fantastic profit considering the work and risk involved in raising that calf.

In South Dakota, ground beef is selling for 89 cents a pound. I understand it is \$1.19 in Washington, D.C., supermarkets. The difference in the price is mostly labor. To sock the point home, let me reprint the menu from the Elks Club in Sioux Falls, S. Dak. Those of us that live and work in the Washington, D.C., area will realize that comparable restaurant prices in the suburban metropolitan area run about \$3 a person more for beef, and even seafood. Certainly the farmer who sold his steer at 56 cents a pound is not responsible for the vast difference in the price of beef here in Washington, and in South Dakota. Where then, Mr. Speaker, lies the difference?

The menu follows:

SOUTH DAKOTA'S TENDER AGED BEEF

262 Roast Prime Ribs of Beef Au Jus, the most tender cut of any beef, \$3.50.

New York Cut Steak, traditionally a man's favorite cut, \$4.25.

T-Bone Steak, \$4.50.

Top Sirloin for Kings, among men of the meat packing industry, this is their favorite. Long on juices and flavor, \$3.95.

Top Sirloin for Queens, ladies' favorite, \$3.50.

Club Sirloin Steak, \$3.95.

Filet Mignon, no footnote needed to describe the queen of red meats. Cut from the best procurable beef, \$4.95.

Sirloin Steak Sandwich, \$3.00.

Steak and Lobster, petite broiled lobster tails and tenderloin steak, \$6.95.

Let us suggest a red wine to complement your dinner.

FROM THE SEA TO YOU

Jumbo Shrimp, whipping big gulf shrimp—deep fried and served with our own hot sauce, \$2.75.

Walleye Pike, from the cold lakes of Canada and served with lemon butter sauce, \$2.75.

Deep Sea Scallops, dipped in a light batter. Deep fried and served with hot sauce or tartar sauce, \$2.75.

Fisherman's Seafood Platter, pike, sea scallops, shrimp served with tartar and hot sauce, \$3.25.

Broiled African Rock Lobster, \$6.95.

OLD BUT DISTINCTIVE FAVORITES

Sauteed Slices of Calves Liver, served under a rasher of bacon, \$2.75.

Ground Round of Beef Wrapped In Bacon, \$2.75.

Disjointed One-Half Spring Chicken, fried to a golden brown, \$2.75.

Grilled Center Cut Pork Chops, served with tangy applesauce, \$2.75.

Bar-B-Queed Ribs, \$3.

**DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR
WILLIAM BENTON**

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my sorrow over the death 2 days ago of William Benton, a distinguished public servant and publisher, and to ex-

press my condolences to his wife and wonderful family.

Bill Benton was a rare and restless reformer, a man dedicated to the very highest principles of our country. His productive life included five careers: advertising, university administration, public service, a term in the U.S. Senate, and chairmanship of a broad publishing career which included the publishing of *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. In each one he excelled, although his courageous opposition to Senator Joseph McCarthy brought him defeat at the polls and ended his Senate term.

It was once said of Bill Benton that "he rushed in where angels feared to tread, but always came out with gold on his wings." He was a pioneer and a crusader in business, education, and politics, and this Nation is all the better for having known him.

Mary Louise joins me in extending our condolences to his widow, Mrs. Helen Benton, his two sons, Charles and John, and his two daughters, Mrs. Helen Boley and Louise.

VA HOSPITALS: GET FULL STORY

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, recently publicized criticisms of VA medicine has resulted in expressed concerns from many Florida veterans.

While all Americans can agree the delivery of health care to our Nation's veterans should be "second to none," each of us feels the reporting of deficiencies in the Veterans' Administration hospital system should be accurate and well documented. There is no question where deficiencies exist they must be corrected. But we must have all the facts. In this connection, I would like to commend to your reading an editorial which appeared in the March 10 edition of the Florida Times-Union which is published in Jacksonville.

VA HOSPITALS: GET FULL STORY

The admonition to "get the facts" seems to be particularly appropriate in regard to the somewhat sensational charges leveled on basis of a "secret" investigative report of Veterans Administration hospitals.

Members of the House Appropriations subcommittee who prepared the 41-page report agreed to give the VA an opportunity to study the charges, and then simultaneously make public both the allegations and the replies.

However, as so often seems to happen in Washington, a copy of the report was somehow "leaked"—containing only the charges of a "dangerous lack of care" and allegations of patients sometimes being "dismissed in worse shape than when they were admitted."

Surely, the operation of this nation's hospitals for veterans is a matter of priority public concern. Faults cannot be corrected before they are uncovered, and it is a matter of sound public policy to take regular searching looks at the operation of such significant facilities.

On the other hand, the prime need of any such "searching look" is perspective. With nearly 100,000 beds listed in the VA's vast

nationwide complex of 168 hospitals there inevitably will be a range of care from excellent to below-standard—just as there would be in a similar study of this number of ordinary civilian hospitals, either public or private.

One of the most significant aspects of the report—as yet unanswered to the public—would be the basis of selecting 14 hospitals out of the total of 168 (or 1 in 12) which were involved in the study.

It would make a world of difference whether these were (a) picked at random by some method to assure a fair, representative cross-section, or (b) selected for the study because of complaints about these particular institutions.

If the latter were true, the picture would not be "representative."

The point of this is neither to defend nor criticize the VA's operation of these hospitals before the pertinent facts are out, but rather to emphasize that neither conclusion can be justly drawn until all such facts (not merely a surface gleaning) have been ascertained.

Only a calm and dispassionate study in depth can achieve the unquestioned goal of the American people (if not the motive of the subcommittee member who "leaked" the report)—the best possible care for the veterans who need this care because they served their country.

CONGRESSIONAL INTERN PROGRAM

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a bill to establish a congressional intern program for high school teachers of government and social studies in honor of President Johnson.

As I stated at that time, my aim in introducing this legislation is to provide teachers with a firsthand view of congressional operations in order to complement the academic training of our teachers with the enrichment of practical experience.

At the time I was working on this bill, I wrote to Mrs. Johnson, and asked that she let me know if she would object to naming my proposed program in honor of her husband.

Since I did not hear from Mrs. Johnson for several weeks, I introduced the bill, assuming that no objections were forthcoming.

Today, I received Mrs. Johnson's reply, and I would like to share it with my colleagues:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEHMAN: Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of legislation to establish a teacher internship program named in honor of my husband. While I have felt that it would be inappropriate for me to involve myself in proposals of this type, I believe that Lyndon would have been in favor of such a proposal. He was dedicated to improving the educational institutions of our nation, and I am sure that the purpose of this program would be very helpful in this direction.

Sincerely,

LADY BIRD JOHNSON.

P.S.: To see government at work at first hand would, I believe, add to their understanding and ability as teachers.

RIISING FOOD PRICES

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Washington Star, there is a page-1 story which states that the Cost of Living Council expects food prices to rise for the rest of the year.

The only hope the Council can offer is not for lower prices, but for a leveling off at a level which may be too high for most American families.

At the end of the story, the Council's Deputy Director, James W. McLane, is reported to have suggested that housewives buy in volume, take advantage of sales, and alter eating habits if necessary.

Mr. Speaker, it is time the administration stopped dreaming. The people of my district in northeast Philadelphia have been hearing this advice for months from just about every spokesman the administration has dared to send out and they have been trying to cope with impossibly high food prices even longer.

Just about the only means they have left of saving money is to stop eating.

At this time I enter the Washington Star article into the RECORD:

[From the Washington Star and Daily News, Mar. 20, 1973]

FOOD PRICE TO RISE REST OF YEAR

(By John Holusha)

The government's Cost of Living Council today has scant encouragement for housewives troubled about rising food prices.

The best that can be hoped for Council Deputy Director James W. McLane said, was for the rate of increase to taper off toward the end of the year—perhaps reaching a zero rate by December.

However, the actual price of an average market basket of food will continue to increase, he admitted. McLane said an Agriculture Department estimate that retail food prices will increase 6½ percent during the course of 1973 is basically correct.

McLane again reiterated the Nixon administration's opposition to a mandatory freeze or ceiling on prices at the farm level. The council officials restated their position at a hastily called news conference on a day when several members of the Senate indicated they would attempt to attach food price freeze amendments to the pending Economic Stabilization Act.

The act is must legislation for the administration since it contains the authority for economic controls. The current legislation expires on April 30.

Meanwhile, Herbert Stein, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, told a group of executives here that he thought the increase in food prices was nearing its end.

Asked if the Nixon administration would support food boycotts by housewives, Stein said: "This is a free country. If your wife doesn't want to buy you any meat, I don't see that I should complain."

In the Cost of Living Council's white paper on food prices, prepared for congressional leaders, the panel stressed the measures being taken to increase supply, eliminate transportation bottlenecks and keep a tight squeeze on price markups by retailers.

The paper said, though, that "much of the price-restraining benefits of bumper crops

this year will not be felt by consumers until early 1974."

The paper covered the familiar ground of the reasons for the rising trend of food prices: Bad weather in the United States, massive sales of grain overseas (which McLane admitted was something of a mistake), and non-stop consumer demand.

It noted that the government is "literally emptying its grain bins to increase supply and cutting out subsidies for stored grains." It noted that some 40 million acres have been taken out of "storage" and placed into production.

The result of all these measures, the report indicated, will be lowered prices on the farm by the end of the year—price reductions that will not be reflected in the supermarket for several months afterward.

The council also hedged its prediction on supply. "The outlook presented here," the report said, "is based on normal weather; unusually favorable weather would improve the outlook, but unfavorable weather would worsen it."

Questioned about specific areas of food price reductions for the end of 1973, the council officials said the only sharp drops likely will be in fresh fruits and pork.

Asked what advice he would give housewives about their supermarket shopping in the rest of the year, McLane suggested they buy in volume, take advantage of sales and alter eating habits if necessary.

SENATOR WILLIAM BENTON

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, in each generation, there emerges a handful of extraordinary men who seem able to jam into lifetime, a number of careers, all successful and all in their way, dedicated to advancement of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, Connecticut's former Senator William Benton was one of those men. Today, the people of the Constitution State—and people from all parts of the world—are mourning his passing.

To give an accurate accounting of Bill Benton's career would take many hours and fill many pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In brief, he was the cofounded—with former Connecticut Gov. Chester Bowles—of the Benton-Bowles Advertising Agency, which in the 1930's, created a new dimension in the corporate world and assisted in returning prosperity to the Nation.

He later became publisher of Encyclopedia Britannica and with his ever present spirit of humanitarianism, tied its earnings to the University of Chicago. Since 1943, this combination has brought more than \$43 million to the Illinois University.

In 1939, he purchased Muzak Corp. and helped bring an increased amount of entertainment to America. In 1942, he formed—with Paul Hoffman, who was later to become administrator of the Marshall plan—the Committee for Economic Development which ultimately helped rebuild war-torn Europe.

In 1945, he began a career in foreign service after being appointed Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. In

that capacity, he supervised the operation of Voice of America and while there planted the seeds for what we now know as the U.S. Information Agency.

In 1946, he was appointed to the chairmanship of the U.S. delegation of the first general conference on the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, a forum he was to return to 15 years later when President Kennedy named him U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO.

In 1949, Governor Bowles appointed Mr. Benton to the U.S. Senate, filling the unexpired term of Connecticut's distinguished jurist, Raymond E. Baldwin. He had not been at his post long before his mark as a humanitarian and civil libertarian became well known and respected. To say that he served his State and Nation with anything less than distinction would do him a great disservice.

Mr. Speaker, I have only recounted the highlights of Senator Benton's career. Interestingly, he once told former Connecticut Gov. John N. Dempsey that of all the honors and opportunities he was afforded in his lifetime, one of the greatest was to serve as a trustee at the University of Connecticut. That is the measure of the man, Mr. Speaker, a man who was interested in his Nation, its growth, and most importantly, its greatest natural resource, its youth.

I know that all the Members of the House join me in extending deepest sympathy to Mrs. Benton and her family in this time of great loss.

INTERNATIONAL TERROR

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the necessary concern which we must have over worldwide terrorist activities is very effectively summarized in a WGN, Ill., editorial broadcast on March 11 and 12. I insert it into the RECORD at this point:

INTERNATIONAL TERROR

The world has been appalled over the last several months by a series of events which have seen the loss of many lives and the dimming of hope for peace in the Middle East. The tragedy at the Munich Olympics—the carnage at Lod airport—the letter bombs—the shooting down of a Libyan jetliner—and the killing of three diplomats, two Americans and one Belgian.

Cleo Noel and George Moore have been laid to rest. They were buried in places of honor at Arlington National Cemetery. They were men of valor, placed in the role of heroes by circumstance. They must have died bravely.

Perhaps their lives could have been saved . . . if President Nixon and leaders of other countries had agreed to terms of international blackmail. But the President acted otherwise, and quite correctly, we believe. As he put it in a speech five days after the three men were slain . . . "The nation that compromises with the terrorists today could well be destroyed by the terrorists tomorrow."

The eight terrorists who took over a diplomatic reception in Khartoum have been taken into custody by the Sudanese government. President Gaafar Nimleri has promised

justice and urged his Arab neighbors to join him in condemning terrorism. We commend him for his attitude . . . and hope that he has the influence, both at home and abroad, to see others follow his lead.

ASSURING SOCIAL SERVICES FOR THE ELDERLY

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, today, I reintroduce, with an additional 32 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle, legislation amending the title IV A of the Social Security Act to exempt the elderly, blind, and disabled from the requirement that 90 percent of the funds for social services to these persons must be spent on actual cash welfare recipients and that only 10 percent of these limited moneys can be spent on the elderly poor or disabled, who are not on public assistance. This limitation was imposed by Congress last year as a part of a hastily adopted amendment to the Revenue Sharing Act of 1972. These 32 cosponsors raise to 54 the number of our colleagues joining me in a bipartisan effort to immediately lift a hardship imposed on many elderly, blind, and disabled citizens by this 90-10 limitation. Previously 22 Congressmen, both Republicans and Democrats from every region of the Nation, joined me in cosponsoring H.R. 4636, identical legislation introduced February 22, 1973.

The legislation we propose stipulates that the 90-10 limitation will not apply to service programs for the elderly, blind, or disabled while assuring that the \$2.5 billion ceiling will remain on Federal support for social services. The effect would be to allow States to fund ancillary service programs for nonwelfare poor who are elderly, blind or disabled. Immediate action on this legislation is imperative since many States will soon exhaust the 10-percent of the funds reserved for social services for nonwelfare recipients.

There are large numbers of elderly persons who, although eligible for welfare, prefer to get by on their modest pensions. Many are able to survive only because a "meals on wheels" program, for example, serves them one hot, nutritious meal a day. Many existing service programs like this will be abolished or severely limited if Congress does not act soon. Transportation, nutrition, recreation, personal care, and other services, things that so many of us take for granted and the services that the elderly or handicapped people are often least able to provide for themselves, are being closed to these poor, but deserving and needy people who refuse to go on welfare.

Because we believe these people are also entitled to a life of independence and dignity, we cannot believe that Members of Congress intended to abruptly close already established ancillary service programs to those elderly who are too proud to go on welfare, even though they are eligible for old-age assistance. But

the effect of existing law is to require these people either to suffer the loss of these necessary services or to go on welfare to receive them. The result of the latter, of course, would be to increase the welfare case load and the cost of welfare. Such a policy would be both unwise and inhumane.

Immediate congressional action is demanded. That is why we have proposed this legislation as a reasonable and necessary solution to this critical problem of services for deserving poor who will not go on welfare. We urge Congress to move with all haste on this bill.

THE WHITE PROBLEM

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues an outstanding article by Mr. Vernon E. Jordan, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League. This column appeared in the March 17, 1973, edition of the Cleveland Call and Post.

Mr. Jordan has written about "the white problem"—the white community's apparent indifference over the efforts by this President and his administration to destroy programs from which they benefited more than any other segment of society. Mr. Jordan goes on to illustrate how black Americans are out front trying to save these vital programs—with virtually no support from the white people who will invariably suffer if the programs are axed.

The great society programs were not set up to help black people or white people; they were established to serve poor people. And there are many more poor whites than there are poor blacks in America today.

It is incumbent upon the white community to stand up and fight—to restore the traditional Federal commitment to the poor of this Nation.

Mr. Jordan's excellent article follows:

[From Call and Post, Mar. 17, 1973]

TO BE EQUAL—THE WHITE PROBLEM

(By Vernon E. Jordan, Jr.)

It is becoming increasingly clear that unless white Americans, in their own self-interest, start fighting for social reforms in this country, further progress for black citizens will be difficult.

Every time black people speak out for full employment, for better schools and housing, or for welfare reform, many white people just shrug their shoulders and assume that this is special pleading by special Americans looking for special treatment.

But every one of those issues directly affects masses of white Americans who seem to be unorganized and sullenly silent in defense of their own vital interests. Blacks are left out on a limb fighting almost alone while the millions of white people who share our humiliations and our pain do nothing.

Just about every single one of the federal programs slated to be ended or sharply cut, services more whites than blacks. The heart of the War on Poverty, the Office of Economic Opportunity, for example, is primarily staffed by white people serving the white poor. The

overwhelming majority of poor people in this country are white.

But to date, the loudest and most determined supporters of OEO's continued existence are black. Somehow, the War on Poverty has gotten tied in people's minds with black poverty and many whites aren't willing to fight for it. So it is black people who bear the brunt of trying to save a program of great importance to white people.

The same can be said for welfare reform. The majority of welfare recipients are white, although the popular image of welfare is that it is a program that helps only blacks. Last year when welfare reform was a hot topic, black-led organizations went down to Washington to fight for a living minimum income standard, but the white poor remained unorganized and silent. I can't help wondering whether they would have sent their checks back to the government if higher payments standards had been passed.

The proposed gutting of education programs will hit the black community hard, but most of the people it will affect are white. The increased Medicare payments will severely harm the black aged, but the vast majority of people who will have to pay money they can't afford are white. The housing freeze keeps black people imprisoned in substandard ghetto dwellings, but the majority of people who live in such houses and desperately need federal housing aid are white.

The list is almost endless—day care centers, job-training programs, and other federal programs all benefit black people to lesser degree than they benefit whites, yet this silent white majority is doing very little to campaign for their retention and their expansion.

White people are going to have to understand that it is their schools, their housing, and their jobs that are being endangered by the planned cuts in social services. The price of their silence is continued poverty and deprivation.

Black people, because of historic and present discrimination, are disproportionately poor and therefore benefit from many programs in disproportionate numbers. But the majority served in each and every one of these programs is the white population. These are just as much white problems as they are black ones, and the continued white silence ranks as this country's number one white problem.

White America had better wake from its deep sleep and start hauling its share of the load if it ever hopes to escape from the poverty and disadvantages so many of its people share with minorities. Too many white people have drugged themselves with the notion that it's enough to be white; but that's poor compensation for a leaky roof and hungry children.

THE EXPIRATION OF THE DRAFT

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I applaud Secretary Richardson's announcement today that the Nixon administration will not seek an extension of the Selective Service induction authority. This, combined with the earlier announcement of Secretary Laird's that the Armed Forces will be placed in a volunteer status completes President Nixon's promise to end the draft.

I am equally pleased by Secretary Richardson's strong endorsement of the

Special Pay Act, legislation which has been one of my major efforts in the 93d Congress. I, Congressman BOB WILSON, Congressman SPARK MATSUNAGA and Congressman WILLIAM STEIGER originally introduced this vital legislation and we were later joined by 120 cosponsors.

The Special Pay Act is a cost effective proposal, which will lead to great savings in training costs, and preclude the need for a return to conscription during peacetime. With the support of the White House, I am confident that this legislation will receive overwhelming support in the House and I am hopeful that the Senate will also act quickly and positively on this important piece of legislation.

MORE STRIDES NEEDED TO CURB POISONING

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has proclaimed the week which began March 18 as National Poison Prevention Week. As the President noted in his proclamation, there has been in recent years a significant reduction of deaths in children due to poisoning. However, much more needs to be done to reduce the unwanted tragedy associated with accidental poisoning, which continues to be a major cause of injury to children as well as adults.

For make no mistake, while we often hear of toddlers ingesting some hazardous substance—adults are also poisoned by such things as giving or taking medicines in the dark, mistaking one container for another, putting hazardous materials in milk bottles or other beverage containers.

With more than 70,000 accidental poisoning cases per year, we need to do more in educating both young children and their parents against the common dangers inside the medicine cabinet, under the kitchen sink or in other familiar places in the home.

Carelessness is often a contributing factor to accidental poisoning—such as the mother who leaves medicines in her purse where they can be found by a curious youngster searching for gum or candy.

While progress has been made in developing safety packaging to reduce the threat of accidental poisoning, not all dangerous substances are packaged in "child-proof" containers. Even these closures are not totally tamper-proof and design criteria recognize that 2 out of every 10 children will be able to open a "safety" closure.

Adults need to know that dangerous substances ought to be kept out of the sight and reach of a youngster, preferably in locked cabinets. But adults also need to remember to read the label on every product or medicine bottle and to follow the directions. Further, they should remember to keep medicines and household products in the original con-

tainers—with labels intact. In case of old medicines, the drugs should be put down the drain and the container destroyed.

Many groups like the Council on Family Health have been working with the National Planning Council for Poison Prevention Week and the Food and Drug Administration. In my own district, the Pinellas County Safety Council has been active in urging safe practices with medicines and household products. But the task is a total one that affects all Americans—and not merely something to be observed during the third week in March each year.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the President's plea for active participation in programs designed to promote maximum protection of our people against accidental poisonings, particularly among children.

UNITED STATES STILL BOMBING: A SOUTH BEND, IND., TRIBUNE EDITORIAL

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the Record the text of this most perceptive editorial from the March 11, 1973, issue of the South Bend, Ind., Tribune entitled, "U.S. Still Bombing."

The concern expressed by the writer of the editorial:

And why doesn't the Nixon Administration tell us what it is trying to accomplish and what it thinks the prospects are? A straightforward presentation of the facts would be a welcome change.

The editorial follows:

U.S. STILL BOMBING

It will surprise many Americans who assume that our fighting role in Indochina has ended to learn that U.S. Air Force planes still are bombing in Cambodia.

How many planes, where and why remains one of those Pentagon secrets that the generals are so reluctant to let the American people know.

Brief cryptic announcements are made from time to time at U.S. Pacific Forces headquarters in Honolulu that planes flew strikes at the request of the Phnom Penh government. That's all.

Trying to understand the complexities of Cambodian politics is a tantalizing exercise in which most Americans don't care to indulge. They just want us out of there.

The United States is spending about \$200 million a year in military and economic aid to support the government of the ailing President Lon Nol. He has suffered a stroke and may come to this country for medical treatments, leaving behind him a power struggle between his younger brother and Gen. Sirik Matak.

A gesture of willingness to negotiate a cease-fire has come from Lon Nol's government, but the Communists are showing scant interest in the idea.

Cambodia always has been a small side-show to the war in Vietnam. In fact, it wasn't a battleground until American and South Vietnamese troops tried to smash a North Vietnam buildup in Cambodia which ap-

peared poised to strike into South Vietnam. The North Vietnamese had used the country as an unmolested supply line sanctuary until then.

Now the war in Vietnam is over, at least on paper, and the American fighting role there has ended. The Cambodian sideshow goes on, however, with little prospect for an early end.

The Paris agreement on Vietnam calls implicitly on Hanoi to withdraw its troops from Cambodia. It sets no timetable, and so far Hanoi has shown no intention of taking out its soldiers. Any negotiated settlement for Cambodia almost certainly would call for the withdrawal of all foreign troops, which is one reason the Hanoi government is reluctant to sign.

By keeping troops in Cambodia, the North Vietnamese retain their potential threat to the flank of South Vietnam if the fighting there grows heavier under the cease-fire agreement. What an ironic twisting of terms!

What are American planes bombing in Cambodia, and why? Are we going to continue bombing indefinitely until a cease-fire is signed, if one is?

Nobody in Congress seems excited about the American bombing. Where are the doves who protested so profusely when American bombs fell on North Vietnam? Why doesn't Ramsey Clark go to investigate?

And why doesn't the Nixon administration tell us what it is trying to accomplish, and what it thinks the prospects are? A straightforward presentation of the facts would be a welcome change.

PRESIDENT HARRY S TRUMAN

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, much has been recorded about the life and times of our former President, Harry S Truman, and I want to join my colleagues who have expressed their sorrow and regret at his passing.

World War II, the Marshall plan, the Berlin airlift, and even the Korean war, are merely events for our younger generation to read about in history books. For many of us, however, these historic milestones evoke many personal and enduring memories. Harry Truman was a part of all of them. Whatever one may think about some of his policies and decisions on the domestic scene—and there was never a more competitive partisan than Mr. Truman—his determination to preserve America's prestige and power in the world was unquestioned.

President Truman was, in fact, a patriot in the old-fashioned meaning of that word. His resolute opposition to expansionist world communism of that era helped to preserve the freedom of Western Europe.

President Truman enjoyed 20 years of retirement after leaving the White House, long enough for the ultimate effects of his foreign policy decisions to become more fully perceived and understood. Future historians, in retrospect, will likely be kinder to him than were his contemporaries, and in any event his place in the annals of great world decisions is secure.

SALT II

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, 14 Republican Members of the House joined, under the leadership of Congressman WHITEHURST of Virginia, in releasing a paper which we had prepared on the subject of SALT II.

In the press conference at which this document was released, we strongly commended President Nixon for his material accomplishments in achieving SALT I and equally strongly expressed our hopes and support for SALT II.

For the information of our colleagues, I insert herewith a copy of our paper:

SALT II: CAN THE ARMS RACE BE ENDED?

Prepared by Mr. G. William Whitehurst, Va.; Mr. Lawrence R. Coughlin, Pa.; Mr. John Dellenback, Ore.; Mr. Pierre S. du Pont, Del.; Mr. William Frenzel, Minn.; Mr. Gilbert Gude, Md.; Mr. H. John Heinz, III, Pa.; Mr. Frank Horton, N.Y.; Mr. Paul McCloskey, Calif.; Mr. Stewart McKinney, Conn. Mr. Charles A. Mosher, Ohio; Mr. Howard W. Robison, N.Y.; Mr. J. William Stanton, Ohio; Mr. Charles W. Whalen, Jr., Ohio

MAINTAINING THE MOMENTUM OF SALT

The SALT I accords, negotiated by the Nixon Administration and signed on May 26, 1972 in Moscow, were the culmination of the most significant arms control effort in the history of the 25-year-old nuclear arms race. The accords—the product of three years of hard bargaining—ended the threat of heavy ABM deployment by both sides and put a ceiling on the numbers of land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM's) and submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBM's) allowed by each side. While SALT I did not limit technological improvements to either ICBM's or SLBM's and did not encompass all strategic weapons, the accords did create a major diplomatic momentum towards further arms control efforts—symbolized by an agreement by both sides to go further in arms limitation at a second round of SALT.

There are five principal reasons for continuing the work begun at SALT I:

First, further negotiations are necessary merely to preserve the gains of SALT I. The Interim Agreement, which limits both ICBM and SLBM levels, will only be in effect until 1977. Unless some permanent ceiling is placed on these weapons by negotiators at SALT II, both sides will be free to add to their strategic missile inventories after this date.

Second, while the SALT I accords eliminated much of the uncertainty and fear that surrounds the Soviet-American nuclear competition, the arms race continues—particularly in areas not controlled and limited by the SALT I accords. Both the United States and the Soviet Union are currently engaged in building a wide array of new strategic weapons, designed both to augment and replace portions of their existing forces. The Administration's fiscal 1974 budget includes funds for a new strategic bomber, a new SLBM submarine, multiple warhead for its strategic missiles, and a cruise missile submarine. Former Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird's fiscal 1973 military posture statement reports that the Soviet Union has built a new bomber, a longer range SLBM and new SLBM submarines, and is developing multiple warheads for its missile force. In some cases these programs may be justified in order to replace obsolete systems, or because

they contribute further to strategic stability. But the best hope in the long run for guarding against the almost unthinkable prospect of nuclear war lies in further attempts through forums such as SALT to mutually control and limit the destructive power of both sides.

The third reason for maintaining the momentum of SALT I is that further agreements could result in significant savings. The strategic weapons portion of the U.S. defense budget now accounts for nearly \$8 billion annually, and when personnel, support, and research and development costs are apportioned to this mission, the costs of operating and supporting strategic nuclear forces rise to over \$20 billion annually. It would be a mistake to expect that a SALT II agreement would result in immediate and drastic reductions in the budget, but Secretary Laird told Congress in June that the ABM Treaty saved over \$1.5 billion in planned defense expenditures. Decisions to limit certain categories of weapons at SALT II could result in similar savings—savings that could be used to modernize U.S. conventional armed forces, to satisfy domestic needs, or to reduce current budget deficits.

Fourth, further agreement at SALT would reinforce the movement towards detente between the two super powers. What happens at SALT affects the whole gamut of U.S.-Soviet relations. As President Nixon has pointed out, the accords reached in Moscow in many respects were interdependent with agreements ratifying expanded technical and economic relations between the two powers. Success at SALT II would not only further curb the arms race, but would contribute to strengthened U.S.-Soviet collaboration on a wide range of fronts. The ramifications of a successful SALT II effort would be felt in almost every area of U.S. concern with the Soviet Union—the Middle East, trade relations, collaboration in space and the maintenance of the Vietnam peace settlement.

Fifth, the lessons learned from further strategic arms control with the Soviet Union could be applied to attempts to limit the arsenals of other nuclear powers—the United Kingdom, France, China and would-be nuclear powers such as Japan or India. SALT II could act as a "springboard" for a wide range of disarmament activities, including mutual balanced force reductions between the NATO and Warsaw pact countries and a comprehensive test ban.

In view of the benefits accruing from a more comprehensive agreement on strategic arms limitation—stabilizing the arms race, realizing significant savings in the defense budget furthering general detente with the Soviet Union—and lessening the threat of nuclear proliferation—it would be folly not to vigorously pursue new understanding at SALT II.

THE STRATEGIC BALANCE

A major obstacle to further arms limitation at SALT II results from the fear in some quarters that the United States came off second best in the first round of SALT. This concern stems from the terms of the Interim Agreement—the accord that limits the number of ICBM's, SLBM's and submarines allowed by each side. It has been argued that in allowing the Soviets a superiority in land-based missiles (1618 to 1054) and submarine-launched missiles, (950 to 710, after both sides retire older ICBM's), the United States has been placed in a position of strategic inferiority. The fact that Soviet missiles generally carry heavier payloads than U.S. missiles is also viewed as a factor that further decreases U.S. security.

These concerns must be carefully examined because they so crucially affect the U.S. bargaining stance at SALT II. In analyzing the relative strategic strengths of the United States and the Soviet Union, however,

all the factors affecting the strategic balance must be taken into account.

As stated above, the Interim Agreement does set ceilings on ICBM and SLBM launchers that provide for a superiority in numbers for the Soviet Union:

Salt I Launcher ceilings¹

	U.S.	U.S.S.R.
ICBM's -----	1,054	1,618
SLBM's -----	656	740
Submarines -----	41	56
With replacements: ²		
ICBM's -----	1,000	1,408
SLBM's -----	710	950
Submarines -----	44	62

¹ Figures for the tables in this section are taken from the International Institute of Strategic Studies' 1973 Strategic Balance. The London-based institute is viewed by experts as being a highly accurate and objective source of military statistics.

² Both sides can replace older ICBM's with new submarines and SLBM's.

But members of ICBM's and SLBM's alone do not provide an accurate overall picture of the strategic balance. The first notable aspect of the Interim Agreement is that it only concerns launchers—numbers of ICBM's, SLBM's and submarines. It does not restrict the modernization of these forces nor warhead technology and the number of warheads allowed by each side—an area where the United States enjoys a clear superiority. In terms of separate targetable re-entry vehicles—the number of different nuclear warheads that can be delivered to separate targets—the United States has a two-to-one advantage that will grow as the U.S. continues to deploy MIRV's—separately targetable multiple warheads on its missiles. The United States is currently MIRVing missiles on 31 of the United States' missile-submarines and on all 550 of the Minuteman land-based missiles. The effect of the U.S. MIRV program on the relative balance of deliverable warheads is shown below:

Warhead levels

In 1972:		
United States -----	4,300	
Soviet Union -----	2,090	
In 1977:		
United States -----	7,700	
Soviet Union -----	2,420	

Also not included in the Interim Agreement are long-range strategic bombers, another area where the United States possesses a significant margin of superiority. The United States bomber fleet of B-52's and FB-111's numbers over 450 aircraft. The Soviet Union possesses approximately 150 long-range bomber aircraft, which are generally older and slower than their U.S. counterparts. The U.S. bomber force is also capable of carrying substantially larger weapons loads than the Soviet Union, and as the chart below indicates, this capacity will grow as the United States begins to deploy the SRAM (short-range attack missile) on its bomber force:

Bomber weapons¹

In 1972:		
United States -----	2,000	
Soviet Union -----	420	
In 1977:		
United States -----	7,500	
Soviet Union -----	420	

¹ Based on current weapons size and aircraft payload capacity.

Another index of strategic power is megatonnage, or the total explosive power that both powers can hurl at each other. The majority of Soviet missiles carry larger payloads than U.S. missiles, while, as indicated above, American bombers carry heavier payloads than their Soviet counterparts. The total nuclear megatonnage capable of being

delivered by missiles and bombers combined is roughly the same for both powers:

Total megatonnage

	U.S.	U.S.S.R.
Missiles -----	2,400	11,400
Bombers -----	18,500	3,600
Total -----	18,900	15,000

It must be emphasized that megatonnage is a crude indicator of power because it does not take into account such factors as missile accuracy and reliability, which in many respects are more important than megatonnage in determining the damage capability of strategic forces.

Other factors must also be considered. The United States, for instance, possesses hundreds of fighter aircraft based in Europe and aboard carriers capable of delivering nuclear weapons on the Soviet Union. Also, although the Interim Agreement allows the Soviet Union more ballistic missile submarines than the United States, a lack of foreign bases means the Soviets are unable to keep as high a proportion of their submarine force within missile range as the United States.

In conclusion, none of the indices discussed give a fully complete description of the strategic balance. Numbers of missiles, bombers or submarines alone cannot provide a sufficient basis for deciding whether or not the United States gained or lost in SALT I. But taken together, the indices do suggest that the United States and the Soviet Union currently possess roughly equal strategic nuclear capabilities—capabilities that make it impossible for either side to disarm the other.

Simple numerical formulas will not suffice for SALT II, for what one side lacks in one area of weaponry, it tends to make up for in another. Recognition of this fact seems essential in approaching future arms control agreements.

THE ISSUES THAT DEFINE SALT II

While the SALT I accords were trailblazing achievements in laying the foundation for President Nixon's "Structure for Peace", the methods and mechanisms for reaching agreements during SALT I should not necessarily be totally relied upon to produce results at SALT II. The "Bargaining Chip" strategy, for instance, of building new weapons in order to force the Soviets into agreeing to their limitation seemed a plausible strategy at a time when the Soviets were engaging in a massive arms buildup. But now that temporary limits have been placed on missile force levels, future agreements should attempt to build on the confidence created by SALT I instead of relying too heavily on the fear created by the threat of new arms deployments.

Because the issues under discussion at SALT II tend to be more complex than those discussed in the first round of the talks, innovative approaches must be considered if substantial agreements are to be reached. At the same time, it is necessary to be realistic when discussing possible achievements of SALT II. Potential areas of agreement should most certainly be analyzed in terms of what the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency calls "negotiability" and "verifiability"—the ability to make an agreement and to enforce it. Possible areas of agreement at SALT II and problems associated with these areas include:

(A) Ceilings on Strategic Weapons—The SALT I Interim Agreement runs out in 1977 and unless the ceilings set on land-based and sea-based missiles are set by a permanent treaty, both sides will thereafter be free to add to their missile forces. It would certainly be in the interest of both countries to negotiate a permanent treaty limiting strategic weapons, particularly if more equal numeri-

cal terms could be worked out. The United States would also probably support the idea of cutting back on the mutual levels for ICBM's prescribed by the Interim Agreement and replacing them with the more invulnerable submarine-launched missiles. (It is generally believed that U.S. ICBM's would be vulnerable to MIRVed Soviet SS-9 rockets.) The Soviets, on the other hand, are not as interested as the United States in reducing the ceilings for ICBM's because they possess a generally newer force of missiles.

One way around this problem would be to design a permanent ceiling on strategic weapons—in terms of launcher numbers, warhead numbers or payload capacity—that would allow each side the freedom to determine what weapons it wished to emphasize within its respective forces. Under such a system, a general ceiling would be agreed to, and then each power could determine what proportion of its force would be made up of ICBM's and SLBM's—within the limits set by the ceiling. The Soviets perhaps would be unlikely to agree to a mutual ceiling with the United States, because under the present terms of the Interim Agreement they are allowed greater numbers of ICBM's and SLBM's. This problem could perhaps be solved by including long-range bombers in a mutual ceiling—where the American advantage in bombers would cancel out the Soviet advantage in numbers of ICBM's and SLBM's. Thus, both powers could agree to a similar ceiling and then would unilaterally decide what proportion of their forces would be made up of bombers, missiles and submarines.

(B) Ceiling on Bombers—Whether or not bombers could be included in a general ceiling on strategic weapons, the attempt to include long-range bombers in a SALT II agreement should be made. The United States superiority in bombers could be used as an inducement for the Soviets to accept a more equitable balance in numbers of missiles, or if the Soviets insist on maintaining superior levels of missiles, the American numerical superiority in bombers could be ratified by treaty.

(C) Forward Based System Controls—While the United States does not consider its forward-based land and carrier-based fighter aircraft to be strategic systems, the Soviets do. And while the Soviet ICBM and SLBM advantage may be a prime U.S. concern at SALT II, the Soviets are said to be most concerned about U.S. fighters stationed abroad that have the capability of striking their homeland with nuclear weapons. Up until now, the United States has not wanted to discuss these weapons in the context of SALT, and for good reasons. Bilateral U.S.—Soviet discussions over the future of European-based aircraft would upset the NATO allies and an agreement to limit U.S. aircraft in Europe might weaken the conventional capability of NATO. But some judicious concessions by the United States on this issue—which included advance consultation with U.S. allies—could bring about greater Soviet acquiescence in other areas of importance to the United States.

(D) Controls on Warhead Modernization—This is an area of strategic weaponry totally neglected during the SALT I that could threaten, as feared earlier with the ABM, to upset the arms race. Recent United States efforts in the area of multiple warheads and improved missile accuracy tend to be destabilizing because they could ultimately give U.S. missiles the capability of destroying Soviet missiles on the ground. While the United States currently enjoys a lead in warhead technology (the Soviets have not tested a MIRV warhead yet), larger Soviet missile payloads mean that once the Soviets do perfect a MIRV system they too will possess a significant kill capability against U.S. missiles.

Controlling warhead modernization is dif-

ficult, owing to the difficulty of verifying compliance. One plausible means of controlling improvements in warhead technology is to focus on limiting U.S. and Soviet development programs—primarily testing. While it is impossible, without on-site inspection, to determine the kinds of warheads each side is deploying, a limit on how many missile tests each side could hold would serve nearly the same purpose. A ceiling on missile tests would prevent both sides from developing sufficient confidence in new warhead devices to warrant wide-scale deployment. And a limit on numbers of missile tests would also have the advantage of being verifiable by satellite surveillance.

(E) Antisubmarine Warfare Controls—The oceans have become the newest arms race arena and submarine-launched missiles are increasingly becoming the primary instruments of strategic deterrence. Both the United States and the Soviet Union are, however, attempting to counteract each other's submarine forces by working on projects of submarine detection, tracking and destruction. Like accurate warheads, anti-submarine warfare (ASW) is destabilizing because a breakthrough in submarine detection and destruction could give one power the capability of destroying the ballistic missile submarine force of the other. There are a number of ways ASW could be controlled at SALT II. Suggestions have been to limit the number of hunter-killer submarines possessed by each side as well as banning certain kinds of underwater listening devices used to detect missile-carrying submarines. Another approach would be to create ocean "sanctuaries" for submarines of both sides to operate, free from attempts to locate and destroy them. While there are certain difficulties with all of these proposals, particularly the problem of distinguishing between ASW designed for conventional naval warfare from that designed to combat ballistic missile submarines, controls on ASW should be pursued at SALT II.

GENERAL BARGAINING PRESCRIPTIONS

Although there are a number of political and technical problems attached to the possibilities presented by SALT II, the benefits stemming from potential agreements listed above provide powerful arguments for approaching the negotiations with as great flexibility as security interest permit. While specific agreements and bargaining formulas can only be determined by Administration officials close to the talks, several guidelines can be suggested to maximize the possibilities for success at SALT II. They embody a whole range of national security concerns—weapons system procurement, arms control leadership, and defense budget appropriations by Congress.

I. Technological restraint

While "negotiating from strength" is a sensible guide to bargaining, too much strength tends to introduce fear and uncertainty into arms control talks. The Soviets, for instance, were unwilling to seriously discuss strategic arms limitation until they possessed a weapons arsenal similar to that of the United States. The tendency of the United States to exploit every technological advance—multiple warheads, improved missile accuracy, ASW devices—to force agreements with the Soviets cannot always be depended upon to produce agreements. The decision to begin the Safeguard ABM program might have contributed to a successful ABM Treaty, but the Soviets had earlier deployed an ABM system of their own. In areas of U.S. technical advantage the decision to MIRV U.S. missiles has made a MIRV agreement difficult to achieve at SALT because the Soviets are unlikely to accept any agreement that permanently places them in a technologically inferior position. This is not to suggest that the United States should not go forward with new research and devel-

opment programs. Instead, careful consideration should be given to new weapons programs before procurement decisions are made. Deployment decisions over such weapons as the B-1 bomber, the Trident submarine, super-accurate missile warheads and advanced underwater listening devices should be carefully evaluated and in some cases postponement of deployment should be considered pending the outcome of the talks.

An active R&D program is probably as good a bargaining chip as actual force deployments. Maintaining a strong R&D program would not only act as an effective bargaining ploy, but could also result in material savings in defense expenditures.

II. Strategic numbers

In view of the complexity of determining the significance of relative strategic force levels, no attempt should be made to tie the hands of U.S. negotiators by insisting on strict formulas of strategic parity. As suggested earlier, a number of factors go into the determination of the United States-Soviet strategic balance. The United States should be willing to accept a numerical disadvantage in certain areas, if a U.S. advantage in other areas is recognized. Better yet, formulas that tie different weapons into overall package ceilings should be discussed at SALT II. Each power would then be able to select the weapons it favored without reference to ceilings on specific weapons categories. In constructing and negotiating such a general ceiling, an attempt should also be made to provide for the gradual reduction of strategic forces possessed by each side.

III. Arms control leadership

The SALT I accords were not only a result of hard-headed bargaining, but disciplined and efficient organization—within the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Pentagon, the State Department, the CIA and the White House. A similar management effort should be directed towards SALT II. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency should again be put in charge of the day-by-day direction of the talks, and the agency should have a budget commensurate with this task. The Administration's FY 1974 budget cuts the ACDA budget by more than one-third and the agency's director, yet to be named, no longer heads the SALT negotiating team.

Possibly more important in the long run, promises of new weapons made by the White House to the services to gain military support for arms control agreements should be restricted. When the Administration earlier linked the continuation of the B-1 and Trident programs with support for the SALT I accords, future arms control possibilities could have been placed in jeopardy.

IV. Other areas of arms control

While the SALT II talks now dominate arms control thinking, there are other areas where initiatives should be attempted. A verifiable Comprehensive Test Ban would, for example, constitute a significant achievement. A total ban on nuclear testing would not only eliminate certain environmental dangers, but would act as a check on new weapons development. Efforts to curb nuclear proliferation—a growing problem that has generally been ignored—is also an area where initiatives are necessary. An agreement by both the United States and the Soviet Union on conventional force reductions in Europe (MBFR) is another arms control goal that should be vigorously pursued.

V. Congressional initiatives

Congress has traditionally supported arms control and disarmament objectives. Congressional hearings in the late 1950's were partly responsible for the establishment of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and Congress has supported, with few reservations, the Limited Test Ban Treaty and

the Nonproliferation Treaty, as well as the SALT I accords. Congress could play a larger role in this crucial area by both fostering a wider discussion of arms control issues and more closely examining the political and technological components of the arms race, thus honoring its responsibility to educate the public in this difficult area. Arms control, however, does not take place in a vacuum—to a great extent it is dependent upon the President's conduct of foreign policy and even more importantly, upon defense spending. Congress, then, must make a determined effort to link arms control issues to the defense budget. Congressional committees concerned with defense spending should not only focus on fiscal and military issues, but these groups should also examine the implications of new programs for the prospects of future agreement at SALT II.

SALT II has become a complex arena for discussion, where the political, strategic and technological factors involved demand a high degree of specialized talent. While recognizing that the Executive possesses the bulk of expertise in this area, Congress does possess analytical capabilities—in the form of committee staffs, the Congressional Research Service, the General Accounting Office and the newly organized Office of Technology Assessment. Each of these groups can provide some of the expertise necessary to deal wisely and carefully with the complexities of strategic arms limitation.

In view of the constructive role Congress can and should play in examination of arms control issues, the following recommendations are made:

(A) Joint panels of the House Armed Services and Foreign Affairs Committees and the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees should be convened to examine the implications of the fiscal 1974-1979 defense program for future arms control agreements.

(B) The House Science and Astronautics Committee, the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee and the Joint Atomic Energy Committee should hold hearings on the effect of new technologies on the arms race and the prospects of negotiating and verifying agreements limiting strategic force modernization. A report by the Office of Technology Assessment could be used as the focal point of these investigations.

(C) The General Accounting Office should provide Congress with a study of possible savings accruing from potential SALT II agreements. Such a report could be used in Defense Appropriations Subcommittee hearings in both houses on the impact of SALT II savings on defense spending.

(D) Proposals to enhance congressional cognizance of the long-term implications of the defense budget, such as basing congressional authorization and appropriations on the five year defense program, should be considered by the Armed Services committee and the Defense Appropriation Subcommittees.

BYELORUSSIA INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marks the 55th anniversary of the day that the Byelorussian people proclaimed their national independence. This day symbolizes the strong aspirations of Byelorussians throughout the world to regain an independence similar to that which existed 55 years ago.

This illustrious, yet often troubled country has a history that dates back to the ninth century. A sizable number of cultural and political achievements have been accomplished by the Byelorussian people. One can point to the many notable contributions made in the fields of printing and literature as examples of the significance of the Byelorussian State, the Grand Duchy of Litva.

I am saddened, Mr. Speaker, by the present conditions in the Byelorussian Soviet Social Republic. My desire, and surely that of my colleagues, is to see Byelorussia rise again to the heights that it reached during its most glorious period. This can only be realized by the complete independence of Byelorussia.

RECONFIRMATION OF JUDGES

HON. STANFORD E. PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the following copy of a joint resolution passed recently by the Virginia General Assembly which requests Congress to adopt and offer to the States a constitutional amendment calling for the reconfirmation of all Federal judges.

As you know, I recently introduced House Joint Resolution 372 which also calls for the action requested by the gentleman of the Virginia General Assembly. I believe their passage of this resolution is further evidence of the need for congressional action in this matter.

The resolution follows:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 130
Memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to tenure of federal justices and judges

Whereas, the justices of the Supreme Court and judges of the inferior courts of the United States are appointed for life, and are removable only by impeachment; and

Whereas, in forty-seven of the fifty states, including this Commonwealth, the judiciary has fixed tenure; and

Whereas, the experience in this Commonwealth reveals that although the judges may be removed from office at the end of their terms, the judiciary has remained independent; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States should be granted the power parallel to that which this General Assembly now has, that is, to review the records of its federal justices and judges of inferior courts; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of Virginia, the House of Delegates concurring, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to adopt and offer to the States for ratification or rejection the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Notwithstanding the provisions of the second sentence of Section 1 of Article III of the Constitution, each justice of the Supreme Court and each judge of an inferior court established by Congress under Section 1 of Article III shall hold his office during good behavior for terms of eight years. During the eighth year of each term of office of any such justice or judge, his

nomination for an additional term of office for the judgeship which he holds shall be placed before the Senate in the manner provided by the law, for the advice and consent of the Senate to such additional term, unless that justice or judge requests that his nomination not be so placed. Any justice or judge whose nomination for an additional term of office is so placed before the Senate may remain in office until the Senate gives its advice and consent to, or rejects, such nomination. If the Senate gives its advice and consent to an additional term of office, that term shall commence from the date of such advice and consent, or the day immediately following the last day of his prior term of office, whichever is later.

"SEC. 2. The terms of office established by Section 1 of this article shall apply to any individual whose nomination for a judgeship is submitted after the ratification of this article to the Senate for its advice and consent."

Resolved further, That the Clerk of the Senate is hereby instructed to send copies of this Joint Resolution to the members of the Virginia delegation in the Congress of the United States and to the President and Vice President of the United States, and the Clerks of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

CWA OFFICIAL TESTIFIES ON TAX REFORM

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, on March 8 the Communications Workers of America's Secretary-Treasurer, Glenn E. Watts, testified before the House Committee on Ways and Means. His statement included a number of substantial and cogent comments on our tax structure which deserve the attention of Congress. With that in mind I place in the RECORD Mr. Watts' statement and other material he submitted to the committee on this important subject:

My name is Glenn E. Watts, and I am the Secretary-Treasurer of the Communications Workers of America, a union which represents more than 550,000 communications and other workers.

On behalf of those workers, President Joseph A. Beirne, and my fellow officers, we appreciate this opportunity to bring you our views on making the national tax burden more equitable.

We believe that a great many members of both houses would agree with us that workers carry too big a share of the tax burden, and the business segment of the economy—along with the very wealthy—carry too small a share.

But—at this point in the 93rd Congress—we do not sense a Congressional awareness of what we see as a strong need in this nation—and that is—real tax burden adjustments.

Our assessment of the Congressional attitude is that Congress seems to be headed once again down the road of token tax reform—that often travelled, old familiar road, lined with wreckage of good intentions.

I do not want to imply that any malice generates the Congressional attitude, and I am not one of those who believes that Congress is out of touch with constituents.

There are other reasons.

All of us who have a vital interest in tax legislation know the multiple pressures that come into play. We know that you are tugged

this way . . . pulled that way . . . where this organization sees economic justice, that organization sees a loophole.

We know that there are monumental questions without consensus answers.

How many jobs do accelerated depreciation and investment credit actually create . . . or destroy?

How do you shift some of the tax burden to corporations without letting them shift it right back to the workers, through higher prices . . . and still maintain a relatively free economy?

I believe it is these factors, plus the still submerged status of the seething resentment against the tax system among your constituents and my members, which create the Congressional attitude existing today.

But I also believe that the resentment is going to erupt—that it will not stay submerged . . . and I am here to urge you to prepare now, by writing true equalization of the tax burden.

You have access to the work of the tax legislation technicians and the tax statisticians, and the Committee knows the dollar value of each exemption, so it would be redundant to repeat this for you. I would like to give you some general views, and ask the Committee to include CWA's tax legislative policy and a CWA Fact Sheet on taxation with my testimony, in the hearing record.

CWA believes that the Mills-Mansfield bill of the 92d Congress, which would have reviewed each of the 54 exemptions over a three-year period, and dropped, modified or reenacted them, is an idea Congress ought to give a lot of thought and study to.

The legislative policy CWA has adopted on taxes—calls for Congress to study the Mills-Mansfield method as the ideal vehicle for equalizing the tax burden.

I know there isn't universal agreement among tax reformers—and there certainly isn't in the labor movement—on the Mills-Mansfield idea, but we like it.

We may be a bit bolder than our brothers, or just a little ahead of time.

Perhaps our attitude comes from the historic policy of the Communications Workers, which requires us to expend every possible effort we can to protect our members—and all workers—from unfair taxation.

The logic in that is simple—what we win at the bargaining table we can lose in the city halls, the court houses, the state houses, and in the Capitol.

We remember especially well 1969, when we found that despite great effort and devotion to the fight for tax reform, we ended up with only token corrections in the law.

There was a slim reduction in mineral depletion allowances, a minimum tax on the very wealthy which is so minimal that I understand it could be called microscopic, a little jump in personal exemptions, and taking tax burdens off the very poor.

We have been told what we consider tokenism should be considered a victory—that without great effort and devotion not even this much would have been accomplished.

That is consoling for the ego, but not the pocketbook, because we see the suffering that severe inequities have caused our people—and all workers.

So far as tax reform in the 92nd Congress is concerned, I don't see how anyone can claim a victory for workers.

It is just not right that workers' paychecks should have to take the kind of beating they are getting because the social insurance part of the total federal tax burden has gone from 21 percent to 29 percent between 1969 and now. Corporate profits and income of the very wealthy should have carried some of this.

It is just not right for any giant corporation with large profits and dividends not to

pay any federal taxes at all, or taxes many percentages below what their workers pay.

It is just not right for individuals to earn hundreds of thousands of dollars, and have their entire income tax free.

It is just not right for the multi-national oil companies to convert their royalty payments overseas into foreign tax payments, and then deduct them from the taxes they owe the United States.

It is just not right for eight percent of the families in America, with 25 percent of the income, to be the beneficiaries of almost 50 percent of the tax subsidies.

It is right to make the graduated income tax really graduated and equitably graduated.

It is right for the Congress to require full and accurate disclosure of country-by-country costs, earnings, profits, and taxes, of multi-national corporations.

It is right to eliminate the investment tax credit accelerated depreciation, mineral depletion allowances and foreign tax credits.

It is right to tax capital gains and large inherited fortunes on a basis of equality with taxes on workers' incomes, and it is right to revise the personal exemption so that workers have a realistic deduction.

In Congress after Congress, legislation is introduced to accomplish some of all of these goals, and you have legislation pending now in this Committee which would bring equity to the tax structure.

We urge you to act boldly, because from what we see and hear around the country, bold and decisive action is what the people . . . the workers . . . want, need and deserve.

Our members read the business pages of the newspapers and magazines, and they see those familiar advertisements selling real estate, oil well drilling and farming tax shelters.

They resent this, because they feel they are being robbed . . . and they are.

We agree with Chairman Mills' descriptive labeling of these shelters—he called them travesties.

When the worker comes across these travesties of economic favoritism, it only confirms to him what political demagogues preach—the system is rigged.

So he becomes a little more susceptible to the demagogue's preaching, and he becomes a little less faithful to the system.

Let's show them that this way of administering government, which has been nurtured and developed over the past couple of hundred years can work equitably . . . without favoritism. Let's show him the game doesn't have to be rigged.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to appear before the Committee.

TAX BURDEN EQUALIZATION

The Communications Workers of America believes that Congress should consider passing legislation which contains a method for review of each tax exemption now in the law, and would also require that unless each exemption was reenacted, it would be dropped. Legislation which would have done this was introduced in the 92nd Congress as the Mills-Mansfield Bill. It would have required Congress to re-examine each one of the 54 tax exemptions now in the law, and then decide whether to retain or terminate each one. This would be done over a three-year period, with 18 exemptions coming up for review, and ratification or termination, in each year. In effect, if the Congress did not re-enact each of these exemptions, they would be terminated, on an exemption-by-exemption basis. Additionally, each could be modified, instead of maintained as now written, or terminated.

The ultimate objective would be to make the national tax burden as equitable as possible.

CWA's endorsement of this method of equalizing the tax burden should not be taken to mean that we oppose continuation of all exemptions in the law. We have fought for those which benefit great numbers of people, such as the child care deduction, and we have fought against retention of such special privilege exemptions as percentage depletion for minerals. CWA has definite views on those exemptions which are major loopholes allowing corporations and wealthy individuals to evade their share of the burden, and we would work to see them diminished or eliminated.

A major objective would be to see a reversal in the relationship between the percent of the tax load paid by corporations and by individuals. In 1960 corporate income taxes were 23 percent of receipts by the federal government, and individual income taxes were 44 percent. In 1973 corporate income taxes are projected to represent 16 percent of revenues to the federal government, and individuals will pay 43 percent. Also between 1960 and 1973 individuals increased their share of federal budget receipts for social security taxes from 16 percent to 29 percent, showing the immense burden shift to individuals.

To alleviate this we make several recommendations.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

Eliminate the investment tax credit, which was reinstated in 1971, with the claim that it would generate jobs for unemployed workers. This is a seven percent credit for businesses who invest in new equipment, and, in effect, is a cut in corporate taxes estimated to reach \$3 billion a year. Studies show that while sales of large corporations increased in 1971, their employment decreased. The investment tax credit does not stimulate anything approximating what the revenue would be worth to the Treasury. If the average worker were to be given an equivalent tax break, the spending that would result would stimulate the economy more than the investment tax credit.

ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION

Accelerated depreciation is another major revenue loss for the Treasury, and, in effect, a tax cut for business. By 1975, when fully effective, it will be costing the Treasury an estimated \$3.5 billion a year. Under this loophole, a business can speed its building and equipment depreciation deductions up by varying percents, going as high as 20 percent, and this gives businesses a bigger deduction than it would normally get for depreciating its equipment.

DEPLETION ALLOWANCES

The oil and other mineral depletion allowances are historic tax breaks. This was written into the tax law supposedly to give mineral companies the right to exclude part of their income from taxes, because their well or mine was being used up, and they needed to develop new resources.

But, it has become a device which allows oil companies to avoid paying taxes on their entire income instead of being an allowance for oil companies to use to develop new resources.

For petroleum, a Treasury study shows that the average well cost is recovered 19 times through this depletion allowance subsidy to the industry. This mineral depletion allowance is worth an estimated \$1.4 billion a year.

FOREIGN TAX CREDITS

Oil companies have another very big loophole, concerning taxes they pay to foreign countries. The big multi-national oil companies are allowed to deduct taxes paid to foreign countries from the tax bill they owe to the United States. So, companies have worked out arrangements to hide some of

their oil royalty payments to foreign countries as taxes to these countries, and then deduct the payment from the amount that should be going to the U.S. Treasury.

CAPITAL GAINS

The average working American has almost no opportunity to benefit from the capital gains loophole. This loophole allows individuals who make a profit on the sale of stock or property after it has been held for a certain period to avoid paying tax on half of that profit.

It means that if the same benefit were given to a worker who made \$12,000 in a year, he would only have to pay taxes on \$6,000. The loophole, estimated to be worth between \$5.5 and \$8.5 billion should be eliminated.

INHERITANCE TAXES

Large, inherited fortunes also benefit from a capital gain feature. Now, if an individual inherits a large block of stock which may have been purchased years ago at a much lower price than it would bring, the person receiving the inheritance does not pay on the present value of the stock. Inherited estates over some minimal amount, possibly \$50,000, should not have this benefit, and the estate should be valued and taxed to include the increased price the stock or other property would bring.

The 1971 tax legislation allowed American companies which export their products to set up separate firms, called Domestic International Sales Corporations. They avoid paying U.S. income taxes on the profits from their export operations, so long as the money was kept in the foreign country. However, the law also allowed the export company to loan money to its parent company, which is a legal way of transferring profits back to parent company without paying taxes on them. This loophole, worth \$170 million in 1973, should be repealed.

The features of the tax law which are emphasized above are not intended to be all of those which we feel should be eliminated. They are among the major offenders against the principle that the income tax burden should be progressive, and no group of Americans, individually or business, should have an advantage which allows shelter from the tax burden others face.

A major reform that would mean as much to a great many workers as a reduction in their own tax burden would be the assurance that every firm which makes a profit, and every wealthy individual who has income, pays a certain minimum percent in taxes, regardless of exemptions, shelters and loopholes.

THE ECONOMY

TAX BURDEN EQUALIZATION

CWA believes the Congress should give intensive study to legislation which would provide a mechanism for review of each tax exemption now in the law, and would require that each exemption be dropped if it is not reenacted. The legislation should provide an orderly method of doing this, such as consideration of the specific number of exemptions in each year, over a three-year period. CWA realizes that some of these exemptions are considered to benefit consumers, such as the interest rate on home loans, but we also believe that if the public can be informed accurately on the tax structure, many hidden and unfair tax burdens which the average worker carries will be uncovered.

We would hope that some of the major changes would be:

1. Make the graduated income tax really graduated for individuals with very high incomes, so that no person evades all taxes or pays only a few percent, while the average worker's tax is sometimes more than 20 percent.

2. Move some of the burden from the individual worker to corporations. Corporations

paid 23 percent of federal budget receipts in 1960, but only 19 percent in 1969, and the projection for 1973 is 16 percent. The 19 largest oil companies paid only 8.7 percent in corporate income tax in 1971, and five large companies paid nothing on their profits in 1971.

3. Move a large part of social security taxes off the worker's paycheck, and provide the funding through general revenues, out of effective corporate taxation. In 1960, social security taxes equaled 16 percent of the federal budget. But social security taxes went to 21 percent of federal budget receipts in 1969, and will be 29 percent of federal budget receipts in 1973.

4. Require full and accurate disclosure of country-by-country costs, earnings, profits, and taxes, of multi-national conglomerates, so they can be taxed effectively.

5. Eliminate the investment tax credit. Sold to the public as a means of generating new jobs, it deprives the Treasury of revenue which workers must make up, and its job creating ability is more public relations than actual.

6. Eliminate the accelerated depreciation allowance, an obvious loophole which creates additional burdens for workers without producing economic benefits.

7. Eliminate depletion allowances. They were first written in the law so that corporations could evade taxes on part of the income from the sale of mineral resources, with the savings going into development of new resources. But no new resources have been discovered to match anything like the amount of money which has been retained by the companies, and the allowance is a burden workers carry.

8. Remove the foreign tax credit for oil companies. Oil companies can deduct the amount of taxes they pay foreign countries from their American tax bill, so many companies have worked arrangements with foreign countries to make royalty payments appear as tax payments. In that way, the American taxpayer has to bear the load for the oil companies' royalty payments.

9. Remove the capital gains loophole, so that profits from sales of stock are taxed equally with worker's income.

10. Require effective taxation of large inherited fortunes.

11. Revise the personal exemption to make it more equitable, perhaps with a tax credit alternative.

12. Eliminate the loophole which allows American corporations to set up separate corporations for export business, in order to avoid taxes on products which are exported.

13. Ban the importation of the regressive value added tax, which exemplifies inequitable taxation.

LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson, in my opinion, will go down in history as a great and good man and as an outstanding President of our Nation. History, I believe, will treat him most kindly and he deserves that treatment. I first met him as a freshman Member of Congress, when he, as Vice President, invited me and my wife to his home. It was an indication of the type of hospitality he was always famous for, and that first party was the best one I ever attended in Washington. During his years

in the White House I disagreed with him on many occasions, but found him a strong man and one who made no secret of his direction or intentions. His relationship with the Congress was magnificent, for he was of the Congress himself and understood it and its membership well. I will always be glad that some of the years I spent as a Member of Congress were spent while he was the President of our Nation.

OUR NATION SALUTES REV. JERRY D. VAN DER VEEN

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker. We are truly blessed by the inspiration of the invocation prayer offered each day here in the Congress. Our State of New Jersey, and particularly the people of our Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey, are privileged and honored to commend to you today's visiting host chaplain for the House, the Reverend Jerry D Van Der Veen, M.A., B.D., S.T.M., Th.D., D.D., minister of the Church of the Covenant, Reformed Church of America, Paterson, N.J., located in my congressional district, for his eloquent and inspirational contribution to our deliberations this day on behalf of the people of our Nation.

His prayer of thanksgiving and inspiration which was received with deep reverence and appreciation by the Members of the House of Representatives today is as follows:

Isaiah 40: 31. "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall walk and not faint."

Almighty, Eternal God, we humbly bow before Thee and with thankful hearts acknowledge that Thou art the Source of all our blessings, even life itself.

We thank Thee for our health and strength.

May we realize that Thou art always with us, every moment of the day.

We pray for Thy blessing upon our country, the land that we love.

Bless the President, and the Vice President. Be with the Speaker of the House. Give him wisdom, guidance and strength to fulfill his calling.

We ask for every Congressman here present today that Thou wilt direct their decisions for the benefit of all our people.

We commend our nation with all its problems and difficulties unto Thy Sovereign Care.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The quality and richness of Dr. Van Der Veen's presentation today is gratefully acknowledged. He has inspired us by his prayer as well as his good example. We want to share with him, his wife Grace, and all of his family the great pride we have in his distinguished and dedicated lifetime of outstanding service and contribution to the religious, cultural and spiritual enrichment of our community, State, and Nation. His long list of exemplary achievements in service to God and his congregation span the needs and concerns of all of our people—young and adults alike—having attained the

highest regard and esteem of all of us who have the good fortune to know him through all of his good works as a leading citizen and respected member of the clergy in the cities of Paterson and Hawthorne and the State of New Jersey. He has served in the vanguard of our community as adviser and counselor in the fields of education, senior citizens programming, community planning and development, health, youth recreation and character building, and many other charitable and civic endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, we do indeed salute Rev. Dr. Jerry D. Van Der Veen for his dynamic and energetic career in the cause of goodwill and understanding among all men, and I know that you and our colleagues will join with me now in expressing our deep appreciation to him for leading us in prayer here today.

1973 FAMILY PLANNING SERVICE LEGISLATION

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. du PONT. Mr. Speaker, during the second session of the 92d Congress, the task force on population growth and ecology of the Republican Research Committee conducted hearings to assess the Federal programs in population research and family planning services. The task force was activated in the spring of 1972 in response to a growing need for an assessment of the Federal Government's role in the delivery of family planning services and in the field of population research. In his 1969 message to Congress on population, President Nixon declared the provision of subsidized family planning services and accelerated research in population a national priority.

That same year, an earlier task force on population headed by the Honorable George Bush, issued a report of its findings and called for increased leadership at the Federal level in the support and development of universally available family planning services and increased contraceptive research. The Congress responded by passing the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act of 1970. The programs created by this legislation were well underway, and the task force believed that an evaluation of the programs' progress was vital. Thus, I was particularly honored to serve as chairman of this new inquiry. Also serving were my distinguished colleagues MARVIN L. ESCH, of Michigan, HAMILTON FISH, JR., of New York, RICHARD W. MALLARY, of Vermont, and PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, of California.

Our investigations of Federal support of this most important field were both enlightening and, I believe, definitive. The task force conducted 4 days of hearings in Washington, where we heard valuable testimony from outstanding experts in the fields of demography, reproductive biology, social science, medicine, and family planning services delivery.

We heard extensive testimony from members of the administration concerning the organization of and support for the national program. In order to assess how Federal efforts could be strengthened to make the job of services delivery most effective at the local level, the task force also had field hearings in Wilmington, Del.

The report of the task force was issued in August, and a summary of the report was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 118, part 25, pages 3381-13, with our 14 recommendations for improving the program. The evidence presented by the witnesses led to three major conclusions. First, while the President had pledged to provide family planning services by 1974 to all women desiring such services but who for economic reasons do not have access to them, we are a long way from achieving that objective. Second, scientific knowledge concerning human reproduction and our present contraceptive technology are not sufficient to enable all people to adequately plan their families. Third, there is very little understanding of population dynamics or knowledge of the motivational factors relating to childbearing.

The Federal Government has taken important steps toward the solution of these problems; but at the same time, continuing increases in our population have intensified the whole spectrum of health, environmental, economic and social problems in our country. The slowing of population growth rates will not be a panacea for all of these problems. However, we must conclude that the reduction or elimination of excess, unwanted fertility—through improved research efforts, the development of new technology, and increased availability of family planning services—would contribute significantly to the solution of some of our problems and to the alleviation of others. I firmly believe that all people, given the knowledge and the means to exercise freedom of choice with respect to their own fertility, will choose to act in a manner benefiting their own health and well-being and that of their families.

The legislation I am introducing today implements the primary recommendations of the task force—renewal of the funding and program authorities of the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act of 1970, which expires June 30 of this year; expansion of biomedical and social research in human reproduction; and improvement in the overall administration of both these programs.

Mr. Speaker, by 1975, approximately 46.9 million women will be of childbearing age. These women, and as many men, will want and need better methods to control their fertility. We know that involuntary childbearing is damaging to both families and children in terms of health and socioeconomic conditions. The incidence of prematurity, infant and maternal deaths, birth defects, and mental retardation can be significantly reduced by the use of effective methods of family planning. Unwanted births can cause a family to cease to be self-supporting, and the continued incidence of

unwanted fertility can trap a family in poverty and dependency.

Families of all income levels have expressed a desire to avoid unwanted fertility. This is evidenced by national studies and by the known rate of 1 million legal and illegal abortions performed annually. Our society has created, through education and technology, a desire for smaller families. Yet we have failed to produce the birth planning agent by which such aspirations may be satisfied, and American women must continue to bear the burden of making amends for contraceptive failures. Similarly, we have not developed the means by which American men and women may overcome infertility problems. Our Nation has failed to mobilize the resources necessary to help people exercise one of their most basic human rights—the right to bear and beget truly wanted children.

The Federal Government has been supporting population research and family planning services for only a short period of time. One of the major accomplishments of President Nixon's administration has been the launching of a national program to provide family services to women who for economic reasons do not have access to such services.

President Nixon was the first President to address the Nation specifically on these issues in his July 18, 1969, message to the Congress. He proposed that in addition to the creation of the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare be given the means to carry out increased research in contraceptive development and the sociology of population growth. He called for increased training of people to work in the population research and family planning services fields. He also stated that the federally aided family planning services efforts should be greatly expanded and directed to the 6.6 million medically indigent women who are estimated by HEW to be in need of subsidized family planning services.

The following year, the Congress passed the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act of 1970—Public Law 91-572—to implement the President's proposed program. This act provided \$382 million for fiscal years 1971-73 to expand the population-related activities of the Federal Government. To strengthen the direction and administration of the program, the HEW Deputy Assistant Secretary for Population Affairs was given line authority, through the HEW Office of Population Affairs, for both the Health Services and Mental Health Administration—HSMHA—family planning services program, the National Institutes of Health—NIH—population research program, the HEW population education program, and the Food and Drug Administration—FDA—contraceptive testing program.

The administrators of the services and research programs, therefore, have dual line responsibilities—one to the Deputy Assistant Secretary and one either to the NIH Director or to the HSMHA Director. This new authority was to be exercised through the appointments of an Assistant Administrator of HSMHA for Family Planning Services and an As-

sistant Director of NIH for Population Research, both of whom would serve as special assistants to the Deputy Assistant Secretary. However, to date neither of these appointments has been made nor has adequate staff for the Office of Population Affairs been hired to enable the Deputy Assistant Secretary to carry out the duties mandated by the legislation. This creates a less than clear administrative organization, poor program stability, and inadequate coordination and liaison.

The act passed by the Congress authorized special project grants for family planning services. This program is administered by the National Center for Family Planning Services of HSMHA. The latest HEW reports indicate that by 1973, when this act expires, approximately one-half of the 6.6 million women in need of subsidized family planning services will be receiving services.

Although I commend HEW on the progress that has been made, I must point out that funding levels have not kept up with projections and service levels have lagged accordingly. I believe, therefore, that this program must be renewed and that the special project grant authority must be continued in order to reach the President's goal of services to all women in need of them. Without renewal and expansion of the project grant program, the rest of the women in need of services may never be reached and those presently receiving services through this program will no longer have access to family planning health care. We cannot condemn these women to the suffering and poverty associated with unwanted fertility.

Although funds continue to be necessary to support the effort to reach the millions of women who are still in need of subsidized services, the development of a range of inexpensive, easily administered, medically safe contraceptives would greatly increase the effectiveness and efficiency of family planning services programs. The Family Planning and Population Research Act of 1970 authorized funds for an expanded Federal population research program. This program is administered by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development—NICHD—through its Center for Population Research—CPR—and encompasses both biological and social science research regarding human reproduction.

Population research in the biological sciences is focused on the basic processes of human reproduction and ongoing evaluation of present methods of fertility regulation. Its goal is the development of new and improved methods of dealing with problems of birth planning and infertility. It has been 16 years since the last major contraceptive development occurred. Even if there were a new major development today, there would probably be considerable lagtime before the method could be made generally available to the public. In the meantime, by 1982 the population of the world will have increased from 3.6 billion to an estimated 4.6 billion.

Until very recently, all of the research and developments in this field were supported by private foundations and drug

companies. The private philanthropic foundations are unable to increase their present level of support, which is currently estimated at \$25 million annually. The efforts of the pharmaceutical companies, estimated at a cost of \$15 million annually, are not being greatly expanded. There are a high number of risks for industry compared to the magnitude of investments and possible profits involved. The incentive for proprietary companies to invest in new contraceptive research is lacking especially when the ultimate goal is the development of an inexpensive, long-lasting method. I believe that the Federal Government must provide the major portion of the funds and resources necessary for the development of a breakthrough in technology and for expanding scientific knowledge concerning population dynamics.

The creation of the Center for Population Research in 1968 was an important beginning in the Government's work in this field; however, it is increasingly apparent that the demands of the field have outgrown the institutional framework to the point that the structure has become ineffective and inefficient.

My major proposals for improving and strengthening these programs are the creation of a new and separate Population Sciences Research Institute and the establishment of a new agency within HEW that would combine both population sciences research and family planning services. Both of these national programs would be under the direct administrative supervision of an Assistant Secretary for Population Affairs, who would also be responsible for all family planning services and population research programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

While I believe that administrative reorganization is not a panacea, it is clear that some measures must be instituted to insure adequate growth and development of these programs if we are to meet our national health goals. We are now well on our way toward meeting the goal of provision of services to all women in need. It is imperative that this demonstrably successful and cost-effective program be continued.

The funding authorizations contained in this bill are based primarily on HEW's 5-year plan for carrying out the mandate of the law. I have found the estimates contained in the HEW plan to be both realistic and responsible. I believe that all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are deeply concerned about fiscal controls and the enormity of Government expenditures. Yet, I wish to call the attention of this body to the fact that the total cost of delivering comprehensive family planning services to those in need is approximately \$60 to \$66 per patient per year. This cost includes basic gynecological examinations, pap tests, VD screening, and other related preventive health care.

It is evident that such a program produces enormous cost savings for individuals and for Government, due to births averted as a result of provision of services. And because such programs must continue to be both comprehensive and voluntary, I believe it to be essential

that the development, financing, and monitoring of these programs come from the Federal Government in order to insure preservation of present national standards for quality of care.

The Congress must continue to support and encourage Federal leadership in this vital field while encouraging private organizations and industry to continue and further their work in a strengthened partnership effort with the Federal Government.

The legislation I introduce today represents a pledge to the people of the United States to continue together our joint congressional effort on their behalf to see that they have the opportunity to freely determine their own family size. We must promise to carry the campaign for services and research until we believe that job is done.

PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to share with my colleagues an article by Ms. Lucy Albright, which appeared in the "Lucy's Letter" column of the Glasgow, Ky., Republican for February 22, 1973.

Upon the recent release of our prisoners of war, surely every American experienced a great sense of relief and a feeling of overwhelming joy for those families, who, after being torn asunder by tragic events of the past, were reunited to function normally again.

I believe that Ms. Albright has captured the inner thoughts of each American who watched as those first returning prisoners set foot upon native soil. Rarely does one find so eloquent an expression of such intense emotion.

The Lucy's letter follows:

LUCY'S LETTER

(By Lucy Albright)

Real life drama holds one with an intensity of emotions that no drama of the theater can even begin to touch. And as television brought us the return of Prisoners of War back to their homeland, and into the tearful, joyful warm embrace of their families, we were deeply stirred and I cried with joy for them, as I am confident teeming thousands of others did. Though we cannot begin to realize the emotions involved among those connected with the homecomings, still it seemed our inward feelings were all tied up with love, compassion, home, family, thankfulness, country, hallelujahs and above all, God.

The month of February, the shortest of the twelve, now adds its greatest event into its annals of historical prominence, for it was in February '73 after many long months and years, even to more than seven when these American soldiers had been held in captivity as Prisoners of War, were at long last being brought home. And will Valentines Day, ever have a greater significance for which to be remembered than the day when the first POWs touched the good earth of their homeland again, and when the hearts of the people overturned with jubilation? A Red-Letter Day in the history of this country. Who said American hearts had grown cold and selfish? This proved to be a fallacy, in

consideration of the all-out manifestations of good will and offers of help from all over to give these returning courageous native sons a wonderful homecoming.

During the years of captivity, there may have been those who endeavored to give the impression to the public that American soldiers in Indo-China had turned against America and its way of life. But as we watched these fine looking soldiers step from the planes, and as spokesmen gave greetings to the American people, this supposition faded into thin air, as words of thankfulness and praise to God and their country was uppermost in their words. And patriotism was at its finest as they said they were glad they could serve their country. Their attitudes, their courage, their faith, which as some remarked was kept alive by their thoughts on Jesus reflect an enduring integrity which was found in the early settlers and pioneer fathers of this great country and should be as a shining example to others.

After the traumatic experiences of all the soldiers who were in combat, and the added experiences of some, who were POWs, they may never be exactly the same, and probably America will never be the same. And in spite of the pain and anguish of war, many may have greater appreciation and deeper regard for our country which was born in travail and endured through sacrifice. And if any on the homefront have stooped so low as to berate and bemean America and its way of life, surely they will be catapulted from out of this attitude of disdain by the words of Col. Risner, who was a prisoner of war, who said, "I want to tell you something folks. To us, this is truly the land of milk and honey, the land of the free, and the home of the brave." It seems the Lord put a flaming torch of Hope in each of us, which helps to dispel fear, and gives us courage, and patience and faith and endurance in times of great stress, which helps to sustain us, and for which we may praise His great name.

DECALOGUE SOCIETY AWARD OF MERIT CONFERRED ON CONGRESSMAN SIDNEY YATES

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an address delivered by Hon. Carl B. Sussman, U.S. magistrate of the U.S. District Court of the Northern District of Illinois, when he conferred the annual award of merit of the Decalogue Society of Lawyers on my distinguished colleague from Illinois, the Honorable Sidney R. Yates.

Congressman YATES, who is a member of the House Appropriations Committee, has been one of the strong leaders in the Congress, having successfully led the fight on many occasions for reestablishment of priorities in our budgetmaking process.

The 38th annual merit award dinner was held at the Palmer House on March 10, and Judge Sussman made the presentation not only in his capacity as a magistrate of the U.S. district court, but also as a past president of the Decalogue Society.

The program for the award dinner and the remarks of Judge Sussman, follow:

AWARD DINNER

The Decalogue Society of Lawyers presents its annual Merit Award to Honorable Sidney

R. Yates, Member of Congress, the Palmer House, Saturday, March tenth, nineteen hundred seventy-three.

Thirty-eighth Annual Award Dinner of the Decalogue Society of Lawyers, program: Oscar A. Jordan, Presiding, and Stephen P. Patt, General Chairman.

Posting of Colors, U.S. Marine Air Corps Color Guard.

National Anthem, led by Theodore P. Fields.

Invocation, Rabbi William B. Gold, and Congregation Beth Shalom of Rogers Park.

DINNER

Introductions, Stephen P. Patt.

Welcome, Oscar A. Jordan, President, the Decalogue Society of Lawyers.

Presentation of Award of Merit, Judge Carl B. Sussman, United States Magistrate, United States District Court.

Response, Honorable Sidney R. Yates.

Benediction.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY CARL B. SUSSMAN

Congressman Yates, Distinguished Guests, Mr. Chairman, Reverend Clergy, Friends of the Decalogue Society: The growth of this Society throughout its more than 38 years of service to the community and to the Bench and Bar in particular, should be attributed to many factors. Among these are our unceasing efforts for the perseverance of the dignity of the lofty traditions of the legal profession, responsiveness to the needs of minorities and active participation in pressing communal problems.

Our steadily increasing numerical strength and the widespread recognition of the Decalogue Society as an important member in the family of American Bar Associations, attest to the soundness of principles that have guided and inspired us.

The stature that our society has attained, the prestige which it enjoys, has been made possible throughout our history by the stand that we take on important issues facing the community, and is again expressed in the choice that we make in the man or woman that we select for our award.

Each year, our Society, the third largest bar association in the State of Illinois, and the fourteenth in the Nation, recognize and applaud such outstanding contribution by an individual to the American or World community by conferring upon that person our Annual Award of Merit. By this action we again this year, as in former years, rededicate ourselves to a reiteration of our principles and our credo, by paying tribute to the achievements of a beloved and a great American, for tonight we honor not only a man but a symbol.

Our formula for selecting the recipient for this award is self evident. To qualify, one must have made a significant contribution to American life and to humanity. He must be creative and affirmative in his dedication to the democratic process. He must have vision and courage and a strong sense of responsibility to society. He must be loyal to his own people in order to be a better American. He must be imbued with the ideal of the brotherhood of man and must use his talents and his energy in the service of all mankind. Above all, his life must be such as to inspire others to emulation.

Such men and women are not easy to find. But this year's choice was inevitable by any standard.

The son of Immigrant parents, Sidney R. Yates was born in Chicago and was educated in Chicago public schools.

He gave early evidence of his character by working at odd jobs to further his education. At the same time, he learned his Judaism and its Heritage, and the true meaning of democracy and social justice, from his parents and family. After graduation from Lakeview High School, he enrolled at the University of Chicago, played on the basketball team, and in 1931, was selected for the All

Big Ten basketball honors. Here again he displayed the attributes of good sportsmanship and fair play toward both his team players and opponents, and received his law degree from the University of Chicago Law School.

Recognizing that mankind shares the shame for the unprecedented decade that saw incinerators reduce six million human beings to dust and ashes, and fearing the consequences for America of Nazi barbarism and evil people, Yates determined to serve his country in World War II, served in the Navy and was released from active duty with the rank of Lieutenant.

Imbued with his ambitious aim and philosophy to do much more with his life's work than most people, and recognizing his ability and talent, his party selected him for high public office, and in 1948, he was elected to Congress from the Ninth Congressional District of Illinois and was reelected ten times thereafter.

His fight for social justice and equality are indelibly written for all time in the permanent records of the House of Representatives. He has fought hard for solutions to our social ills, and was a champion of civil rights long before these words became fashionable.

Because of his respect for justice, he took on the fight single-handedly against great odds and vested interests, to restore Admiral Hyman Rickover to his rightful place in the United States Navy. He succeeded in this task to right this wrong and America applauded Yates for his courage and tenacity. Again in more recent years he has been heedless of personal consequences—witness the fact that he led the successful fight in the House against the S.S.T.

In 1963, the President of the United States recognized in Yates other great qualities—his ability to work in the diplomatic field—to help the world in its search for peace. He was appointed by President Kennedy as United States Representative to the Trusteeship Council of the United States Mission to the United Nations. There, his work won high praise from his countrymen, and in particular from his two dear friends and colleagues, Governor Adlai Stevenson, then the Ambassador to the United Nations and the former Senior Senator from Illinois, Senator Paul Douglas. Yes, tonight, Yates joins the roll of honor—a select group of men and women of world renown, former recipients of the Decalogue Award—Great Americans who have toiled with Yates to make America an even better country—Governor Adlai Stevenson, Senator Paul Douglas, Prof. Albert Einstein, Dr. Percy L. Julian, Col. Jacob M. Arvey, Eleanor Roosevelt, Bishop Bernard Shell, Rabbi Stephen Wise, President Harry Truman, and with us tonight Judge Abraham Lincoln Marovitz and Barnett Hodes. They and all other former recipients—catalogued and recorded in our program at your places—have appeared on this platform in prior years to receive our thanks and appreciation, for all of them with Yates have a common bond—for all of them—like Yates, exemplify the truth that character—is the prime essential of greatness.

As an active participant in many of the social programs enacted under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, Yates has made it a special goal to aid the elderly (our senior citizens), and to hear the cries of the weak and the wronged and he has used his legislative talent to lift crushing burdens from the brows of those who cannot plead for themselves. For in the Congress, he is the people's advocate, and his contributions have been positive and numerous; there—he has waged war against the common enemy—hunger, disease and apathy. There he has helped relieve human suffering by devoting his energies for equal opportunity in employment, housing and education. There he has encouraged the immigrant and the oppressed from other lands to migrate to America, the land of the free, and make a new beginning. And, in recent months, he has used his in-

fluence to help Soviet Jewry in its quest for freedom so that they too may begin a new life in the land of Israel—and since his election in 1948, inspired by the bold and courageous leadership of President Harry Truman, Yates has labored mightily for the welfare and security of this small but great democracy in the middle east—the State of Israel.

A member of the Appropriations Committee for 22 years, he also serves on the Transportation and Interior subcommittees. In this capacity, Yates continues to exercise his special skills, talents and learnings to defend the weak and to enlighten the confused. He has played a major role in protecting and improving our environment and ecology.

He is the true liberal with his goals and sights high, but with his feet on the ground. He has vision and courage in abundance. He is modest and humble.

His every action in the Congress is positive proof that he is conscious of the universal truth—that the struggle for human liberty is ceaseless and exacting and that only in a just world will all peoples find justice for themselves.

So this day, as in former years, we bestow our coveted award upon a citizen for distinguished service to humanity, believing that our award serves as an inspiration for the common good. He is eminently qualified for our award. He has grown to full stature, but his growth continues. His work for humanity over the years stands out like a beautiful tree, that bends with the wind and time but does not snap. He is a man of compassion and concern. He is a man of peace and reconciliation. By honoring him, we honor ourselves. We are all grateful beneficiaries of his achievements, and we are his respectful admirers. He is dedicated to the pursuit of justice. We owe him much and we applaud him. I am indeed privileged to be the instrumentality through whom this award is conferred.

Sid, on behalf of the Decalogue Society of Lawyers, of which you, yourself are a distinguished member, I am proud to present to you the 1972 Annual Award of Merit.

**AWARD AND PRESENTATION PRESENTED BY
CARL B. SUSSMAN ON BEHALF OF THE
DECALOGUE SOCIETY OF LAWYERS**

Award of Merit for the year 1972 presented to the Honorable Sidney R. Yates, Member House of Representatives, United States Congress:

For his forthright, imaginative and dynamic leadership and courage within the government of the United States in the unceasing struggle for progress and betterment for all people;

For his staunch support of the security and well being of the State of Israel as a free and democratic nation;

For his devoted efforts to fair treatment and equal opportunity in education, housing and employment to all segments of our society;

For his roll in preserving, protecting and improving the ecology and environment in which we live.

Chicago, Illinois, March 19, 1973.

Take this, Congressman, with our deep gratitude and carry on the good fight.

DRUG LEGISLATION

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the legislation introduced today by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FREY) who, at the

request of the President, is presenting to the House the Heroin Trafficking Act of 1973.

As a cosponsor of this legislation, I firmly believe that tough, mandatory penalties for those who engage in the trafficking of hard drugs is a necessary component of any effective program aimed at curbing widespread drug abuse.

We have learned over the past few years that individuals who sell hard drugs have now moved into suburban neighborhoods, high schools and grade schools, and virtually any location where a potential "market" exists.

In my judgment, persons who make it a profession to sell these drugs are among society's most hardened criminals, and a strong, comprehensive policy to deal with them by appropriate legal means must represent a positive step forward in the effort to protect society from those who cannot obey the law.

The legislation being introduced today goes further than mandating the imposition of tough penalties. The legislation being placed before Congress today would also place new restrictions of the conditions which could permit a drug pusher to be freed on pretrial release. The need for speedy trials is acute in this area.

This action is being taken in response to information which shows that in a large number of cases, persons charged with narcotics violations are being set free before trial only to continue their criminal actions until once again apprehended by law enforcement officers.

Mr. Speaker, the Heroin Trafficking Act of 1973 represents a vital step in the development of a comprehensive national policy aimed at strengthening the laws to deal with those who sell hard drugs.

Its enactment by the Congress would signal our own commitment to correct the problem of drug abuse, and to correct the problem by assuring that heroin trafficking carries criminal penalties which are commensurate with the gravity of that crime.

I urge the House to give its early consideration to this bill, in order to bring the full force of the law upon those who violate the law with their cruel and inhumane actions.

CUBAN REFUGEES DENIED U.S. ASYLUM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, another cherished American freedom, the right of political asylum, may be destined to be discarded on the same trash heap as so many other rights and freedoms we Americans once cherished. Oppressed people throughout the world have for generations looked toward this country for sanctuary when tyranny threatened them in their native lands. Political refugees who seek to find in America their last hope for liberty have been sold out by the Department of State.

The most recent incident involves two

Cuban fishermen who seized control of their fishing vessel March 8 in an effort to flee the Communist stranglehold on their country. Their taste of freedom was short lived, however, when the Immigration and Naturalization Service ordered them deported last week. The INS cited the "spirit" of the recent antihijacking agreement between the United States and Cuba. Apparently, three two young men are to be sacrificed as a "show of good faith" to Castro.

More than half a million of their anti-Communist countrymen have sought refuge in the United States since Castro came to power in 1959. Small boats and makeshift contrivances have been used by more than 14,000 Cubans to make the 90-mile voyage from the dictatorship. Not one Cuban political refugee has been refused entry into the United States or deported until now.

This dangerous trend toward closing the door to Cuban asylum actually began last year when a similar case involving the commandeering of another craft by three Cubans seeking escape from their island prison came to light. These men were ordered back to Cuba because of a legal technicality—they lacked the proper immigrant visa. When a person is fleeing for his life, he can hardly be expected to take time to make the necessary bureaucratic documentation.

No intelligent person would condone terrorists hijackings of aircraft or boats for political blackmail or other extortion. And it was hoped that the antihijacking agreement with Cuba would be a step toward preventing them. This agreement is clear in its protection of asylum rights for political refugees. It should be noted that this document is not a treaty, ratified in accordance with the constitution. Article IV of the February 15 accord states:

The party into whose territory the perpetrators of the acts described in Article I (hijacking of air or maritime craft) arrive may take into consideration any attenuating or mitigating circumstances in cases where in the persons responsible for said acts find themselves persecuted for purely political reasons, or in actual or imminent danger of death and without any other viable means of abandoning their country, so long as no economic extortion or physical injury to the crews, passengers or other persons is involved in the abduction.

Fear that the agreement would endanger the haven Cuban refugees now find in the United States was expressed soon after the announcement of the signing by Dr. Manolo Reyes, well-known Cuban exile. Dr. Reyes' reservations were well founded. In the February 20, 1973 edition of *Diario Las Americas* he writes:

It is important that its (the anti-hijacking agreement) points be clarified, because the treaty is vague, ambiguous and contradictory, and represents a danger to Cuban refugees fleeing by boat across the Florida Straits. Furthermore, as we are dealing with a Cuban affair which Cuban exiles must consider odious, we must request Congressmen and Senators that respect Cuban interests to look into this matter.

The actions of the State Department are clear. In the name of normalizing relations with the Cuban Communist dictatorship and in abiding by the so-called spirit of the antihijacking agreement, the State Department is closing

the doors of political asylum to Cuban anti-Communists. And in doing so, our Government has signed the death notices for thousands of remaining Cubans unable to escape.

I insert the following related newspaper clippings.

[From the Houston Tribune, Feb. 8, 1973]

CUBANS FACE DEPORTATION
(By Jay Mallin)

MIAMI.—Three unlikely Cubans—a fisherman, an electrician and a math teacher—are the center of a controversy directly bearing on relations between the United States and Communist Cuba.

Since Premier Fidel Castro came to power in 1959, more than half a million anti-Communist Cubans have sought refuge in the United States. More than 14,000 have braved the Straits of Florida in small boats and on makeshift contrivances in order to flee the Castro dictatorship.

Not one Cuban had been refused entry into the United States. Not one had been ordered deported back to Cuba. But here in Miami an Immigration Department hearing was held in December for the fisherman, electrician and math teacher and the three were ordered "excluded and deported from the United States to Cuba."

Why was this action taken? Ostensibly, on a legal technicality. But one should keep in mind that the United States and Cuba, through the good offices of the Swiss Embassy in Havana, were in the process of negotiating a hijacking treaty. The United States wants Cuba to return hijackers who force planes to fly to that country. Castro, in turn, wants the United States to return refugees who commandeered planes or boats in order to escape Cuba.

The United States, in the past, has always refused to return Cubans whom it feels are political refugees entitled to a safe haven in the states.

Alan Becker, attorney for the three Cubans, states: "Never has this country refused asylum to those asking for it, particularly when they are faced with physical persecution if sent back. I hope and trust this will not be the first time."

And Becker adds, "I don't think the United States should succumb to Castro's morality."

The fisherman in the group, Isidoro Alfaro Alvarez, had hidden two friends under floorboards of the fishing boat on which he worked. Also on board were the father and son who owned the vessel, but they did not know there were two stowaways.

Once the vessel was at sea, the stowaways emerged from hiding and with Alfaro seized control of the boat. One of them was armed with a knife and a pistol that couldn't fire.

They sailed to Key West, where they were picked up by the Coast Guard. The father and son were released and permitted to sail their boat back to Cuba.

The other three men, however, instead of receiving the routine processing usually given to Cuban refugees, found themselves in jail in the town of Miami Springs. The United States had decided to make theirs a special case. The hearing was held—they had to stay in jail almost a fortnight—and they were ordered deported.

The reason for the deportation order was a flimsy one: the three were "not in possession of a valid, unexpired immigrant visa, reentry permit, border crossing identification card or other valid entry document." The special inquiry officer did not mention the fact that probably thousands of other Cubans have come to this country without any proper documentation.

Nor did the Immigration Department care to consider the men's assertion that if they are returned to Cuba they will face jail and possibly death. Said the inquiry officer, "There is no authority in exclusion provisions of the statute for consideration of a

claim that an excluded alien will be subject to persecution if returned to the country from where he came."

The three men are now free on bond. Their case has been appealed to Washington. Will the United States persist in punishing three men for trying to flee tyranny?

Lawyer Becker says: "Hopefully the government will find its conscience. The government put itself on the spot. There was no treaty and there was no need to sacrifice these men to get one."

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 20, 1973]

U.S. CITES HIJACK PACT IN BARRING TWO
(By Bernard Gwertzman)

Citing the "spirit" of the recent Cuban-American antihijacking agreement, the United States has refused to grant safe haven to two Cuban fishermen who had briefly seized control at sea of their nine-man Cuban fishing boat.

The two defectors were expected to repeat their request for asylum today, however.

The fishermen, while being transported back to Cuba, jumped overboard Sunday night off Key West, Fla., and were reported by Cuban exile groups to be hiding in Florida.

A State Department spokesman said yesterday that although last month's agreement with Cuba on combating hijacking did not seem to fit this case exactly, the United States decided that the actions of the fishermen violated the "spirit" of the agreement and made it impossible for them to be granted asylum here.

As related by State Department officials, the two men, Orlidio Hernandez Perez and Heriberto Caridad Perez Martinez, both in their 20's, took control of the boat, the *Gayo Largo*, on March 8, and at pistolpoint locked the captain and the other crew members in the hold.

They tried to sail the boat to Mexico, but lost their bearings and released the crew. Then the boat ran out of gas and the Coast Guard pulled it into Key West.

There the two crewmen asked immigration authorities to be allowed to stay, but were refused. When the boat sailed for Cuba they jumped ship rather than face Cuban penalties for hijacking.

Yesterday the anti-Castro exile group Executive Committee for Liberation, headed by Tomas Cruz, said the group has picked up the two defectors and was hiding them until it was given assurances that they would not be returned to Cuba. (Cruz told newsmen last night that the two would voluntarily surrender to U.S. immigration authorities today and seek asylum, UPI reported.)

Under the antihijacking agreement signed in Washington and in Havana on Feb. 15, the two countries are obliged either to extradite or to seek "severe punishment" in their own courts of any hijackers who commit "acts of violence" on planes or boats from one country to the other.

The agreement allows either country to consider mitigating circumstances in cases where persons charged with political crimes are "in real and imminent danger of death without a viable alternative for leaving the country."

THE NAVY-GRUMMAN AIRCRAFT CO. CONTRACT

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Grumman Aircraft Co., already in deep trouble with the Navy over the F-14 jet

fighter program, has also encountered at least \$52 million and possibly much higher contract cost increases as part of its Hawkeye warning aircraft program. A comparison of the original contract price and current estimates appears to indicate a \$161 million increase, but the Navy claims that it is not a real increase. These cost increases are related to the research and development of the plane and the purchase of the first 11 aircraft. Apparently, Grumman's bad performance on the F-14 is being repeated on the Hawkeye program.

The Navy's most recent report made available to Congress concerning the E-2C indicates that the cost of the development contract and the first procurement contract for 11 planes has increased a total of \$161 million. While, apparently, the Navy does not dispute the \$52 million increase in development costs, they claim that at least part of the \$109 million in the procurement contract is the result of the addition of items of support and is not really a cost increase. As a result, I have asked the General Accounting Office to conduct a special investigation of the entire E-2C program to determine the exact cost of this contract.

At least \$28.8 million of cost increases on the program have been the result of the Navy's decision to pay a larger part of Grumman's overhead as a result of the company's reduced business base. I am also asking the General Accounting Office to investigate whether Grumman was legitimately entitled to increased overhead payments.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am suspicious that the Navy has given Grumman an unwarranted helping hand on a troublesome contract and concerned that this so-called increased overhead may be related to problems on the F-14. Specifically, I am asking the GAO to determine whether these increased overhead payments might really be used to help pay for the troubled F-14.

It is also important to remember that the Navy's estimate of the cost of this program has more than doubled since 1967 from \$426 million to \$873.8 million. According to the book entitled "Program Acquisition Costs by Weapons Systems," prepared by the Comptroller of the Defense Department, 19 Hawkeye planes were approved in fiscal years 1972 and 1973 and the Pentagon is requesting an additional nine planes in this year's budget. It is not clear whether additional planes will be requested or not.

According to the GAO the causes of this spectacular cost overrun have been Navy revisions of cost estimates, engineering changes, schedule delays, the Navy's assuming a larger share of the contractor's overhead, and inflation.

In addition, the Navy in its test of the new plane has also encountered 29 major technical deficiencies in the aircraft, but Grumman is reportedly working to correct all deficiencies.

These cost overruns are the first indication that Grumman's problems are not limited to the F-14 but rather that the company is having difficulty in its aircraft procurement programs. The GAO should completely review this program to make sure that all payments to Grum-

man have been in accordance with the contract and that the company is not using any extra money to pay for problems on the F-14.

A CRAM COURSE IN AMERICAN GOVERNMENT

HON. DONALD D. CLANCY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to announce the presence in Washington this week of 58 fine high school seniors from Cincinnati.

They are here, participating in the second annual congressional scholarship program sponsored by Congressman WILLIAM J. KEATING and myself through the cooperation of the Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce. While they will spend a few hours looking at the many historical attractions of this Nation's Capital, they will be mainly occupied in listening to and talking with Government officials and persons vitally concerned with American Government.

Many of my colleagues and leaders in this House have taken a few minutes of their valuable time to meet these young people and I thank them for that because it is important that these future citizens learn face-to-face about the mechanics and personalities of their Federal Government. Additionally, these seniors have met with members of committee staffs, the executive and judicial branches of Government, and the special interests, or lobbyists, so that they might gain a more comprehensive education about Government operations.

These youths were not selected solely because of scholarship or popularity. Each high school selected a senior according to his or her scholarship, leadership, activities, citizenship, but most of all, because of his or her interest in government.

We feel that they are above average high school students who have the potential for being leading citizens in the future. They, their schools and their sponsors from the Second Congressional District are:

LIST OF SCHOOLS, STUDENTS, AND SPONSORS

Aiken High School—Becky Jones, Greg Rooks, Whiteway Manufacturing; Colerain High—Marla Jelen, Student Council; Elder High—Edward Huber, Gary Jeffcott, Elder Welfare Association and Amity Advertising; Finneytown High—Ellen Roberts, Parent Teachers Association; Greenhills High—Larry Evans, Keystone Savings and Loan Association.

William Henry Harrison High—Vince Dougoud, School and Clubs; Hughes High—Terrie Anna Smith, Anthony Bowden, Kroger Company and Cincinnati Retail Merchants Association; LaSalle High—Thomas Osterday, LaSalle High School; McAuley High—Jacki Russell, McAuley Mother and Dad Club; Mother of Mercy Academy—Karyn Schlueter, High School Parents Association.

Mount Notre Dame—Mary Breen Wood, School and Parent Teachers Association; Mount Healthy High—Holly Higgins, Daniel J. Schenke, Parent Teachers Association and American Legion; North College Hill High—Mark Discepoli, Junior-Senior Parent Teach-

ers Association, North College Hill Women's Republican Club, North College Hill Republican Club and North College Hill Democrat Club; Oak Hills High—Gregory Reece, Jacqueline Eagan, Oak Hills Kiwanis and Parent Teachers Association.

Seton High—Jennifer Riegler, Mom and Dad Club; Taft Senior High—Jacki Billings, Greater Cincinnati Jaycees; Taylor High—Philip J. Siegel, Three Rivers Jaycees; Western Hills High—Elaine Perkins, Theresa Rusyn, Westwood Cheviot Kiwanis and Price Hill Kiwanis, and Wyoming High—Marcy Toney, Parent Teachers Association.

The chaperones are Jim Jurgens, Bob Wagner, Steve Baker, Joe and Sue Suhre, Major McNeil and John Morley.

ALLEN M. TROUT

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the late Allen M. Trout was known as the knife-swapping, yarn-spinning, gourd-growing writer in residence at the Louisville, Ky., Courier-Journal for many years. Through his daily column "Greetings," he dispensed tales of life along the backroads of Kentucky which often served as lessons in human behavior.

At this time, I have the pleasure of sharing with my colleagues an article by that esteemed author, the late Mr. Trout, as it appeared in the "Taylor's Tales" column of the Glasgow, Ky., Republican for February 22, 1973.

The story of Miss Grace Butte's goose is one of many produced during Mr. Trout's tenure at the Courier. Its plot is simple, yet its lesson remains valuable to us all in our ceaseless effort to accommodate change.

The article follows:

TAYLOR TALES

(By Stanton Taylor)

Written for Wednesday morning, January 1, 1964: "The silver anniversary of greetings is at hand today. But I shall not invoke the privilege of the occasion and claim silver. Instead, I shall bide my time to March 12, 1971, when upon the propitious publication of my 10,000th column, this remarkable newspaper has promised me a gold cadillac. Oh, I have the silver at hand. But, human like, I prefer to reach for the gold in the bush.

"Yes, it was 25 years ago this day—January 1, 1939—when I started this fearful forum in an unguarded moment of unwarranted optimism. Few, indeed, are newspapermen who can look back across 8,000 daily columns and nearly 4,000,000 words in a continuous stream of what is euphemistically called consciousness.

But I can, and it numbs me. Things have run together in my mind. What I think is 10 years ago turns out to be 15. I will think of something as yesterday and it is yesterday. The only two things I know for sure are that I am 25 years older, but I am not 25 years smarter. I seem to have dropped more than I picked up. When baffling things enter my mind and come out on paper the essence of simplicity, it is only because I have lost the power to take the problem through all the correct but complicated processes of solution.

"A remarkable goose at Science Hill in Pulaski county was hatched out in the spring of 1939. This goose, owned by Miss Grace Butte, is as old as this column. Mrs. Sarah Jasper, Science Hill, knowing my peculiar interest in the aged fowl, kindly keeps me

abreast of the bird's slow waddle toward the sunset. In her last report Mrs. Jasper wrote: "Back in October Miss Grace had a big light installed in her back yard, making night as bright as day. For the first few nights the old goose walked the yard, fretting and talking to herself. But she finally had to accept new things as new. So she gave up and started going to bed at night as usual."

Just so with your valiant columnist, I was born in the horse and buggy era, and learned to read by a coal-oil lamp. In 1939, I could look back across more progress than had occurred in a thousand years. But from 1939 to 1964 have occurred the miracles of electronic computation, television, human exploration of outer space, the atomic and hydrogen bombs, travel faster than sound, and telstar."

"Since 1939 have occurred World War II, the Korean Conflict, the ascendancy of colored races, the cohesion of Russia and the United States in enlightened self-interest, and the assassination of a president of this republic in his own country at high noon in a crowded city.

"It is simply too much for an ordinary man to assimilate. Like my ancient feathered contemporary in Pulaski county, I have learned to accept new things as new and then go on to bed and sleep."

REMARKS OF DR. LOWELL BENNION ON PROBLEMS WITH THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED BUDGET

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, since becoming a Member of this body 10 weeks ago, I have undertaken the practice of holding regular town meetings in my district to which I have invited local community members to express their feelings and to pose questions to me as their Congressman.

Over the last 2 months these meetings have dealt largely with the implications of the President's fund impoundments and his budget projections for 1974.

In addition, I have received many letters—mounting into the hundreds—protesting the abrupt, insensitive manner in which programs which Congress has passed to redress economic and social wrongs and inequities, have been summarily killed by presidential directive.

A letter which I received from Dr. Lowell L. Bennion, executive director of the community services council, Salt Lake area, shows particular understanding of the situation confronting us. The questions he asks are very basic and must be answered before Congress endorses the President's proposals.

Dr. Bennion has a distinguished background in both religious and secular education and is one of the most respected social service leaders in the State of Utah. I am inserting Dr. Bennion's letter in the RECORD to make it available for all Members to read:

COMMUNITY SERVICES COUNCIL, SALT LAKE AREA,

Salt Lake City, Utah, February 20, 1973.

HON. WAYNE OWENS,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: Congratulations on your meeting at the City Chambers. You were candid, sincere, good-humored, well orga-

nized, respectful, even patient. I was pleased to be there and to sense the accumulated effect as well as hear individual pleas.

May I just add my own input very briefly—points I would have made had the audience remained.

(1) What is the alternative to the programs the President has cut, e.g. housing, head-start, unemployment, manpower training, mental health? (We have held the naive assumption in this country that if we leave the economic system alone, all other problems will be solved. "Hold down inflation and all else will be ok." The truth is that our economic system has created or contributed largely to social problems such as unemployment and urban slums.) I am for free enterprise, having lived in Europe, but the 20 per cent who cannot compete successfully in our system, need alternatives to give them dignity and a meaningful role.

(2) Revenue sharing has limitations:

(a) It is not nearly enough to compensate for cutbacks in human areas.

(b) A transition period is needed.

(c) Local politicians, like the President, can and will channel this money into tax reduction, police force and are not likely to remove the causes of crime, poverty, mental illness.

(3) If we don't become generous in trying to prevent social ills, we shall never get the upper hand. The more we cut back on social programming, the more we are prone to deal only with symptoms.

(4) In America, we glorify material values on T.V., in movies, in advertising—and unconsciously children, youth, and adults are inculcated with materialistic goals and values. At the same time, the uneducated, impoverished, lower socio-economic class is denied the means of reaching these goals. No wonder they turn to drugs and crime and sex to compensate.

In my new job in the Community Services Council, I shall be looking at social problems with some intensity and specificity. If we get any insights into the local situation, I'll pass them on for what they may be worth.

Be assured of my interest and support of your efforts. Let me know, where we can assist.

Sincerely,

LOWELL L. BENNION,
Executive Director.

A GREAT DAY, WITH TEARS

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, this month, the city of Chicago lost one of its biggest boosters. It was forced to say goodbye to a man who had given more of himself just to his city, than most of us are capable of giving at all. Yes, when John McNulty passed away, Chicago lost one of her greatest citizens. I lost a very dear friend.

Most of the stories of this man and his good works will probably go untold. But then, that is the way he would have liked it.

David Condon, award-winning sports-writer for the Chicago Tribune, has, in my opinion, captured the true spirit of John McNulty in a recent column. Because I feel that it accurately embodies both the warmth and the strength of the man, I would like to insert the article in the RECORD at this point for my colleagues' attention:

A GREAT DAY, WITH TEARS

(By David Condon)

LOS ANGELES, March 16.—The bad luck of the draw will have me spending St. Patrick's Day out here, where an Irishman is in uniform on March 17 if he wears a green chili on his leather motorcycle jacket. It's just as well. Tomorrow really isn't going to seem like St. Patrick's Day in the County of Cook.

No, it won't seem a real St. Patrick's Day in Chicago. Not with a trio of the regulars moved on to that great big patch of Ireland "way up there among the angels".

Smiling Irish eyes will be tinged with dew when Ed Moran and Pat O'Malley and Joe Meegan and the other laddies convene in Latner's and Tommy O'Leary's tomorrow to warm up for the wearin' o' the green down State Street.

There will be tears aplenty between toasts to the good saint. The tears will fall as the laddies whisper their aves for Gabby Hartnett, Steve Lamb, and John McNulty, who will be marked absent this St. Pat's Day and forever more.

Maybe someday there'll be another Gabby Hartnett. Somewhere, if a rare mold is rediscovered, there could be another Steve Lamb. There isn't ever going to be another John McNulty. Not in Bridgeport, Beverly, or anywhere.

I have many pleasant memories of Gabby Hartnett and Steve Lamb. I cherish a treasure house of memories about John McNulty, head of the Board of Local Improvements. When it came to charity, John's big heart and big pocketbook always were open.

John always was the first to call and ask what could be done to help the Special Olympics for the Mentally Retarded. But no publicity, please.

Weeks before his death only a few days ago, John renewed an annual ultimatum to me: "Put me down for 50 top-priced tickets to the All-Star football game."

Then as always, John McNulty added: "You got any charitable projects that need some help?" Once John asked that when I was lunching with Gabby Hartnett, and Gabby mentioned his pet project—Father John Smyth's Maryville Orphanage for lads and lassies. John's check was forthcoming, pronto.

A while back I asked John McNulty what he did with his stack of All-Star tickets. "Oh, I can use 'em in business," said John, "tho often I forget about 'em and they turn up in some suit coat about two months after the game."

John McNulty was generous. He was loyal, to his friends, neighborhood, and city. The John McNulty must have learned in geography class that there were other cities besides Chicago, he never really believed it.

Most of all, John McNulty was proud. We were cutting up touches in one of his downtown offices—either the Shangri-la or Fritzel's or the Celtic Bar, because John was a man about town as well as a man about the old neighborhood—and I said: "John, you must be awfully proud of all the money you've made."

"Kid," said John McNulty, "I'm more proud of the money I've turned down."

In a time that now seems too long ago, The Tribune's late golf editor, Charlie Bartlett, told me: "I just talked to John McNulty. He's with his brother, Ed, and Jimmy Hart and Marty Hogan and Joe Wosik, and none of 'em are about to let Chicago lose that golf tournament that George May is quitting at Tam O'Shanter."

"If they can clear the dates, the McNultys are going to put on the same tournament at their Gleneagles club."

So that's how it happened that for two years the fabulous Chicago Open, won both times by Ken Venturi, was played at Gleneagles, summer home of the Upside Down Club and the Hamburgs.

Promoting a major golf tournament is no

easy job. Certainly not when you start from scratch a few weeks before post time. But no one ever received more help from their friends than did the Bros. McNulty, Wosik, et al.

Every policeman in Chicago must have volunteered to assist with parking and ushering. Every badge wearer along the fairways and greens seemed to be a fireman. John Carmichael, Jim Mullen, Tom Kouzmanoff, Jim Kearns, almost every writer in town churned out stories on the McNulty Gleneagles tournament.

Marty Hogan and Tom Haviland and Bill Lee kept the WCFL airways flooded with publicity. Bud Rodi, now gone, commanded the official scorers.

I hate to feel sad on a St. Patrick's Day. But John McNulty would want me to drop a tear. Not for him, because John disliked personal emotion. But John McNulty would want us Irish to cry for the now gone Celtic Bar, Fritzel's and Shangri-la, where so many of us had so many good times. Will the Shannon Rovers play a dirge while the banshees shriek?

DANIELSON SAYS BIG CARS CAUSE MANY PROBLEMS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, one of our colleagues from the Los Angeles area, Congressman GEORGE E. DANIELSON, appeared before the Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works today to propose a unique addition to the 1973 Highway Act, which is now under study. As a member of that subcommittee, I felt that this proposal to study the relationship of car size to many of our current transportation, pollution, and fuel resource problems deserves to be brought to the attention of all of the Members.

Therefore, I insert Mr. DANIELSON's testimony in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON, 29TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA, BEFORE THE TRANSPORTATION SUBCOMMITTEE, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

My purpose in testifying here today is to urge the Committee to make provision in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 for a study of the relationship of car size to many of our current transportation, pollution, and fuel resource problems. I am proposing that language be included in the Highway bill similar to that embodied in H.J. Res. 301 which I have introduced.

GERMANENESS

First, I would like to point out that this proposed study would not be out of place in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973. Clearly, it relates to the purposes for which Federal Highway funds are used. Also, I note, that the Senate version of this legislation, S. 502, makes provision for several studies, including a "Highway Litter Study," a "Study of Toll Bridge Authority," and a number of other studies under the heading of "Feasibility Studies."

The study I propose would describe and define the relationship between automobile size, on the one hand and, on the other, the need for additional highway construction, the frequency of highway repairs, the lack

of adequate parking in urban areas, motor fuel consumption, which is directly related to our critical fuel shortage, and, of course, the pollution of the air. The need for such a study is urgent, and I do not use the term "urgent" lightly.

There is a significant and growing body of evidence that our big American cars, because of their size, weight and power, consume more of our irreplaceable petroleum and mineral resources than is necessary, take up more space than is necessary, and are more likely to get into an accident than a smaller car, and even cause more pollution than is necessary. We need more evidence on this subject. As we continue to allocate federally-collected revenues to highway uses we should have enough hard facts on the subject so that we can make sound judgments as to whether we are using our resources as wisely as possible, or whether we should make changes in our policies with respect to the size of motor vehicles.

THE FUEL SHORTAGE

The fuel shortage has passed the stage of being worrisome—it is critical. America's need for fuel has outstripped her available resources so far that we have been a fuel-importing nation since 1963. America is literally, "running out of gas." We no longer can afford automobiles that consume gasoline at the rate of 8 or 9 miles to the gallon, when it is reasonable and possible, and is well within the state of the art, to have automobiles which will give us 20 or 25 miles to the gallon.

For example, I have been informed that, based upon actual data as to gasoline consumption during 1969, 1970, and 1971, and the first 6 months of 1972, southern Californians will consume an estimated average of 400,000 barrels of automobile fuel per day during 1973. This does not include fuel consumed for other non-automotive purposes such as diesel engines in trucks and buses, aircraft, locomotives, the generation of electricity, industrial uses, propane or anything else. There are an estimated 11 million people in this region of California. With 42 gallons of fuel per barrel, this means that we are consuming $1\frac{1}{2}$ gallons of automotive fuel every day for every man, woman and child in Southern California; that is, for EVERYONE, including infants and centenarians.

Assuming that the average automobile in that area consumes 1 gallon gasoline for every 12.5 miles traveled, which is the national average, then we can figure that all of the cars of Southern California will travel a total of 210 million miles every day, and most of this is on the freeways and city streets.

On the other hand, it is within our present engineering capability to produce and use smaller autos which can get as much as 25 miles to the gallon. With no reduction in total miles traveled, this would result, under the figures I have mentioned, in a savings of 8,440,000 gallons, or 200,000 barrels of motor fuel per day, a most substantial savings of our irreplaceable natural resources.

The Environmental Protection Agency has stated that an increase of only 500 pounds in car weight can decrease an auto's miles-per gallon by 14 percent, and that a 5,000 pound automobile consumes 100 percent more gas than its 2,500 pound counterpart. EPA has also estimated that if the weight of automobiles were limited to a maximum of 2,500 pounds, the total projected gasoline consumption for the year 1985 would be reduced to the level which is now estimated for 1975. This in turn would reduce crude oil imports by 2.1 million barrels per day in 1985 and would reduce our projected balance-of-payments deficit by more than \$2.3 billion annually at current prices.

The automobile industry has blamed the decrease in fuel economy of our cars on emission controls. The Environmental Protection Agency, in a study entitled "Fuel

Economy and Emission Control" has refuted this charge in part and has shown that loss of fuel economy attributable to emission controls is only about 7 percent. The major cause of the increased fuel consumption, according to EPA, is increased weight. For example, the 1958 Chevrolet Impala weighed 4,000 pounds and got 12.1 miles to the gallon. A comparable 1973 Chevrolet Impala weighs 5,500 pounds, and gets only 8.5 miles to the gallon.

When I inquired on this subject to the Department of Transportation nearly a year ago, Secretary Volpe responded that—

"If it can be assumed that small cars have the same travel patterns as the standard American car, then the difference in air pollution becomes a function of the difference in fuel consumption. The small car consumes considerably less fuel because of its much lower weight. There is probably an added advantage in that fewer of them have automatic transmissions, power brakes, power steering and air conditioning. I am not sure to what extent this applies to the American made subcompacts."

AIR POLLUTION

This brings me to the subject of air pollution. As you well know, Southern California is the first region of the nation to be confronted with the grim prospect of transportation controls, being imposed in order to bring the level of air pollution in line with Federal standards.

EPA Administrator Ruckelshaus has stated that "... if all available measures are taken to reduce reactive hydrocarbon emissions from individual motor vehicles are stationary sources, the ambient air quality standard for photochemical oxidants will still be exceeded in the (South Coast Air) basin approximately 90 days per year in 1977 ... between the months of May and October ..." and that a reduction of over 80 percent in vehicle miles travelled will be required to achieve compliance with 1977 air quality standards. Right now this is Southern California's problem, but it will not be too long before other regions of the nation are confronted with this disaster.

It has been estimated that up to 75 percent of vehicle miles travelled in southern California are work-related; obviously vehicle miles travelled cannot be reduced by 80 percent in order to achieve air quality standards. The solution is unacceptable; it would destroy the economy of Southern California; it would create a national disaster. Even a superb system of mass transportation in southern California, if there were one, or if one could be constructed before 1977, would be unlikely to reduce automobile traffic by the required 80 percent. It would help, but it would not meet the need.

Car size enters this picture. Our current emission regulations specify the maximum amount of pollutants a motor vehicle will be allowed to emit per mile; it establishes a ceiling. If Detroit succeeds in developing emission controls adequate for the 1975 standards, chances are that the cars will pollute at a rate very close to the maximum allowable. If emissions are to be further reduced below the ceiling, then engine size will probably have to be reduced.

It is more than coincidence that the engines which now meet the 1975 standards are small car engines. These are the Honda CVCC, the Mazda rotary, and the Mercedes-Benz diesel engines. Honda Motors, for one, claims that their engine can also be equipped with external pollution control devices, such as the catalytic mufflers which Detroit is working on. An engine such as this, which already meets 1975 emission control standards, would be even cleaner with the addition of a catalytic muffler.

The American automobile industry has made some amazing progress in developing catalytic mufflers. They have accomplished what many said was impossible, even though

they are still far from success. But, in addition to our fuel consumption problems, it seems that engine size also bears significantly on our pollution problems. It may be that we will have to retreat from our air quality standards to a certain extent, but how much we retreat may very well depend upon the size of our automobiles.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

I also note that car size is a significant factor in highway safety, and safety concerns us all. Small cars have less accidents, as evidenced by statistics and also by the fact that insurance companies have lower rates for small cars. For example, a 1969 study of accidents on the Garden State Parkway in New Jersey showed that, while small cars comprised 35 percent of the total number of cars using the parkway, they were involved in only 24 percent of the accidents. When small cars are involved in accidents, the injuries to the occupants are usually more serious, but I suspect that this is because the odds are two-to-one that when a smaller car collides with another vehicle, it will collide with a larger vehicle, if only because there are twice as many large vehicles. A collision between two small cars would not result in as serious an injury as would a collision between a small car and a larger car. Additionally, in a collision with a fixed object, it appears that occupants of small cars fare no worse than the occupants of big cars.

URBAN PARKING

In addition to considerations of pollution, fuel consumption, foreign trade deficits, and highway safety, the size of cars is also a factor in the overcrowding of city streets, and the lack of adequate parking in our urban areas. Right now, because of the size of cars, the average parking stall is 18 feet in length, while a suitable stall for small cars is 15 feet.

Thus, designing for small cars would give us about a 15 percent increase in available parking spaces. We also know that vehicle weight is a factor in the severity of damage to road surfaces and how often our highways must be repaired or resurfaced.

CONCLUSION

I am convinced that we need a study in order to bring together all these facts and bring out a few facts we don't now have. We need to look at the problem from every possible angle, and to balance the competing interests and considerations, so that we can take the action which best serves the public interest. The language I am proposing requires that the needs of motor vehicle users be considered, as well as the problems of the automobile manufacturing industry, motor vehicle insurers, and the various supporting industries.

My proposal calls for funding the study at \$2 million, which the Committee may, in its wisdom, see fit to change. I am not wedded to the details of this proposal. I am however, convinced of the need for a study such as this because we cannot make sound judgments without sound information, and nothing even close to it exists. This is a task which demands the immediate attention of the Federal government. I strongly urge you to include provision for such a study in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973.

U.S. GRAIN SALES TO THE SOVIET UNION AND THE GREAT UKRAINIAN FAMINE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that the historic U.S. grain sales to the

Soviet Union fall on the 40th anniversary in Ukraine. History records that it was in 1932 and 1933 when Soviet leaders forced the Ukrainian farmers into collective farming. When the Ukrainian farmers protested, the Soviets retaliated by confiscating most of the farmers' grain and imposed a famine which took the lives of 7 million Ukrainians, mostly women, children, and the aged.

The oppressed plight of the Ukrainian people continues to this day, including the refusal of the Soviets to grant the Ukrainian people self-determination and self-government, anti-Christian religious persecution, suppression of Ukrainian free speech, free press and intellectual incarceration.

Coinciding with the U.S.-Soviet grain sales, the 40th Anniversary of the Ukrainian famine and the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution Americans of Ukrainian ancestry have presented a petition to the International Court of Justice in the matter of violations of the universal declaration of human rights of the U.N. and the persecution and imprisonment of innocent people of Ukraine.

I insert the petition of the Women's Association for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc.:

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE; PEACE
PALACE: THE HAGUE, NETHERLANDS

In the Matter of Violations of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations and the Persecution and Imprisonment of Innocent People in Ukraine

Because the nation of Ukraine is imprisoned and those who purport to represent Ukraine in the United Nations, in international, external and internal affairs and who wear its badges of civil authority are enemies of the people of Ukraine and cannot possibly represent their welfare or best interests, and,

Because the people of Ukraine have no one clothed with the external symbols of authority to speak for them, and,

Because of the long standing, continuous and present intolerable violations of the United Nation's Declaration of Human Rights, including the current increased persecution and imprisonment by agents of the government of the USSR of innocent people, and,

Because of the eloquent silence of the leaders of all other nations effectively to speak in behalf of the people of Ukraine,

Now therefore, comes Ulana Celewycz, supported by the signatures of 5,000 Americans of Ukrainian background, and as president of Women's Association for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc., and also in behalf of American Citizens of Ukrainian descent and petitions the above Court as follows:

1. Women's Association for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc., is a duly authorized non-profit corporation in the State of New York with more than 3,000 members in 30 branches in major cities of the United States. There are more than two million citizens of the United States of Ukrainian descent with strong ties of family and blood with the people of Ukraine.

2. Ukraine is the largest of the non-Russian nations of the USSR with a population of forty-eight million. Historically, Ukraine was a free state and played an important role in the life of Eastern Europe as early as the Ninth Century. Russia's desire for expansion and the invasion of Ukraine by the czar's armed forces was the cause of Ukraine's downfall.

The Ukrainian people now, as in the past, are determined to be free, to guide their own destiny in their sovereign state.

In this spirit, in the year 1917, when the revolution broke out in Russia, Ukrainian leaders called a Ukrainian National Congress in March, 1917 in Kiev, the capitol of Ukraine, which elected a Ukrainian National Council (Ukrainian National Rada). The Ukrainian National Council was recognized as the Ukrainian government by a majority of the people of Ukraine (by the Congress of Ukrainian Armed Forces, by the Congress of the Ukrainian Peasant Party, and by the Congress of the Ukrainian Labor Party). On January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian National Council proclaimed Ukraine as an Independent State.

Russia immediately thereupon sent her armies into Ukraine and the Ukrainian government faced a bloody war with Russia, completely unarmed and unprepared. At this time, the Ukrainian government was recognized by approximately thirty-five foreign powers, England and France being the first to grant recognition.

On February 9, 1918, a Peace Treaty of Brest Litovsk was signed between the Ukrainian government and the Central Powers. On September 10, 1918 in Kiev, the Russian government under Lenin's leadership recognized Ukraine as a Sovereign State and signed an Armistice. Under this document, Russia agreed to withdraw her armies from Ukrainian territory and further agreed to respect the right of Ukrainian sovereignty. As in the past, Russia did not respect the Kiev agreement. The war continued. After three years of fighting and subversive activities, Russia conquered the Ukrainian Armies and occupied the territory of Ukrainian State.

Against the will of the overwhelming majority of its people Ukraine was forcibly incorporated into the USSR as the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic with a Soviet-type government and parliament. The Soviet Constitution gave Ukraine the right to withdraw from the "Federation" upon its own volition. During the past fifty years the people of Ukraine have repeatedly made heroic efforts to be free and independent of the government of the USSR. These efforts were ruthlessly crushed by the USSR despite Article XVII of Chapter II of the Constitution of the USSR which gives the right "freely to secede" to any nation of the Soviet Union.

3. During the past fifty years millions of innocent people in Ukraine, for the "offense" of not accepting the Communist way of life, have been persecuted and imprisoned by the agents of the government of the USSR Ukraine, a nation which accepted Christianity in the year 988 and with 1,000 years of a deep Christian tradition, opposed the forcible imposition of Atheism. Russia retaliated with mass arrests of Ukrainian Orthodox church hierarchy (28 archbishops and bishops) in the years 1926-1929. In the years 1945-46 the Ukrainian Catholic Church was liquidated and its hierarchy arrested (10 Archbishops and Bishops). Churches, monasteries, theological seminaries were closed and religious life suppressed.

In 1932-33, the Ukrainian farmers faced forced Collective Farming. When they protested, Russia retaliated confiscating most of the grain and imposing a famine which took the lives of seven million Ukrainians.

In 1937-38, Ukrainian intellectuals rejected the Russification of Ukraine and because of this thousands were arrested, persecuted and brutally murdered. Many were imprisoned for expressing their objections to injustice and to the ruthless destruction of human rights in Ukraine by the USSR despite the Soviet Constitution (Chapter X, Article 125) which guarantees every citizen "freedom of speech" and "of the press" and also Article 127 of the same Chapter which states, "citizens of

the USSR are guaranteed inviolability of their person."

The Ukrainian Insurgent Army and Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists opposing Russian domination, fought Russia during World War II and for five years thereafter. Here again, over three million Ukrainians were committed to concentration camps, murdered or deported to Siberia.

4. Although from 1963 to the present, alarming numbers of arrests were made, new waves of arrests in Ukraine by agents of the government of the USSR have been increasing in this current year of 1972. Arrests of Ukrainian intellectuals, writers, literary critics, professors, students, scientists and representatives of every strata of society were made for "anti-soviet agitation and propaganda." In reality this "propaganda" consisted on petitions, appeals and letters submitted from concentration camps by prominent political prisoners and prominent Ukrainians at home to the Communist party and government officials of Ukraine and USSR bringing to their attention the questions of terror, Russification, and violations of constitutional and human rights. Since there is no free press in Ukraine, the above mentioned arrests and persecutions were published in the self-sponsored (samvydav) magazine, the Ukrainian Herald. The Ukrainian Herald can be compared with the Chronicle of Current Events published in Russia.

Among the victims of this new wave of arrests on January 11, 1972, who have tried to live under Soviet Law are Vyacheslav Chornovil, writer and author who protested to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of UKR, SSR against the barbarous desecration of cemeteries in Ukraine and in the City of Lviv (Western Ukraine) the demolition of military graves with a bulldozer; Ivan Dziuba, author *Internationalism or Russification*; Ivan Switlychnyy, literary critic; Wasyl Stus, poet; Ihor Kalynech, poet; Irene Stasiv-Kalynech, poetess; Stephany Shabatura, artist and designer; Stephanie Hulyk, mother of an eight month old infant and member of the association to preserve historical monuments; Raisa Moroz, wife of Valentyn Moroz, whose fate is unknown; Nina A. Strokata-Karavanskyj, Mrs., arrested December 8, 1971 in Odessa for refusing to divorce her husband, Sviatoslav Karavanskyj, and for supporting him and refusing to condemn him; Yuriy Shukhevych, the son of the former commander-in-chief of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (APA); Roman Shukhevych-Taras Khuprynyk, for not condemning his father in 1948, he was sentenced to 20 years of imprisonment at the age of 15. He was released and arrested again on January 11, 1972 and received a sentence on September 12, 1972 to serve ten years at hard labor by the Soviet Court.

Among the practices of the agents of the USSR against innocent people in these various categories are the following:

(a) Soviet authorities are using torture and psychiatric methods of inhuman¹ treatment to people of Ukraine who have been unjustly imprisoned such as poisoning their food and using other methods so that they will not survive the period of their sentence.

(b) Secret trials² are conducted of such innocent persons and not even members of the family are allowed to be present and the accused may not have the attorney of his choice;

(c) Many such innocent persons are convicted of actions³ which are specifically permitted by the provisions of the Constitution of the USSR;

(d) After the sentences of such innocent persons who have been imprisoned have

Footnotes at end of article.

been served and completed they are not permitted to return to their homes to work. They are given no protection of the laws and they are rearrested for not working.⁴

(e) Not only are such persons prosecuted and persecuted but members of their family, and in many instances the whole family of such persecuted persons and also their relatives are prosecuted and imprisoned. When such innocent people are imprisoned, although prison rules allow one letter per month, they are actually permitted only one or two letters per year;⁵

(f) There have been many instances of completely normal persons who have been arrested by Soviet authorities and thereafter such Soviet authorities have contrived to produce a psychiatric evaluation of such normal persons as being "insane" and thereafter such normal and innocent person is incarcerated in an insane asylum and no trial of him is permitted.⁶

5. This petitioner avers that such wholesale denial by the government of the USSR of human rights of innocent people in Ukraine contravenes the principles of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* of the United Nations, which reads in part:

"Whereas disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people,

"Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of the law."

6. From the facts set forth above it is clear that the present government of the so-called Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic does not truly represent the people of Ukraine but said government would in fact prevent them from appealing to the above Court in behalf of their fundamental human rights.

It is essential to the dignity of the human race that an oppressed nation of forty-eight million people such as Ukraine should have a voice in the above Court.

Wherefore your petitioner as president of the Women's Association for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc., and in behalf of the more than two million American citizens of Ukrainian descent prays that the above Court take jurisdiction of the matter herein set forth and take such steps and measures which will bring the above facts to the attention of world opinion and to the United Nations and do such other things and make such orders as it deems equitable and just to aid in the release of political prisoners from concentration camps, psychiatric institutions, mental wards and prisons.

ULANA CELEWYCH,
President of the Women's Association
for the Defense of Four Freedoms for
Ukraine, Inc.

FOOTNOTES

¹ *Revolutionary Voices* (pp. 168, 169-70) Press Bureau ABN, Munich, 1971.

² *The Trial of Valentyn Moroz*, idem, pp. 1-21. Idem, (pp. 148-150) Dr. Volodymyr Horbovyi. Idem, Karavansky, pp. 186-195.

³ As Lev Lukianenko, Ivan Kandyba, Stepan Virun, Oleksander Libovych, Vasyi Lutskiv, Yosyp Borovnytskyi, Ivan Kypys, idem pp. 151-170; *Ferment in the Ukraine*, pp. 56-93.

⁴ Case of Yuri Shukhevych, idem pp. 236-39, 250.

⁵ Idem pp. 188-190.

⁶ Cases of Gen. Hrehorenko and Wasyi Stus—pp. 127 *Uncensored Russia* by Peter Reddaway, American Heritage Press (1972).

PRESSURING FOOD PRICES IS A RISKY BUSINESS

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, one of the big problems facing our food producers is the misleading information that is being spread, mainly in the metropolitan media, in regard to high food prices.

While the producer, in general, is not responsible for high food prices, he is responsible for the production of our food and the whole world would be in a terrible fix if he ever decided that farming was not a paying proposition.

Roe C. Black, editor of *Top Operator*, a Farm Journal publication, recently wrote a very discerning editorial on this matter which I would like to share with my colleagues by inserting it in the RECORD.

I would like to particularly point out to my colleagues, the closing paragraph of Mr. Black's editorial. It holds a warning we dare not ignore.

PRESSURING FOOD PRICES IS A RISKY BUSINESS
(By Roe C. Black)

When the city newspaper reporters find the news a little stale, they can always drop in at their nearest neighborhood supermarket and interview some "irate customer" standing in front of the meat counter howling about "skyrocketing" or "soaring" food prices. It has become so common that I think "skyrocketingfoodprices" really should be a single word.

Food prices did go up by 4.8% last year. Meat led the way, of course, yet many other foods held below the average national rate of inflation. How that percentage can be considered "skyrocketing" when "compensation to employees" in all business rose over 10% and social security recipients got a 20% raise in one jump last year boggles the mind. Even more ironic, consumers are reaping the benefits of a vicious price war among chainstores which has put about one out of four in the red as they battle for consumer business. Part of their problem is the fact that the wages they have to pay labor in retail food stores has almost doubled in the past 10 years.

Even if it is unjust to single out food prices, it is happening. And almost every day high-ranking government officials are apologizing for them and assuring consumers and businessmen that the government will do something to lower them.

"A member of the President's Council of Economic Advisors, Dr. Marina Whitman, says soaring food prices will soon be stabilized," writes a reporter in an Eastern daily.

"Several moves announced by the Administration," she said, "would eventually stem the pace of inflation in the agricultural sector." These moves includes the lowering of barriers on meat imports putting idle farmland back in production, and reducing farm subsidies. "Sooner or later this will increase the food supply and lower prices," she said.

Perhaps so, but something seems a bit illogical here. Current prices for most farm foods are certainly high enough to encourage rapid expansion of food supplies by this fall and next winter, even before the current year's larger crops come out of the field. USDA acknowledges that "a very rapid expansion of beef cattle is now underway." In fact, total red meat production in 1972 only missed by 2% its seventh straight year of

record increase. Actually, it looks as if we're seeing an attempt to increase grain supplies for export in the name of lowering food prices (see page 21).

In any event, the main question is whether government officials are prepared with a contingency plan that will keep farmers and stockmen in business if officials guessed wrong and come up with an over-heated, over-produced agriculture? They better have.

A government that assumes the responsibility to lower food prices and keep them "reasonable" is also assuming the responsibility to keep food in ample supply. Over-production that puts farmers and stockman out of business will in the long run hurt the government and consumers far more than a temporary period of higher prices.

We are proud that the American farmer and stockman can feed himself and 45 to 50 other people. But when you think of it, with a ratio like that, tampering and manipulating programs to depress prices he receives is risky. He can't stay in business without making a profit—with prices that are reasonable for him. And if he doesn't stay in business, where do government and consumers go next for food abundance and variety?

THE EXPIRATION OF THE DRAFT

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I applaud Secretary Richardson's declaration that the administration will not seek an extension of the selective service induction authority. Coupled with former Secretary Laird's earlier announcement that the armed forces would henceforth be placed on a volunteer status, this statement fulfills President Nixon's pledge to end the draft.

I should like to pay particular tribute to Roger T. Kelley, Assistant Secretary of Defense—Manpower and Reserve Affairs. Secretary Kelley, and his able staff, performed magnificently in the difficult task of reversing policies based on 30 years of the draft, and managing the return to our historic tradition of voluntarism.

I am also pleased by Mr. Richardson's strong endorsement of the Special Pay Act, modeled after legislation which passed the House last year. Two distinguished members of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. BENNETT and Mr. BOB WILSON, my good friend from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA), and I have been joined by 120 Members of the House in introducing a similar bill during this session. The Special Pay Act is a cost effective proposal, which will lead to great savings in training costs, and preclude the need for a return to conscription during peacetime. I am confident that this body will give its overwhelming endorsement to this measure, and I am hopeful that the Senate will also act expeditiously.

I include Secretary Richardson's statement at this point in the RECORD:

MARCH 21, 1973.

Secretary of Defense Elliot L. Richardson issued the following statement today during his visit to the Air Force Academy where he

is participating in an Interservice Officers' Conference which is discussing the all-volunteer force concept:

"I am delighted to be able to announce here at the Air Force Academy, where so many fine, volunteer young men are training to serve our country, that a major new milestone has been reached in our program to fulfill President Nixon's goal of an all-volunteer armed force.

"The Department of Defense, on behalf of the Nixon Administration, has today informed the Chairmen of the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives that it will not be necessary to extend the draft induction authority beyond its expiration date of July 1. Not only have we not had to use the draft since January 1, but our recruiting and retention progress toward an all-volunteer force now convinces us that there is no reason to ask Congress to extend the induction authority, even on a standby basis.

"The four military services have made truly remarkable progress in eliminating the draft without weakening our military forces.

"We have not solved our problem, however, and I have asked Congress to expedite passage of some additional special legislation which will help us solve some special manning problems including provision of adequate incentives to attract and retain qualified medical personnel. Basic Selective Service legislation will remain on the books, even though the specific induction authority will expire.

"I have asked the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Roger T. Kelley, to provide a special news briefing at the Pentagon Friday morning to describe in more detail the progress we are making toward an all-volunteer force and some of the problems remaining on which we need the continued understanding, help and support of the Congress and the American people.

"I count it as among my most compelling tasks as Secretary of Defense to make the all-volunteer force a working reality. And, that is why I am so pleased to announce today that we are confident we can make it—confident enough to tell Congress that the legal induction authority can become a thing of the past just as draft calls already have become a thing of the past."

ASBESTOS, THE SAVER OF LIVES, HAS A DEADLY SIDE

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the wide recognition of industrial hazards by workers and management is a relatively new development. We have only recently passed comprehensive legislation to control the work environment in the hope of preventing on-the-job accidents and illnesses. Our recognition of occupational diseases is even more recent, and the discovery of the extent of a particular disease caused by a common material—asbestos—is one of the most frightening.

Last year many health and union officials urged the Secretary of Labor to promulgate an emergency temporary standard for airborne asbestos in accordance with his powers under section 6(c) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act. An advisory committee was set up, but the final standard did not reflect

their recommendation of two asbestos fibers per cubic centimeter. The standard was set at a tolerance of five fibers even though there is no known exposure to asbestos that is small enough not to produce either lung-scarring asbestosis, lung cancer, or mesothelioma, a rare cancer of the chest or abdominal lining.

The following article on the subject by Robert Sherrill, is of great importance to understanding the dangers facing all of those who breathe asbestos dust. The article has been edited to two RECORD pages. The full text appears in the New York Times magazine of January 21, 1973:

ASBESTOS, THE SAVER OF LIVES, HAS A DEADLY SIDE (By Robert Sherrill)

Shipyard work attracted about 4.5-million Americans into its ranks at one time or another during World War II, and an estimated 3.25-million of those people are still alive. If they think about the experience at all these days it is probably to again remind themselves with satisfaction that things could have been worse. Whether they went into the work simply for a paycheck, or as a kind of emancipation (at some shipyards nearly one-third of the workers were women), or an alternative to the military draft, those who built and repaired America's ships took comfort in supposing that however dirty and boring the work sometimes became, at least it was safer than being in the front lines.

Now it appears they may have been wrong to think so. The fatality statistics are still too scattered and iffy to yield a solid conclusion, but there are some disquieting hypotheses to be drawn from such cases as that of the New York tire company executive we shall call Charles Armin because his family prefers to keep his real name out of this. Armin had never had a serious illness in his life. He was a 200-pound, robust, hearty fellow who looked much younger than his age, 60. He enjoyed sailing in his spare time and ran a taut ship on the job, too.

Then in December, 1971, he began getting sharp pains in his chest, enough to worry about, enough to send him to the doctor. Tests showed his heart was in fine shape, and the lung X-rays showed nothing wrong. Still, the pains persisted and grew worse, and in April the doctors decided to go in for a look.

They found that Mr. Armin was suffering from mesothelioma, a kind of cancer that has only come into the medical fraternity's conversation in recent years. Mesothelioma, which has been so rare that it is not separately categorized in international medical classifications, is cancer of the chest lining or of the abdominal lining. Everyone who gets it is going to die from it within a year because it covers the whole lung area from apex to base, or infuses the whole abdomen, and no surgeon can take out so much and leave a survivable patient. It is a painful disease and progressively so. The cavity lining fills with fluid, which must be drawn off periodically; when the disease strikes the chest area the patient slowly suffocates. None of the usual cancer palliatives do much good, and there is no known cure. Mr. Armin's mesothelioma was discovered in April. He was dead 14 weeks later.

The thing that makes his case—among a number of others—seem so ominous to some occupational health experts is that they know what caused it, and they know that the same cause has touched the lives of millions of other Americans. The cause was asbestos.

Occupationally, probably five million or so Americans—insulation workers, construction workers, oil-refinery workers, etc.—breathe a

significant amount of asbestos dust every day they go to work. The hazard also crops up in distinctly nonoccupational places, such as the Northside Elementary School in Lander, Wyo., which recently was closed by the state health department because asbestos which had been sprayed as an insulation on the ceiling was beginning to come loose and mix with the air in dangerous amounts. But wherever encountered, the hazard is especially insidious because it is like a long-term time bomb: For reasons doctors don't fully understand, the diseases related to asbestos do not explode for many years after the patient breathed it in.

Mr. Armin, for example had had nothing to do with asbestos since World War II, when, from 1941 to 1943, he was a tinsmith in the Brooklyn Navy Yard. He helped install fiber glass in destroyers' refrigeration holds, and he also secured asbestos-covered pipes with hangers and straps. After 1943, he got a white-collar job away from the shipyard and never again worked with asbestos. His 29-year lag between contact and illness was not surprising; indeed, for asbestos disease, 25 to 30 years is the normal period between exposure and development of symptoms, which is why medical scientists who have specialized in the occurrence of asbestos-related industrial diseases believe that the first big wave of cancers from World War II shipyard exposure may be at hand.

Among those who think so are Drs. Irving J. Selkoff and E. Cuyler Hammond. Dr. Selkoff of Mount Sinai School of Medicine, City University of New York, is at least among the three or four top authorities on asbestos disease. Dr. Hammond is vice president of the American Cancer Society in charge of epidemiology and statistics, who already has gained a slice of immortality as the fellow most responsible for statistically demonstrating the relationship between smoking and cancer. To some high officials at the U.S. Department of Labor and to many high officials in the asbestos industry, these two doctors and their colleagues represent a kind of reform plague.

The thing that is so alarming to Selkoff's group is that some risk applies not only to asbestos workers (only one-five-hundredth of the shipyard payroll), but to everybody who worked downwind or in the general vicinity of the asbestos jobs. In shipbuilding, this means anybody who has worked within the confines of the ship's structure: welders, shipfitters, machinists, pipefitters, electricians, carpenters, boilermakers—the whole gang.

"You don't have to work with asbestos for 30 years to develop mesothelioma or some other cancer or asbestosis from it," Selkoff explains. "Absolutely not. Because once you get it in your lungs, it stays there forever, and as the years go by your lung continues to be exposed even though you may be out in the Rockies. The nice air in the Grand Canyon won't protect you because you've already got it in your lungs."

The response of the industry and especially of the Federal bureaucracy has been strangely indifferent. The random breather may not care, even though asbestos can harm him too—if, for example, he inhales asbestos thrown into the air by the demolition of buildings. But the asbestos worker feels very lonely with his special demon. William G. Bernard, secretary-treasurer of the Asbestos Workers Union and himself a victim of lung-scarring, complains, "You know, we have damn near as many, or more, people who work with asbestos as there are coal miners in the country. But nobody cares about us, because we don't have any disasters. The miners have a disaster and their pictures show up on the front pages with dirty faces, and everybody feels sorry. So

they put a black lung bill through Congress. We have a higher percentage of people dying of respiratory trouble, but nobody gives a damn about it."

On Jan. 1, 1943, Locals 12 and 32 of the Asbestos Workers Union in New York and Newark, N.J. had 632 members. Dr. Selkoff and his colleagues have traced the 625 who matter here (seven died early, mostly of accidental causes). Given their age, 203 of these men would normally have been expected to die by the end of 1962. Instead, 255 had died—an excess over the normal death rate of more than 20 per cent. About seven should have died from lung cancer, but 45 died of it. Instead of the normal nine or 10 deaths from cancer of the stomach, colon or rectum, there were 29—"not so unexpected," as Selkoff points out, for "anybody who inhales dust also ingests it. Any worker is always spitting out the stuff you think he's only inhaling." And whereas nobody in the general population dies of asbestosis—scarred lungs—12 men in this study group died of it during the first 20 years, and 4 died of mesothelioma.

That left 370 of the group still alive on Jan. 1, 1963. Between then and the end of 1971, 78 of them should have died if they followed the pattern of the general population. Instead, 168 died. "And why? The same thing," says Selkoff. "There should have been four or five lung-cancer deaths in this group. There were 43. There should have been no deaths of mesothelioma—that doesn't occur in the general population. There were 23. There should have been three deaths of cancer of the stomach or rectum. There were 12. And of course there should have been no deaths from scarred lungs. There were 20."

"If we total up this one small group of workers from Jan. 1, 1943, to Dec. 31, 1971, almost 20 per cent died of lung cancer. Out of the 430 men who died, one out of every five asbestos workers died of lung cancer. Almost seven per cent died of mesothelioma. Almost 10 per cent died of cancer of the stomach, colon and rectum. Over seven per cent died of asbestosis."

Nor are these figures peculiar to the locals in question. Selkoff goes on to cite more extensive studies confirming that similar increased deaths "occur in every single group of asbestos workers that's been examined." And he concludes, "This is simply an occupational disaster without parallel in American history."

The asbestos industry and the U.S. Department of Labor have not seemed exactly overjoyed to receive all this new data; indeed, their basic response has been a combination of defensiveness and hostility and furtiveness. In 1964, when Selkoff was organizing an international symposium, he received a letter from the law firm representing asbestos textile companies, informing him that the industry was aware of what he was up to and implying that if any derogatory remarks about asbestos that might harm its sales should emanate from the conference, he could expect to see them in court. The U.S. Public Health Service conducted air samplings in a couple of dozen asbestos plants in 1964, but it refused to disclose its findings to Selkoff, or, as he puts it, "apparently the key to the file cabinet was lost." Though workers in shipyards today are subjected to much the same asbestos hazards as in World War II, Navy medical officers generally refuse to talk about the problem or to discuss what they are doing, if anything, to protect workers in the yards under their command.

The most impressive case of bureaucracy/industry indifference occurred at the Union Asbestos and Rubber Company factory in Tyler, Tex. This is the same outfit that had operated the factory in Paterson, N.J., before closing it in 1954. Union Asbestos later sold out to Pittsburgh Corning Corp. But under

any name, the Tyler plant was still a foul place to work. Reputedly, in some areas of the plant the asbestos dust was so thick workers couldn't see across the room. Medical facilities consisted of two first-aid cabinets, one with a broken glass door admitting asbestos dust.

Beyond the factory itself, asbestos waste was dumped in nearby fields, sometimes to a depth of three feet, that children sometimes used as a playground. Bags in which asbestos had been shipped to the plant and which were still coated with asbestos dust were sold to local nurserymen who do a tremendous business in roses.

It is futile to guess at the number of nurserymen and customers who breathed an injurious amount of asbestos dust from the sacks, but the factory workers can be counted. Personnel records microfilmed by the Public Health Service show that between 1954 and 1972 at least 895 persons were employed there. They were working under deadly conditions and the U.S. Department of Labor and the Public Health Service were aware of these conditions at least as early as 1967. But they kept quiet.

That's the way things stood until 1970, when Congress passed the Occupational Safety and Health Act. With that act, BOSH was phased out and replaced by NIOSH—the National Institute of Safety and Health. With the change of initials came a change of bureaucrats and attitude, too. Among them were Dr. Joseph K. Wagoner, who became director of the Division of Field Studies and Clinical Investigations, and Dr. William M. Johnson, a recent product of the Harvard School of Public Health, who became Wagoner's assistant. They inherited a medical chaos, a burial ground of old statistical bones hastily covered by their predecessors.

"We even inherited about 2,000 air samples that hadn't been counted," Johnson recalls, "because the previous inspectors had been out collecting data without ever coming to grips with what they were doing. They would just keep rescheduling surveys, sometimes a second or third time around at a plant without really giving any thought to what it was really showing from a health standpoint."

Buried deep in the files he found Tyler, Tex. Why had Public Health Service and Labor Department officials covered it up? "I could say they were stupid, or that it was criminal negligence, or bureaucracy, or I could say they were afraid that if they did start getting concerned about this that their right of entry would have been cut off," says Johnson, "but the fact is, I don't know." All he did know immediately from the records he uncovered was that "the plant had no business operating."

But still the higher bureaucracy balked. "We transmitted our sampling results to the Labor Department," says Johnson, "and also followed up with a comprehensive report." The report showed that of a sampling of 17 men who had worked in the plant 10 years, eight had asbestosis. "The Department of Labor would not honor our samples. They wanted to take their own for compliance. They went in—I don't remember the exact date; I believe it was November, 1971—and they took some samples and came up with citations. But they didn't mention asbestos in the citations and the citations only added up to \$210 in nonserious violations."

So much public ridicule and bad publicity greeted that punishment that Labor felt obliged to reinspect the factory and levy a \$6,990 fine. Two weeks later, claiming the fines were too great a burden to bear, Pittsburgh Corning decided to close the plant. Left behind were many Tyler residents who will eventually die of asbestos disease.

As for the enforcement of health standards established under the Occupational Safety

and Health Act, Federal officials have conceded in testimony before Congress that if they were going to enforce health standards properly, they would need about one hygienist per 35,000 workers.

So far as can be determined, the Labor Department at present has 60 hygienists—or about 1 per 1.2 million workers—to enforce all health standards, not just those relating to asbestos hazards.

Since there seems to be no great rush to enforce any asbestos health standards, it hardly matters whether the standards are the proper ones. But the manner in which they were decided may give some further indication of what the laboring man can expect in the way of protection from the Federal agencies and the industry.

At issue was whether to set the standards at a maximum permissible air content of two asbestos fibers (each longer than 5 microns) per cubic centimeter of five asbestos fibers. In either case, that's quite a bit of dust. A cubic centimeter is about the size of a small thimble of air, and a workman will inhale about six to eight million of them in a typical day. So the issue was whether to require the companies to maintain conditions which would prevent a worker from having to inhale more than 12 million to 16 million fibers of a certain length, or 30 million to 40 million fibers. With a substance that the Labor Department concedes "is casually related to asbestosis and cancers," the multimillion differences were obviously no trivial matter.

With what appeared to be an effort to get the best answer, Labor Secretary James Hodgson early in 1972 appointed an outside Advisory Committee on Asbestos Dust made up of scientists and engineers and labor officials. He also had the assistance of an inside advisory group of medical men and scientists put together especially for this problem by NIOSH.

Also from the outside he hired Arthur D. Little, Inc., a consulting firm, to come up with some advice on the economic feasibility of requiring industry to get rid of its asbestos dust. Arthur D. Little's panel of experts was made up of 13 executives from the shipbuilding industry, 12 executives from the asbestos industry, and a health group of 11 doctors and technicians, all but two or three of whom reputedly have been "consultants" to the asbestos industry at some time in their careers.

The Advisory Committee on Asbestos Dust told Hodgson he should drop the standard to two fibers. NIOSH's panel agreed that two fibers was none too low. But Arthur D. Little concluded that five fibers was perfectly safe and that dropping the standard to two fibers would cost industry far too much money. In addition, four days of hearings were held at the Labor Department offices in Washington, with industry contending that Selkoff is right up to a point, but that he goes too far and interprets his findings too wildly. Matt Swetonic, Secretary of the Asbestos Information Service, a New York health data distribution center funded by the industry, says, "There has been considerable controversy with Selkoff not so much on the effects of asbestos, but on the best means to control it and what sort of levels are necessary to control various asbestos diseases." Industry people, says Swetonic, believe that the perils of the insulation workers—who face periodic massive doses of asbestos-laden air—are too often confused with what industry contends are the manageable low-level exposures of the asbestos manufacturing factories.

In the end, Hodgson, insisting that he had arrived at his decision by an independent appraisal of all evidence, rebuffed his own advisory group and said that a five-fiber standard would be in effect for the next four years. (Coincidentally, Johns-Manville Corporation the same day notified its stockholders that

the ruling would not hurt their sales and earnings.)

Sellkoff points out that this ruling was designed to set a safety level for asbestosis, not for cancer, and that in any case, qualified scientists simply cannot be sure enough about the nature of asbestos related disease to say where the level should be fixed. In this light, he argues, Hodgson's ruling was at best incautious. "There's a lot of published evidence that in two fibers per c.c. mesothelioma occurs, lung cancer occurs, asbestosis occurs. An industrial hygiene practice in our country has been that when there is a serious risk, you build in a big safety factor. But what the Labor Department has done is say, 'We don't know for sure what level will certainly cause cancer and without this knowledge there is no requirement for extra caution,' instead of saying, 'These are the lives of hundreds of thousands of American workers that we are responsible for and therefore let's set the most prudent level.'"

By continuing the five-fiber standard for another four years a period that will probably see 100,000 or so new men enter asbestos-related industries—Sellkoff predicts the Labor Department has doomed 20,000 to unnecessary lung-cancer deaths, 7,000 to unnecessary mesothelioma deaths, 7,000 to unnecessary asbestosis deaths as well as deaths of other cancers. And that's not counting combination effects—*asbestos plus tobacco smoke, asbestos plus the coal-tar pitch workers like roofers must handle.* All in all, Sellkoff predicts that "by a stroke of the pen, 50,000 more lives were thrown down the drain."

INDEPENDENCE FOR LITHUANIA

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian Americans of this Nation have a proud heritage. For more than 20 years in this century, the Lithuanian nation enjoyed independence as a free democratic republic, thereby exercising the right of self-determination.

Then by a secret protocol, subsequent to the Ribbentrop-Molotov Agreement in 1939, between the two totalitarian regimes of Hitler and Stalin, the Lithuanian nation was included in the Soviet sphere of interest.

Less than a year later, Lithuania was given an ultimatum: Accept incorporation into the Soviet Union or invite a Russian invasion. Since 1940, the proud Lithuanian nation has been governed as a colony of the Soviet Union and denied freedom and the right to determine its own form of government.

The Lithuanian Americans of Boston commemorated the 55th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, February 18, 1973, in South Boston. These and thousands of other Lithuanian Americans will continue to importune our Government to demand that the Soviets withdraw their administration and forces from Lithuania and allow that nation with a long history of freedom and self-rule to restore its rightful independence.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the resolution adopted by the Lithuanian Council of Boston in the RECORD at this point.

RESOLUTION

We, Lithuanian Americans of Boston, assembled this 18th day of February, 1973, at

South Boston to commemorate the 55th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, do have unanimously adopted and passed the following resolutions:

Whereas on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian nation proclaimed its independence as a free democratic republic which act was ratified by its duly elected Constituent Assembly, thereby exercising the right of self-determination to be free and independent for all times; and

Whereas Lithuania was forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union in June 1940 and since that time Lithuanian people have fought and died for their national independence; and

Whereas so many countries under colonial domination have been given the opportunity to establish their own independent states; on the other hand, the Baltic nations having enjoyed the blessings of freedom for centuries are now subjugated to the most brutal colonial Russian oppression; and

Whereas we express our sincerest gratitude to the Administration and Congress of the United States of America for the continued nonrecognition of the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, but

Whereas the mere denial to recognize the Soviet claims to Lithuania does not and will not bear the slightest effect on the leaders of the Soviet Union; *Now, therefore, be it*

Resolved, That leaders of the free world must never be maneuvered into a position where they will become accessories to the crime of Russian enslavement of Lithuania and the other Baltic countries;

Resolved, That we ask our Government to continue, whenever and wherever possible, to demand that the Soviets end their colonialism, withdraw their administration and forces from Lithuania and the other two Baltic States and allow them to restore their freedom and independence and self-rule;

Resolved, That the copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State to the United States Senators and Congressmen from our State and to the press.

CHILD CARE CENTERS

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the proposed new regulations for social service programs have received constant and intelligent criticism since they were introduced on February 16. One area especially open to criticism has been the effect of these regulations on the Nation's child care centers. If these regulations were enacted as they now read they will have a disastrous effect on the lives of working mothers and their children.

Ms. Barbara Garson wrote of the effect of the regulations on one child care center in New York in the March 15 edition of The New York Times. I believe she expressed her situation, and the situation of thousands of others, in an excellent literary display. Therefore, I would like to share Ms. Garson's article with my colleagues and insert her story in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

OEO, FIRST ON THE ONE HAND, THEN ON THE OTHER

(By Barbara Garson)

When my daughter was 3 years old, I wanted to start writing again. I didn't have

the money for professional child care so I got involved in a string of collapsing parent-controlled co-ops. After a few months Juliet was getting ragged around the edges. So I decided to put off my literary comeback.

Then I was lucky enough to get into Greenwich House, a first-rate daycare center with a long, long waiting list. Greenwich House is 75 per cent Federally supported. We parents pay zero to \$25.25 a week, depending on income. Greenwich House is professional, loving, unexperimental and above all, stable.

Now I could start writing full time with a clear conscience and a good hope of supporting myself. As a matter of fact, I've finished another play which I have dedicated to my school.

Among the mothers at Greenwich House are nurses, receptionists, messengers, and a couple of welfare women going to school. Most of them are divorced, or separated like me.

Many of us single parents have somewhat unstable lives. It must be the times. We always seem to be losing a job or an apartment or a husband. That makes childhood a little different for my daughter than it was for me.

My parents have been married for 34 years. They still live in our old home with the same good neighbors on the block. When I visit my folks I feel like I'm on an anthropological field trip. "Look Juliet," I say, "This is a home. This is how people once lived."

Greenwich House helps me give my child a little of that world I grew up in.

After nursery school Greenwich House sees our children through the years with the after-school program, summer camp and even music lessons.

Many of the day-care mothers have worked out exchanges so that Billy's mother picks Jerry up after school and Jerry's mother takes them both to the movies on Saturday. These are more than free baby-sitting arrangements. This is how our children can make friends that don't disappear. Making friends in the neighborhood seems so simple and ordinary. Yet without Greenwich House it would be difficult for us modern Manhattan working mothers to arrange.

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare has decided that the Federal Government will no longer subsidize child care for working mothers. The new H.E.W. regulations don't close the centers. They simply transfer the subsidy from working mothers to welfare mothers. Now surely welfare mothers need a Greenwich House, too. If working eight hours a day is a hard way to be a mother, staying home alone in a room all day with your kids is even worse. A welfare child needs the continuity of day care at least as much as my child does.

But this is not what the new regulations provide. Under the proposed rules the Federal Government subsidizes day care only to make welfare mothers find jobs (or work off their checks for below the minimum wage on the work-fare program). After three months it is assumed they have "stabilized" their incomes. Then they too are kicked out. From a school Greenwich House becomes a temporary holding hall for little kids, while their mothers seek work. Then those mothers, like me, must find some other makeshift arrangement.

What can those politicians, those motherhood lovers have in mind? I guess they figure they'll use day care to clear the welfare rolls. The mothers will manage somehow. And the kids—oh, they'll turn out all right. After all, didn't Mr. Nixon grow up in adversity?

Private day care costs at least \$45 a week per child. For most of us at Greenwich House that's about one-half of our salaries. Under the new regulations our only real options are to go on welfare, or to find some woman with two kids of her own who takes in three children at \$25 a week and sits them in front of the television all day. That's the kind of

arrangements most low-paid working mothers make right now. Frankly I'm too middle class for that. I'd rather do the responsible thing for my child, stop working, and go on welfare.

DAY CARE PROGRAMS

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the new regulations proposed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to govern federally assisted programs in the areas of day care, aid to the elderly, mental retardation, juvenile delinquency and other social services are cause for great concern here in the Congress. If implemented, these regulations will cripple thousands of vital human service programs across the Nation. Just a cursory review of the proposed regulations reveals many serious weaknesses.

First, these regulations seek to prohibit the use of private and donated funds to make up the required State or local match in cooperative Federal-State programs. They would also prohibit the use of "in kind" contributions for the non-Federal match. These two restrictions would undermine the existing private-public partnership approach to solving human problems. They threaten the continuation of many existing programs.

Third, the regulations redefine eligibility for assistance under title IV-A programs. Under the new definitions, former welfare recipients appear to be denied eligibility for day care, for instance, just after that day care service has permitted them to secure employment and leave the welfare rolls. Deprived of day care, they will have to leave work, and return to their homes and children—and the welfare rolls. The regulations are self-defeating.

Fourth, the proposed regulations are not clear with respect to Federal standards for day care services to be provided. For the past 5 years, Federal interagency standards have been applied to all federally assisted day care services. The proposed regulations raise serious questions in this area.

These regulations also limit the type of services to be funded. The list published omits such worthwhile programs as alcohol and drug abuse treatment. Services for the mentally retarded and elderly may be cut by as much as 50 percent in some cases. Steven Minter, commissioner of public welfare in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts estimates that 70,000 in Massachusetts would be affected if these regulations go into effect. Fully 80 percent of the children in foster homes in Massachusetts would be ineligible. Elimination of supportive services for the elderly would mean that thousands of our senior citizens could be forced to abandon their independence and would have to be placed in rest homes.

I supported the \$2.5 billion ceiling placed on social service spending by the Congress last year. However, these regulations go far beyond this limitation.

They constitute a backward step in the delivery of social services to the elderly, handicapped, and disadvantaged. They are also a backward step in unnecessary bureaucracy and confusion.

Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to letters I have received from experts in the field of social services in my congressional district. These letters describe the devastating effect the proposed regulations would have if implemented.

The letters follow:

METROPOLITAN SPRINGFIELD YOUNG
MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION,
Springfield, Mass., March 9, 1973.

Representative EDWARD P. BOLAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOLAND: From the enclosed letter you will note that I have concern about the proposed new regulations with regard to among other things, Title IVa and b of the Social Security Act.

While new regulations are probably needed, it is my opinion that these proposed regulations go too far in being restrictive rather than enabling. I would trust that we ought to be about the business of encouraging collaborative effort of both the private and public sector in meeting the needs of our people. I would urge any action you might be able to take in revising these proposed regulations to eliminate some of the restrictive measures.

I believe in particular the prohibition against the use of private funds and "in kind" contributions (Section 221.62) is particularly restrictive and does in fact, negate opportunities for a voluntary association such as the YMCA which I represent, and the Government, to work cooperatively together. The amount of paper work also to be required with these regulations would also discourage any voluntary and/or private organizations from cooperative efforts. It would push the administrative overhead cost farther than we are able to justify to local United Funds and Board members on our agency boards. Frankly, I also believe it would be again directing the dollars into the hands of bureaucrats rather than getting them directly to the programs and services.

Any help and attention to these particular regulations which you might give would be appreciated and I respectfully urge your immediate attention.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD F. SANDOW, JR.,
General Executive.

SPRINGFIELD DAY NURSERY,
Springfield, Mass., March 7, 1973.
Congressman EDWARD BOLAND,
Springfield, Mass.

DEAR SIR: As a concerned citizen and as the President of the Springfield Day Nursery Corporation of Springfield, Massachusetts, a private agency which operates 5 quality Day Care Centers in metropolitan Springfield and serves 156 children and their parents, from all walks of life, I am writing to you concerning the recent releases (February 15th to be exact) from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, pertaining to the future of Day Care in Massachusetts and actually in all of our 50 states.

We are an agency which is funded by the United Way of Pioneer Valley, interest from private endowment monies, fees from clients who can afford to pay, and welfare funds. We presently have 50 welfare slots in use, and have recently signed a contract (February 15th) with the State Welfare Department for \$36,000. In Title IV A donated funds to expand and operate one of our schools which presently is running at a deficit. The Title IV A contract, though formally signed, has not been funded yet, and is in great jeopardy as are all of our welfare monies.

As I am sure you well know, quality Day Care is an absolute necessity in this day and

age. We must all do everything in our power to help those less fortunate than we to attain and maintain the position in life which is the absolute right of all human beings. Offering Day Care to these families is one of the ways of accomplishing this goal.

We have been offering expert Day Care services in the Springfield area for (89) eighty-nine years and expect to continue to do so for at least (89) eighty-nine more! We need your help! If we are not allowed to use private donated funds to match with Federal monies for the Title IV A program, we shall have to close one on-going program. If the guidelines of "past, present, and potential" welfare recipients are drastically changed, we will have to seriously curtail all of our other services. If the Federal Inter-Agency Requirements are removed, quality Day Care will become a thing of the past.

As President of the Springfield Day Nursery Corporation, I respectfully request your immediate attention to this very urgent matter! I am anxiously awaiting a reply from you! Until then, I remain,

Most Sincerely,

(Mrs.) EUGENE B. BERMAN,
President, Springfield Day Nursery Corp.

A POLISH PRIEST WHO OFFERED PROOF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to present an article by Patrick Owens commemorating the great Polish priest-scientist, Nicolaus Copernicus, who discovered that the Earth revolves around the Sun. The article appeared originally in the March 11, 1973, edition of Newsday.

The article follows:

A POLISH PRIEST WHO OFFERED PROOF

(By Patrick Owens)

Nicolaus Copernicus was born 500 years ago last Feb. 19 so this commemoration is tardy. I doubt Copernicus would have minded; he was so non-passionate about his discovery that he had to be badgered into publishing it, and then wound up with an introduction by a skeptical, or at least timid, Lutheran who suggested that Copernicus's theory had at least the virtue of novelty and should provide amusement for the mind.

Copernicus was Polish and his discovery was the greatest Polish joke of his or any other day: He asserted, in defiance of the Pope and all knowledgeable men, that the earth revolved around the sun. This heresy was taken up by people more persuasive than Copernicus himself and is believed to this day by most so-called intellectuals and all astronauts.

Copernicus proves the virtue of clean living. His big brother, Andreas, took Nicolaus to Italy to study but fell in with fast company, debauched himself with loose women and went home to Poland stricken with either leprosy or syphilis.

The priests of the cathedral of Frombork, where both Andreas and Nicolaus were canons, found him physically repulsive and paid him to get out of town. He became an early remittance man. Copernicus devoted his early years to study and remained virtuous, or at least discreet. He did not involve himself in scandal until much later, when he was an old man by medieval standards. The neighbors raised a fuss about a serving wench who seemed to them to compromise the canon's respectability. Doubtless it was stubbornness and regard for the principle of the thing that caused Copernicus to resist

for some time his bishop's instructions to get-that-woman-out-of-there.

Copernicus proves that pluck and a strong heart conquer all. His father died when he was 10 but Copernicus soldiered on.

Strange as it may seem, Copernicus also proves that it ain't what you know, it's who you know. His father was a rich copper merchant and one of the movers and shakers of the town of Torun. When the father died, the family was taken over by an uncle who was then himself a canon of the cathedral and who became bishop and prince of Warmia.

The family connections made possible a good education, including eight years in Italy, and a good job at the cathedral.

Copernicus was not the first theorist to contend that the earth moved around the sun. This had been contended by the men of science of ancient Greece. But the idea had died out and the alternative theory, that the earth was the center of the universe and everything moved around it, had been enshrined in the dogma of the church. This was good theology, because it confirmed man's role as the most important of God's creatures, but it was hard to explain mathematically.

Copernicus proved his theory, and that is why he is one of the half-dozen greatest names in science. Writing in Smithsonian magazine, Donald Gould reports what little is known about Copernicus's life and sums up his contributions to astronomy this way: "They included the real secret of the release of the mind of Man from the concept of an earth-centered universe, which was an appreciation of the fact that the apparent movement of the firmament around the earth could equally well be due to the earth's spinning on its own axis . . . the facts that the earth is not the center of the universe, but only of the orbit of the moon, and that the sun is the center of the planetary system, and that the distance from the earth to the stars was far greater than anyone had supposed. There were certain other concepts, which together amounted to a nearly faultless statement of the broad geography of the universe as we now understand it."

Copernicus, who talked in Latin, wrote up his theory briefly, without offering his proofs. He spent up to 20 years backing up this first effort in a long dissertation. Then he locked up this book for nine years, until a mathematician from Wittenberg dropped by. This fellow, Rheticus, persuaded Copernicus to go ahead and publish. Rheticus copied the entire manuscript by hand—this was in 1542, before Xerox—and took it to a printer in Nuremberg. When Rheticus got a better job and moved, a Lutheran named Oslander took over the publishing project. He wrote the skeptical preface. Copernicus suffered a stroke while all this was going on. He got a copy of the book before he died, but no one knows whether he knew what it was. He may have been brooding over the injustice of expelling the serving wench.

Perhaps because of the preface, the church did not ban the book (which was called *De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium*) for another 80 years. It stayed banned for two centuries.

Copernicus might not have minded so much. He seems to have been more interested in finding things out than in telling people about them.

AMERICAN INDUSTRY REPLACED BY CHINESE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the American tung oil program, encouraged on

American farmers as a patriotic investment to help make our country self-sufficient, is now scheduled to be discontinued. Tung oil, it seems, can be imported from foreign countries at a much cheaper cost. In fact, last month a shipment of about 1,900 metric tons—4.2 million pounds—were imported from Communist China.

It is true that the tung nut industry in the United States involved about 100 farmers in three Southern States, at a programed cost of \$500,000 to \$750,000. But this may just be the start. If we are now to export jobs and dependence on Red China in one field, what will be next—peanuts, tobacco, or rice? For that matter, what American industry can compete with the mainland Chinese on labor costs?

THE HISC APPROPRIATION

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 21, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, some idea of the work of the House Internal Security Committee can be gleaned from a review of its annual reports during the past several years. The chairman of HISC, Congressman RICHARD ICHORD, commented extensively on the outside opposition to HISC in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 9, starting on page 537, and he emphasized the uniqueness of this opposition from a source over 12 years in existence, well financed, and employing a full-time lobbyist—all for the purpose of crippling or eliminating the House Internal Security Committee. To supplement his remarks, I believe it would be useful, especially to new Members, to briefly review the vital areas in which HISC has been involved during the last several years.

During 1969, 1970, and 1971, HISC via legislative, investigative, and oversight hearings looked into such organizations as the SDS; Black Panther Party; the Young Workers Liberation League which is the youth arm of the Communist Party; the National Peace Action Coalition and the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice, both captured by radicals of various orientations; the Socialist Workers Party and the Young Socialist Alliance, both dominated by a dissident Communist element, the Trotskyites; and, of course, the Communist Party USA.

Unlike most standing committees in the House, HISC is both an investigative and legislative committee. In the past few years many of its hearings have been of an investigative nature. However, extensive hearings were held on the Emergency Detention Act, on legislation covering industrial, vessel and port security, on legislation dealing with the obstruction of the Armed Forces and legislative and oversight hearings relating to the Subversive Activities Control Act and the Federal civilian employee loyalty-security program.

In addition, HISC reviewed subversive influences in the Armed Forces and

heard witnesses from Red China, the Soviet Union, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, and East Germany concerning Communist tyranny in these countries. These witnesses testified during the committee's continuing series of hearings on the theory and practice of communism. Their experiences refute the claims of one 1972 Presidential candidate, Gus Hall, a leading Communist Party official in the United States, when he seeks to entrap American citizens into granting him and his followers respectability via the ballot.

While the 1972 annual report of HISC is not yet available, I believe the reports for 1969, 1970 and 1971 as summarized in the table of contents, will give a bird's-eye view of the committee's operations in recent years and help afford an objective basis for evaluation of the work of the House Internal Security Committee.

I insert at this point excerpts from the tables of contents as they appear in the above-mentioned annual reports:

CONTENTS

Foreword.

SECTION A: HEARINGS ON BILLS

Chapter I.—Hearings relating to H.R. 12699 (reported with amendments as H.R. 14864): Industrial, vessel, and port security. (Hearings held September 9, 10, and 24, 1969.)

Chapter II.—Hearings relating to H.R. 959: Obstruction of Armed Forces. (Hearings held September 15 and 16, 1969.)

SECTION B: INVESTIGATIVE HEARINGS

Chapter III.—National SDS data and local chapter activities at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C. (Hearings held June 3-5 and 17, 1969.)

Chapter IV.—SDS activities at Kent State University, Kent, Ohio. (Hearings held June 24 and 25, 1969.)

Chapter V.—SDS activities at George Washington University in Washington, D.C. (Hearings held July 22-24, 1969.)

Chapter VI.—SDS activities at American University, Washington, D.C. (Hearings held July 24, 1969.)

Chapter VII.—Communist Party and SDS activities in Chicago, Ill., including the University of Chicago, and aspects of the SDS 1969 Convention. (Hearings held August 6 and 7, 1969.)

Chapter VIII.—SDS activities related to high school students and other teenagers in the summer of 1969 in Columbus and Akron, Ohio; Detroit, Mich.; and Pittsburgh, Pa.; plus involvement in labor-management dispute in Washington, D.C. (Hearings held October 20-22, 28-30, and December 17, 1969.)

Chapter IX.—SDS and "Newsreel" involvement in the release of American prisoners of war in North Vietnam. (Hearings held December 9-11, 1969.)

Chapter X.—Hearings on links between SDS and Newsreel film propaganda company; SDS activity at Fort Dix, N.J., Army Base; SDS National Action activity in Chicago, Ill., October 8-11. (Hearings held December 16-18, 1969.)

SECTION C: REFERENCE SERVICE AND COMMITTEE PUBLICATIONS

Chapter XI.—Report of Committee's Files and Reference Section.

Chapter XII.—Committee Publications.

CONTENTS

Foreword.

SECTION A: LEGISLATIVE HEARINGS

Chapter I.—Hearings on various bills to repeal the Emergency Detention Act, Title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950. (Hear-

ings held March 16, 17, 19, 23, 24, 26; April 20-22; May 21; and September 10, 1970.)

Chapter II—Hearings with respect to the administration of the Subversive Activities Control Act and the Federal Civilian Employee Loyalty-Security Program. (Hearings held September 23, 30, 1970.)

SECTION B: INVESTIGATIVE HEARINGS

Chapter III—Black Panther Party activities in Kansas City, Mo. (Hearings held March 4-6, 10, 1970.)

Chapter IV—Black Panther Party activities in Seattle, Wash. (Hearings held May 12-14, 20, 1970.)

Chapter V—Black Panther Party activities in Detroit, Mich., Indianapolis, Ind., and Philadelphia, Pa. (Hearings held July 21-24, 1970.)

Chapter VI—Black Panther Party National Office operations and investigation of activities in Des Moines, Iowa, and Omaha, Nebr. (Hearings held October 6-8, 13-15, and November 17, 1970.)

Chapter VII—Hearings on the extent of subversive influences in leadership of New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam. (Hearings held April 7-9, 15, and June 9-11, 1970.)

Chapter VIII—Hearings on aspects of life in Communist-run countries as described by refugees from the Soviet Union, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, together with information on Communist theory and practice from an American academician, expert in Communist affairs. (Hearings held June 23-25, 1970.)

SECTION C: REFERENCE SERVICE AND COMMITTEE PUBLICATIONS

Chapter IX—Report of Committee's Files and Reference Section.

Chapter X—Committee Publications (including commentary on special reports on Students for a Democratic Society; Black Panther Party paper; New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam; Committee action on Emergency Detention Act; Committee action on H.R. 959—Obstruction of Armed Forces; and Inquiry Concerning Speakers' Honoraria at Colleges and Universities).

CONTENTS

Foreword.

Chapter I. Theory and Practice of Communism: testimony of escapees from communist tyranny in Red China, Latvia, and Germany. (Summary of hearings held March 23-25, 1971.)

Chapter II. Theory and Practice of Communism: testimony of two leading American academicians, one an expert on Eastern Europe and the other expert on the Far East, plus testimony of an informant who was a member of the Young Workers Liberation League (a CPUSA "front" organization) in New York and of an informant who was a high-ranking member of CPUSA in New York City. (Summary of hearings held March 29-30, April 1, and May 10-12, 1971.)

Chapter III. Theory and Practice of Communism: testimony of witnesses expert in the subject of communism in Cuba, together with a leading American academician expert in the subject of communism in Latin America generally. (Summary of hearings held October 5-7 and 14, 1971.)

Chapter IV. Origins, Organization, and Activities of the Progressive Labor Party. (Summary of hearings held April 13, 14, and November 18, 1971.)

Chapter V. The Administration of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 and the Federal Civilian Employee Loyalty-Security Program, involving testimony from executive departments and agencies. (Summary of hearings held April 21, 22, 27-29; June 2, 3, 8-10; July 27-29; August 3; and November 4, 1971.)

Chapter VI. Summary of Committee and House Floor Action on Bills to Repeal or Amend the Emergency Detention Act of 1950.

Chapter VII. Origins, Organization, and Leadership of the National Peace Action Coalition and the Peoples Coalition for Peace & Justice. (Summary of hearings held May 18-20, June 16-17, and July 21-22, 1971.)

Chapter VIII. Origins, Organization, and Leadership of the National Peace Action Coalition and the Peoples Coalition for Peace & Justice. (Summary of hearings held May 21, June 15, and July 13-15, 20, and 21, 1971.) (Committee minority witnesses.)

Chapter IX. Subversive Influences Affecting the Military Forces of the United States. (Summary of hearings held October 20-22, 27, 28, and November 9, 10, and 16-18, 1971.)

Chapter X. Summary Report on the Termination of Suit Instituted Against Publication of Committee Study of Amounts of Honoraria Paid Campus Speakers Associated with Revolutionary or "Front" Group.

Chapter XI. Report of Committee's Files and Reference Section.

Chapter XII. Summary Report on Committee Publications (Including commentary on a special report on the Black Panthers, a committee print regarding the origins and objectives of the Socialist Workers Party and Young Socialist Alliance, and a report on the Emergency Detention Act of 1950 Amendments.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 22, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Sviatoslau Kous, Byelorussian Orthodox Church, New York, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Our Lord, and God Jesus Christ, receive from us, Your humble servants, our most sincere prayers and in forgiving our sins bless all our enemies and those who would do harm unto us. Rather, show our enemies the true goodness of man. Those of us who believe in Your righteousness ask that we may never be led astray. Keep in Your grace the people of these United States of America and give guidance to our democratic principles.

Hear the lament of my Byelorussian people crying day and night for freedom. Give unto these people, through Your sacrifice, peace, and tranquillity. Do not forsake those who have forsaken You but rather make Your truth appear to all mankind. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

REVEREND KOUS DELIVERS OPENING PRAYER

(Mr. ADDABBO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the opening prayer in the House of Representatives was delivered today by the Reverend Sviatoslau Kous, rector of the American-Byelorussian St. Cyril of Turov Independent Greek Orthodox Church in Richmond Hill, N.Y. It is an honor for all the residents of the Seventh Congressional District in Queens, N.Y., to have Reverend Kous here today and I am proud that he was invited to deliver the opening prayer.

The Greek Orthodox church in Richmond Hill where Reverend Kous serves as rector is newly built and was consecrated on October 29, 1972. Reverend Kous was born in Wilno, Byelorussia, and graduated from the Stephen Batory University in Wilno.

He came to the United States in 1949 and was ordained to be a priest by the Metropolitan Germanos of the Greek Orthodox Church on February 9, 1969. Reverend Kous, in addition to his duties as rector of the church, teaches at the high school in South River, N.J., where he lives.

It is particularly appropriate for Reverend Kous to lead us in prayer this week because March 25 will mark the 55th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

On behalf of my constituents and my

colleagues in the House of Representatives, I thank Reverend Kous for being with us today to deliver the opening prayer.

ITT—\$1 MILLION DONATION CONTAMINATES THE PURPOSE OF CIA

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's disclosures of an offer by the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp. to contribute up to \$1 million in support of any Government plan for the purpose of bringing about a coalition of opposition to President Allende of Chile suggests the likelihood of precedence and pattern of private and corporate contributions to the Central Intelligence Agency to fund activities and operations of special interest to such contributors.

It is shocking if such contributions are legal or have been made in the past. If an agency of the Federal Government can receive private contributions for specific activities of a public agency or department, the commingling of private resources with the Federal funds of a Government agency contaminates the public purpose of the agency. If an agency or department of the Federal Government can receive such funds to provide direction or support of a specific goal or purpose, it opens up a form of bureaucratic bribery which should be prohibited.

I am currently preparing legislation