

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 26, 1973

gress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States concerning abortion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

110. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to "National Hunting and Fishing Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

111. Also, memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to expanding the medicare program to include drug costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 6116. A bill for the relief of Gloria Go; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 6117. A bill for the relief of Hernan Beteta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 6118. A bill for the relief of Ramo Alvez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCFALL:

H.R. 6119. A bill for the relief of Arturo Robles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Illinois:

H.R. 6120. A bill to permit the vessel *Manatra II* to be inspected, licensed, and operated as a passenger-carrying vessel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

74. Also, petition of the Fourth Marian Islands District Legislature, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, relative to the Office of Economic Opportunity; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

75. Also, petition of the Assembly of Kenai Peninsula Borough, Alaska, relative to development of the oil industry in the Gulf of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

76. Also, petition of Arnold E. Tarr, Lincolnton, N.C., relative to protection for law enforcement officers sued for damages in Federal court resulting from the performance of their duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

77. Also, petitions of various lodges of the Fraternal Order of Police, relative to protection for law enforcement officers sued for damages in Federal court resulting from the performance of their duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

78. Also, petition of K. Waligora, Baltimore, Md., relative to redress of grievances; 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:

73. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the council, Maui County, Hawaii, relative to funds for certain social service programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OBLIGATION TO OUR VETERANS

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, our satisfaction with the disengagement of our troops from Vietnam and our delight with the return of our prisoners of war must not overshadow our continuing obligation to all those who served this Nation during the war.

The administration's recent attempt to reduce benefits for disabled veterans, apparently defeated by a public outcry, is indicative of what may happen to returned veterans if we do not speak out and act in their behalf.

None of us would begrudge the former prisoners of war their offers of new cars, new wardrobes, and jobs. On the contrary, they earned everything they are receiving. But 2½ million other men served in the Vietnam war, and they too have earned a right to a fair deal from their country.

Within the Second Congressional District in Iowa, we have over 1,200 Vietnam era veterans registered as job ready with the Veteran's Employment Service but unable to find jobs. Additionally, there are 60 handicapped Vietnam era veterans listed as job ready; but they too are unable to find work.

Recently, the Des Moines Register published an editorial entitled "Don't Forget the Other Veterans" which states the case explicitly and which I would like to call to the attention of the House. I am including it as part of my remarks.

DON'T FORGET THE OTHER VETERANS

The first American prisoners of war to return from Vietnam were treated as heroes, their arrivals marked by red carpets, honor guards, brass bands and cheering onlookers. They were promised free vacations, a year's use of a new car and jobs with major industrial firms if they chose to leave the armed forces.

Operation Homecoming dramatized the end of a long and divisive war. The event was carried off with military precision as television cameras hovered over almost every stage of the return. It was not flawed by the

rancor that marked the prisoner exchange after the Korean War, but it lacked the spontaneous jubilation of the victory celebrations after World War II.

The POWs deserve a warm welcome back to their homeland. They endured much, both physically and mentally, during their imprisonment. But the public adulation given them must not be allowed to overshadow the less visible return of others who bore the battle in Indochina. The attention focused on the POWs could provoke jealousies among veterans who were not promised jobs, cars or free vacations.

Nearly 50,000 Americans were dead when they were brought home from Vietnam. About 300,000 were wounded, half of them seriously, and thousands of them have permanent, disabling reminders of their ordeal. Sixty thousand or more became addicted to drugs, but only about a third are getting adequate treatment.

Unemployment among Vietnam veterans is not as bad as it was several months ago, but about 8.5 per cent of the veterans aged 20 to 24 don't have steady jobs. That is about 50 per cent higher than the jobless rate for the whole population. Unemployment among black veterans is about 9.5 per cent.

President Nixon's proposed cuts in public payrolls and in federally funded vocational training programs could adversely affect the jobs and job prospects of as many as 100,000 Vietnam veterans.

Let's not forget the other veterans of Vietnam while we share the happiness of the POWs and their families.

NORTH GEORGIA COLLEGE CENTENNIAL

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in May of this year North Georgia College at Dahlonega, will celebrate the 100th anniversary of its founding. This is a very proud occasion for North Georgia College, the second oldest unit in the university system of Georgia and our first State-supported coeducational college.

I salute the college, its administration, faculty, students, and alumni and extend my sincere congratulations on this centennial.

Gov. Jimmy Carter, of Georgia, has proclaimed the week of May 6 to May 12, 1973, as North Georgia College Week, and I ask unanimous consent that his proclamation be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

NORTH GEORGIA COLLEGE CENTENNIAL

BY THE GOVERNOR

Whereas: North Georgia College, The second oldest unit of the University System of Georgia, opened its doors for class in 1873, one hundred years ago; and

Whereas: North Georgia College, inviting "Whoever will, may come," was Georgia's first state-supported coeducational college, and is today the State's only coeducational, military, liberal arts college; and

Whereas: North Georgia College has contributed significantly to education in Georgia, and through her alumni to the integrity and dignity of the State, the armed forces, and the nation at large; and

Whereas: North Georgia College stands on the site of the Old United States Gold Mint at Dahlonega, in Lumpkin County, the heart of one of Georgia's most historically important and colorful areas, the center of America's First Gold Rush; and

Whereas: The Faculty, Staff, Students, and Alumni of North Georgia College and the people of Dahlonega and of Northeast Georgia, who have supported the college and whom the college serves in turn, will commemorate the centennial anniversary of the founding of the college during the week of May 6 through 12; Now,

Therefore: I, Jimmy Carter, Governor of the State of Georgia, do hereby proclaim the week of May 6 to May 12, 1973, as North Georgia College Week in Georgia, and urge all the citizens of our State to join in celebrating this historic occasion.

THE DEFENSE BUDGET

HON. DAVID C. TREEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. TREEN. Mr. Speaker, the President's decision once again to direct America on a path of fiscal responsibility has been met by criticism from certain segments of our society. These crit-

ics are advocating a spend-now-pay-later policy which places a heavy burden on every hard-working family in this Nation, for programs which have proven to be fiscally irresponsible and socially unacceptable.

These critics argue that our national priorities are misplaced and that if we are to cut the Federal budget it should be cut in the area of defense. Well, I wish that we did not have to spend one single dollar on defense. But as the Poet Milton once observed:

Peace hath her victories (and price I might add) no less renowned than war.

I believe that President Nixon is aware of the emphasis which must be placed on our national priorities. For fiscal year 1974, for example, the shift in budget priorities, which began under the Nixon administration, has continued. Budget priorities for human resources are expected to grow at an annual rate of 15 percent from 1970 to 1974. Furthermore, by 1974 the budget for the Department of Defense will drop to 30 percent of the total budget at a time when human resources will rise to 47 percent.

In constant 1974 dollars the total figures for our defense budget are less than they were in fiscal year 1964, before the Vietnam buildup. Moreover, in the President's attempt to produce an effective and efficient all-volunteer military force—which I applaud—56 percent of the present budget goes for manpower costs. This means that we are now spending substantially less on weapon systems. In fact, if we consider inflation, spending for new weapons has decreased 24 percent in the last 9 years alone. Defense spending is thus at its lowest point—in constant dollars—since 1951.

I think, therefore, that it is important to keep these figures in mind when we talk about our national priorities. And, while I would be the first to say that we should save whatever and whenever we can, including in the area of defense, I think it is equally important to remember the words of British Air Chief Marshal Slessor:

It is customary in democratic countries to deplore expenditures on armament as conflicting with the requirements of the social services. There is a tendency to forget that the most important social service that a government can do for its people is to keep them alive and free.

I think most Americans feel this way and I am convinced that President Nixon is right, and that peace can only be achieved if we deal from a position of unquestioned military strength.

A recent editorial in the New Orleans Times-Picayune deals with this question and I am inserting it in the RECORD at this time to share with my colleagues:

DEFENSE BUDGET AND NEW "WAR GAMES"

As if to lay down a smokescreen to mask the nation's on-the-double march toward the social welfare state, high-pitched liberal blasts seem certain to bugle a counterattack on the 1974 Nixon budget.

One fiscal theater of operations to draw considerable flak will be the presumed preposterous budget for national defense.

"With American involvement in Vietnam at an end after 12 years," says paragraph two of an Associated Press news story on the subject, "proposed national defense spending for fiscal 1974 falls shy of the record \$81.6

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

billion national defense budget of 1945, the final year of World War II."

It's not till paragraph 14 that that bit of editorializing is put into perspective thus: "If the 1945 defense budget of \$81.6 billion were converted to current dollars"—constant dollars are the only means of legitimate comparison—"it would actually total more than \$160 billion, far above the amount contemplated for next year."

Put another way, President Nixon's defense proposal is half as large as the record \$81.6 billion budget of 1945—in actual purchasing power.

Dollar-for-dollar can be deceptive, moreover, for other reasons. Differences in technology, weaponry and strategic military planning preclude item-for-item comparisons between World War II defense budget days and today.

The \$4.1 billion increase over this year's defense spending is attributed largely to higher pay levels associated with all volunteer forces and raises for civilian and military workers in the Defense Department.

Then there's the relative size of the 2,288,000 armed forces, which will be trimmed by 55,000 to reach the "lowest level in 24 years." Again, if such military comparisons must be made—they're superficial exercises that ignore world conditions and changing modes of warfare—by extending such logic a nation of 210 million people today which was 150 million in 1950 should have a proportionately strong army of 3,100,000. Reasoning from either angle is obviously absurd.

The American people, we believe, are squarely behind the President's world strategy of negotiating for peace and stability from strength—the only stance that Communist militarists seem to understand or respect. As world tensions ease, further mutual reductions in weapons and military forces should be possible, as in Europe and elsewhere.

Considering the shortcomings of Moscow's new five-year plan for economic progress, including agricultural woes that led to record grain purchases from the United States, the time may be ripe for Russians to agree to convert more of their swords into plowshares.

L. R. HARRILL—"MR. 4-H" IN NORTH CAROLINA

HON. JESSE A. HELMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, a few weeks ago a distinguished citizen of my State, a close personal friend of mine, was presented a certificate of appreciation signed by both Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz and Mrs. Butz. The certificate read:

To L. R. HARRILL

For over 25 years of dedicated service and outstanding contributions to the development of the youth of our Nation through the 4-H Program of the United States Department of Agriculture.

Now, Mr. President, the brief text of that certificate tells something, but it by no means tells it all. In the first place, it should be noted that the certificate was signed by not only Secretary Butz, but by the charming Mrs. Butz as well.

There is a story behind that, Mr. President. Mrs. Butz is a native of my State. In 1930, she came to Washington with a group of other North Carolina 4-H youngsters. While here, she met—as Secretary Butz tells it—"a young 4-H

farm boy from Indiana." L. R. Harrill was the leader of 4-H in my State. In fact, he is known throughout my State as the "Father of 4-H." And on that occasion in 1930, when the group of young North Carolinians came to Washington, L. R. Harrill was the chaperone.

That is when and where Earl Butz met the future Mrs. Butz. Needless to say, he has a very special gratitude for Mr. Harrill.

Mr. President, I could not begin to describe the noble career of L. R. Harrill in any adequate sort of way. He has meant so much to so many. He has given countless thousands of young people a helping hand. He has given them direction and inspiration.

Mr. Harrill's association with 4-H began with the 2 years he served in Cleveland County, N.C., as a "Cotton Club Boy." That was in 1915-16. He became State 4-H leader for North Carolina on January 1, 1926, and he served in that capacity until his retirement in 1964.

Since retiring, he has compiled and written a 50-year history of 4-H Club work in North Carolina. Recently, Mr. Harrill told me some of the highlights of his 40 years of service. With a smile, he said:

I would love to do it again.

He may be retired, Mr. President, but he maintains an abiding interest in young people, and particularly in 4-H. He is a distinguished Rotarian, having served as president of the Rotary Club of Raleigh, and as district governor. He is an active churchman, a dedicated Christian. Without question, he ranks as one of the most beloved citizens our State has produced.

On a personal note, Mr. President, let me say that L. R. Harrill has had a profound influence upon my life. He is no fair-weather friend; he is the kind of man who stands up to be counted.

My late, great friend, Senator Dick Russell of Georgia, used to describe his very special friends as "nature's noblemen." If I may borrow that expression from Senator Russell, I should like to apply it to my friend L. R. Harrill. It fits him like a glove.

THE CONSUMER'S RIGHT TO KNOW

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today's consumer is more sophisticated and more educated than ever before and is demanding to know what is in the prepared foods he is buying. Every day the Food and Drug Administration, the agency responsible for the regulation of food labeling, receives calls from consumers complaining that the ingredients are not listed on ketchup, ice cream, bread, mayonnaise, and dozens of other products. These are all members of a group of foods which are not required to list their ingredients.

This exemption from disclosure requirements is the result of that part of

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the 1938 Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act regarding standardized foods. The law authorized the Secretary to issue standards of identity for any food when he feels it will "promote honesty and fair dealing in the interest of consumers." The label of such a standardized food is required to bear only the name specified in the standard of identity and certain optional ingredients. Standards of identity have been established for more than 350 products.

The food standards law was enacted to protect the consumer. Prior to 1938, there were numerous instances of manufacturers cheating on the ingredients of a product, using such things as starch for fill. It was felt that standards would help the consumer by establishing the ingredients which a product should contain. Violation of the standard could be dealt with speedily and effectively with the regulatory tools of the FDA.

However, exemption of standardized foods from listing of all ingredients is no longer valid in view of the change in lifestyles since 1938. At that time housewives knew that should be used in making such things as mayonnaise. Today's consumers are not familiar with preparation of many of these foods and there exists no practical way for them to find out what ingredients are in these products. Aside from the basic ingredients such as flour, milk, eggs, and so forth, advanced technology in food processing has resulted in the addition of many ingredients which even the most sophisticated consumer would be unaware of.

H.R. 1650, a bill which I cosponsored, provides a remedy to this very situation. It would amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require a listing in the order of the predominance after processing, by their common or usual name, of all ingredients present in standardized foods along with an accurate statement of the amount of each ingredient present in the food—stated as a percentage.

The need for such legislation has been widely recognized. The FDA supports a program of disclosure for standardized foods but lacks the legislative authority to require such labeling. The White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health recommended legislation to repeal the labeling exemption for mandatory ingredients in standardized foods. Numerous consumer groups are demanding more information in labeling.

In addition to requiring disclosure for standardized foods H.R. 1650 would require percentage listing of all ingredients in nonstandardized foods.

These measures are imperative not only to aid the consumer in shopping wisely but to protect him. Those with allergies or diet restrictions are threatened every time they eat prepared foods for which standards have been established. The consumer has the right to know what is in the food he is eating and it is the responsibility of the Congress to provide legislation requiring manufacturers to include the needed information on the label.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1650 is worthy of close attention by my colleagues and I urge bipartisan support for this much needed legislation.

THE NIBBLING AWAY OF THE WEST

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, recently, the legislative chairman and publicity chairman of the White Pine County chapter of the Nevada CowBelles wrote to me and called my attention to an article, "The Nibbling Away of the West," which appeared in a recent issue of the Reader's Digest.

Nevada members of the CowBelles believe many important facts were overlooked by the author of the article and have composed a rebuttal which they feel deserves the attention of the public. I concur, in that I have always subscribed to presenting both sides of a given issue when possible.

As a result, Vivian Joy and Beth Robinson of Ely, Nev., have submitted an article to me for my consideration. I know both of these fine ladies and commend their article to Members of the Senate.

Ranchers in Nevada have always been cooperative with agencies of the Federal Government. They have a large investment in lands under jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service. The CowBelles want the public to know of this interest and their financial support to good range practices and conservation of the public domain.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that the CowBelles' article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

REBUTTAL OF ARTICLE IN READER'S DIGEST

(By the White Pine CowBelles)

In an article in Reader's Digest, December 1972, "The Nibbling Away of the West" James Nathan Miller describes the alarming deterioration of our Public Range and Forest Lands. Mr. Miller places the major portion of responsibility on the shoulders of the Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Forest Service, and livestock ranchers whose animals graze on these lands.

The following are some of the facts that we feel have been neglected or denied in Mr. Miller's article.

1. The Safford Grazing District in Arizona which he used as a typical example is not typical but one of the most extreme cases of range neglect and abuse. An accurate assessment of the problem could be arrived at only by consideration of a more reasonably typical example than Mr. Miller's choices. The Ely Grazing District and the forest lands adjacent to it provide such an example.

2. Even in the Safford District a combination of factors contributed to erosion and depletion.

3. Not all public domain was a continuous grassland dotted with flowers when the livestock industry began, as reported by early exploration accounts.

4. Cuts in range livestock numbers have been affected in many areas, in the Ely Grazing District as early as 1945 and as late as 1969. Over the years only 4 out of 19 units have had no reductions. In four units even greater second cuts were made after 20 years because the original cut was ineffective. Cuts have ranged from 5% to 70% in the 19 grazing units that comprise the Ely District.

March 26, 1973

Similar cuts have been made by the Forest Service in the past proving just as ineffective.

5. These livestock cuts have not proven the answer except in combination with other practices. In the Ely Grazing District at the present time there are 14 range allotments involving 992,000 acres under allotment management plans as well as 5 out of 15 cattle allotments with the Forest Service, all in cooperation with the ranchers which incorporate a grazing system such as rest rotation.

6. Cooperation on the part of ranchers is not the major factor any longer. As a matter of fact, this District office of the BLM has 17 firm requests for more management plans. Time has shown that management plans and a rest rotation system with consideration of the physiological needs of plant life allows for restoration of plant vigor, seed production and reproduction of plant and also allows for the harvesting of plant resources as forage. Of interest is the fact that money in the Ely District contributed by ranchers in sagebrush and juniper rehabilitation projects has amounted to \$655,000 since reseeding was started in this district. This is just towards plowing, chaining, and seed purchase. Fencing was cooperative in addition.

In the past most range improvement plans were on a financially cooperative basis with ranchers contributing around 50% in BLM units and 25% in Forest Service units. Under the more recent Range Management plans both agencies usually finance all or a major portion of the cost. The ranchers' investment comes in the form of management of their livestock to comply with management plans and grazing systems and routine maintenance of existing and new range improvements.

The present fee on the Forest is 72¢ per animal unit month (AUM) with a proposed raise to 91¢ AUM and an anticipated further increase up to \$1.23 per AUM. In the last year BLM fees were raised from 53¢ AUM to 66¢ AUM with still further increases proposed up to \$1.23.

7. Mr. Miller has failed to recognize the fact that time is required to do an extensive range practice and environmental analysis on each individual allotment as well as the time required to outline the new practice and implement it.

8. Mr. Miller stated that range management agencies have been negligent in recognizing the needs of wildlife. On the contrary, wildlife and recreational needs are given full recognition in the Forest Service and are an integral part of environmental analysis made by the BLM and the Forest Service preliminary to any allotment management plan system.

9. To a degree livestock can give complement to wildlife grazing. One example being that of a cow's tendency to crop the bitter brush branches thereby stimulating more tender shoots to sprout and ultimately providing more browse for wildlife. Improvement of water by livestock producers has benefited wildlife as well as the reseedings which give animals a diversity of forage.

10. Mr. Miller seems to have overlooked the growing counter balance of the sentiments of the general public over minority private interest lobby groups, also the fact that the livestock producer is becoming a decreasing minority, having even less impact on legislation.

If Mr. Miller's objective was to stir public interest and instigate action he undoubtedly has achieved his goal. On the other hand by neglecting to describe some factors and emphasizing others his article has presented a distorted picture of what is admittedly a problem. It would be unfortunate if any solutions were based on such evidence as he gives.

Mr. Miller has made a point that to effect a cure and add recreational facilities will require greater funds not only through increased fees but also appropriations. We would like to still some impatience he seems

to want to generate, for it will take time to effect good range management.

We would agree with him that the BLM does need more inclusive authority in addition to that of range management provided by the Taylor Grazing Act if it is to be totally effective. Hopefully a reasonable National Land Use Policy Act will be enacted in the present legislative session. Sportsmen, recreationists, vacationers, rockhounds, livestock people, and the general public who use public lands should be aware of regulation changes going in.

Since about 86% of Nevada is Public Domain, it would appear that it is economically wise to perpetuate the livestock industry which makes use of these lands and provides tax revenue to our state and contributes to a stable economy.

MORE COMPLAINTS ABOUT THE SNAIL SERVICE

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, in the past I have shared with you the letters and complaints I have received from individuals about the U.S. Postal Service. Now this steadily deteriorating situation has reached the point where I am hearing from an entire town. Mr. Ralph C. Murray, city attorney for West Helena, Ark., sent the following letter to Postmaster General Klassen complaining about the inefficiency of the system in handling West Helena's mail. I would like to share that letter with you at this time. The letter follows:

MARCH 19, 1973.

Re: West Helena, Ark.
Hon. E. T. KLASSEN,
Postmaster General, United States of America Post Office Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the City of West Helena, Arkansas, and its citizens, I would like to bring to your attention a situation concerning the mail service which this city and its citizenry are experiencing at the present time. First, let me state that the population in and for the City of West Helena, according to the last census, is greater than for the City of Helena, Arkansas. The situation regarding the mail service to which I refer is that, for example, mailings from the City Hall of West Helena, Arkansas, are picked up by a postal vehicle operated by employees of the Helena Post Office, are postmarked Helena, delivered to West Memphis, Arkansas, for processing and delivered back to the West Helena Post Office for delivery to a West Helena citizen. It is very difficult for the officials of the City of West Helena and its citizens to understand such a situation as this. There are a number of other like situations existing in the handling of mail service from our city. As another example, on certain occasions, mail from the City of West Helena to Helena or from Helena to West Helena is processed through West Memphis for delivery which in effect causes delay of two to three days. This has been experienced by myself as well as others and even though the two cities of Helena and West Helena are only four or five miles apart.

As concerned citizens of these United States, we are as concerned with the expenses of our government as anyone but feel that expenses should not be curtailed to the extent that it would be so detrimental to efficient mailing services.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Your assistance and advice in this situation would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

RALPH C. MURRAY,
Attorney for the City of West Helena, Ark.

POSSIBLE ELIMINATION OF RURAL POSTMARKS

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in the midst of increasing protests about inefficiency in the U.S. Postal Service, there is growing concern about steps being taken that will eliminate rural postmarks.

There recently was brought to my attention an excellent column written by Prof. Spencer R. Gervin, of Southwest Virginia Community College about this problem, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Lebanon (Va.) News.
Feb. 24, 1973]

SNOWBALLS FROM HELL

(By Dr. Spencer R. Gervin)

Perhaps to keep the mail zipping may be worth the deprivation. But many will regret the effacement from Americana of "Hell", "Bowlegs", "Santa Claus", "Paw Paw", and "Spencer". These names are soon to disappear from the mail, swallowed in the maw of automation.

In its elan to outzip the wind, the U.S. Postal Service is installing giant mail sorting and cancelling equipment at selected centers. Some 357 of these Area Mail Processing Centers are either now operating or being readied. Because these expensive machines must be kept busy, no longer can smaller post offices maintain their own postmark identity. Letters are to be hustled uncancelled from the mailing point to an AMPC, there to be processed for further zipping. All that will appear on the letter will be the state abbreviation and the last three digits of the area zip code.

Thus Tiptop (Virginia) will become something like VA242. Smartt (Tennessee) will emerge from automation as TN373. Crum (West Virginia) will disappear as WV660. Paw Paw (Kentucky) and Paw Paw (West Virginia) are headed for defruting. Santa Claus (Indiana), Bow Legs (Oklahoma), and Tight Wad (Missouri) likewise are doomed to postmark extinction. Spencer (Virginia), Spencer (West Virginia), and Spencer (Tenn.) will be postally interred.

One group is distinctly displeased by this automated esurience. The Post Mark Collectors Club of America plans to take up the matter at its annual convention this summer in Findlay, Ohio. For 27 years now this organization has avidly collected postmarked envelopes from post offices with unusual names.

Some collectors specialize in topical, that is, names of a particular genre like animals or weather. In the first category are such fauna as Raven (Virginia), Wildcat (West Virginia), and Lamb, Kentucky. Of the latter type are Thunderbolt (Georgia) and Hurricane (West Virginia).

In addition this club has established a museum in Republic, Ohio. Enshrined there are some 500,000 post marks. Of course, after

the "expressive" postal names have been zipped into limbo, anyone may ask a post office to cancel his letter with an individual place-name stamp. Thus collectors may, so postal officials state, continue to pursue their hobby by personal contact with an individual post office. But it would take time and money, for example, to secure the postmark of Long Bottom (Ohio) or Rabbit Hash (Kentucky) for this purpose.

So the Post Mark Collectors Club plans to fight. Its President Herbert H. Harrington, of Warren, Ohio, is planning to throw the club's weight into a campaign of letter writing to Congressmen and Senators. "These machines," he fulminates, "are taking all the romance out of postmarks. They're ruining a poor man's hobby. It's getting now so as you don't know where your mail is coming from. All the envelope has is a lot of cuckoo numbers." The club's address is P.O. Box 87, Warren, Ohio 44482. Dues are \$4 a year.

And just as hiked postal rates were a factor in the death of Life Magazine last year, so a thriving business in Michigan expects to suffer from these postal changes. No longer will it be possible to purchase "Snowballs from Hell" (Michigan)—with a postmark to prove it.

ABRIDGING THE RIGHT TO VOTE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker in 1972, the Citizenship Education Department of the National Urban League, Inc., undertook a study of restrictions to black political participation that exist in the northern sector of this country. I recommend the booklet entitled "Abridging the Right To Vote" to all of my colleagues.

I now submit for your attention and the attention of my colleagues, the introduction to this booklet.

The Voter Registration Rights Act of 1973 (H.R. 4846) that I introduced in the House of Representatives will serve to eliminate many of the barriers placed in the way of eligible black voters:

ABRIDGING THE RIGHT TO VOTE: A STUDY OF STATE RESTRICTIONS AND BLACK POLITICAL PARTICIPATION¹

INTRODUCTION

Most analyses of barriers to black political participation inevitably focus on the South, since the more blatant measures to disenfranchise black people were adopted there. The "grandfather clause," the "white primary" and the unceasing acts of terrorism and violence to prevent black political involvement are still vivid in the minds of many Americans.

But this focus has had at least two unfortunate consequences. The first is that, with the passage of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, and the disappearance of many of the more odious forms of disenfranchisement, increasing numbers of Americans now believe the major battles for the black franchise in the South have been won and that official disenfranchisement is a thing of the past.

Secondly, this "Southern perspective" also

¹ This report was prepared by Robert B. Hill, Director, Research Department, National Urban League, with the assistance of George A. Jordan, Research Assistant, and Esther Piovia, Social Science Analyst.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

permits the American public to believe the primary barriers to the political participation of minority groups in the North have been internal and not external: it is only their apathy that hinders them.

The fact is that most studies of American voting procedures agree that external impediments, and not apathy, are primarily responsible for the relatively lower participation of Americans, whether black or white, compared to many Western countries. For example, only 61 percent of the U.S. electorate voted in 1968, while recent elections in England, Canada, West Germany and Denmark had turnouts of 72, 76, 87, and 89 percent, respectively.

Of course, these external barriers, particularly those related to registration requirements, fall disproportionately on persons who are black or Spanish-speaking, low income, and less educated.

Minority groups are particularly plagued by antiquated residency requirements, inaccessible sites, inappropriate registration hours, literacy tests and disqualifying regulations.

GUN CONFUSION

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "Gun Confusion" appearing in the West Side Courier published by its editor, my distinguished friend, Mr. Harry H. Weinbaum.

This fine editorial points out the un-wisdom of many of the gun control proposals now pending before the Congress. The editorial follows:

GUN CONFUSION

Persistent confusion concerning crime control and gun control lies at the heart of controversy over the more radical anti-firearms proposals. The confusion has been compounded by those near-zealots who pursue but a single goal—the disarming of law-abiding citizens and the branding of the millions of members of such organizations as the National Rifle Association, at least by indirection, as little better than thugs.

In response to a nationally-syndicated article that compared handguns to heroin as a threat to the quality of American urban life, a police commissioner of Buffalo, New York commented: "In the long run, there must be a sensible system which will protect citizens' rights and still curb the illegal use of firearms, but no one has come up with it yet." The commissioner added, "As to the 'myth' about the National Rifle Association blocking effective gun laws, I hope all gun owners belong to the NRA... most members are respectable people who know how to handle arms properly."

Commenting on the same antigun article, the sheriff of Erie County, New York presented a refreshing approach to gun control legislation when he said, "I believe it is important to safeguard that right (to keep and bear arms), but we must also explore every possibility to reduce injury caused by firearms, taking into serious consideration proposals for gun control legislation which encourage rather than discourage the safe and proper possession and use of any firearms by all Americans who choose to have them."

Statements like this help correct the confusion created by promotion of the fallacy that banning gun ownership by the law abiding is synonymous with controlling crime.

SUPPORT FOR FISCAL RESTRAINT

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard from the spenders as they have complained about the President's efforts to keep spending within bounds. It is time that we listened to those who support Mr. Nixon's campaign for fiscal restraint.

One of those who has spoken up for commonsense about the national budget is James A. Dunham, commissioner of accounts and finances for the city of Springfield, the capital of my State. In a recent appearance before the Springfield City Council, he made a very forceful statement in defense of the President. I am inserting it in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

FEDERAL SPENDING

Can a budget of approximately \$268.7 billion be termed a "penny pinching budget" or "Uncle Scrooge"? Of course not.

From all the talk one would not easily get the notion that the President plans to spend \$115.7 billion on "income security benefits" in the 1974 fiscal year. Or that this spending—on such things as old age benefits, medicare and medicaid, aid to families with dependent children, veterans benefits, and food stamps—is up 10% from the current year and 27% from the 1972 year.

Or that the share of the new budget such spending accounts for, 43.5%, is up from 42% this year and 39% in 1972. Or that the share of the budget that goes for most other purposes has been declining. National defense, for example, will account for 30.2% of the new budget, compared with 30.6% in 1973 and 33.8% in 1972.

So as you can see, social spending is still rising.

What the advocates of this resolution do not point out is that the Federal Government has not balanced its budget in the last 40 years. What has been the effect of this?

The Government expects to end the coming fiscal year more than half a trillion dollars in the red.

The total Federal debt is projected to climb to \$505.45 billion by June 30, 1974, from an estimated \$473.33 billion at the end of the current fiscal year.

Interest costs are expected to rise to \$24.67 billion in the coming fiscal year, from \$22.81 billion in the current year and \$20.58 billion in the year ended last June 30. Next fiscal year's interest burden amounts to about 9% of the budget total and is nearly double the \$12.59 billion paid in fiscal 1967, when the debt totaled \$344.68 billion.

Interest on the debt is the third-largest category of outlays in the budget, trailing only income-security programs, and national defense.

In conclusion, if the Congress and the "social theorists" cannot add, then the President must subtract or else our taxes will continue to multiply.

March 26, 1973

HIGHWAY HEARINGS TESTIMONY

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week Clark McClinton appeared before the Transportation Subcommittee to testify on behalf of the National Crushed Stone Institute. Clark is a personal friend of mine and a distinguished Arkansas citizen.

He is a past president of the Arkansas Chapter of Associated General Contractors, past president of the Fayetteville, Ark. Chamber of Commerce, past chairman of the Fayetteville Planning Commission, and is now serving as a board director of the Arkansas State Chamber of Commerce.

In my judgment, Clark McClinton's statement is outstanding and I, therefore, want to share it with all of my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF CLARK C. MCCLINTON

Distinguished Chairman and Members of the Committee, thank you for giving us the opportunity to again appear before your committee.

I am Clark C. McClinton, President of McClinton Brothers Company, Fayetteville, Arkansas. I am also Immediate Past-Chairman of the Board of the National Limestone Institute. I am here today to speak on behalf of the National Crushed Stone Institute which is a federation of the National Crushed Stone Association and the National Limestone Institute. The federation consists of almost 800 individual member companies in some 40 states. The members of the two associations are responsible for a great majority of the crushed stone produced in our country. Sitting with me is Mr. S. James Campbell, Executive Vice President of Harry T. Campbell Son's Company, Division of the Flintkote Co. of Towson, Maryland. Mr. Campbell is the Immediate Past-President of the National Crushed Stone Association and also Immediate Past Co-chairman of the National Crushed Stone Institute. All of us—the members of the National Crushed Stone Institute—appreciate sincerely your hearing and consideration of our position on the subject of transportation for this Nation of ours.

Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that anyone in this room, or in this country, for that matter, can deny the outstanding success we have had with our Interstate System. It is very difficult to put a yard stick to this success because the benefits this Nation has reaped since its undertaking have been varied and tremendous. I think the committee will agree that the most important result of the Interstate System has been the thousands of lives which have been saved—modern roads do save lives—and when measured in millions of passenger miles traveled, the fatality rate of the Interstate System is less than half that on the rest of the road and street network.

Economically the Interstate System has been good not only to the Nation as a whole but also to local areas as well. In a recent study undertaken for the Federal Highway Administration, it was shown that National Interstate expenditures of \$2.6 billion annually have resulted in the generation of approximately 955,000 jobs and more than \$7.5 billion in total economic activity each year.

The Interstate System has become an essential and fundamental element of our na-

tional economy. Without Interstate routes, the production, assembly and distribution lines of industry and commerce would be fragmented to an impossible degree.

Mr. Chairman, the history and accomplishments of the Interstate program are indeed impressive; but now, as this success story nears its end with over 80% of the system completed, we must turn our efforts toward our ABC roads. Thousands of miles of these roads, which carry 70% of all highway travel, have been bypassed for improvement during the 17-year effort to build the controlled-access Interstate System. Many have become dangerous and unable to cope with today's greatly increased travel demands. And we are constantly demanding more and more of these roadways. For example, in the 17 years from 1956 our automobile population has grown from just over 65 million to nearly 118 million today. This is an unbelievable increase of over 80%. Also, under national policy prevailing today in regard to railroad transportation, hundreds of miles of track are being abandoned and dozens of rural communities are forced to rely on only one possible mode for their personal mobility and for all of their needs in hauling commodities. That one mode, of course, is the highway system. Since 1956 the railroads have abandoned over 15,000 miles of rail trackage. During that period only one state has shown an increase in rail trackage and that was only 20 miles. Add to this the fact that Penn Central has petitioned the courts to allow it to drop some 5,000 miles of track, and you have what amounts to quite an additional burden on our highways.

An outstanding example of the high price we pay in the lives of our citizens, because of our failure so far to adequately attack this problem, is Highway 27 in Florida, which runs between Miami and South Bay. In 1972 alone, twenty-nine human beings lost their lives on U.S. 27. What is the problem? Well, according to the safety director for Palm Beach County, the only problem is that Highway 27 is a two lane road. Years of pleading and demanding by public officials, private citizens and the news media to "do something" about U.S. 27 brought replies from state highway officials that there wasn't enough money to improve it. The tragic story of "Bloody 27", as it is now referred to, was graphically presented in the Miami Herald of February 18, 1973, and has been reprinted and included as part of this testimony.

Unfortunately this situation is not peculiar to Florida or U.S. 27—similar examples, I am sure, could be found in every other state. I know that out where I come from, we're driving on roads that were engineered and built forty and fifty years ago. Between my home town of Fayetteville and other parts of Arkansas, we badly need improved roads. And unless we do something to correct this deterioration of our primary and secondary roads, and do it now, the problem will continue to compound at an alarming rate.

The Department of Transportation has recognized and documented these needs in its 1972 Transportation Needs Study which it submitted to the Congress. In that report they indicated that the Nation's highway needs would require an expenditure of \$29.6 billion a year to meet the current public demand. And most of that fantastic figure is not for new road construction, but for needed improvements on existing roads.

Mr. Chairman, for the reasons I have outlined, we feel very secure in restating the position we took last year before this committee, that is, we strongly recommend that at least an additional billion dollars be devoted to ABC and Urban Extension systems. We do not feel that this recommendation is out of context with our highway needs. The trend in recent years has been toward a reduction in our Interstate expenditures and

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

we would suggest that money taken off the Interstate authorization be added to the ABC authorization. Another possible source is the billions of dollars currently held impounded by OMB.

Now I just talked in terms of billions of dollars, and it was easy to do so. It is not easy to understand the significance of a billion—it's not easy for me, it's not easy for most private citizens out around the country. All we know is that it is an awful lot of money, and it scares us to talk about spending that much. It goes against the innate thriftiness of most Americans, and that's one reason for some opposition to highway building. So let me put my point in a language and location which I do understand and which people out in the towns and cities of this country understand. This fiscal year, about \$9.9 million in Federal money is being spent in Arkansas on primary roads. This is matched on a 50/50 basis by the state, so we will have almost \$20 million total for those roads. Arkansas has 10 highway districts, so we have an average of less than \$2 million per district. Well, no matter where you go in Arkansas, the most of an upgraded primary road you can get for \$2 million is seven or eight miles. In most cases, furthermore, that is only a two-lane road. The point is, gentlemen, a billion dollars has not and will not buy much upgraded ABC road when looked at on a 50-state basis.

We have continually gone on record in support of adequate funding of our highway program so that we can meet the tremendous needs I have outlined. At our January convention the Board of Directors of the National Limestone Institute adopted a resolution which I believe would be appropriate to have inserted in the record at this point. The substance of this resolution was also adopted by the National Crushed Stone Association at their annual convention.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, American highways are a major and vital segment of our Nation's total transportation system and provide the greatest flexibility in the movement of people and materials within our mobile society; and

Whereas, the Federal-aid Highway Program was established by Congress in 1956 to initiate an ongoing program of highway development and to share with the various local governments the financial obligations necessary to secure an adequate highway transportation system in all sectors of our country; and

Whereas, the investment of funds in the Federal-aid Highway Program has perhaps generated more dollar movement in our economy through increased employment, greater industrial production and a heightened demand for goods and services throughout our economy, and has been financed entirely by a system of user taxation; and

Whereas, there still remains a tremendous need for highways to connect our major metropolitan areas and their suburban communities and outlying towns and villages, and for the improvement and upgrading of the already existing highways to a condition such that they can be used safely and efficiently by modern motor vehicles; now therefore

Be it resolved by the Board of Directors of the National Limestone Institute, Inc., this 17th day of January, 1973, that this Institute affirms its resolve to support and work for a Federal highway program that will most adequately serve the needs of all the American citizens; and

Be it further resolved that this Institute urges the elected representatives of the people to recognize the unfulfilled need for legislation to achieve implementation and continuation of highway building programs.

Another point to which we would like to address our remarks is that of diversion of

Trust Funds for mass transit purposes. As is well known, the Administration and others have been and are continuing to push hard for diversion of over \$1 billion from the Highway Trust Fund for mass transit use. It is also well known that the Senate last week narrowly passed a similar measure which opens up the \$850 million in the Urban Systems Fund for mass transit. What I find surprising is that they did this after voting an additional \$3 billion for mass transit contract authority out of the General Fund and \$800 million, also out of the General Fund, for operating funds for mass transit. There seems to be no end to the demand for mass transit money and I am afraid that if we do open up the Trust Fund it would only be a short time before they would be demanding and getting a much larger share.

I would like to make it clear that we at NCSI are not against mass transit. As we pointed out in our testimony before the Senate Public Works Subcommittee on Transportation, we fully realize the mass transit needs of our major metropolitan areas. We feel we have recognized those needs by going on record for the establishment of a Mass Transit Trust Fund and are supporting a one cent increase on taxes levied on all transportation fuels to help finance it. We do not see the logic of splitting and therefore weakening the Highway Trust Fund in order to finance two modes when by all standards it is not nearly enough to meet the needs of our highways alone.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we would like to address ourselves to the immediacy of passing a highway bill. We are all well aware of the fate of last year's highway legislation. The problems caused by failure to pass a bill are reaching epidemic proportions in the states. Several states have had to stop highway lettings due to a lack of funds and by July of this year a total of 37 states will be out of funds. It is plain to see that the important work of providing a highway system so necessary to our economy and way of life is rapidly coming to a halt. This not only allows already dangerous highways to further deteriorate but also escalates the cost of their repair as well as the cost of constructing new roads.

Gentlemen, we strongly urge early enactment of a highway bill that will take us closer to meeting the great transportation needs of our Nation.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 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 rel-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

atives 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?"

MR. AND MRS. HARRY STEVENSON
TO CELEBRATE GOLDEN WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on April 8, Mr. and Mrs. Harry Stevenson, of my hometown of Taylor, Mich., will celebrate their golden wedding anniversary. I bring this to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress because the Stevensons are a very special couple.

Both Harry and his wife, Gertrude (Koths) Stevenson, are descendants of pioneer families in Taylor, which discarded township status only a few years ago to become one of the fastest-growing cities in the area.

Harry Stevenson, now 73 years old, worked in Detroit automotive plants until his retirement 12 years ago as a supervisor. During this period, he continued a tradition of public service that had been begun by his father early in this century. The elder Stevenson served as township highway commissioner from 1910 to 1912; his son, Harry, served as township treasurer from 1939 until 1949. In the early 1950's, he was chairman of the local planning commission and served also on the zoning board of appeals and the water and sewer commission.

He has also been active over the years in many civic and social groups in Taylor, and most recently, was the charter president of the Taylor Senior Citizens Club. In 1970, he was named Taylor's "Most Outstanding Citizen" in recognition of his many contributions to the community.

Harry recalls that he bought a Model T Ford in the early 1920's—one of the first in the community—and used it in his courtship of Gertrude Koths, who lived on a nearby farm. After their marriage, they built a home on part of the Koths farm, and have lived there since that time on a street which bears the Koths family name. While serving as township treasurer, he worked with Willard Koths, his wife's cousin, who was township supervisor for several years. Mrs. Koths has also been active in the Taylor Senior Citizens Club.

The Stevensons have three sons, Harvey, Melvin and Gervin, and five grandchildren—and an uncountable number of friends and admirers throughout Taylor and the surrounding area.

I am proud indeed to include this remarkable couple among my constituents—among my friends—and I am pleased to share their life's story with my colleagues in the Congress. I am sure you all join me and the Stevensons' many friends in wishing them a joyous golden wedding anniversary, and many more happy years together.

WHY CAN'T TROOPS COME HOME?

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduced a resolution calling for the President to vigorously press our NATO allies to assume a greater proportion of the cost of their own defense and to take whatever steps necessary to immediately withdraw 50 percent of our present troop commitment.

Gordon E. Duenow, editor of the Saint Cloud Daily Times, in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District, recently wrote an editorial on this matter which merits publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where his views can be shared by all of the Members of Congress and the other people who read the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Duenow's editorial in the RECORD:

WHY CAN'T TROOPS COME HOME?

Apparently we aren't looking for an easy way to cut our balance of trade deficit and at the same time help stabilize the dollar. If we were we certainly could take a close look at troops we have stationed around the world. This is a costly business.

For instance, according to preliminary calculations, it will cost the United States about \$17 billion in fiscal 1974 to maintain a land, sea and air force of some 300,000 men in the European area along with elements in the United States ready for quick deployment there. If this figure is accurate, it would mean a jump of almost \$3 billion in two years. The 1972 estimate came to \$14 billion.

Columnist Bob Considine reported in the Times last week that the Germans still want us there in strength for protection, but they want us in the next town, not theirs.

If cost of maintaining our armed forces in foreign lands continues to go up, Congress may have something to say. In fact, the Senate Democratic caucus last week, by a margin of 6-to-1, demanded broad cutbacks in forces overseas in an effort to slash the balance-of-payments deficit and hold down the federal budget. So maybe something will be done.

The Nixon administration has been standing firm against U.S. troop pullbacks from the NATO area unless there is agreement with Russia and their European allies on mutual and balanced reductions on both sides. Complex negotiations on this issue have a long way to go.

Secretary of Defense Elliott L. Richardson has expressed strong opinions against withdrawing troops from Europe. He contends that a troop pullback might result in a buildup of the West German army and air force to fill the gap with the result that this could disturb other European nations with long memories of World War II.

While standing firm in the European area, the Nixon administration has favored trimming American forces in Asia.

There are 600,000 American troops overseas. It does seem strange that we have to

maintain such a large armed force overseas when World War II has been over for more than 25 years.

LONG BEACH GIRL WINS NATIONAL VFW DEMOCRACY SPEECH CONTEST

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to present to the Congress the winning speech in the national Veterans of Foreign Wars "Voice of Democracy" contest.

The winner was Miss Cindie Pridy, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth G. Pridy of Long Beach, Calif., and resident of my Congressional District. Cindie was the California State winner in this 26th national contest and the eventual winner over more than 500,000 other entrants across the Nation.

She is an A-student at David Starr Jordan High School in Long Beach, active in athletics, a former Foreign Exchange Student, and president of the school's Cosmopolitan Club.

Cindie's prize-winning talk, "My Responsibility to Freedom," reflects her deeply held belief in the future of the United States and a commitment to preserve and protect our freedoms.

She received a \$10,000 college scholarship from the VFW and its Ladies Auxiliary at a banquet here in Washington hosted by Vice President Agnew.

It is my pleasure to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point her outstanding talk.

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

(By Cindie Pridy)

This past summer, I spent two and one-half months in Denmark as a foreign exchange student, living with a Danish family. Fantastic would be a very mild adjective to describe the summer I experienced. But of all my memories, one stands out as kind of special. And I'd like to share that with you now. There were 148 of us together on a charter flight from Copenhagen to New York City and we of course had to go through customs upon entry into the United States. After having such a fantastic summer I think you can appreciate the feeling of misgivings some of us had about coming home. But you know, even as depressed as I was; as the plane circled over New York prior to landing a chill began to run down my spine. Below me, just a few 100 feet was the United States. After what seemed an infinite amount of time, the wheels finally touched the ground and I thought to myself, "I've made it; I'm home." But the best was yet to come. As we walked down a long corridor, we neared the customs inspection center where there were flags outside of the doors. As I caught my first glimpse of an American flag I felt the excitement mount inside me and I knew that this was to be the climax of my summer.

Now I could sit down and analyze this feeling that I had and come up with some very complicated, intelligent sounding answers as to symbolism and so forth. But the simple fact is that I really got charged up when I saw the American Flag on American soil for the first time. Maybe it was a sense of pride, a calling out saying; "This is my flag . . . and this is my country." But whatever it was, when I look at an American Flag now, I look at it through different eyes. And

when I'm given the honor of saying the Pledge of Allegiance, I'm proud.

But what you may wonder, does all this have to do with "My Responsibility To Freedom?" To me the American Flag stands for a very special kind of freedom. The kind of freedom that over 580,000 American men have died for in the Revolutionary War, two World Wars and Korean War; not to mention the hundred of thousands that have died in other smaller scale conflicts. These men died not only for their flag and country but for the freedom they both represent. Now if even one man can give his life for this freedom we have, doing it in the name of his country and flag then I should surely strive to take pride and show respect to my flag.

But this is only part of my responsibility. I could sit all day long and worship a flag but that would not insure this freedom that so many have bravely and sometimes vainly fought for. No, although showing pride and respect to my flag are part of it, there is still a much greater part remaining; the responsibility of not being satisfied with the status quo.

We must not and will not allow ourselves to become idle and satisfied with the way things are. If you say that our government is no good and we are not really as free as people say we are then we must strive together to form a better government and free freedom. We must not be satisfied with wide extremes of poverty and wealth. If a man cannot honestly feed himself then we must help to feed him. If a man is true in his desire to work and be helped, then we must help him. If a man is sincere in his desire to become educated, then we must educate him.

You may have noticed that I have changed to WE instead of I, that's because "My Responsibility To Freedom" is your responsibility to freedom. For you see my friends freedom cannot run on hunger, idle desire, or illiteracy. Broken dreams are not mended by one but by many. I remember a verse that says "One man working alone can do many things; many men working together can do anything."

"My Responsibility To Freedom" is to show honor and respect to my country and flag so that those who fought and died will not have done so in vain; to work with my brothers and not become idle and satisfied with what has already been done before me; to hope that someday my sons and daughters will know a freedom and peace even sweeter than this one, always keeping in sight that freedom is a privilege and not a right; always working for the birth of a new freedom for the sons of men not only in America . . . but everywhere.

ATLANTA LEADERS CALL FOR CONTINUATION OF OEO, COMMUNITY ACTION

HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on March 5, under the leadership of Vice Mayor Maynard H. Jackson and Alderman Marvin Arrington, the Atlanta Board of Aldermen adopted a resolution calling upon the President of the United States to continue the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity and the Community Action Program pursuant to the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1972. Mayor Sam Massell signed the resolution on March 9.

Our OEO program, Economic Oppor-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tunity Atlanta, and the community action services in our city have been of great value to the thousands of impoverished people they have reached. Poor people have been meaningfully involved in such efforts as Headstart, legal services, manpower training, and economic development. Now these efforts are threatened with cruel and unwarranted extinction.

The action of the leadership of the city government in Atlanta is one more example of nationwide concern and protest against elimination of OEO and Community Action programs. The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION BY VICE MAYOR MAYNARD H. JACKSON AND ALDERMAN MARVIN ARRINGTON

DEPARTMENT OF CITY CLERK,

Atlanta, Ga.

Whereas the United States Office of Economic Opportunity was established in 1964, pursuant to the Constitution and laws of the United States of America, to eliminate the causes and effects of poverty in America by affording the poor themselves maximum feasible opportunity to design programs to deal with these causes and effects and effectively to mobilize and coordinate available federal, state and local resources; and

Whereas the Office of Economic Opportunity is the only major federal agency devoted exclusively to the plight of the poor American; and

Whereas local public officials, poor people and private organizations all over America jointly organized broadly based local community action agencies which were recognized and funded by OEO; and

Whereas those community action agencies not only operate headstart, legal services, manpower training and economic development projects and perform countless other services for the poor, but are important and valuable bridges of communication between the poor, local public officials and private agencies and have been instrumental in fostering the peaceful rather than the violent approach to long-standing poverty related problems; and

Whereas President Richard M. Nixon proposes to abolish and is in the process of abolishing the Office of Economic Opportunity and direct federal support to the local community action programs by June 30, 1973, without establishing realistic alternatives for continuation of these functions:

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Mayor and the Board of Aldermen that we respectfully urge President Nixon that the Office of Economic Opportunity and the community action program be continued pursuant to the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1972.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this Resolution be transmitted forthwith to President Richard M. Nixon, the majority and minority leaders of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, the entire United States Congressional Delegation for the State of Georgia, the respective chairmen of the appropriations committees of the United States House of Representatives and the Senate, the House of Representatives Education and Labor Committee, and Mr. Howard Phillips, Acting Director, Office of Economic Opportunity.

LEGISLATION FOR PRISON REFORM

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the incidence of crime continues to mount in our country. Unfortunately, there is no one simple

solution to the so-called crime problem. For, it is a problem whose many facets must be tackled through different programs before we can hope to be free of the criminal activities that engulf our cities.

While we press to eliminate the roots of crime—poverty and social alienation, we must also seek to rehabilitate those who have committed crimes. One area that directly affects such individuals is prison reform. I find this issue so important because of what can be done through the rehabilitation of offenders and the alternative of what happens to such individuals who are incarcerated under brutalizing prison conditions. I have introduced several bills on this subject and I would, at this time, like to bring them to the attention of my colleagues.

H.R. 677 is designed to provide for the development and operation of treatment programs for certain drug abusers who are confined to or released from correctional institutions and facilities. In 1970 the Omnibus Crime Control Act was amended to establish a program for the improvement of States and local correctional facilities. Under this law, grants for the upgrading of correctional facilities are made upon the submission and approval of a plan, meeting certain minimum requirements by a State. This bill adds a new requirement—that States make necessary provisions for the establishment and development of narcotic treatment programs in their correctional facilities and in their probation and parole programs.

Another bill I have introduced is H.R. 684 and is entitled the Family Visitation Act. It has 10 cosponsors, and would give prisoners in Federal institutions a minimum of 12 and up to 30 days of furlough during each year of his or her confinement, subject to his or her good behavior. This decision would be made by the chief executive officer of the institutions to which the prisoner is confined after consultation with the classification committee or treatment team, the mental health supervisor, and the individual's caseworker. Any violation of the furlough privilege would be deemed an escape and subject to penalties under existing laws.

H.R. 685 provides minimum standards for State and local correctional institutions receiving certain Federal financial assistance. H.R. 685 amends the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 by creating a Federal Prison Review Board. This Board shall establish minimum standards relating to: First, the construction, operation, and administration of correctional institutions and facilities, and, second, the training of personnel and the implementation of probation, parole, counseling, medical, psychiatric, vocational, and other rehabilitative programs with respect to correctional programs and practices. The Board may conduct studies and investigations, consult with Federal, State, and local personnel and hold any hearings which are necessary for the purpose of establishing and periodically revising the minimum standards and to determine the extent to which the standards are being implemented.

H.R. 686 and H.R. 687 both seek to reduce crimes committed by people who are

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

free on pretrial release, and those who are released after serving a prison sentence. The Pretrial Crime Reduction Act requires that criminal trials be held within 60 to 120 days after arrest. It provides a system of time limits and requires Congress to provide the money and personnel needed to clear up presently clogged dockets. It also establishes improved controls over probationers and parolees charged with crimes of violence. The Correctional Services Improvement Act attempts a sweeping reorientation of existing State and local jails and prisons. The Attorney General would be empowered to build, staff and turn over to the States model correctional facilities. They would be small in size with less than 300 inmates each, and would implement enlightened corrections techniques including work release, school release, and extensive personal counseling. Halfway houses would also be used to ease the transition from prison life back into normal society.

While these bills may not totally solve the crime problem, it is my belief that if passed and implemented effectively, we would be taking a significant step toward the goal which we all seek. I urge, therefore, favorable congressional action on these bills.

NATIONAL HUNTING AND FISHING DAY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 22, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, again this year I was proud to be one of many co-sponsors of the joint resolution to declare the fourth Saturday of September National Hunting and Fishing Day. This measure passed both Houses unanimously last year, and Hunting and Fishing Day, September 23, 1972, was celebrated throughout the country as a day of special recognition for more than 55 million hunters and fishermen.

In my own congressional district, the event was celebrated in Marilla by the Allied Sportsmen of Western New York as it was throughout the Nation by officially recognizing the role of America's sportsmen in conservation and outdoor recreation. Hundreds of clubs took the opportunity of this special day to lead the public in a rededication to the conservation and respectful use of our wildlife and natural resources.

Last year this special day was observed in some areas by adapting club facilities for conservation displays and exhibits and by showing conservation movies in clubhouses. Sportsmen's groups were assisted by civil clubs, schools, State game and fish departments, new environment clubs, and garden clubs in raising funds for conservation projects. Some clubs set up facilities to teach young people to shoot bows or rifles, pitch tents or catch fish.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased my colleagues once again this year passed this measure unanimously to give our hunters and fishermen a special opportunity

to work in their communities with their neighbors and business associates to show the public that the American sportsman is the best friend fish and wildlife ever had.

GREAT LAKES FLOODING AND THE INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, throughout the Great Lakes Basin, communities and homeowners are suffering from unprecedented high water levels, flooding, and accelerated erosion. On Friday, March 23, and today, Monday, March 26, the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, chaired by the Honorable DANTE FASCELL, has been holding hearings on the reasons for these disastrous conditions as well as possible solutions.

Because of the intense interest in this subject throughout the Great Lakes area, Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter in the RECORD at this point a portion of the statement which I made before the committee today:

ACTIVITIES OF THE INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

I am sure that I speak for all my colleagues from the shoreline areas of the Great Lakes when I express my appreciation for your leadership in calling these hearings on the activities of the International Joint Commission.

DAMAGE FROM HIGH WATER LEVELS

I have just returned from my Congressional District. I have seen the fresh toll of damage from Lake Erie's high waters. I have seen devastated homes. One man described how he lost 50 feet of his property last week by flood and erosion damage. He has photographic evidence of where his land was, and where it is now—and he wonders about where it will be before we are through. The fishing industry, the recreation industry, the homeowners all suffer. How can we tell a person whose lifetime earnings are invested in a house washing into the Lake that he built too close to these waters which never before came so high.

The water which navigation so critically needs overwhelms the flooded resident. The erosion going on in Lake Erie today will all have to be dredged out when the Lake will have to be deepened for modern navigation. Preventing erosion now will save dredging later on.

Mr. Chairman, we recognize that there is very little that can be done about this disaster situation today, next week, next month, or even this year. But what this hearing can do is help determine why the situation became so bad this winter—and what we can do to prevent this from happening again.

A MORE VIGOROUS I.J.C.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, from a review of the testimony given by the two I.J.C. Commissioners Friday, I would agree with your statement that it is obvious that a deeper look at the whole situation is needed. Today, I would like to make a few comments about some of the answers given by the Commissioners. I would like to point out some areas in which I believe better planning could

March 26, 1973

have prevented some of the problems which we are facing today. I will try to point out some areas where man has affected the levels of the Lakes—sometimes with harmful side affects—and I would like to suggest some areas where better control of the range of Lake levels could be obtained. These issues are obviously too broad and too important to be covered in one day. I hope, therefore, that these discussions will raise some questions and ideas which can lead to further hearings and more thorough investigation of the issues involved.

I understand that Commissioner Herter pointed out that he was wearing "two hats"—not just an American hat; that it was a joint commission, a supra-national commission, in which almost all decisions made were unanimous. That is all very nice, Mr. Chairman, but who is looking out for the homeowners of my District and the other Districts along the Lakes? Where was the American representative when the Canadians unilaterally closed the Welland Canal? I would hope that in the future the American Commissioners could be a little more careful of the interests of the American public.

With regard to the question of the closing of the Welland Canal, I understand that the Commissioners said that they "do not want to cast aspersions" as to who was at fault for "the problems in liaison". Well, Mr. Chairman, the closing of the Welland increased the level of Lake Erie. It is increasing the damage to the people of my State. I would like to "cast aspersions"; I would like to know how this happened—and who is going to see that it doesn't happen again.

It seems to me that from Friday's testimony, the authority and the quality of the I.J.C. needs to be up-graded. Perhaps it is time that we had some full-time Commissioners. Perhaps it is time that we carried our full load of Commission responsibilities. I am embarrassed that the Canadians have assumed so much of the work of the Commission, when so much of the potential benefit falls to the American side. It is obvious from the delays in implementing the Ottawa Water Quality Agreement of last year that the Commission is under-staffed. Perhaps a more adequate budget and more adequate staffing will enable it to more adequately do its job. But I also feel that a little more public attention—such as this hearing—will help improve the performance of the Commission.

It increasingly appears that the authority of the Commission may be too limited.

It is time that we establish a Federal agency which could and would provide overall leadership of government activities on the Great Lakes. Since it is vital, by law and by common sense, to coordinate with Canada, an organization such as the I.J.C. is the logical group to take on leadership responsibility. At present, most of the agencies on the Great Lakes—especially the Corps of Engineers—are oriented too much toward navigation interests. What is needed is an agency which will watch out for and balance all of the various competing interests on the Great Lakes. The homeowner and city official deserve the same consideration as the power company and the big ore carrier. Pollution control activities and lake restoration efforts must be increased. The two governments should cooperate on public health issues and the maintenance of water quality.

For too long construction on the Great Lakes has been geared just to protect the shippers and power companies. The suits which have been brought against the Chicago diversion have all been one-sided, for the benefit of power generation and larger ships. It is past time that these interests were balanced against the interests of shore protection and the maintenance of beaches and recreational facilities. Today, ships have been and are being built on the Great Lakes which are so large that they cannot be fully

loaded at normal water levels and can only enter a few selected harbors. These shippers have an interest in high lake levels—but it is time that their interests be balanced against the needs of the shoreline communities.

A properly constituted I.J.C. could fulfill this responsibility to all the people of the region. It is the type of agency that we desperately need on the Lakes.

THE PRESENT HIGH WATER LEVELS: PARTIALLY A PRODUCT OF LACK OF PLANNING

The record high water levels which are causing so much distress are partially a fault of poor planning. In June of this past year, Hurricane Agnes dumped heavy rains on several of the lower Lakes. This followed the period January-May in which 15 inches more rain fell on the lower Lakes than in the comparable period in 1971. It just seems to me that those who study the Lakes for the government should have begun, at that time, to close off the Long Lake-Ogoki diversion, to keep the Welland Canal open, to plan for an early closing of the St. Mary's River. Better planning could have helped. Why was the Welland closed? Why was the first "special" action on the St. Mary's not taken until December 1 and the final necessary action delayed until January 30 of this year?

In their testimony Friday, the Commissioners indicated that these changes would only result in lowering the Lakes an "inch or two". Let me say here that a combination of changes can cause up to eight inches or more change in water levels. In other words, just as pennies add up to dollars, inches add up to feet. Lake Erie is about three feet above normal. An eight inch reduction then becomes quite significant. I might also point out here that the Commissioners said that one of the areas most susceptible to flooding was the western part of Lake Erie. This is because the Lake is very shallow throughout the area. Storm winds can easily whip up enormous waves in what is called a "sucer" effect. Thus in my area, particularly, a two inch increase in water levels can be transformed into an additional four inches in storm wave height. Thus in my area, every inch does count.

POSSIBLE WAYS TO CONTROL WATER LEVELS

In addition to better planning and use of existing controls, I would like to point out several areas where improvements in water controls could be made without undue expense.

LAKE SUPERIOR

For example, water can be diverted from the Hudson Bay Basin into Lake Superior, mostly for power generation purposes. This is the Ogoki-Long Lake Diversion. During high water periods on the Great Lakes, could not this flow of water be reversed. That is, the water could be pumped out of Lake Superior, through the power plants, and into the northern watershed.

CHICAGO DIVERSION

Second, the various court orders and Federal permits governing the Chicago Sanitary and Shipping Canal diversion seem to have grown together into a tangled web of red-tape which now denies us any flexibility in using the Chicago Diversion. I can certainly understand why the various states of the Basin, acting on behalf of their power companies and shippers, would want to restrict the flow of water out of Southern Lake Michigan during low water periods. But none of the States would have any objection now. What must be done, either through Congressional action or through modification of the court orders, is to permit the use of the Chicago Diversion on a flexible basis. When we have a low water cycle on the Lakes, keep the diversion to a minimum. When the water levels are high—and the situation on the Mississippi permits—let more water out. We must break our bondage to

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

these inflexible court orders which are senseless 50% of the time.

I might add here that the International Joint Commission could have and should have a major role to play in providing for the better use of the Chicago Diversion. The Commissioners said Friday that they have no jurisdiction over the Chicago Canal. Well, from a reading of the 1909 Treaty and the debate surrounding it, that is officially correct.

In fact, the I.J.C. could play a leading role in the rationale use of the Canal. The International Waterways Commission of 1902 recommended limits on U.S. diversions in 1907. The Federal government has intervened in the Chicago Diversion cases on the grounds—among other things—of its interest in maintaining good relations with Canada. Canada has contributed to the discussion in these cases and has even communicated with the Court's special master.

The spirit of the 1909 Treaty and subsequent Canadian objections have played a major role in limiting diversions from Lake Michigan. I would like to enter in the hearing record at this point several passages from Don Courtney Piper's recent study entitled, *The International Law of the Great Lakes*:

"A study of the treaty and analysis of the correspondence relating to the negotiations supports the conclusion that Article II of the treaty accords to the United States the legal right to make a diversion at Chicago, but it does not accord a right to divert an unlimited quantity of water. Canada may object to the diversion if it produces "material injury" to navigation interests on its side of the line. Two difficult problems thus emerge that engender controversy. At what point does the diversion produce "material injury" to Canadian navigation interests? The treaty provides no criteria for making this judgment. Second, what legal weight must the United States accord to Canadian protests? The treaty does not provide any guidance."

"Since 1912, when the Secretary of War was asked to permit a diversion greater than 4,187 c.f.s., the Canadian government has consistently opposed any proposed additional diversion of water from Lake Michigan. Its objections have varied but in general they are based on the potential injury to Canadian navigation and hydroelectric power interests."

"In 1926 Canada reminded the United States that "neighborly goodwill" and the 1909 treaty led to the conclusion that no diversion from one watershed to another could be made without joint consideration and agreement."

It is obvious from a review of the history of the Chicago Diversion that consideration must be given to Canadian feelings on the issue, that diplomacy is required, and that the I.J.C. does in fact have a major role to play in obtaining Canadian agreement to changes in diversion rates.

Now the Canadians are up to their necks in the same water that we are, and I would feel that they would be willing to permit more flexible usage of the Chicago Canal. But in checking, my staff has found that the American side of the I.J.C. has not even raised the Chicago Diversion issue. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the unwillingness to become involved in this issue once again displays a lack of initiative and aggressiveness on the part of the American Commissioners. It is not too late for this issue to be raised, and I would hope that the Committee could encourage the Commissioners to do so.

NIAGARA RIVER

There are other areas where better water level controls could be obtained. It appears that the Niagara River could be modified so that controls could be installed similar to those on the St. Mary's River. The flow of water over the Falls is already carefully regulated.

In addition, there is already a diversionary

canal, similar to the Welland Canal, in existence. This Canal, called the Black Rock Lock, might be modified to permit an additional diversion of water out of Lake Erie. More careful planning of water flow out of the St. Lawrence could help alleviate problems on Lake Ontario.

On Friday, Rep. McClory pointed out that when some of the Lakes are regulated and the others are not, the whole system can become distorted, with adverse effects on the unregulated Lakes.

I feel that a classic example of this is seen in the heavy channel dredging which has occurred between the ore fields of Lake Superior and the ports of Lake Erie. By dredging shipping channels along the upper Great Lakes—and particularly in Lake St. Clair—we have permitted more water to flow out of the upper lakes and into Lake Erie. In essence, we have lowered their elevation—but we have not lowered Lake Erie's elevation. We have not provided a way for that extra water to get out! If one could imagine Lakes Superior, Huron and Michigan as large bathtubs full of water, what we have done is to increase the size of the plug or drain. Thus more water flows out more quickly into Lake Erie and Lake Erie acts as a sink for the other Lakes.

In conclusion, I recommend that the International Joint Commission be given a fresh mandate for action solving the commercial, pollution, erosion and recreational needs of the Great Lakes Basin;

That the Commission be directed to immediately take steps to curtail the rising levels of the Great Lakes, by recommending increased outflow from the Chicago Drainage Canal to its full potential (from 3,000 cubic feet per second to 10,000); that the flow of the Albany River diversion from Hudson Bay be curtailed until the Great Lakes reach a more normal level;

That the American members of the Commission be instructed to develop with the Canadians a range of maximum and minimum levels of the Great Lakes consistent with the needs of commerce, recreation, pollution control and shoreline protection.

LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDTS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

MR. ARENDTS. Mr. Speaker, Lyndon Baines Johnson was an extraordinary man—an extraordinary Congressman, an extraordinary Senator, an extraordinary President.

I served with Lyndon Johnson in the House of Representatives. I worked with him when he was in the Senate and while he was in the White House. His remarkable capacity for leadership was always evident.

When he set objectives, he was not to be deterred in trying to reach them. While I saw him at work in many settings, I especially recall observing him in bipartisan leadership meetings. He was a master in any debate or discussion—always a forceful factor to be reckoned with. I was able to cooperate with him on several occasions. Yet, no matter how much we might have disagreed—and we did from time to time—I could never find myself in diminished respect of him.

It was especially interesting to witness Lyndon Johnson as Senate majority leader, and former Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn in action together. Both of

them clearly exemplified a philosophy which they most certainly must have shared—"To be leaders, you must lead!"

I was in attendance at President Johnson's burial in Texas. Being there for that service, I could truly understand why Lyndon Baines Johnson loved his native Texas, his beautiful home along the Pedernales, and the people who were his neighbors. It was from there that he drew his great strength, the strength which made him a skillful leader whose indelible print is left upon history.

TRIBUTE TO OUR FIGHTING MEN

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, now that the U.S. participation in the Vietnam war has almost ended and our prisoners are returning home, it is a fitting time to express our appreciation for their sacrifices and to let them know that we are proud of the courage with which they have endured a difficult and unpopular war.

The sacrifices these prisoners have been called upon to make have been made with deep respect for America. We should be grateful as a nation for their service and total dedication to God, family, and country. We know that these men will be facing many problems in the future months and years ahead in adjusting back to normal life. We must be ready not just to welcome them back, but to be willing to lend a helping hand at many points along the way as they return to the land they love and to which they sacrificed so much.

I have written or called each of the prisoners residing in the congressional district, which I represent, to let them know that I and my office will be available to them for any assistance that can be provided in resolving problems.

As we welcome back and pay tribute to our prisoners of war, who have served their country under difficult circumstances, let us not forget the more than 1,300 men still missing in Southeast Asia and the continued bravery of their families; nor the more than 46,000 Americans who made the supreme sacrifice; nor the 200,000 others who have been wounded, many of whom are in our Veterans' Administration hospitals. By the sacrifice of these men in a strange land in behalf of an alien people, they have helped strengthen the position of the free world.

I have been pleased to note that some of the counties and towns in my district are celebrating the return of our prisoners of war and are planning future programs paying tribute to those who are wounded and missing in action, and killed in action.

In some parts of this nation among some people it is not fashionable these days to honor our fighting men. These people have been so much against the unpopular war in Vietnam that they show no appreciation to the men who

served there. The very word "patriot" has almost disappeared from respectable use. It has somehow become sophisticated and liberal and altogether cool to dwell incessantly upon the tragic mistakes that are a part of any war, but thank God, I believe that the people of western North Carolina know what the word "patriotism" means and realize that this country is truly a great country.

THE CONFEDERATE MUSEUM ON BERMUDA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on the corner of Kings Square and Duke of York Street across from the Town Hall in Saint George, Bermuda, visitors find a well-kept building bearing the sign "Confederate Museum."

Few descendants of Americans, even those of the Old South, are aware of this museum or its bold reminder of the past from over 100 years ago.

During my recent trip to Bermuda, on nearby Featherbed Alley, I noted an old antique print shop operated beneath a main museum. The gentleman in charge was a Mr. Frewen, who resorted to his notes to refresh his memory.

It seems that history records that the English were disposed to tolerate gentlemen of the Confederacy so long as cotton or coin were made available for Enfield rifles powder, and the like which were needed for the South.

So the United Confederate States assigned a council to Bermuda, a Mr. Bourne, who took up residence at Rose Hill, now Globe Hotel. The chargés d'affaires and chief Confederate agent in charge of blockade running was Maj. Norman Walker and his wife from Mississippi. Major Walker must have been a most dedicated and efficient man for the Southern cause since his record was of 2,054 attempts to run the Union blockade. He was successful on 1,735.

Another Confederate officer was a Lieutenant Chapman of the Navy, whose assignment was to import a custom-made seal and printing press from England to Bermuda and into the Confederate territory. Not until the fourth attempt to run the blockade was Lieutenant Chapman successful in getting the seal through to Wilmington, N.C. In 1912, the seal was placed in the Richmond museum.

The printing press never got to America and seems to have disappeared for a while, only to turn up when purchased at a public auction by John S. Dowell. From all reports, the press is now owned by Sir John Cox of Orange Grove Valley, Bermuda. A duplicate seal for the press had been obtained from England after Mr. Dowell came into control.

Major Walker did most of his work in the rooms above the present Confederate Museum and while it is reported that he left a detailed diary which should prove

to be interesting data and facts, unfortunately, the present whereabouts of the diary is uncertain.

Perhaps the most interesting yarn on Mr. Walker is this—a loyal Mississippian, the major had sworn that his children must be born on Mississippi soil. Unable to get his wife off Bermuda, he imported two barrels of Mississippi dirt and placed it under the bed on which his child was born.

A brief report on the Confederate forces being present at Bermuda is reported in a pamphlet by David F. Raine entitled "A Guide to the Historic Towne of St. George, Bermuda," published by Pomano Publications, "Lazy Corner" Flatts, Bermuda.

I insert the relevant portion of the Guide in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TOWN AND THE CONFEDERATE FORCES

When the American Civil War broke out on 12th, April 1861, it was almost inevitable that many Bermudians would sympathise with the Rebels. Strong economic and social ties were, after all, traditional with Virginia and her allied states. Therefore, when President Lincoln announced a blockade against the Confederate coast, the town of St. George soon became a focal point in the gun-running between Europe and the South.

These operations were directed from the kitchen section of the old Government House of Samuel Day. Built in 1699, it became the Headquarters of Major Norman S. Walker—Chief Political Agent for the Confederate States in Bermuda. Major Walker was dispatched to Bermuda in order to act as negotiator and supervisor of the blockade runs and, through the town, European guns, ammunition, clothing and money readily began to pass.

Major Walker worked in the main upstairs room of the building—now called "The Confederate Museum". His wife, Georgina, cooked their food in the nearby kitchen and they slept in an adjacent room. From his 'office', he studied details of the war's progress, held conferences with suppliers and shipping agents, and wrote numerous letters and reports. Outside, in St. George's harbour, gun-running vessels—such as the "Fergus" and "Robert E. Lee"—became frequent visitors.

Since the prices of the goods were prone to wide fluctuations, he had to bargain for virtually each cargo individually; when the costs were extremely high, he consulted with his superiors in Georgia and awaited their decision. The price of one Enfield rifle, complete with bayonet, scabbard, ram-rod and snap-cap, stood at 80 shillings in 1863; but the price was by no means fixed and the next shipment would have to be renegotiated. It was Major Walker's task to arrange payment and shipping of the goods, either directly to the mainland or else down to the Bahamas for re-routing to other Rebel ports.

From here, he also tried to secure loans and credit-notes, for the Confederate armies. The conflict was, in fact, destined to cost the Southerners a grand total of \$3000 million—some of which passed through the hands and diplomacy of Major Walker.

At the conclusion of the war, Norman and Georgina Walker remained in Bermuda for a while and then eventually returned to America. The old Headquarters, however, still contain relics of his activities in St. George. There are buttons, badges and Confederate monies; bills and correspondence. Across the bannisters of the stairs which he had so often climbed a Rebel flag droops in grim remembrance of the defeat.

For the Confederate States, Bermuda's involvement was a vital link in their support system. For the privateers of these islands, it was an occasion to acquire additional wealth.

SOMETHING VERSUS NOTHING

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, the efforts of our President to cut back on Federal spending are certainly to be applauded, and though I may not agree with all that he has proposed or with the extent to which he wants to cut some existing Federal programs, I have seen little in the way of serious alternatives proposed. This dilemma is well expressed in the following timely editorial taken from the March 9, 1973, edition of The Evening Press, published in Binghamton, N.Y., in my congressional district.

I am often impressed with the thoughtful, to-the-point opinions expressed by this paper, and the following is no exception. I commend "Something Versus Nothing" to my colleagues' attention.

SOMETHING VERSUS NOTHING

One of the sounder principles of politics is that you can't beat somebody with nobody. It carries over into the area of political thought. You can't that is, beat something with nothing.

And that, it seems to us, is the predicament congressional Democrats have reduced themselves to in the Great Spending Debate of 1973.

Whatever else the Nixon Budget for next year represents, it also is a carefully conceived economic plan designed to alter or eliminate a good many of the Democratic programs that have grown up over the last 40 years.

The Democratic response to all of this has been discouragingly simple: Put them all back. Make the government keep on doing what it has been doing, no matter how useless or discredited.

The President, as it happens is on fairly sound ground in contending that many of the programs, especially those created in the '60s, failed in practice. Some, however, did not, and there probably are others that could be rescued with a little patience.

This isn't what the Democrats are saying, though. They apparently are unwilling to concede that any of the programs have been demonstrably unsuccessful, and then suggest an alternative approach.

In any event, political roles have been reversed. Democrats have become defenders of the status quo, whether it deserves defending or not. Republicans, thanks to Nixon, have become the innovators.

There has been no inclination on the part of Democrats to suggest that federal spending should be higher than the \$268.7 billion proposed by the President, or even to argue that the projected \$12.7 billion deficit is not about the right size.

National Democrats content themselves with insisting merely that the federal government keep on doing anything and everything it has been doing since Franklin Roosevelt came to office in 1933.

Democratic leaders at the state and local level are concerned for the most part only with whether their constituencies are getting an appropriate share of the federal pie.

All of this adds up to a position of sorts, but it hardly represents a policy, a clear alternative to the Nixon proposals.

There has been no effort, as an example, to question whether Nixon's revenue sharing approach will work in the fashion that he contends, and, for that matter, whether it is a particularly good idea anyway.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

There has been no serious Democratic effort to suggest that a modest rise in the income tax would be an appropriate response to the harsh arithmetic of a federal budget that must pay heed to strong inflationary pressures at a time of rising economic activity.

The Congress has shown no inclination to draw up its own order of spending priorities to meet that of the President.

The Great Spending Debate thus is no debate at all. We are never going to know whether Nixon's answers are the right ones, largely because the Democrats don't have any counter-program, except of course, to keep on doing everything we have been doing for 40 years.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE?

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my March 26, 1973, Washington Report entitled "What's Wrong With the U.S. Postal Service?"

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE?

Even the President has complaints about the mail service. Recently he sent a special congratulatory message by mail to a 175th anniversary celebration in East Windsor, New Jersey, and it arrived six days after the celebration.

Any Congressman can tell you that a brief stroll down Main Street in any town in his District will bring a few complaints on the postal service, like these:

Too much mail takes too long to reach its destination.

Some mail never gets delivered—it just disappears."

Mail pick-ups are being cut.

Too many packages are damaged or ruined when they reach their destination.

Mail delivery is erratic and undependable.

It is not easy to determine just what the reasons are for the deteriorating service. Some experts point to these factors:

More mail with fewer postal employees to handle it. A freeze was put on hiring, reducing the work force by 40,000 in the last year.

Morale among postal employees is at an all-time low. Understaffing and unrealistic work loads have caused much friction, and labor-management relations are jagged.

Experienced postal managers and postmasters have been lured into retirement by bonuses, and the new postal executives, accustomed to private business, have not managed the postal system well.

Transportation problems abound. Railroads no longer carry much mail, and air transport has low priority.

At the heart of the problem is the question whether delivering mail in this country is a business or a service, and the relationship between costs and service. In recent months the U.S. Postal Service has viewed it as a business, sharply reducing costs in response to the Congressional mandate for the Postal Service to pay its own way in time. But, as costs are reduced, service deteriorates, the public becomes dissatisfied, and the pressure builds for better service. The Postmaster General has recently said the Postal Service may have "lost track of service in its quest for reducing costs."

I believe the key to improved service is to view the Postal Service not as a business, but

a service to be conducted in a businesslike fashion.

The more familiar one becomes with the size and complexity of the postal system, the less strident his criticisms are apt to be. The Postal Service is the largest enterprise in America, with 680,000 employees, 41,500 places of business, and handling 90 billion pieces of mail a year. Delivering mail efficiently at a reasonable cost to every home in America is a staggering task. In the "good old days," the mail service enjoyed, in the words of the Washington Post, "cheap labor, a widespread system of passenger trains, and an uncritical political climate that tolerated deficits in the name of public service and national unity." The postal system's problems stem from the absence of these factors.

Some improvements are being made. The deficit has been reduced from \$204 million in Fiscal Year 1971, to \$175 million in FY 1972; revenues were up by 18.3 percent, a postal rate increase was cancelled, and employee productivity climbed. The Postal Service has begun a \$400 million effort to modernize and rebuild its physical plant (28 new processing plants in 1972-1973), to install automated mail-handling equipment, and to make efforts to speed mail delivery (average time for delivery decreased from 1.7 to 1.6 days between 1971 and 1972), and to protect parcels from damage. But for every report of progress there is a refutation, and the complaints continue.

The Congress must keep a sharp eye on the quality of mail service and exert pressure on the postal managers to achieve excellent service. Every avenue of improved service must be explored, including better labor-management relations, high speed mail processing equipment, modernization of facilities, a top-flight management team, improved transportation, and good working conditions for postal employees.

Better service will not come easily, but it must come, because it is vital to the unity and the prosperity of the country.

FIFTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 55th anniversary of Byelorussian independence. Accordingly, I rise to pay my respects and to express my admiration to the brave people of Byelorussia on this solemn occasion.

I say solemn for March 25 is not celebrated in Byelorussia. Soon after independence was declared the Soviet Union invaded and forcibly incorporated Byelorussia into the Soviet Union. No rhetoric, no rationalization, no alteration of history can excuse this brutal and savage show of force.

Today, the people of Byelorussia still long for the freedom which they lost 55 years ago. Despite the persistent efforts of the Russian Government to destroy the language and the culture of the Byelorussians, they have maintained their national and ethnic identity. No less than the captive peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, their determination to regain their freedom remains firm and strong.

Byelorussia has throughout her long history endured more than her fair share

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

of misery. Yet, on that day in March more than 55 years ago, centuries of perseverance against a succession of foreign rulers culminated in the victory of Byelorussian independence.

Measured in terms of history, the years of Soviet oppression that have followed are short indeed. Surely, they are much too short to extinguish the universal desire of all nations including Byelorussia to control their own destiny.

That is why I am confident that someday Byelorussia, like the other captive nations of Eastern Europe, will eventually throw off the chains of Soviet domination and join the community of free nations. At that time, March 25 will once more become a momentous and festive day to be celebrated not only by Byelorussians but by men of good will throughout the world.

RETIREMENT OF THE GREAT PATRICK CARDINAL O'BOYLE

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on March 2 of this year the country in general, and the District of Columbia in particular, lost an invaluable church and civic leader when Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle stepped down as the archbishop of Washington after a quarter of a century of service. His loss will be felt deeply by those who knew him and by those lives he touched. I am sure all the members of this august body will join with me in wishing Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle peace, happiness and Godspeed in his retirement.

Under unanimous permission heretofore granted me I include at this point in the RECORD an article on Cardinal O'Boyle which appeared in the Washington Star-News shortly after his retirement:

O'BOYLE RECALLS HIS TRIALS

Young Patrick Louis O'Boyle had been warned that when he was ready to take exams to determine his eligibility for entering a Catholic seminary he should do everything in his power to avoid getting Msgr. Connell McHugh as his examiner.

McHugh, although Irish himself, was a decided anglophile. Things could be rough for an Irish lad from Scranton, Pa.

Well, it was the luck of the Irish for Patrick. First of all, the day chosen for his exam was the 4th of July. But, worst of all, who was the only examiner around that scorching day in Brooklyn? None other than the awesome McHugh.

O'Boyle related the story with a twinkle in his eyes yesterday as he reminisced over the career that led him to become the first and only archbishop of the Archdiocese of Washington.

Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle, 76, received word Friday that Pope Paul VI had accepted the resignation he had tendered 18 months earlier, "for reason of age."

The cardinal said that when he entered the room or the examination, the all-business McHugh shoved a Greek New Testament into his hands and demanded, "Read."

"I hadn't read two lines when he yelled to me, 'Stop!' I thought I had had it."

"Who taught you your Greek?" McHugh asked. Young Patrick replied that he had learned it while studying at St. Thomas College in the coal-mining city of Scranton.

"Are you sure your teacher didn't study at Oxford?" McHugh asked. It nonplused the lad. Why, he asked, was there concern?

"Well," McHugh responded, "it seems strange that a young man who was trained in St. Thomas College in Scranton should have an Oxford accent in Greek."

The Oxford accent did it. There is no surer way to the heart of an anglophile than to exhibit an Oxford accent. Young Patrick was on his way to seminary.

O'Boyle's career in Washington has not been without its share of continuing tests. In some of them he may not have fared as well as he did that day before McHugh. But his accomplishments far outweigh the criticism that has been leveled at him.

CONSERVATIVE IMAGE

The cardinal has been pictured as one of the more conservative American bishops, primarily because of his staunch stands on birth control, abortion and church discipline.

Yet, in the area of race relations, for instance, he desegregated the churches and schools he had inherited when he became archbishop 25 years ago.

Aside from the general spiritual tone of the archdiocese, with its 400,000 Catholics in the District, its Maryland suburbs and five Southern Maryland counties, O'Boyle takes considerable pride in the desegregation and race relations efforts.

When he came to Washington as archbishop in January 1948, segregationist policies were being practiced even at St. Matthew's Cathedral, which became the seat of the new archdiocese. And there was strong segregationist feeling in Southern Maryland. Without hesitation, O'Boyle ordered that segregation cease throughout the archdiocese.

60,000 BLACKS

There now are 60,000 blacks who are Catholics in the archdiocese, giving it the fourth largest black Catholic population of the nearly 290 American dioceses.

The archbishop said that of about 1,800 converts in the archdiocese annually, more than 1,000 of them are blacks. The percentage of blacks converting here is second among the U.S. dioceses, he said.

O'Boyle also was an early champion of open housing. One of his major accomplishments was establishment of the Urban Rehabilitation Corp., a nonprofit organization which reclaimed scores of houses for purchase by low-income families.

The archdiocese has been keeping pace with the growth of the metropolitan area, increasing from the 165,000 members when it was carved out of the Archdiocese of Baltimore, to its present level of 400,000. Then it had 74 parishes; O'Boyle has established 47 new ones.

He said there have been 317 buildings erected in the archdiocese since he took over—"all for a spiritual purpose."

"There is no use to put up a building . . . if it is not for a spiritual purpose," he said.

SCHOOLS CITED

There is other evidence of progressive attitudes. "I don't want to toot the horn," O'Boyle said, "but we've closed fewer schools than any other diocese in the country. We are keeping schools open that are a tremendous financial burden to us." Many of them, he said, contain a large number of children from poor families.

The cardinal, who was elevated to the rank in May 1967, also eliminated two orphans' homes when he came to the archdiocese and replaced them with 18 group homes, considered much more effective in meeting children's needs.

O'Boyle's fore, long before coming to Washington, was raising money to aid charitable

March 26, 1973

causes. When he came here the annual "Orphans' Collection" was netting \$39,000. He has burgeoned the annual fund drive into something which now nets more than \$800,000 annually for charity.

RAISED \$100 MILLION

When World War II ended, just a few years before O'Boyle came to Washington, he became executive director of War Relief Services. Before he came to Washington he had raised about \$100 million in private funds and distributed help to the needy in 48 countries.

Auxiliary Bishop John S. Spence said, "I think it true to say that no worldwide figure helped more nations to recover their independence and more people within those nations to recover their respectability than did the director of War Relief Services."

O'Boyle's sense of helping the poor is reflected in the archdiocese by the fact in the parishes 85 St. Vincent de Paul conferences have been set up "to give instant help to the needy." The Ladies of Charity, he said, also have been strengthened considerably to assist the needy.

It was O'Boyle who inaugurated the drive to raise \$12 million to erect the imposing Shrine of the Immaculate Conception adjacent to Catholic University. This he considers to be one of the landmarks of his career.

STERN HE IS NOT

Notwithstanding the accomplishments—and there are considerably more significant ones—the impression many people have gotten of O'Boyle is that he is conservative and a somewhat austere stern person.

Theologically conservative he might well be—judging by post Vatican II standards. But he is not austere or stern, at least not on the personal level.

It has been his stand on the birth control-abortion issue and his position of holding the hard-line authoritarian Catholic views that have created the image. In pre-Vatican II days his views would have been considered the normal Catholic way of looking at things. They still are the official way.

When "Humanae Vitae," the birth control encyclical, was handed down in 1968, controversy erupted. O'Boyle stuck to what he believed the Pope to be saying, namely that birth control by artificial means was not to be permitted Catholics.

When several of his priests joined the ranks of numerous liberal Catholic theologians and scholars at Catholic University and other institutions, he disciplined them on the ground that they were inveighing against Catholic doctrine which had not changed, despite popular demand that it should.

O'Boyle maintained that in good conscience to the task he had as a prince of the Church he could hold no other view and he could take no lesser action.

OUTSPOKEN ON ABORTION

The cardinal has been the most outspoken of the bishops on abortion. And his position is aggravated by the fact that some of American catholicism's most liberal scholars teach in his archdiocese—at CU and Georgetown University. Conflicts of the same magnitude ordinarily do not erupt in less pivotal dioceses.

O'Boyle last year celebrated the 50th anniversary of his ordination into the priesthood. He said it was the example of some sisters in his Pennsylvania hometown and of a priest that made him want to enter the ministry.

When O'Boyle was 10 his father, a coal miner, died and he and the other children had to help keep the family together. He worked as a \$3-a-week messenger for Dun & Bradstreet. He also delivered morning and evening paper.

When he became archbishop he adopted the Latin motto "State in Fides"—stand fast in the faith. This, he said, was but a spirit-

ual extension of a cardinal rule he adopted early in his life: "When you've got a job to do, do it."

HE LOOKS AHEAD

So what is O'Boyle going to do now since he no longer is archbishop of Washington but officially the apostolic administrator until the Vatican names his successor?

"Well," he said, "I certainly don't want to be idle. But that's up to my successor. I propose to remain in Washington. The new ordinary is the one who will be in charge. It is simply my office to help him in every way possible. It is my obligation and duty, but I do it even beyond that . . . for the good of the Church."

Might a black become his successor? There is a strong move by blacks and others for this to happen.

"Whoever the Vatican wants to send to succeed me, if he's black or whatever, is fine with me," O'Boyle said.

Has he been disappointed in his tenure as archbishop?

"There have been difficulties, sure, but I can go to bed at night and say I tried my hardest."

"Or I like the way President Truman put it—but you can't quote that one—I did my damnedest."

VOLUNTARY ARMY PLANS MEAN HUGE DEFENSE INCREASES WITH LESS MANPOWER

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Joseph A. Califano, Jr., formerly special counsel and assistant to President Johnson, has written a most illuminating article in the Washington Post concerning the administration's proposed budget for the Department of Defense for fiscal 1974.

Mr. Califano points out that increased pay recommended to assure a viable volunteer military force is a major factor in the proposed increase of \$5.4 billion in the Department of Defense budget over fiscal 1973. The defense budget goes on from \$76.4 billion to \$81.8 billion while Armed Forces strength from 1968 declines from 3,547,000—3½ million—to 2,233,000—2.2 million.

This analysis of the defense budget points out further that compared to the 1968 defense budget, the 1974 budget request will cost more than 30 percent more although the services will contain 1,314,000 fewer personnel.

Because of the concern of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter, I place the article by Mr. Califano in the RECORD herewith.

The article follows:

A COSTLY ARMY OF VOLUNTEERS
(By Joseph A. Califano Jr.)

Lost in constitutional rhetoric and political bickering between the Hill and the White House may be the hope of any serious debate about some of the real choices that have quietly been made in the fiscal 1974 budget. Foremost among these is the decision to achieve an all-volunteer force through pay rates high enough to attract sufficient manpower.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

An all-volunteer military is a very expensive proposition, since raising pay at the bottom requires increase in higher ranks and in retired pay as well. As in the case of so many weapons system, the Pentagon has already confronted a cost overrun.

Three years ago the President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Force, chaired by former Defense Secretary Thomas Gates, estimated that an all-volunteer force of 2 million men would cost the nation \$1.5 billion per year more than it was then paying; 2.5 million men would cost \$2.1 billion more.

The fiscal 1974 Nixon budget carefully avoids telling us precisely what the taxpayer will have to put out for the all-volunteer force; it nevertheless contains some interesting figures. The defense budget shows an increase of \$5.4 billion over fiscal 1973—from \$76.4 billion to \$81.8 billion. This increase, the budget message tells us, is "primarily as the result of an additional \$4.1 billion required to maintain military and civilian pay levels comparable to those in the private sector, to raise pay and benefit levels sufficient to achieve an all-volunteer force, to meet normal price increases, and to pay for higher military retirement annuities." The detailed manpower cost explanations are more revealing:

The proportion of the defense budget devoted to manpower costs in all-volunteer force fiscal 1974 will be 56 per cent; in fiscal 1968, the proportion for the combined draft and volunteer force was 42 per cent.

In 1968 manpower costs were \$32.6 billion; in 1974 they will be \$43.9 billion.

In 1968 the end strength of the armed forces was 3,547,000 men and women; in 1974 it will be 2,233,000.

Thus we will pay an additional \$12.3 billion for a military manpower force reduced by 1,314,000 men and women. Put another way, an all-volunteer force 37 per cent smaller than a combined volunteer and draft force will cost over 30 per cent more. True, some of the \$12.3 billion will go to higher retirement pay in line with new pay levels needed to attract the volunteers.

Thus even with a generous allotment for inflation, the nation will be spending some \$6 billion more in fiscal 1974 for only two-thirds of the number of soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen that it had on active duty in 1968.

By design and incentive an all-volunteer army is structured to bring into the armed forces the poor and near poor and to free of even the danger of military service the middle- and upper-middle-class young. The draft never achieved perfect egalitarianism in distributing the burdens of military service, but at least it made the attempt. The all-volunteer concept—and the investment of billions to make it a reality—is consistent with the overall thrust of the administration's budget for fiscal 1974: a budget designed to appeal to the more affluent majority.

It is appalling that so many antiwar congressmen have climbed and stayed on the volunteer army bandwagon. Many have done so because of their revulsion at the Vietnam war and because they can rationalize the concept as providing that only those who "volunteer" will have to go to war.

This is a gross misreading of one of the central historical lessons of the war in Southeast Asia. What turned this nation around on Vietnam was not demonstrations in the street nor the demagogic rhetoric of Delliinger, Hayden and Spock. It was, in quite readable political terms to the Presidents who agonized over Vietnam, the realization that the vast middle class of America would not permit their sons to die in a war which they considered meaningless.

MARY CLARK RETIRES AS WELLESLEY TOWN CLERK

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Wellesley, Mass., has been extremely fortunate for the past 20 years to have had as its town clerk, Mrs. Mary C. Clark. Mrs. Clark retired from her office this month, and she will be sorely missed. Mary is a long-time friend of mine and well known to thousands of Wellesley residents. She is warm, understanding and thoughtful, and during her two decades as town clerk, she demonstrated an unqualified loyalty to the town. Her competence and integrity have been a constant source of pride to all the people of Wellesley.

Mary has seen great changes in the last 20 years—particularly in election laws. In an article by Nona Dearth in the Quincy Patriot Ledger of January 20, 1973, Mary Clark says:

The changes have created a greater workload but it's worth it—They lead to a fairer and more closely knit government.

We are greatly in need of dedicated public officials, and Mary Clark's career should serve as a model to those of us wishing to perfect the democratic process at all levels of Government. Mary has helped bring Government closer to the people. She will continue to live in Wellesley with her husband Kenneth now that she has retired, and we will all keep in touch with her.

Reprinted below is the Patriot Ledger article:

PROFILE: WELLESLEY'S MARY C. CLARK—20 YEARS AS TOWN CLERK
(By Nona Dearth)

WELLESLEY.—Probably the most respected person in the public eye in Wellesley is Town Clerk Mrs. Mary C. Clark. Her words carry weight, her opinions receive close attention.

A quiet spoken, reserved woman who prefers to remain inconspicuous, she has achieved her position of rare respect through her dedication to the town and her office.

When she retires a week after the election in March, she will have served Wellesley in the town clerk's office for 26 years—six years as assistant to the town clerk and the last 20 years as town clerk. It is obvious that she will miss the town hall at least as much as the town hall will miss her.

TIME TO CATCH UP

"But it is time I get caught up with my family and friends," she says.

Though she has watched the growth of the town since she was a little girl, she still finds it essentially the same friendly, lovely, intellectually stimulating community that it was when she was growing up.

She speaks fondly of the college atmosphere, the shopping facilities, the still gracious residential aspects of the town.

Born in South Natick, her family moved to Wellesley when she was just a few months old. She attended the Wellesley schools and went on for further studies in the liberal arts at the Boston Evening School.

Her devotion to the liberal arts is still a central interest in her life. Art and antiques are her consuming hobbies. She is an expert on the history of art.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"I enjoy the French painters of the 19th century, and I am especially interested in colonial American antiques," she says.

GOVERNMENT FIRST

But, obviously, her major interest for many years has been town government.

When she was still a young girl, she would attend town meetings with her father, James P. Keating, one of Wellesley's early businessmen who started his interior decorating and upholstering firm in 1899.

There were open town meetings then, upstairs in the town hall. The concern of residents, the give and take of discussion and the intricacies of town government held a fascination for the young Mary Keating that has not diminished.

When she decided to go to work, it was natural that she should gravitate to the town hall. She served as an assistant to Town Clerk John T. Ryan for six years, and when he died, she was appointed to fill the vacancy. She ran for the office the following March, won the election and has been re-elected for the past 20 years.

ELECTION LAWS CHANGED

She notes that the greatest change while she has held office has been in the election laws, changes she actively worked for. It pleases her that new residents in the state can now vote without a lengthy resident requirement. And she is especially pleased about the increase in absentee voting.

"The changes have created a greater workload but it's worth it," she comments. "They lead to a fairer and more closely knit government."

An active member of the International Institute of Municipal Clerks for 18 years, she has served on its advisory board and on its membership committee. She has also been secretary of the Massachusetts Town Clerks Association and served on the association's legislative committee.

SPACE NEEDED

For the past two years she has been putting the town's registered voters list on IBM equipment, a task that will be completed by the end of this year.

"That will be a real time-saver, helping to lighten the workload," Mrs. Clark remarks.

Asked if there are any changes she would like to see in her office, the answer is immediate.

"We need more space."

Twenty years ago there were three people working in the office. Today there are five, plus a part time worker—as well as reams upon reams of town records.

And what changes of significance would she like to see in the town government?

"That is a hard one to answer," she says, and pauses reflectively. "I feel Wellesley is well governed. There are very good people serving on town boards and committees. We are very fortunate."

However, she comments, with feeling, what she would not like to see—the town go to a town manager form of government.

"TOO MUCH POWER"

"It is too much power to give a man who is not elected," she states firmly.

Though she describes her job as "full time plus," Mrs. Clark makes it clear that she has not been chained to her desk.

"I have raised a son," she says with a twinkle, "and I am a past president of the Quota Club, for professional and business women, and years ago I was president of the St. Paul's Book Club."

Her son, Ralph Ditano, lives in Washington, D.C. where he works for the National Air Carriers Association. She remarried four years ago, becoming the wife of Kenneth F. Clark, a plant superintendent.

Even though she has enjoyed her years in office, Mrs. Clark is looking forward to more

relaxed years. There will be more time to devote to art and antiquing. There will be time for travel. She has traveled extensively in the United States and has made five trips to Mexico but there are always new places to see.

ENJOYING THE TOWN

And there will be the real pleasure of just enjoying the town she loves—seeing her friends more often, shopping leisurely in the stores she has frequented all her life.

"I do all my shopping in Wellesley," she admits. "It is so friendly and personal. I have known the managers for years, and everything is available."

It is all part of the special aura that is Wellesley. Mrs. Clark believes there are three reasons in particular that have made it possible for Wellesley to maintain its aura even though the population has grown considerably, from 20,876 in 1950 to more than 28,000 today.

"Wellesley has always enforced its very strict zoning laws, it is an educational and residential center and many residents are affluent. That combination produces the special quality of Wellesley," she says.

It is an atmosphere in which one can go willingly into retirement. Mary Clark is looking forward to it.

WELFARE SCANDAL II

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, every day the Congress delays in enacting welfare reform legislation is another day marked by fraud, waste, and mismanagement of a totally ineffective system of public welfare. A series of articles by two investigative reporters of the Milwaukee Sentinel exposes the waste of an estimated 20 percent of the funds allocated for public welfare in Milwaukee County. Our system is unfair to the honest and needy recipients. It is unfair to the hard-pressed taxpayer. The only gainers in this system are the welfare cheats and the gold-bricking caseworkers who are exploiting a rotten system.

I call the Members' attention to this second installment by Stuart Wilk, one of the two reporters, in which he describes his application for welfare using an assumed name and identification. Within a 20-day period of his application, Mr. Wilk had fraudulently obtained \$145.20 from the Milwaukee County Welfare Department. All of the vouchers, checks, and other benefits Mr. Wilk received were returned upon publication of the exposé.

The article follows:

YOU CAN WALK RIGHT IN

(By Stuart Wilk)

It's true that you can simply walk in off the street and get on welfare in Milwaukee County.

I did it.

Within a 20 day period, the Milwaukee County Welfare Department gave me a series of vouchers, checks and bus tickets worth \$145.20.

All vouchers, checks and bus tickets issued to the reporter are being returned by The Milwaukee Sentinel to the Milwaukee County

March 26, 1973

Welfare Department. This project cost the county nothing.]

All it took was patience. The wheels of the county's largest agency turn slowly as they convey clients from section to section and from case aide to case aide.

But basically getting on welfare is as easy as filling out a form and waiting for it to be processed.

Virtually everything on the form that I filled out was untrue. If the department had attempted to verify the "facts" on the application, it would have discovered that I had submitted a false application and was ineligible for general relief.

My experience with the department confirms what many people have believed for years.

Some persons receiving welfare assistance in Milwaukee County are ineligible.

The way the department claims it operates and the way it actually operates are two different things.

Going through the department's intake process can be agonizing and frustrating.

The first step for a single male to get on welfare is to visit the Wisconsin State Employment Service so the department is satisfied that the applicant has made an effort to find a job.

The "effort" turned out to be minimal, merely filling out a form and going through a perfunctory interview with an employment counselor.

My interview took place the afternoon of Jan. 15.

I used a borrowed Social Security card for identification at the employment service and registered under the name on the card.

I later used the Social Security card as my sole identification at the welfare department.

The card states: "For Social Security and tax purposes—not for identification."

Several days earlier I had rented a sleeping room at a rooming house at 1435 W. Kilbourn Ave. I used the Kilbourn Ave. address as my home address.

I never lived at the rooming house, although I showed up several times a week to chat with the landlord.

After going to the employment service, I went to the welfare department to get an application for general relief. I was given a declaration form and was told to return with the completed form before 8 a.m. the next day.

AREA CROWDED

I went back on Jan. 16. I stood in line to drop off my application and was then told to wait for my name to be called.

The waiting area was overflowing with applicants and other persons in various stages of the intake process. There were about 300 of us in all.

The lucky ones found seats. Others—some with infants in their arms—stood, sat on the floor or leaned against walls in various hallways.

Potential clients are given no indication how long they will wait before a case aide sees them. It is usually an eight hour process and applicants often have to come back two or three times.

Most applicants are afraid to go out to eat lunch or even to the rest room for fear that they will miss their call.

CARD SHOWN

The first case aide I saw read through my application and asked for "any kind of identification." She said it didn't matter what kind.

I showed her the borrowed Social Security card.

[This procedure did not jibe with what The Sentinel was later told by Frank Pokorny, financial assistance supervisor and head of the intake division.

[From everyone who walks in I have to have a driver's license and Social Security

card. We require identification" for all categories of aid, Pokorny said.

[He added that "anybody coming in the front door better be who they (say they) are."]

After the interview, the aide said my name would be called again later in the day.

It was called again—10 minutes before the department closed at 4:30 p.m.

I was told by a different case aide that my file had not arrived from Record Control but that I could get a voucher for a meal. The voucher—for \$2.17—was redeemable at various Milwaukee County restaurants.

I was told to return at 9 a.m. the next day. I went back on Jan. 17 and waited for my name to be called. It wasn't.

After an hour and a half I walked into the case aide's office.

She was involved in paper work.

"I haven't left my desk yet," she said, adding that my file still had not come back from Record Control.

I asked how often records were delayed.

"Oh, it happens from time to time," said the aide.

I asked if it was possible that the record was sent to the wrong worker.

"Oh, I suppose it's possible," she said. "It's not supposed to happen but it happens. A lot of things happen around here that aren't supposed to happen."

STILL WAITING

At 1 p.m. I was still waiting.

The case aide said I could "take my chances" and continue to wait or that I could return the next day.

I said I'd come back later in the afternoon and asked for a voucher for a razor and soap. She issued a voucher for \$1.95 for personal use.

Then she returned to her paper work.

I went back later that day, directly to the case aide's office. She said the file had arrived from Record Control, but that, since I had registered as a nonresident, I had been transferred to another case aide.

[A nonresident is one who has not lived continuously in the state of Wisconsin for a year. If one has lived here for a year but was on welfare during that time—or the state was in some other way supporting him—he would still be considered a nonresident.]

AFFIDAVIT SOUGHT

I was told to wait and that my name would be called by the other case aide.

Later in the afternoon, the other aide called me and said I should come back on Jan. 19 to fill out an affidavit listing my addresses since 1968 and my last two employers.

She asked the name of my landlord so that arrangements could be made for the department to pay my rent. I was given a voucher for \$17.36 for eight days of meals and a slip for four bus tickets, which can be used for adult fares on Transport Co. buses.

When I returned on Jan. 19 I supplied the needed information for the affidavit and signed it.

Except for the Kilbourn Ave. address, none of the information I gave the department was true.

I made up past employers, former addresses, the names of schools.

INFORMATION RECEIVED

I was told by the case aide that my first grant would arrive at my home on Jan. 25. I asked for a clothing allowance and was told to come back on Feb. 1 to get a clothing voucher.

I was given a slip for four more bus tickets and also was given a photo ID card.

At this point I was officially on the Milwaukee County welfare rolls.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

[According to Pokorny, however, all general relief applicants must see a counselor on the county's Work Experience and Training Program before receiving a welfare grant.

[I don't give them a sou—not one penny" until they do, Pokorny said.

[In most general relief cases, Pokorny said, a single male will be working within one or two days.

[Asked if this was in theory more than in practice, he responded, "Hell, no! It's in operation!"]

AIDE ARRIVED

I went to my rented room at 8 a.m. Jan. 25 to wait for the case aide to deliver my welfare grant.

Early in the afternoon, a case aide arrived—the fourth I had seen.

He asked my name and handed me two vouchers.

One was for food, to last from Jan. 23 until Feb. 20, made out for \$56.42.

The other voucher was made out for \$5 for personal use.

The aide asked me to sign a form for the request for clothing—socks, underwear and shirts. I signed the form and he left, less than a minute after his arrival.

On Feb. 1, I went back to the department for my clothing voucher. After I had waited several hours, my name was called by still another case aide, the fifth I had seen.

There had been some sort of "mixup," she told me, and it would be too late that day for the business office to prepare a clothing voucher.

She gave me a slip for four bus tickets and told me to return the next day.

When I went back Feb. 2, the clothing voucher was ready, made out for \$12.30, redeemable only at Marcus Discount Store, 1730 W. North Ave.

"You have to go to Marcus Discount," the case aide said.

[But, according to Pokorny, "the worker doesn't specify the name of the store. . . . Usually it (the voucher) is undesignated."]

[Sometimes the client will tell the worker that "he usually shops at a certain store so the voucher is made out to that store," Pokorny continued.

[Or, he said, the worker may "suggest" three or four stores if the client does not know where to shop.]

The case aide then gave me a slip for four more bus tickets and I left the department.

Later that day I checked with my landlord to see if he had received a rent check.

He had received a \$42 check and had not cashed it. I bought the check back from him, explaining that I had found a job and would return the check to the department.

[The \$42 was another apparent error on the part of the welfare department.

[According to Pokorny, the maximum rent allowance for a single male living in a sleeping room is \$7 a week or \$28 a month.

I "That's absolute tops," said Pokorny, except in cases with "extenuating circumstances." In those cases, the additional rent would be cleared with Pokorny.

[But the case aide said the rent allowance would be \$9 a week or 4.3 times \$9 for a month.

[Even if that formula were correct, the proper amount of the check would have been \$38.70 and not \$42.]

For all I know, I'm still on welfare.

As of Feb. 2, I had received:

A \$42 rent check.

\$75.95 in meal vouchers.

\$12.30 for a clothing voucher.

\$6.95 in vouchers for personal use.

\$8 worth of bus tickets.

Pokorny told The Sentinel:

"No one gets a penny unless he's eligible."

HOUSING MORATORIUM: REHABILITATION

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, one of the housing programs affected by the administration's illegal and unconstitutional moratorium on Federal housing assistance in rehabilitation.

A picture of what this means in my home city of New York appeared in yesterday's New York Times, and I would like to share it with each of my colleagues.

This is what the Nixon program means down at the grassroots. We are not dealing here with abstract figures, but with attempts to provide decent homes for working people and their families.

The article follows:

U.S. FREEZE CURBS REHABILITATION PLAN

(By Robert E. Tomasson)

The efforts of some banks in the city to salvage their mortgages on financially troubled apartment buildings through rehabilitation and resale have been undercut by the Federal moratorium on housing subsidies.

More than two months after the Nixon Administration announced the subsidy moratorium, bank officials say they see no other alternative at present to the abandonment of several rehabilitation projects in the Bronx, upper Manhattan and Brooklyn.

"What you will see now is just more abandoned buildings, more foreclosures and vandalism in many of these neighborhoods," said George A. Mooney, president of the Washington Heights Federal Savings and Loan Association.

However, John B. Maylott, the area director for the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, indicated that some of the buildings slated for rehabilitation may be granted special exceptions from the subsidy moratorium.

The subsidy program has provided the banks with an opportunity to recover millions of dollars on foreclosed mortgages and it has engendered extensive modernization projects. In the longer range, it has worked to stabilize some neighborhoods, a trend that helped protect mortgages on other buildings that seemed headed toward abandonment by their owners.

The experience of the Washington Heights institution illustrates what has been done. Starting some three years ago, the association acquired 28 apartment buildings in the Mott Haven section of the South Bronx—four of them through foreclosures and 10 when the owners simply turned back the mortgages after giving up on payments.

The remaining 14 buildings, several of them adjacent to the original properties, were purchased from private owners who were apparently on the verge of abandonment or from banks that had foreclosed on the structures.

The buildings, which contain about 1,000 apartments, are around St. Mary's Park, near the Bruckner Expressway and the approach to the Triborough Bridge. While all were classified as structurally sound, the five-story and six-story walk-ups were gradually sinking into disrepair, tenant abandonment and vandalism. Demolition of physically sound housing is often the end result of this process.

The mortgages on the four foreclosed and 10 abandoned buildings totaled about \$1.5 million, a sum that the bank apparently had little prospect of recovering. The 14 other structures were purchased outright for a total of \$700,000.

Today, the 28 buildings, known as the José de Diego-Beekman project, have been transformed into sparkling new apartment houses in which monthly rents average less than \$38 a room.

Many of the entranceways into the original structures have been bricked over and common lobbies have been created for clusters of four or six buildings. The plumbing, wiring and heating systems have been replaced. Elevators and trash compacters have been installed.

Diego-Beekman, which opened almost two years ago, is the largest renovation carried out under Project Rehab, a program begun less than three years ago by HUD to help upgrade poor areas in 10 cities.

During its brief life, Project Rehab has completed, begun or committed funds for the rehabilitation of 75 buildings containing almost 2,000 apartments. Seven other Bronx buildings containing 148 units are still being considered for funding and may be approved for the program, according to HUD officials.

But for 63 Bronx buildings with 1,852 units, three buildings in Brooklyn with 107 units and 28 in Manhattan with 711 apartments, the subsidy moratorium apparently marks the end of hope for rehabilitation. Without Federal subsidies, rents in the renovated buildings would be too high to make renting possible.

Renting was possible in the Mott Haven project only after a complex series of financial arrangements had been completed. When it has assembled the 28 buildings, Washington Heights Savings and Loan sold them to the Continental Wingate Company, Inc., of Boston for \$2.3-million, enough to cover its \$1.5-million mortgages and the \$700,000 it spent buying the 14 buildings on which it had not held mortgages.

"We simply don't have the people to process a complex deal like this," said Richard H. Grant, a senior vice president of the association.

Continental Wingate, a private development company that specializes in the rehabilitation of urban housing, was formed in 1966 by A Carleton Dukes, a lawyer with extensive real estate experience. The company has been active in Boston, Detroit, St. Louis and Buffalo under a variety of Federal subsidy programs. The Federal moratorium has come as a blow to Continental Wingate.

"Instead of gut rehabilitation, we will now have to look more at other programs, such as the Mitchell-Lama programs, and plans for moderate rehabilitation," Mr. Dukess said.

In Mott Haven, the largest rehabilitation project in the country, Continental Wingate had to coordinate the efforts of private lenders and city and Federal agencies.

It applied for and received a total abatement of city real-estate taxes for 40 years. The abatement will have little financial impact for the city because the original properties had produced only minimal taxes.

Continental Wingate then recruited 30 private investors—individuals and companies—who pledged some \$5-million. The investment provided them with accelerated depreciation, a "tax shelter," which is important to those in high tax brackets.

The city tax abatement and the participation of private investors were dependent upon the guarantee of the new mortgages by the Federal Housing Administration and upon approval for Project Rehab aid.

The Project Rehab subsidies, which total about \$1-million a year for the Mott Haven buildings, reduce the effective interest rate from about 7 per cent to 1 per cent.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The new permanent mortgages for the buildings total \$25-million. The 40-year loans were provided by The Federal National Mortgage Association, the Government National Mortgage Association and a group of private investors.

While officials at Washington Heights Savings and Loan are hesitant about discussing profit and loss figures, Mr. Grant, the association vice president, said that the institution had suffered "a paper loss" of about \$500,000. It was, however, able to recover the \$1.5-million outstanding on the original mortgage.

The bank had been prepared to proceed with the rehabilitation of 14 other buildings containing about 600 units. The buildings, on East 141st Street between Cypress and St. Ann's Avenues, are about 60 per cent vacant.

"We assume this project is dead unless something happens," said Mr. Mooney, president of the bank.

Mr. Maylott, the HUD official who suggested the possibility of special exceptions to the subsidy moratorium, said:

"If any of these projects go ahead, it will be those connected with other Federal programs, such as Model Cities."

Both the completed Mott Haven project and the pending 600-unit program are in the Bronx Model Cities area, he noted.

North of the Mott Haven project—and outside the Model Cities area—nine buildings in the Morrisania section are being rehabilitated in a similar effort.

The structures, which were assembled by the Woodside Savings and Loan Association in Queens, are in the area bounded by 165th and 169th Streets and by the Grand Concourse and Webster Avenue.

Work on the nine buildings is nearly finished, but the Federal moratorium has thrown into doubt the next step of the program, in which 20 more structures would have been renovated.

"I just can't believe the subsidy program will stay frozen," said David Walentas, a partner in Two Trees, the development company on the Morrisania project. "If it does and nothing replaces it, it will mean there will be no more 'rehab's."

Alexander Frank, the president of Woodside Savings and Loan, said: "We are in some delicate talks with Federal officials and have not given up yet."

GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER DESIGNATES APRIL AS CANCER CONTROL MONTH

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, over 16 per cent of all deaths in the United States are caused by cancer. This dread disease now ranks second on the list of the Nation's greatest killers.

Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller of my State of New York has issued a proclamation making April 1973 Cancer Control Month. In his proclamation, the Governor points out New York State's long commitment to the conquest of cancer and the part that the American Cancer Society and the world-renowned Roswell Park Memorial Institute play in the war against cancer in New York State.

Although the institute is not in my district, many of my constituents owe a debt of everlasting gratitude to Roswell Park and its director, Dr. Gerald P. Murphy, for their outstanding programs

March 26, 1973

in cancer research, education, and service to cancer patients. Nobel prize winners, Drs. Carl and Gerty Cori did some of their early work on carbohydrate metabolism there.

It has been estimated that many thousands of persons needlessly die of cancer because they neglect the warning signs of this dread disease. Governor Rockefeller is to be commended both for his long commitment to finding a cure for cancer and for setting aside the month of April as Cancer Control Month. The Governor honors those involved in the battle against cancer and urges that every citizen learn the potentially life-saving cancer danger signs.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this time for the RECORD Governor Rockefeller's proclamation concerning Cancer Control Month:

PROCLAMATION

Cancer is one of mankind's most vicious scourges. It strikes, in its many forms, both young and old. Currently, it ranks as the second leading killer disease in New York State.

New York State has long been committed to an unrelenting campaign to vanquish this destroyer. One of the primary weapons employed by the state is its world-renowned Roswell Park Memorial Institute, the State Health Department cancer research and treatment center at Buffalo. The Institute and its staff of 2,000 dedicated professionals have been responsible for numerous scientific breakthroughs.

The Institute, employing the latest surgical and technological advances, provides treatment in its 313-bed hospital to more than 4,000 cancer sufferers and outpatient services to an estimated 75,000 people each year. Its director, Dr. Gerald P. Murphy, is a member of the National Cancer Board and chairman of the National Prostate Cancer Task Force.

The American Cancer Society is playing a significant part in the war against cancer in New York State. In addition to numerous educational programs aimed at alerting the public to cancer's seven warning signals, the Society provides invaluable rehabilitative services to cancer patients and the financial support so crucial to the work of researchers and clinicians.

This fine organization deserves the support of every New York State citizen.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the month of April, 1973, as

CANCER CONTROL MONTH

in New York State.

Given under my hand and the Privy Seal of the State at the Capitol in the City of Albany this seventh day of March in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and seventy-three.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
Governor.

KOREA GETS MUCH DESERVED CREDIT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, too often in the United States, public opinion tends to rush from headline to headline and the friendship of trustworthy allies is too often taken for granted.

Therefore, I am especially pleased to direct the attention of the Members to an editorial by the distinguished international correspondent of the Copley Press, Dumitru Danielopol, which appeared in the Aurora, Ill. Beacon-News of March 8, 1973, which I believe is a very factual commentary on the Republic of South Korea.

The article follows:

KOREA GETS MUCH DESERVED CREDIT

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—House Minority leader Gerald Ford of Michigan took time out the other day to pay a much deserved tribute to the Republican of South Korea.

Too often, it has been stylish—and disturbing—for Washington figures to minimize the sacrifices of allies, like South Vietnam, South Korea, Greece, Portugal, Spain etc. Listening to some, one would think they were enemies, not friends.

"I take this occasion, to pay tribute to the South Koreans, a gallant people who stuck by us to the very end in the Vietnam conflict," Ford said.

He reminded the House of the vital role they played throughout the war, keeping two divisions, 40,000 men in Vietnam.

"No nation could have had a more capable and willing ally," he said.

It was high time we gave credit to the Koreans. They fought side by side with the American GIs and the South Vietnamese since October 1965 in a war which was not their own and in a country which was as alien to them as to the Americans.

But the Koreans had one thing in common with their Vietnamese allies: they knew what communism was like. They had first hand experience when Communist armies overran most of their country early in the Korean War.

The Korean contribution in the Vietnam war involved a total of 310,000 men who took part in the fighting. At one time 50,000 Koreans were in action.

It was the first time in the history of Korea that its fighting men went to a foreign war. Their job was to pacify the heavily populated coastal plains. Between Nha Trang and Quang Ngai centering in Binh Dinh province—some 5 per cent of the South Vietnam land space.

Their performance, as might be expected, got no favorable press from Communist or leftist-liberal newsmen.

The Koreans were accused of "paying off" the United States for its military aid. That is so much nonsense. Their troops fought valiantly and bravely under tough circumstances. Some 3,700 were killed (about 10 per cent of the U.S. casualties) and another 8,300 were wounded in battle.

Another accusation brought against the South Korean troops was that they used terror against the South Vietnamese civilian population. The charges were never documented or substantiated, despite thorough investigation by joint American and South Vietnamese missions.

"The Viet Cong don't wear uniforms," one Korean veteran told this correspondent. "When they shoot at you and you shoot back, you are accused of shooting a civilian. That's the vicious nature of a guerrilla war."

During their stay in South Vietnam, the Koreans protected and helped some 4.5 million South Vietnamese. They built 1,755 homes, 357 classrooms, 245 miles of highway. They taught the art of self-defense—the Korean version of Karate—to nearly a quarter million South Vietnamese.

They supplied some \$71 million in Korean products.

"If there have been minor incidents, these must be expected in time of war," said a South Vietnamese official.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Even the critical, liberal Manchester Guardian of Britain concedes that "the Koreans are now going home to a hero's welcome."

"They were assigned some of the most difficult territory to control . . . they fought tenaciously and bravely . . ."

POLITICAL SOLUTIONS PRODUCE REVERSE ECONOMICS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as public attention is being mobilized into opposition to high food prices and energy shortages, many people are irrationally looking for political solutions, to economic questions.

Economists tell us that price is dependent upon supply and demand. If money is diverted through nonproduction into the marketplace, prices must rise. If production does not keep pace with supply, needs and demands, prices must rise. Supply and demand are further upset by well meaning "easy solutions" and government influences which threaten a natural condition.

Supply is dependent upon production. To gain more production people must work and capital must be attracted to increase output by the expectation of profit. The greater the incentive, the quicker production is increased and once supply meets demand prices level off or drop.

Another alternative is to reduce the demand by voluntary restraints and selective buying. But, the powers that exert the pressures of public opinion in our country seek not to solve the problem—not to encourage production, but to stagnate the short supply by imports and threats of price controls.

Reverse economics can only continue to turn our market prices upward and the accepted standards of living that we have achieved, upside down.

Again, we are watching the comforts and pleasures achieved by our free enterprise system being used as a political promise to destroy our system and change our country. There is nothing wrong with our system. The problem is that our system is not permitted to work by those who think a larger dose of socialism will improve on a little socialism.

I insert the related newscuttings, as follows:

[From the Evening Star and Daily News, March 23, 1973]

FARM PLANS DIM HOPE FOR MEAT PRICE CUTS

CHICAGO.—Midwestern cattle and hog raisers say they plan only modest expansions of their herds this spring, indicating that supplies of meat will be only slightly larger by fall and that retail meat prices will be little changed from today's record levels.

Their announced intentions contrast with Nixon administration promises of lower wholesale food prices in the second half of the year that might check the rising cost of supermarket beef and pork.

On the other hand Herbert Stein, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, said yesterday consumer boycotts appear to

be slowing down the rise in wholesale meat prices.

In a news conference reviewing economic developments so far this year, Stein said that part of the slowing down might be due to an increased number of cattle going to market. But he added that consumers may be making their mark too.

PASSING DOWN PRICES

"So the boycott or consumer resistance, which doesn't necessarily take the form of parades, seems to be having an effect," Stein said.

Meanwhile, the Cost of Living Council announced yesterday that it will require meat processors, both smaller firms as well as the 21 largest meat packers already supervised by the council, to pass on to retailers any decreases in livestock prices.

The council, noting that such a requirement had not been effectively enforced in the past, warned it was going to crack down.

In a related development, the United Auto Workers said it would spearhead a nationwide meat boycott the first week in April to protest the "serious drain on the average American's take-home pay."

"It should be perfectly clear that in Phase 3 as in Phases 1 and 2, the average American family remains the chief victim of the administration's economic policies," said a resolution adopted by 3,000 delegates to the union's special collective bargaining convention, in Detroit.

Grain farmers in the Midwest, following new Agriculture Department urgings and policies, say they intended to plant a lot more soybeans and a little more wheat and corn this spring. This would insure a decline in feed grain prices after the fall harvest.

But this would be meaningless to consumers before the following spring unless there is an unforeseen surge in the number of hogs and beef cattle that farmers begin fattening now to market late this year and early in 1974.

To the great surprise of agricultural forecasters, Mid-western ranchers indicated this week that they are not rushing in to take advantage of today's record high live cattle and hog prices by increasing their herds.

Were they doing so, consumers could expect substantially lower pork and beef prices by Christmas, when this increased supply would pull ahead of consumer demand.

But the indicators farm economists have used in the past to forecast price trends were not working today, and the economists were at a loss to explain why farmers were not being encouraged by high market prices to expand meat production faster.

CONFIDENCE PUZZLING

They were equally puzzled by the Nixon administration's earlier confidence that meat prices would level off and perhaps decline by winter.

Despite a full year of increasingly profitable hog prices, there are only 2 percent more hogs on farms today in the Midwest than there were last year at this time. Hog raisers say they expect to increase their baby pigs by 5 percent in the March-May quarter and by only 4 percent in the June-August quarter.

But with exports to Japan expected to rise and American demand continuing, the economists expect only a slight decrease in wholesale prices that could be passed on to consumers.

The cattle report shows an increase of only 8 percent in the number of animals now on feed, fattening for market. But forecasters are predicting an increase in per capita consumption of beef that would largely offset this rise in supply.

Ranchers specializing in fattening hogs or beef cattle are already operating near the limits of their capacity and cannot put a great many more animals on feed, observers argue.

[From the Washington Post, March 24, 1973]

OIL IMPORT QUOTA CUT SECOND TIME

(By Thomas O'Toole)

Amid growing signs of an impending gasoline shortage, President Nixon for the second time this year relaxed the restrictions on oil imports into the United States.

The President yesterday issued an order from the Florida White House in Key Biscayne abolishing the limits placed on independent oil distributors that allows them to import no more than 60,000 barrels of oil a day.

The chairman of the White House Oil Policy Committee "has found that the national security will not be adversely affected." President Nixon said in a prepared statement. "I agree with his findings and recommendations."

The President's move comes at a time when the Interior Department is deluged with a record 220 petitions for oil import tickets from independent distributors, all pleading hardship. The petitions request imports of more than one million barrels of oil per day.

Under the current oil import policy, U.S. refiners are allowed to bring in 2.7 million barrels of foreign oil a day. The Oil Import Appeals Board is allotted another 60,000 barrels of oil per day for hardship cases, which are almost always small independents who normally get their oil from the large companies.

President Nixon's action yesterday does not affect the 2.7 million barrels a day allotted to the large refiners. What it does is abolish the 60,000-barrel-a-day limit for the hardship cases, in effect taking some of the pressure off the big refiners and putting more oil into the hands of the small independent who say they are unable to get crude oil to refine.

Yesterday's action marked the second time this year that President Nixon has moved to ease the fuel shortage in the United States by easing restrictions on oil imports. The first time was in January when he raised the import quota to its present 2.7 million-barrel-a-day level.

The White House move comes at a time when warnings of a gasoline shortage are cropping up around the country. The White House Office of Emergency Preparedness called on refiners to increase their gasoline output, declaring that oil companies are not producing enough to avoid shortages.

Earlier this year, the industry was jawboned into producing more heating oils and diesel fuels because of shortages of those two distillates. Typically, refineries produce heating oils before the winter season begins and gasoline before the spring motor season arrives.

OEP Acting Director Darrell Trent said gasoline production for the past five weeks averaged 42.5 million barrels per week, only one million barrels more than output during the same period a year ago.

"This increase is not enough to meet the need," Trent said, urging the industry to "immediately increase" production of gasoline, both by operating refineries at near to capacity levels and by devoting a larger share of their yield to this product."

The shortage was already a reality to at least two distributors, one in New England and the other in the Middle West. One firm that sells gasoline to 13 service stations around Norwalk, Conn., said it had only one week's supply on hand. Another firm that operates a chain of 25 service stations around Minneapolis-St. Paul, reported it had to close all but six of them because it couldn't get any gasoline.

In Atlanta, the Gulf Oil Corp. told the city of Atlanta that it could not supply diesel oil for the city's buses past April 30. Gulf said its contract commitments will leave it

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

so short of diesel fuel at that time that it will be unable to supply fuel to Atlanta, with which it has a verbal contract for five million gallons of oil a year.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 24, 1973]

SOVIETS MAY JOIN U.S. ICE PROBE; DRILLING FINDS ANTARCTIC FREEZE ERA

The National Science Foundation said yesterday that the Soviet Union was considering favorably joining America's deep sea drilling project and contributing \$1 million yearly.

If Russia joins, its contribution would cover about one-tenth the project cost.

The announcement followed by one day the announcement in New York that the project's drill ship, the Glomar Challenger, arrived in Christchurch, New Zealand, with discoveries about the Antarctic.

The expedition found evidence that the antarctic has been frozen at least 20 million years and that the Australian continent broke away from it 50 million years ago.

The frozen period is three to five times longer than had been believed, Dennis E. Hayes of Columbia University and Lawrence A. Frakes of Florida State University said. They were co-chiefs aboard the 400-foot ship.

Core samples taken by drilling into the ice confirmed the theory that Australia was part of the Antarctic until about 50 million years ago. Drilling samples also found traces of natural gas on the sea bottom.

LICENSE TO KILL

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a recent article by Dr. Herbert Ratner, editor of *Child and Family Quarterly*, on the subject of abortion:

LICENSE TO KILL

It's kind of ironic that now that we've ended the killing in Vietnam, we have given the approval to killing right within our Country on a much larger scale. What I think is similar in both killings is that what makes the killing easy is you're not looking into the eyes of your victim, whether you're dropping a bomb from 30,000 feet or whether you're killing in the darkness of the womb.

Everybody recognizes that abortion involves killing and that this means the physicians of the Country will now be doing more killing than curing. It is a sad commentary on American medicine and foreboding for the future once we get started on this path. The original reason for the establishment of the learned profession of medicine was to distinguish real doctors from the sorcerers and巫doctors who both killed and cured, and there was a basic need for society to make certain their healers weren't killers.

It's very distressing to see a decision, an opinion rendered which is based on data that is factually wrong. From this point of view, I think the justices were propagandized, either personally or by the mass media. As an example, over fifty percent of the women now getting abortions consist of young White women of college age. Contrary to Justice Blackmun's statement, abortion is much more dangerous than normal childbirth for this group both in respect to death and to the complications of abortion—which are very serious like perforation of the uterus, sterility, infection—than normal childbirth.

In claiming that they cannot determine

March 26, 1973

when human life begins because there is disagreement among scientists is like saying the Blacks and Orientals aren't human beings because in terms of prejudices, this is what some people are still saying. What Justice Blackmun is saying is that if some people decide to call a fish a bird or a man a monkey, for whatever propaganda reason, that just because some people say it, we no longer know the difference between man and monkey. But contrary to Justice Blackmun and his colleagues, all the scientific evidence is in on who is a human being and the answer to what a fetus is can be as clear to the justices as it is to a Montessori pre-school child.

Though I haven't seen the final text, it has been stated that the majority opinion has dismissed the Hippocratic Oath because one scholar has presented as an hypothesis—a tenuous one at that—that the Hippocratic Oath was written by a small religious group of Greeks in the fifth century B.C. who weren't representative of all of the thinkers of the time. What is completely ignored is that the Hippocratic Oath has been accepted and treasured by the profession of medicine for over 2,000 years, and following the Nazi holocaust, was reaffirmed by the World Medical Association in Geneva in 1947.

Certain historian alleged that the German Catholic Bishops and in particular, Pope Pius XII, were guilty of not speaking up against the slaughter of the Jews. It is a similar situation now, in which the Bishops, along with men of other faiths and the general public, are convinced that people are being killed and they have spoken up against what they think is murder. In this case they are told, "Stop imposing your morality on others" The critics cannot have it both ways. They have urged the Bishops and leaders of all religious faiths to speak against the killing in Vietnam, but at the exact same time, on another kind of killing, they tell these religious leaders to keep their morality to themselves. What nonsense!

Personally, I am shaken at the superficiality of the thinking that has gone into what is clearly an opinion that doesn't rise above the utilitarian and the pragmatic. It is also shocking to think, and as the two dissenting justices have pointed out, that the Supreme Court of this Land has introduced this license to kill over the wishes of the public and the majority of legislatures of the Country.

When Supreme Court Justice Douglas wrote a majority opinion dealing with Mineral Springs Valley last Spring, he didn't hesitate to attribute, in the ecological context, personhood to a grove of trees whose preservation he was concerned with. It is clearly a sign of the anti-humanity of the times when the Supreme Court urges personhood for a grove of trees but not for the child in the womb.

MINNEAPOLIS' NICOLLET MALL

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, these days when the suburban boom is threatening many downtown retail centers with extinction, downtown is still alive and well in Minneapolis.

A recent story in the New York Times tells how our city has pumped new life into its central shopping district through the use of an imaginative new pedestrian and transit way, the Nicollet Mall.

I want to take this opportunity to insert the New York Times story in the RECORD:

MALL FOCUS OF DOWNTOWN MINNEAPOLIS RISE
(By Robert A. Wright)

MINNEAPOLIS.—In winter, snow melts upon touching the heated pavement of the Nicollet Mall, the eight-block-long hub of the downtown shopping district, raising small clouds of steam. Even without this convenience, it is unlikely that shoppers here—inured to hard winters—would find weather an obstacle. But, increasingly, shoppers never have to go out of doors, proceeding from auto parking lots to stores, offices and hotels via a network of second-story enclosed bridges.

This so-called skyway system, a kind of above-ground Rockefeller Center concourse, is the latest phase in a downtown revival here focused around the mall—the largest at its completion in mid-1968 and perhaps the most successful in the nation.

Delegations of concerned downtown merchants worried about the flight to the suburbs, including those involved with the proposed Madison Avenue Mall in New York, have beaten a path to the doors of the Minneapolis Downtown Council for advice.

The mall is pedestrian territory, the sidewalks having been extended into the former Nicollet Avenue, leaving just enough roadway to accommodate passing buses, which meander north and south along the gently curving street. Several plazas accommodate art, music and dance shows. One-way streets crossing the mall accommodate auto traffic and provide connections with suburban buses.

A minibus, serving just the mall area, carries some one million passengers a year. Passengers wait for their buses in heated shelters. Instead of the customary brilliance and obstruction of commercial signs, strollers along the mall encounter soft clusters of light, potted trees, flowers, sculpture and decorous fountains. Overhanging signs are prohibited.

Here are all of the city's major department stores—Dayton's, Donaldson's, J. C. Penney, Power's—and a wide variety of specialty shops, restaurants, hotels, banks and office buildings.

The mall cost \$3.8-million to build all of it coming from assessments against property owners in the Nicollet Mall area, except for \$800,000 in Federal Government grants.

"We believe we're the biggest mall in the U.S.," say O. D. Gay, executive vice president of the Downtown Council. "And we're by far the most successful. It's no trick to build a mall in Tampa or Laguna Beach. But we've done it in a cold climate."

Mr. Gay says he cannot calculate the amount of retail sales dollars that the mall has kept downtown and that might have been spent in suburban shopping centers, but, he points out, "there's not a vacant store on the mall."

"From the time the mall was planned to date I can trace over \$250-million in new construction or rehabilitation on the mall or within one block of it," he said.

How has the mall affected stores in the vicinity? Apparently it has improved their business. Howard Parent, the store manager of Three Sisters, an apparel shop at the corner of 6th Street and Nicollet Avenue, who recently moved to Minneapolis from Cleveland, had this to say:

"My wife and I walked the length of the mall, a distance of 10 blocks, between 8 and 8:30 in the evening. What impressed us was all the window-shoppers."

"I don't have to tell you that window-shoppers are potential customers. In Cleveland you don't dare go downtown at night, but here there were people milling around, looking in windows."

"It has made a big improvement for the store," he said. "We use no newspaper ads, just window ads, and it has been very successful. Business has been on the upswing for the past two years. It must have something to do with the mall."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BLACKS AND THE ADMINISTRATION: ADDRESS BY VERNON E. JORDAN, JR.

HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia, Mr. Speaker, on March 16 Vernon E. Jordan, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League, made a reasoned and perceptive analysis of the Nixon administration's policies and budget.

In an address to the National Press Club, Mr. Jordan cited the devastating impact the administration's proposals would have on minorities, poor whites, and the society as a whole.

Vernon Jordan and the National Urban League have earned the respect of rich and poor, black and white, because of a constructive, nonpolitical approach to solving urban problems. When Mr. Jordan speaks of the seriousness and urgency of matters before the Congress, Mr. Speaker, I think we should listen. The full text of his speech is as follows:

BLACKS AND THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION:
THE NEXT 4 YEARS

In his Budget Message to the Congress, the President once again called for "a new American Revolution to return power to the people." But the Message itself, and the provisions of a federal budget that hacks away at social spending with ruthless intensity, can only be seen as the first shots of a counter-revolution designed to destroy the social reforms of the 1960s.

Indeed, the proposed budget is the blueprint for the conversion of a national policy of "benign neglect" into a policy of active hostility to the hopes, dreams and aspirations of black Americans.

I do not believe this policy is intentional, nor do I believe that it is the product of conscious, anti-black, anti-poor reasoning. Rather it is the by-product of a view of society and of the proper role of government that is incompatible with the implementation of the precious rights won by minorities in recent years. The yawning gap between the philosophy of decentralized government marked by a passive domestic role for the federal Administration, and the effects of such a system on poor people and minorities vividly illustrates how honorable intentions can have disastrous results.

I am reminded of the famous lines by T. S. Eliot: "Between the idea and the reality/Between the motion and the act/Falls the shadow." Today that shadow falls on black Americans, minorities, and on the overwhelming numbers of poor people who are white. It is they who are being asked to carry the burdens imposed by the impending massive federal withdrawal from moral and programmatic leadership in the domestic arena. The shadow that falls upon them is deep and its darkness spreads a blight across our land.

The Administration's domestic policy, as revealed in its budget proposals and in a flurry of public statements, encompasses on the one hand, sharp cuts in spending on social services, and on the other, a massive shift in resources and responsibility from Washington to local governments. These are the two prongs of a pincer movement that entraps millions of Americans.

A brief examination of just a few of the federal actions both proposed and already taken, are enough to indicate that urban America is well on the way to becoming a free

fire zone doomed to destruction by the very forces it looks to for salvation.

In employment, the Emergency Act will be phased out, ending public service jobs for about 150,000 state and city employees, some forty percent of whom had been classified as disadvantaged. Job-creation and training programs already crippled by the refusal to spend appropriated funds, will be cut sharply. A wide variety of federally-backed summer and youth employment programs will be dropped, and special programs for high unemployment areas will be eliminated.

In housing, a freeze has been imposed on federally-subsidized housing affecting hundreds of thousands of low-income families and robbing construction workers of jobs.

In education, federal programs to provide compensatory educational services to disadvantaged children, and important vocational education programs will be dismantled, while day care student loans, special school milk programs and aid to libraries will be eliminated or reduced to a small fraction of their former size.

In health, 23 million aged and handicapped people will have an extra billion dollars torn from them in higher Medicare charges and lessened coverage, while funds for the successful community mental health centers and for new hospitals will be eliminated.

In addition to this listing of horror stories, there are further atrocities—the dismantling of the Office of Economic Opportunity and abolition of its over 900 community action programs; the end of the Model Cities program, and the effective end of urban renewal and a host of other federal programs of community development.

A number of arguments have been advanced to justify the far-reaching changes the new American counter-revolution seeks to establish. Taken together, they recall Horace Walpole's comment about the world: that it "is a comedy to those that think, a tragedy to those that feel."

It is said, for example, that the budget cuts are necessary to avoid new taxes and to control inflation. This neatly avoids mention of the imposition of a sharply increased social security payroll tax that falls disproportionately on the same low-income families that will be hurt most by social service cutbacks. I accept the need for a ceiling on federal expenditures, but I cannot accept the faulty priorities that raise military expenditures by just under five billion dollars while slicing funds for the poor and for the cities. The cost of one Trident Submarine would pay for the public service employment program. The requested increase in funds for the F-15 fighter is about equal to the amounts cut from manpower training funds. Federal disinvestment in human resources reflects an irrational choice of priorities.

Another reason for the cuts is the overly-optimistic view that many of the federal programs are no longer needed. The President himself seemed to be making this point in his Human Resources Message when he said: "By almost any measure life is better for Americans in 1973 than ever before in our history, and better than in any other society of the world in this or any earlier age." And the theme was repeated in the Message dealing with cities, which declared that "the hour of crisis has passed."

I cannot agree. I believe, instead, that the hour of crisis is upon us, and is intensified by the federal withdrawal from urban problems. I would hate to have to explain to a poor black family in Bedford-Stuyvesant that's chained to an over-crowded slum apartment because of the housing subsidy freeze that this is really the best of all possible worlds. I would hate to have to explain to a poor black farm worker in Mississippi that the record gross national product means he's living in a golden era. And I would hate

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 26, 1973

to have to explain to an unemployed Vietnam veteran who can no longer enter a federal manpower training program that he is being adequately repaid for his sacrifices.

Life in 1973 may be better for some people, but it is not better for black Americans. We are afflicted with unemployment rates more than double those for white workers. Black teenage unemployment is near 40 percent. Unemployment and under-employment in the ghettos of America is from one-third to one-half of the work force. The total number of poor people in this country has risen sharply in the past several years. No. This is no Eden in which we live and we cannot complacently agree that there is no longer a need for federal social service programs.

Another justification for ending some programs is arrived at by a method of reasoning I confess I am unable to comprehend. Such programs, it is said, have proved their worth and therefore the government should no longer operate them. Since they are so good, someone else should do them. I can only suppose that the next step will be to tell the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the armed forces have done such a good job that the federal government will stop funding them.

Another argument—a serious one of some substance—is that some programs have not worked and therefore should be abandoned. Such programs fall into two categories—those that appear to neutral observers to have accomplished their goals, and those that clearly have not been as effective as they should have been.

It is inaccurate and unfair to suggest that the community action programs or the Model Cities programs, to take two important examples, have failed. There is every indication that they have brought a new sense of spirit and accomplishment to many hundreds of cities. By fully involving poor people in the decision-making process they have contributed significantly to urban stability and to individual accomplishment. Federal evaluation studies endorse this view. Local political leadership has also insisted that the programs are successful. For years, the agony of the Vietnam War was justified on the grounds that we had made a moral commitment to the people there. Can we now abandon the moral commitment to our own cities and to our own people?

Some federal programs have been clear disappointments. Some of the housing subsidy programs, for example, were sabotaged not by poor people seeking a decent home, but by some speculators in league with some federal employees. Thus, although thousands of families have been sheltered by these programs; although scandal-free housing has been produced by effective non-profit organizations and although the need for low- and moderate-income housing is pressing, federal housing subsidies have been frozen and appear on their way to an early death. The victims of federal housing failures are being punished doubly—once by ineffective program control, and again by the moratorium on all housing subsidies. Ending all housing programs because some have shown signs of failure makes about as much sense as eliminating the Navy because some new ships have had cost over-runs.

The final justification of the Administration's policies, and the core of the new American counter-revolution, is that federal funds will be transferred to local governments in the form of bloc grants in four major areas—community development, education, manpower and law enforcement. It is proposed that the federal government end its categorical grant programs administered, financed and monitored by federal agencies and that local governments should now decide whether to spend federal monies on job-training or on roads, on compensatory education in the ghetto or on a new high school in the suburbs. This has been called "returning power to the people."

To black Americans, who historically had no choice but to look to the federal government to correct the abuses of state and local governments, that is very much like hiring the wolf to guard the sheep. It is axiomatic in American political life, with some exceptions, that the lower the level of government, the lower the level of competence and the higher the margin for discrimination against the poor and the powerless.

The power that has accrued to the central government is due to the failure of localities to be responsive to the needs of all but a handful of their constituents. Black Americans have looked to the federal government to end slavery, to end peonage, to restore our constitutional rights and to secure economic progress in the face of discrimination. Yes, we looked to Washington because we could not look to Jackson, to Baton Rouge or to Montgomery. White people looked to Washington too, for the federal programs that helped many of them survive the Depression, helped them move to suburbia and helped them to prosper economically. Now that Washington has finally embarked on programs that hold out some hope for minorities, we are told instead to look to local governments notorious for their historic insensitivity to the needs and aspirations of blacks and the poor.

Before falling prey to the siren song of local infallibility, the Administration should examine the use local governments are making of general revenue sharing grants already distributed. News reports from across the country repeat the same dismal story—federal money used to build new city halls, to raise police salaries, and to cut local taxes. All this is taking place at a time when school systems are falling apart, housing is being abandoned, and health needs are unmet. The record does not inspire confidence that lost federal social service programs will be replaced with effective local ones.

General revenue sharing is a fact. It is a reality. Thirty billion dollars is in the pipeline for state and local government. Rather than throw still more money at local governments at the expense of federal programs with proven track records, the Administration should be developing performance standards and effective compliance mechanisms that assure these local programs will work. Folding—or rather, crumbling—federal social service programs into no-strings-attached special revenue sharing packages seems to me to be a prescription for disaster.

Black Americans have been assured that anti-discrimination regulations will prevent local abuses. While the Treasury Department's guidelines have been revised and strengthened, we still cannot take heart from such assurances. They come just a few weeks after the Civil Rights Commission reported the persistence of "inertia of agencies in the field of civil rights," and after the government was subjected to a federal court order to enforce the laws against school segregation. It is hard to imagine that the politically-charged decision to withhold funds from states or cities that discriminate will be made. And without federal standards assuring that funds will be used in behalf of poor people in need of job-training, public housing, and special school and health programs, the money will once again find its way into the pockets of entrenched local interests.

The proposed special revenue sharing approach breaks faith not only with poor people, but with local governments as well. What Washington gives with one hand it takes with the other. Mayors who once hungered for no-strings-attached bloc grants are now panicked by the realization that the funds they receive will be inadequate to meet the needs of their communities and will be less than their cities get in the current categorical-aid programs. In addition, there is the

probability that future special revenue sharing funds will continue to shrink. Rather than shifting power to the people, the new American counter-revolution creates a vacuum in responsible power.

We must not forget, as so many have, that federal programs today do embody local initiatives and local decision-making. The myth of the Washington bureaucrat making decisions for people 3,000 miles away is false. The money often comes from the federal Treasury. The broad program goals and definitions of national needs come, as they should, from the Congress. But the specific program proposals, their implementation, and their support come from local governments, citizens and agencies. Those federal dollars that are now deemed tainted actually enable local citizens to meet local problems under the umbrella of national financial and moral leadership. To shift the center of gravity away from national leadership is to compound the drift and inertia that appear to categorize our society today.

It is in this context that the blast of white silence is so puzzling. Far more white people than blacks will be hurt by the budget cuts. Yet the responsibility for calling attention to their impact falls increasingly on black leadership. There are three times as many poor white families as there are poor black families. The majority of people on welfare are white. Of the black poor, more than half don't get one devalued dollar from welfare. Two-thirds of the families who got homes through the now-frozen 235 subsidy program were white. The majority of trainees in manpower programs, and three-fourths of the people who will lose their jobs under the public employment program are white.

But because black Americans have been the most vocal segment of the population in urging social reforms, there is the mistaken impression that only blacks benefit from them. The Battle of the Budget is a large-scale replay of the fight for welfare reform waged—and lost—last year. Then, as now, black leadership was out front in favor of a living guaranteed income for all. But we had few white supporters, although many more white people than black would have benefited. It is reasonable to ask, had we won that struggle would all of those poor white people have returned their income supplement checks? And it is fair to ask today that white people join us in the struggle to preserve the social services of the federal government that enable them, too, to survive.

The silent white majority that has been the prime beneficiary of the programs of the 1960s and is today the group most in need of further federal services will have to speak up. They are not stigmatized, as are blacks, by charges of special pleading by special Americans looking for special treatment. And their representatives in the Congress will have to act, too. They cannot complacently watch their constituents' welfare being trampled on, nor can they accept the shrinkage of their rightful constitutional role in our system of government.

Already, there have been signs that some Congressmen whose votes helped to pass progressive legislation a few short years ago are now of a mind to compromise with Administration power, to compromise the jobs and livelihood and needs of their constituents, to compromise the power of the Congress to control the purse and to influence domestic policies, and finally, to compromise their own principles. If this is so, it will be tragic for the Constitution, tragic for the country, tragic for the poor people, and tragic for the heritage of liberalism.

The gut issues of today—better schools, jobs and housing for all, personal safety and decent health care—are issues that transcend race. So long as they are falsely perceived as "black issues," nothing constructive will be done to deal with them. White America must come to see that its cities, its needs

and its economic and physical health are at stake. The needs of blacks and whites are too strongly intertwined to separate. As Whitney Young used to say, "We may have come here on different ships, but we're in the same boat now."

So White Americans must join with black people to rekindle the American Dream, and to sing, in the words of Langston Hughes: "O, let America be America again—The land that never has been yet—and yet must be."

LEGAL SERVICES FOR THE POOR

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the need for legal services for the poor in this country is more widespread now than at any time in the past. But the President has not let this need affect his decision to dismantle the Office of Economic Opportunity, of which the legal services program is a part.

The legal services program has been providing invaluable legal assistance for the poor since its inception 8 years ago. Its 2,500 attorneys represented nearly a million poor people last year.

It is quite clear that the President is not overly concerned about the future of legal services. He has said that he would prefer to see it become an independent corporation so it would be excluded from political pressures. He vetoed such a bill 2 years ago. It is obvious that his real concern lies with constructing a program that would be under his control.

His Acting Director of OEO, Howard J. Phillips, has speculated that funds for legal services could come from individual cities by way of revenue sharing.

The differences in opinion suggest something less than a firm commitment to the survival of legal services.

But there are many people in this country who realize the importance of an independent program that would provide legal services for the poor. I am inserting into the RECORD the following resolution which was passed by the Student Bar Association of New York Law School. It will be a tragedy for America if the proposals they set forth, or similar proposals, are not enacted:

RESOLUTION

Whereas: There is a continuing need for legal services for the poor.

Whereas: There are federally funded Legal Services Programs to meet this need in each of the states.

Whereas: These programs are facing an expanding demand for legal services and increased operating expenses.

Whereas: This Association continues to support the need for adequate legal services to the poor and the need for vital and independent programs to provide this representation.

Now, therefore, it is resolved:

1. The United States government should increase the level of funding of Legal Services programs to enable them to provide adequate legal services to eligible clients and to prevent a serious deterioration of the quality and quantity of service because of increased expense and mounting caseloads.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

2. Government at all levels and lawyers from both the public and private sectors should take every step necessary to insure that legal services remain independent from political pressures in the cause of representing clients.

3. The Congress of the United States should enact a legal service corporation of a design consistent with the foregoing principles and the need to maintain full and adequate legal services for the poor.

LET US ACT NOW ON CONGRESSIONAL BUDGETARY CONTROL

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this Wednesday, March 28, 1973, the House Committee on Rules, of which I am a member, will begin hearings on H.R. 5193 and related bills to restrict the authority of the President to impound funds appropriated by the Congress. While the bill introduced by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) is commendable in many respects, the fact remains that it does not begin to come to grips with the problem that has prompted Presidential impoundments in the first place, and that is the inability of the Congress to exercise comprehensive, coordinated and responsible budgetary control. What we are being offered in that anti-impoundment bill is an antidote to neutralize an antidote which many Members justifiably find distasteful; but not only does this antidote not check the spreading poison of irresponsible and inflationary spending which is poisoning our fiscal system; in neutralizing the antidote used by the President it only guarantees the further spread of that poison.

What is clearly needed if we are serious about limiting the President's impoundment authority is a mechanism for at the same time setting our own fiscal house in order—an enforceable budget ceiling. That is the only rational and responsible approach to this problem. I therefore intend to support in the Rules Committee an amendment to H.R. 5193 which would make the provisions of that act contingent upon congressional adoption of an enforceable spending ceiling.

Last fall, in title III of the Public Debt Limit Act, this Congress established a Joint Committee on Budget Control and charged it with the responsibility of recommending appropriate budgetary control mechanisms and procedures no later than February 15 of this year so that these might be applied to our fiscal 1974 activities. Unfortunately, the Joint Committee was only able to make its preliminary recommendations by that date, and on February 27, 1973, Senate Concurrent Resolution 8 was slipped through the House, without prior warning, debate, amendment or a recorded vote, extending the final reporting deadline of the Joint Committee to the end of this session. Thus, any recommendations which finally emerged would obviously have no applicability to fiscal 1974.

I think this extension was a mistake, and to remedy this situation I am today introducing a concurrent resolution authorizing and directing the Joint Study Committee on Budget Control to report by bill or resolution no later than June 1, 1973, its final recommendations with respect to the operation of a spending ceiling for fiscal 1974 and procedures for limiting the impoundment authority of the President.

During our impoundment hearings this week, I intend to urge the Rules Committee to not only adopt the amendment to H.R. 5193 which I have earlier described, but also to report my concurrent resolution as a companion bill. If the Rules Committee rejects that amendment, I will urge that it provide a rule making my concurrent resolution in order as a substitute. This, in effect would postpone House action on impoundment legislation until it is brought to the floor by the Joint Committee as part of an overall budgetary control bill.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include the full text of my concurrent resolution along with an excellent letter to the editor from the Sunday, March 25, New York Times from Prof. Alpheus Thomas Mason of Princeton University on this subject:

H. CON. RES. 165

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Joint Study Committee on Budget Control is authorized and directed to report to the Congress, by bill or resolution, no later than June 1, 1973, its final recommendations with respect to any matters covered under its jurisdiction, provided that such report shall include, but shall not be limited to (1) procedures for improving congressional control of budget outlay and receipt totals, including procedures for establishing and maintaining an overall view of each year's budgetary outlays which is fully coordinated with an overall view of the anticipated revenues for that year; (2) procedures for the operation of a limitation on expenditures and net lending commencing with the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1973; and (3) procedures for limiting the authority of the President to impound or otherwise withhold funds authorized and appropriated by the Congress.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 25, 1973]

THE VIBRATIONS OF POWER

TO THE EDITOR:

President Nixon's impoundment of funds invades a peculiarly Congressional province. Two bills, one sponsored by Senator Ervin, another by Representative Mahon, are designed to restrain him (editorial March 18). The situation is serious generally. Despite constitutionally shared powers, the President has monopolized war-making and foreign affairs. It's about time Congress got its back up.

Separation of powers is a misnomer. National power is inextricably fused, not separated. The principle is "subverted," Madison tells us, "where the whole power of one department is exercised by the same hands which possess the whole power of another department."

In the abstract, Congress has a strong case, but it is difficult to achieve a corrective. Irked by the President's non-unprecedented action, Congress accuses him of violating separation of powers. When Congress tries to recover what it has lost by acquiescence of executive usurpation, the President raises the same banner. History underscores Presidential aggrandizement. In retrospect, the Sen-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ate's triumph over Wilson in 1920 and the come-uppance the Supreme Court dealt Truman in the Youngstown Steel case seem like aberrations.

Successful operation of the separation-of-powers principle depends now, as always, on mutual respect and sensitivity to the requirements of free government. Jefferson held that "each party should shrink from all approach to the line of demarcation, instead of rashly overleaping it, or throwing grapples ahead to haul to hereafter." The self-restraint Jefferson had in mind is not likely to be forthcoming from President Nixon.

The Founders put powerful weapons in the hands of Congress, available for both direct and oblique counterattack. To use them at this critical juncture might seem retaliatory and thus violative of the Jeffersonian prescription. A not-unreasonable reaction may be that we are faced with a condition, not a theory. If, for example, President Nixon persists in withholding testimony necessary for an informed decision on the qualifications of Patrick Gray, the Senate has a heaven-sent opportunity to demonstrate its role, without shrinking an inch from Jefferson's sometimes fuzzy line.

The most dramatic parallel with the present crisis is the 1937 impasse between Court and President. The Court, transcending the line set by the separation-of-powers principle, had become a superlegislature. The President counterattacked with his court-packing threat. The outcome was ambiguous. Both sides won; both lost. The President won judicial acceptance of his program. Congress defeated Court packing. If either had scored outright victory, the separation-of-powers principle would have been "subverted."

Congress itself, like the Court in the 1930's, has contributed to the deadlock. The Justices did so by transforming judicial review into judicial supremacy, Congress by default or surrender of its role. The proposed bills, even without enactment, constitute overdue action, creating the tension that is incident to the balance of national power. Hamilton called "vibration of power" the "genius" of our system. This means preservation of enough tension to discourage any one department from daring to bid for total control.

ALPHEUS THOMAS MASON.
PRINCETON, N.J., March 22, 1973.

THE REAL COST OF IT

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, year after year the American people were told by the Washington giveaway forces that foreign aid amounted to only a small fraction of the total Federal budget.

As the annual bills were presented, we heard figures of three or four billion and cuts in these down to an even more modest level, if anything it terms of billions could be considered modest.

Then, in 1971 as part of that year's foreign aid act, the Congress demanded that all the giveaway totals be lumped together in one document so the overall costs could be known.

So now we have the real picture of what was taken from our people in 1972 and scattered abroad under one program or another. Total foreign aid spending for that year was a staggering

\$11.3 billion in economic and military giveaways.

With this, then, as the 1972 figure, we only can wonder at what actually was given away in those years of the last quarter century in which foreign aid was in its heyday and generally unquestioned—the years in which our billions were used not only to resuscitate the war-damaged economies of Japan and Europe but to build up our present-day competitors who are preying on American jobs.

Surely, the \$11.3 billion total for 1972 shows conclusively that our people have been taken for a merry ride. And now they are paying an awful price for that experience as the dollar crisis and the recent devaluations document.

Many of the billions of dollars now clogging money markets around the world originally were giveaway dollars, hard earned by Americans and taken from them in taxes for distribution abroad with no strings attached. And, in the most callous of ironies, the giveaway still continues.

When is this thing going to stop? We should have learned by now the bitter lesson that no nation can be recklessly generous and long survive as a solvent, money-sound member of the world community. And yet we persist in the handouts as though there were no cuts in our dollar's value, no enormous payments balance against us, no monumental Federal deficits and no unfilled needs at home.

THE 55TH ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the philosopher, Schopenhauer, said—

A people which does not know its past is living merely for the time being in the present of the existing generation, and only through knowledge of its history does a nation become truly self-conscious.

Americans with links to eastern European nations which are now submerged under the Red seas of Soviet domination strive to keep alive the knowledge of the roots, traditions, and culture of their ancestors, for from this knowledge comes the foundations upon which much of the strength of America is laid. March 25 is one of the occasions when this is done. On March 25, Americans of Byelorussian descent and all those who cherish freedom from bondage and tyranny observe the 55th anniversary of the founding of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

On that date in 1918, the Rada, representing the first All-Byelorussian Congress, issued a proclamation of the independence of Byelorussia, which read:

A year ago the peoples of Byelorussia, together with all the peoples of Russia threw off the yoke of Russian tsarism which, taking no advice from the people, had plunged our land into the blaze of war that ruined most of our cities and towns. Today we, the Rada of the Byelorussian National Re-

March 26, 1973

public, cast off from our country the last chains of the political servitude that had been imposed by Russian tsarism upon our free and independent land. From now on, the Byelorussian National Republic is to be a free and independent power. The peoples of Byelorussia themselves, through their Constituent Assembly, will decide upon the future relations of Byelorussia with other states....

Tragically, independence for Byelorussia was short lived, for within a year, the forces of the Bolshevik army brought about the subjugation of the Byelorussian people, and once again they found themselves under the yoke of Russian oppression—enslaved this time by the very forces which had enabled them to declare their independence from the tsars.

Even today, while under the heel of Soviet imperialism, the fierce pride in national identity, begun some seven centuries ago, burns brightly in the hearts of the Byelorussians. On March 25, as we commemorate Byelorussian Independence Day, we join in the hope that the Byelorussian struggle for independence, dating back to the 13th century, will succeed as it did for so brief a period in 1918. Drawing on the strength of their people's endurance during these seven centuries, the Byelorussians remain truly self-conscious as a nation; and so long as they do, the bright light of freedom will again shine on them.

PRESIDENTIAL PRIORITIES AND POCKETBOOKS

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, on January 31 WMAQ-TV, a Chicago station presented an editorial on President Nixon's budget priorities. John A. Kociolko, a graduate student of Loyola University, offered a rebuttal on February 7.

Mr. Kociolko's reply to the editorial was so well reasoned and so well worded that it merits an even wider audience. I am therefore inserting it in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

PRESIDENTIAL PRIORITIES AND POCKETBOOKS

(The following is a reply to the January 31, 1973 Editorial on President Nixon's budget priorities. The reply was presented by John S. Kociolko, a graduate student of Loyola University.)

WMAQ-TV has joined the chorus of critics who demand that Congress reduce the Presidential authority of Richard Nixon. In November, voters gave the President a resounding electoral triumph. It appeared that the American people approved of Mr. Nixon's stewardship, and wished that he continue his policies in a second term. Yet we are now told that the power of the White House is too great, that Congress must seize the reins of government, and that the President must be restricted.

America's liberal spokesmen tried to restrict Mr. Nixon last year. They ran their candidate, and they lost. Undaunted, they insist that the man whom they despise so intensely shall not govern, regardless of the election. They speak loftily of restoring pow-

er to Congress, although for years these same individuals asserted that the nation needed a strong Presidency. In the 1960's liberal analysts applauded the far-reaching programs of the New Frontier and Great Society. Then one day they found Mr. Nixon in the White House, and suddenly discovered that Presidential prerogatives were far too extensive.

The authority of the Presidency is not a political balloon that can be inflated or diminished depending upon who sits in the Oval Office. Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman, John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson pursued their policies as vigorous Chief Executives. Richard Nixon is today entrusted with the Presidency. He is entitled to a full measure of the power of that office, in order to achieve his goals at home and abroad. His platform of strengthening national defense while reducing government meddling with the lives—and pocketbooks—of the American people was endorsed at the polls. Those who dispute this mandate should retrieve a November newspaper—and re-read the election returns.

(This editorial was broadcast at various times on February 7, 1973.)

NEW DECOY DEVICE

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, as part of a bitter internal struggle within the Pentagon, the Air Force is covering up at least \$600 million in cost growth on a new Air Force decoy designed for bombers known as SCAD. The internal dispute which began in 1968 concerns whether the new decoy should be armed or not and whether the new device should be placed on old B-52 bombers, the new B-1 bomber, or both.

A showdown meeting between various factions was scheduled recently, but apparently no final decision has been made. The Air Force is covering up at least \$600 million in cost growth on this program and probably hundreds of millions of dollars more in new cost overruns that will occur in the near future. The Air Force currently estimates the cost of the new decoy device at \$926 million. But the Air Force does not include in its estimate the \$109 million it will cost to modify the B-52's to use the new decoy and at least \$500 million needed to arm the device.

The real cost of this new decoy is at least \$1.5 billion and probably much more—not less than a billion as the Air Force has tried to convince Congress and the public.

The General Accounting Office—GAO—in a general staff study to Congress, also warns that as a result of technical changes and problems, including an increase in the weight of the device, additional cost overruns will occur. GAO says, it is expected that these changes will increase the procurement cost estimate.

In addition, current Air Force estimates do not include the cost of placing the decoy device on the new B-1 bomber. If SCAD is placed on the new B-1 bomber, the cost of the program will be boosted hundreds of millions of dollars.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Air Force has also violated Pentagon regulations by refusing to provide Congress with quarterly reports on the status of the program. In addition to covering up hundreds of millions of dollars of cost growth, the Air Force has ignored Congress right provided by the Pentagon's own regulation to receive regular reports on weapons systems.

As many of my colleagues know, if any weapons system will cost more than \$250 million, Pentagon regulations require that Congress be provided with a quarterly report known as a Selected Acquisition Report—SAR. The Air Force has refused to provide SAR's to Congress for several years.

Rather than create another gold-plated monstrosity causing massive cost overruns, the Pentagon should buy a cheap, effective decoy to protect our B-52 bombers.

The years of indecision, mismanagement, and internal haggling may prevent the B-52 from having the decoy devices it needs to penetrate the Soviet Union. The GAO in its report warns:

As a result of indecision and disagreement over basic issues, the program has experienced delays to the point that SCAD is now scheduled to be operational nearly 2 years after the threat it was intended to counter.

Secretary Richardson should put his foot down, stop the petty infighting among the brass, and opt for a cheap, inexpensive decoy to protect our B-52's. Otherwise our bombers, as a result of bickering and internal dissent, may not have the defenses they really need.

WHY AN ENERGY CRISIS?

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Columnist Rus Walton of the Daily Pilot newspapers in Orange County, Calif., has put together a very entertaining, informative, and constructive article on why the Nation is facing an electric power shortage.

He points out that in our zeal to protect the environment, the "bug and bunny" people have successfully blocked many attempts to assure adequate supplies of electricity.

Mr. Walton's is one of the most cogent comments on the subject I have read in some time and I include it in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Daily Pilot, Mar. 8, 1973]

"BUG AND BUNNY" PEOPLE TO BLAME

(By Rus Walton)

There will come a day when the people of California will damn the Sierra Club and the Friends of the Earth and the other environmental extremists. And the politicians who have catered to them.

That day may come in the depths of a frigid winter—or in the middle of a broiling heat wave.

It will be a day when you flip the switch and there is no light. A day when you adjust the thermostat and there is no heat or air

conditioning. A day when you go to the factory or the office and there is no job because there is no juice to turn the wheels or run the computer.

This State faces a critical power shortage. And, it is not far away: 8 to 10 years as things go now.

Paul Clifton, project coordinator for the state Resources Agency and chairman of its Power Plant Siting Committee, wrestles with this problem and he is worried.

Clifton is part of a team that is about to release an inventory of power facilities and projected needs. It is a grim projection.

"California's power requirements will double in the next 8 or 9 years and there is reason to really wonder if the power supply will keep pace with that demand," says Clifton.

"Even if things were opened up and the utility companies start building facilities right now, it would still be nip and tuck. It takes time to plan and license and build a power plant."

The big problem is that the bug and bunny people persist in slowing down, or halting, almost all attempts to solve the power problem.

California faces a severe shortage of fossil fuels on a "near term" basis. Which means that unless new sources of oil and gas are found, the barrel will be dry. Yet, the so-called conservationists persist in blocking plans to expand the oil supply.

They demand a moratorium on offshore exploration and drilling; they are successfully delaying the Alaskan pipeline.

"That pipeline means millions of barrels of oil a day to California. It wouldn't solve our problem, but it would sure help."

One of the obvious answers to the power crunch is the nuclear reactor. But say "nuclear" anywhere near a posey plucker and he goes into orbit.

"Those people have the idea that a nuclear power plant might explode. That it might go off like a bomb. It doesn't and it can't."

Clifton doesn't like the term "conspiracy" but he does feel that unfounded fears, ignorance and extremism are depriving the public of a vital power source.

The likelihood of an accident at an atomic reactor is extremely remote. A UCLA study done for the Resources Agency found that "the public health risk from . . . (either oil or nuclear fueled plants) . . . is in the range of the very low hazards . . . such as being struck by lightning or bitten by a venomous animal (about one death per year in a million population)".

The same report found that workers are 10 times safer in a nuclear power plant than in one fueled by oil.

Clifton believes that nuclear power plants are the only way to meet the power demands of the future.

He is all for the development of "exotic" sources such as geothermal and solar energy. But, those are still a long way off.

"Geothermal power, fully developed from known resources, would supply maybe 10-15 percent of our needs."

As for solar energy, one engineer observed it would require "batteries as big as Arizona" to provide power in any significant amount.

Some of the back-to-nature folks are against the construction of any additional power sources. They want reduction, not production. One of their suggestions is a progressive power rate: the more heat and light and power you use, the higher your rate.

You know who would get it in the neck on that one—the working guy. Through higher utility bills, higher prices for food and clothes, and higher taxes (schools, hospitals and public buildings are major users of power).

The state legislature had better get cracking on removing obstacles to the construction of power facilities.

March 26, 1973

WALTER R. GRAHAM, NOTED SPORTS EDITOR OF THE SPRINGFIELD, MASS., REPUBLICAN AND DAILY NEWS, RETIRED EDITOR OF THE SUNDAY REPUBLICAN, AND CIVIC LEADER: 1899-1973

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest journalists I have ever known, Walter R. Graham, retired editor of the Springfield Sunday Republican and sports editor of the Republican and the Springfield Daily News, died last Friday while vacationing in Florida.

Mr. Graham was a good and close friend of mine. Years ago I worked with him for several seasons managing the Springfield Daily News sandlot leagues and found him to be a tremendously understanding and warmhearted human being.

As the editor of the largest Sunday metropolitan newspaper in western Massachusetts, the Springfield Sunday Republican, Mr. Graham exercised his tremendous responsibilities in a fair, impartial, interesting, and knowledgeable manner. He had the wonderful ability to maintain marvelous communications with many hundreds of people with whom he came in contact and were privileged to know him.

Walter Graham joined the sports staff of the Springfield Daily Republican in 1923 following his graduation from Boston College, and was named sports editor of both the Republican and the Daily News in 1930. As both editor and columnist he understood the world of sports and its personalities as did few of his contemporaries in the newspaper business. He knew all of the great athletes of his era, and wrote about them with passion and consideration while utilizing his vast storehouse of information and knowledge of the world of sports.

He was named editor of the Springfield Sunday Republican in 1947, but he continued in his role as sports editor of the Sunday paper. During his years as sports editor of the Republican, he built up one of the finest sporting sections of any newspaper in the Nation, giving comprehensive coverage to all major national and international sporting events, and complete local and regional coverage to high school, prep school, college, sandlot league, and industrial teams.

Walter Graham's career in journalism spanned 43 years until his retirement in July 1966. Retirement did not put an end to his activity and personal involvement in the affairs of his community. He continued to display an intense interest and participation in the many civic, business, fraternal, and sporting organizations to which he belonged. They included: the Boston College Club of Western Massachusetts, which he founded; the Joint Civic Agencies of Greater Springfield, the Civic Action Committee, United Fund, Red Cross, Chamber of Commerce, Citizens Action Commission, the Springfield Area Development Corp., and as a trustee of the Naismith Memorial Bask-

etball Hall of Fame at Springfield College.

In 1965, Mr. Graham was honored at a testimonial dinner for his years of dedication to amateur sports and civic affairs in Greater Springfield. The board of directors of the Small School Basketball Tournament honored him that same year for his contributions to basketball and he was presented with the 25th Harold M. "Kid" Gore Award. In 1969 Mr. Graham received the John L. Sullivan Memorial Award for his contributions to amateur sports. He also received the Van Horn Parents Sportsmanship Award and a citation from the American Legion for his support of that organization's baseball program.

The Pioneer Valley Press Club in Springfield awarded one of its annual scholarships in Mr. Graham's name in 1965. The Walter R. Graham News Media Award is also given in his honor to outstanding supporters of amateur sports through the western Massachusetts news media. Upon his retirement in 1966, the Massachusetts Senate adopted a resolution commending Mr. Graham for his accomplishments in journalism.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks at this point editorials on Mr. Graham published in today's Springfield Union, yesterday's Sunday Republican, and Saturday's Springfield Daily News:

WALTER R. GRAHAM: LIFE OF SERVICE

Walter R. Graham, retired editor of The Sunday Republican and sports editor of The Republic and The Daily News, who died Friday at 73, was widely known and highly regarded.

An unusually competent newsman, during his 43 years on the Springfield papers, he did much of value for Greater Springfield.

He was one of the most enthusiastic and successful influences in the development of many sports and recreational programs for young people. He was equally zealous and effective in the promotion of numerous worthy civic enterprises for the general community.

Thus his life truly was one of public service. His many good deeds were beneficial to countless people. The memory of Walter Graham, a kindly and generous man, will be treasured forever by all who knew him.

SO LONG, WALTER GRAHAM

Editors don't write about other editors. We don't make news.

Normally.

That was not the case with Walter Graham, retired editor of the Springfield Sunday Republican and sports editor of the Daily News.

He had a gift that most hard-headed newsmen aren't blessed with. He charmed people. He had a knack for relating to the young, the old, the deprived. He walked with kings and queens and paupers, too. If a situation was dark and dreary, Walter brought sunshine.

His ballpark was sports. His fans were every man.

To walk in his shadow, as Horace Hill, his right arm and now associate editor of these newspapers, said was "a profound thing."

Walter Graham is missed. To his widow and family and host of friends, we can only add that his legacy of encouraging sports at all levels, especially for the young, was, and is one of the cornerstones for which the Springfield Union and Sunday Republican exist.

Who says newspapermen don't make news?

WALTER R. GRAHAM, A NEWSMAN FIRST

Walter R. Garham was a newspaperman, first and foremost. He was a skilled editor

who made the sports pages of The Daily News and The Republican come alive for thousands upon thousands of sports fans throughout Western Massachusetts and for many readers outside of this area.

As sports editor of both papers for 36 years, and as managing editor of The Sunday Republican, Mr. Graham compiled a record of achievement that is tribute enough to his long service with The Springfield Newspapers.

But, Walter Graham was much more than a professional newsman. He was—to his many coworkers at the newspapers and to his countless friends in the world of sports and in the Greater Springfield community—a gentleman and a warm and friendly person.

In fact, during his more than three decades as a sports editor, Mr. Graham was probably the best known and most widely known representative of The Springfield Newspapers in Western Massachusetts. He served as toastmaster at banquets and sports functions on more occasions than probably even he could remember. And his "biographical poetry," with which he saluted many outstanding athletes and others in the community, came to be regarded as a Walter Graham "trademark."

Yet, it would be telling only part of his story to confine his accomplishments to his years as a reporter and then as an editor—a career that spanned 43 years from the time he joined the sports staff of The Republican in 1923 to his retirement in 1966. And the story is not complete if it stops with his many years of service in community affairs, or his reputation as a speaker and toastmaster.

For Mr. Graham was intensely interested in the people who populate the world of sports. He knew them all in this area and he was particularly interested in amateur sports. He was, as fellow newspaperman George Keefe point out, "The heart and soul of The Daily News sandlot baseball for 40 years."

He was, in point of fact, the "heart and soul" of whatever sport you care to name—baseball, hockey, basketball, boxing, and all the rest.

It is a measure of the great esteem and deep affection in which Mr. Graham was held by his coworkers that the first tributes—when the tragic news of his death reached us last night—came from the people who worked with him and knew him best at the newspapers.

As Sam Pompei, co-sports editor of The Daily News, summed up his feelings on learning of Mr. Graham's death in Florida: "He'd bend over backwards to be fair to anybody. He tried to be a good guy almost to a fault. I can't begin to list all the people he did things for. And he did them because he wanted to and for no other reason."

Walter Graham's death is a shock to all who respected him as an editor, admired him for his many, many contributions to sports programs and the concept of good sportsmanship, and loved him as a friend.

His death, at age 73, must also sadden the entire community because the Greater Springfield community is a better place today because of the personal imprint Mr. Graham left upon it.

We salute him for a job well done. And we mourn his passing.

HENRY GOUDY

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay public tribute to one of my constituents, Mr. Henry Goudy,

who retired recently after 34 years as fire chief in the city of Wayne.

Mr. Goudy, who was born September 2, 1911, in Wayne, was the son of Charles Goudy, the city's fire chief from 1911 until his death in 1938, when Henry was named to the position. As a result, for the first time in 62 years, a Goudy is not serving as the head of Wayne's Fire Department.

Henry Goudy actually began his firefighting career as a high school student, in 1926, when he began working for the city as a Jack of all trades in the public works department. At that time, all city employees were automatically members of the volunteer fire department. When the fire siren sounded in the village hall—now the city's historical museum—young Henry rushed from his classroom to join his fellow firefighters. He had permission from his teachers and was the envy of the other students.

In 1929, the community established a formal fire department, and Goudy became half of the two-man force, working nights while the other man worked days. They were assisted by volunteers. The senior Goudy was still in command. Upon his death in 1938, the village council named Henry as chief.

Under his leadership, the department grew steadily. For more than 20 years, from 1941 until 1962, the Wayne Fire Department provided protection to both Wayne and the township of Nankin. In 1953, they moved to the present-day fire station.

By the time Goudy retired, the department listed 19 fulltime firemen, with a fleet of modern equipment including two rescue units.

During his long tenure, Goudy received many awards and citations for his service. He is especially proud that he served a year as president of the Great Lakes District of Firefighters, which includes fire chiefs in a nine-State area. He is also justly proud of his department's firefighting record. Although Wayne has had its share of fires, there has never been a major fire involving loss of life. No fireman was ever lost on the job during his years as chief.

Goudy and his wife, Genevieve, who taught in Wayne schools for more than 20 years, have been married 31 years. They live on Sims Street, next to the house in which he was born. The couple's daughter, Jane, is a senior at Eastern Michigan University.

Mr. Speaker, I share in the pride which every Wayne resident feels for this outstanding public servant, and I am happy to bring his story to the attention of my colleagues.

IN SUPPORT OF CONGRESSMAN O'NEILL

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago our distinguished colleague and House majority leader, Congressman

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

O'NEILL, spoke out against the administration's tampering with farm policies which have resulted in some of the highest food prices in years.

As a result of unrealistic crop production controls and inept administration of our national farm output, families across the Nation are forced to pay prices which are often 20 percent or more than we paid last year.

I fully agree with Congressman O'NEILL that the administration's action in these matters deserves the full indignation of the American people. And, Congressman O'NEILL is to be highly congratulated for speaking out against the policies which have unnecessarily brought economic hardship to many persons, and in particular to the poor, the elderly and others who must subsist on fixed incomes.

The American citizens of Guam must suffer the fruits of our present farm policies also—policies which tell farmers to cut back on planting vital crops at a time when we need more output and not less. Guam imports a great deal of our food-stuffs from the mainland United States. Because of the considerable distance which these items are shipped, our cost of living is among the highest for any American community.

The cost of meat, eggs, milk, bread, and almost any other staple which we consider necessary for our daily diet will cost the consumer almost twice as much on Guam as it will in California, for example. It does not take much imagination, then, to understand what happens to food prices on Guam as a result of skyrocketing prices on the mainland.

But in the midst of this unprecedented rise in food prices, do we find succor in the statements of our Federal officials? Do we hear promises of action which will result in food prices being lowered and farm production being increased to meet the growing demands of both the American consumer and that of others to whom we sell great amounts of food?

Hardly. What we hear is administration spokesmen telling us that we should all be thankful that the food price increases will be a bit slower during the rest of the year.

And while we are also being lectured that price controls will not work, the Labor Department is stunning the consumer with the news that our cost of living, mainly thanks to higher food prices, increased more last month than in any other month since 1951.

There are many inequities in life which man is willing to bear with some degree of resignation. But farm policies which give the Russians cheap wheat and make the middleman rich, while forcing some American families to go without a decent meal, are not among the things in life which we should forebear willingly.

Across the Nation voices are rising in protest against the relentless march upward of food prices. How much longer is the American public to condone policies which seem to have no other purpose than to benefit the few and deny the many?

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the American consumer, whether he be on Guam or anywhere else in this great country, will continue to protest vigorously until those

who are making our farm policies understand that the time has come to put the interests of the average family first, before that of business or our foreign trading partners.

THE PONY EXPRESS—MAIL SERVICE OR SNAIL SERVICE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the operation of the U.S. Postal Service regrettably has become something of a bad joke—a return to the Pony Express mail service of the Old West days would be an improvement in many areas of the Nation.

For example, in Watertown, Tenn., in the Fourth Congressional District of Tennessee which I am honored to represent in the Congress, 6 days were required for urgently needed medicine mailed from Lebanon, Tenn., to reach Watertown, Tenn., some 15 miles distant.

The press, congressional hearings and my mail have provided many such examples.

The fact is that rather than providing an efficient mail service, the U.S. Postal Service has developed inefficiency into an art. One letter, for example, required 17 days to reach its destination 50 feet away in Charleston, W. Va. One citizen in Lantana, Fla., was outraged when 2 weeks was required to receive a letter from his next-door neighbor. In Atlanta, 10 days was required for a letter to reach its destination 4 miles away.

Recently I received a call from a friend and constituent, Mr. Cecil Elrod of Murfreesboro, Tenn., who related the instance of a resident of nearby Smyrna who called his dress shop on a Monday to order a pair of gloves for a wedding on the following Saturday. Smyrna is 12 miles from Murfreesboro.

The gloves failed to arrive in time for the wedding 5 days later—they were delivered the following Monday, precisely 7 days later.

As a result of this continuing and persistent pattern of inefficiency and poor management, I have reluctantly concluded that my vote in favor of establishing the Postal Service was a mistake. In my view, Congress should seriously consider reestablishing the Post Office Department as formerly constituted.

The Constitution, Article I, Section 8, declares:

Congress shall have the power to establish post offices and post roads.

Congress exercised its mandate and responsibility for almost 300 years—and achieved a much more efficient mail delivery service than the now highly-touted mail service, which has been called the "snail service."

However, we were led to believe that the Post Office Department should be turned over to management experts who could solve the isolated problems that existed at that time.

Frankly, it has been my suspicion all

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

along that much of this was a political ploy to replace career specialists with favored appointees—and a recent study showed that the hierarchy of the Postal Service is loaded with fat cat political appointments.

Twenty postal officials earn more than \$42,500 a year. I am advised that this equals the number of officials in this salary range in all other executive branches, Cabinet members excluded.

The American Postal Worker magazine in a recent article points out that executive positions in the \$15,000 to \$60,000 bracket in the Postal Service have increased in number from 84 to 1,846.

The magazine then lists a number of examples of little known patronage jobs created in the Postal Service.

These include Manager of Creative Services—\$25,183 to \$33,493; Social Priorities Specialist—\$18,634 to \$24,783; and Suggestions Award Administrator—\$22,767 to \$30,280—among many others.

It is no wonder then that the operation of the Postal Service under this type of management has been replete with miscalculations, poor judgment decisions, slowdown in service, blunders, and the projection of a false image of accomplishments that reportedly even deceived the top Postmaster General.

Indications are that many of the problems confronting the Postal Service stem from these basic mistakes:

A reduction in the postal work force of 40,000 employees with a job freeze at a time when the volume of mail is increasing by the billions of pieces each year.

Forcing postal workers to work overtime and long hours on a continuing basis, resulting in lost efficiency and low morale, and increased costs.

Offering bonus incentives to encourage veteran career employees and experienced management personnel to retire, which left great gaps in the management experience and capability of the Postal Service.

A breakdown in management in varying degrees caused by the inexperience of the new executives who, as one magazine charitably put it, are unfamiliar with the quirks of public service.

Rushing into an automated system without proper testing.

Reductions in mail service with elimination of many post offices, rural routes and other services in rural areas and small towns.

The general "public-be-damned" attitude by many officials of the Postal Service that relegated service to the people to a lower priority than effecting reductions in personnel and budget.

The refusal to heed advice and counsel from Congress.

Postmaster General Elmer T. Klassen recently, in a moment of candor, admitted that the Postal Service was so "hell bent" on reducing costs that we perhaps lost track of service, which is an amazing admission from the manager of the national postal service corporation. In another moment of candor, General Klassen said, as reported in the press, that he did not give a damn what publicly elected officials say about mail service.

March 26, 1973

double bent, insured parcels broken & handled like pieces of cast iron.

Pass this along to the proper committee Chairman or other bureaucrat.

RALPH BEARD.

MAIL SERVICE DETERIORATES ACROSS UNITED STATES

The mail service in the U.S. just ain't what it used to be.

The old philosophy that the mail must get through doesn't mean much anymore. The new postal service, that is being run as a private corporation instead of as a branch of the government, seems to have a completely new theory about moving the mails.

Transportation in this country has improved considerably in the past few decades over what it used to be. Yet it takes longer to get a letter from Florida to California than it did 20 years ago. An airplane can fly from coast-to-coast in three or four hours but it may take as much as three or four days to send a letter across the country by airmail.

"We take our hats off to the post office people," Bill Stewart, president of D & S Color said. "They're doing their best to make an impossible system work."

"We have nothing against the people who work for the postal services, but we do believe the present system of handling the mail needs revision."

One of the major reasons for breakdown in efficiency since the system became a private corporation is that the thousands of postal workers who are retiring all the time are not being replaced. And despite the claims of automation in the post office these days, it's still not possible to move the mails without people.

Mail is being received at D & S Color without post dates or even the town it was sent from. The mail boxes in front of our local main post office have no pickup time on them anymore. Apparently the postal service isn't quite sure when the mail will be collected from the boxes.

As far as D & S photo packages are concerned, all of them leave our West Coast Florida lab stamped with the mailing date. Any of our customers who receive their photos late should have their local post office stamp when the box arrived at its destination and return the stamped portion of the box along with a letter protesting the mail service to D & S. We'll take care of the rest.

Stewart feels that now is the time to let the politicians know about the inefficiency of the postal service. It's an election year and if our elected officials get complaints from thousands of their constituents about the deterioration of the service they will undoubtedly take notice and possibly even do something.

Although the control of the postal service has been taken out of the hands of the politicians in Washington, it is still under the control of the Capitol bureaucracy and the elected officials still have some say. In fact, they have considerable say if they want to, because they allocate a portion of the money used by the new postal service to keep the mails moving.

So let your elected officials know how you feel about the service you've been getting. Whether it's the slow down in the packages from D & S or the inability to get a letter from place-to-place within a reasonable time—let them hear about it. That's the only way the mail service will be improved.

TULLAHOMA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INC.

Tullahoma, Tenn., June 8, 1971.

Mr. W. D. PARHAM,

Postmaster Tullahoma Tenn.

DEAR MR. PARHAM: As President of the Tullahoma Chamber of Commerce, with over 160 commercial, industrial and professional members, I request your assistance in realigning Tullahoma in the Area Mail Processing Sys-

Regrettably, the Postal Service has become an object of concern and ridicule, and much of the great service tradition of the Post Office Department has been lost.

Someone has suggested that the next Christmas stamp bear the words—"O Lord, Deliver Me."

It has also been suggested that all postal executives be required to see the movie "Deliverance" in the hope that they will get the point.

However, this subject is really not a joking matter—this relegation of a proud service to a symbol of bad management and inefficiency and the resulting impact on vital and needed mail deliveries.

In this connection, a sampling of the mail I have received from constituents concerning the poor Postal Service follows:

WATERTOWN, TENN.,
December 1, 1971.

HON. JOE L. EVINS,

DEAR SIR: I'm writing you in regard to our mail. We order medicine mailed out from Lebanon and we live at Watertown and the postmaster at Lebanon told me on the telephone that they send the mail that is to come from Lebanon to Watertown—He sends it to Nashville and they keep it there until he gets a sack full then is sent back thru Lebanon back to Watertown. It doesn't make sense to me. We ordered some medicine the other day was mailed on Thursday and we did not get it until the next Tuesday and I thought mail was always sent the quickest route.

If you will look around Lebanon you will find plenty complaints besides us. This happens very often but this is just one example. I told Mr. Wright that I was going to write you about it and he said I need not do that there was nothing you could do about it.

We have had this trouble for 5 or 6 years and I just hated to write you about it.

Yours,

HOMER JOHNSON.

LIVINGSTON, TENN.,
October 17, 1971.

HON. JOE L. EVINS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EVINS: I'm writing you this letter on a Sunday, but there's no good reason for it because it won't leave Livingston until Monday afternoon. Since one of the recent "efficiency" moves by the post office, there has been no mail going out or coming into Livingston on Sundays or holidays. This means that during the increased number of Monday holidays we have no dispatches of mail from Saturday afternoon until Monday afternoon . . . which is almost unbelievable in these days of supposed "rapid communication"!

All along, it seems that the postal rates have increased and our mail service decreased. This is a bad combination! Can you assist us in securing adequate mail service? I am sure that I speak for a large number of citizens of this town and the surrounding area in bringing this situation to your attention. All of us will greatly appreciate the help you are able to give us toward improvement of our mail service.

Sincerely,

RALPH A. PRATHER,
LEWISBURG, TENN.,

August 24, 1972.

Rep. J. L. EVINS,
Washington, D.C.:

Attached is a clipping that expresses my experience with the deteriorating Postal Service.

I have received 1st Class Air Mail double Cardboard protected that was punctured &

tem. I understand that both Chattanooga and Nashville will be Sectional Centers and under the present alignment, all the Tullahoma out-of-town mail will go to Chattanooga for canceling and sorting and will then be rerouted. I also understand that you will be required to dispatch the out-of-town mail at 3:30 p.m. rather than 5:30 p.m.

If the proposed alignment becomes effective, one extra day and possibly two extra days will be involved in sending and receiving mail to and from Nashville. For example, if a business order from Tullahoma to Nashville is mailed after 3:30 p.m., it would not leave here until 3:30 p.m., the next day. It would then be canceled and sorted in Chattanooga, and then sent to Nashville and delivered probably on the third day after the mailing date. This situation would cause a very adverse effect on the residents of Tullahoma and on business activity here.

As you know, Tullahoma is economically and culturally aligned with Nashville instead of Chattanooga and the bulk of our out-of-town mail and commercial orders go to Nashville in the natural course of events. It is, therefore, very important that Tullahoma be aligned with the Nashville Center instead of Chattanooga.

Please advise us what we can do to accomplish this alignment.

Yours very truly,

DOYLE E. RICHARDSON,
President, Tullahoma Chamber of Commerce.

CUMBERLAND VALLEY
BROADCASTING CO., INC.,
McMinnville, Tenn., February 26, 1973.
Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: A recent article which appeared in an issue of the "American Postal Worker," a copy of which is enclosed, has infuriated employees of the McMinnville post office. Frustrated already as a result of the mounting complaints which are accompanying the handling of mail by the National Postal Service, one of them handed me the enclosed and suggested that I pass same along to you.

As I have earlier suggested, I do not believe the Post Office Department can long continue under its present method of operation. I further believe that 95 per cent of the employees of the local office would prefer to return to the former system.

The poor performance of the mails is a daily topic of conversation among business people, shippers and those who must rely on the service and because of this poor performance, many are turning to such agencies as U-P-S and others for delivery service. If present arrangements continue, it will not be long until such agencies as U-P-S will make the post office an almost total liability on the taxpayers.

"Where The Plums Are" is just another example of the false economy of the Nixon administration and its deception.

Ever your friend,

CHICK BROWN.

The Postal Service has established methods of processing mail that requires that much mail travel circuitous routes to reach a destination of only a few miles.

Mail deliveries have been reduced and cut back, collection boxes have been removed, small branch post offices have been closed, post offices are closed on Saturdays in many communities—all of these cutbacks in services are occurring despite increases in postal rates.

Our people have a right to demand and expect efficient mail delivery service and we must remember that the Post Office Department was not established as a profitmaking business venture, but as a

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

needed and necessary service—an essential service mandated by the Constitution.

If strong action to remedy these deficiencies requires the restructuring of the present Postal Service and the reestablishment of the U.S. Post Office Department—responsive to the public need—then Congress should act in the public interest.

DR. RALPH DAVID ABERNATHY TESTIFIES ON REVENUE SHARING

HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Reverend Dr. Ralph David Abernathy, president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, testified at the U.S. Department of the Treasury, Office of the Secretary and Office of Revenue Sharing, on proposed regulations under the Revenue Sharing Act.

Dr. Abernathy gave a stern warning about a danger implicit in the concept of revenue sharing when he said:

... we cannot ignore the possibility that in the long run "Revenue Sharing" may prove to be merely the financial underpinning for a return to the infamous "states rights" doctrine, which, as we all know, so far in the history of this country has never been progressive.

Dr. Abernathy specifically called for strengthening of antidiscriminatory rules under revenue sharing, and guaranteeing compliance with the regulations.

I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to read this statement and take note of Dr. Abernathy's reminder that the victims of poverty and discrimination are taxpayers, too, and have a right to their full share of the funds disbursed under revenue sharing. Dr. Abernathy concludes—

Our movement to secure these rights, is in no mood to put up with the kind of trickery and cruel deception which was the experience of our people when Reconstruction was brutally ended 100 years ago.

His full statement follows.

STATEMENT BY DR. RALPH DAVID ABERNATHY

Mr. Chairman: These public hearings are being convened at a time of deep social crisis in our country. The evidence of this crisis is all around us. It need not be detailed by me at this time. Nevertheless, none of us can afford to be unmindful of the fact that the nature of the crisis in our country today threatens the important gains achieved by the American people through the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960's; gains which took much hard work and much sacrifice to make a reality.

Today, with unemployment and underemployment for millions of people who want jobs becoming a permanent feature of the economic life of this society; with deplorable housing conditions and declining social services, especially in the cities, a fact of everyday life, one must pose the question: Does this General Revenue Sharing Act represent a serious effort by the Congress to honestly meet its moral obligations as elected representatives of the people of this country? I, for one, having serious reservations about the very philosophy behind the Revenue Sharing proposals as a means of dealing with

the many problems facing our country today. For we cannot ignore the possibility that in the long run "Revenue Sharing" may prove to be merely the financial underpinning for a return to the infamous "states rights" doctrine, which, as we all know, so far in the history of this country has never been progressive. As a case in point, in the city of Atlanta, where the Southern Christian Leadership Conference maintains its national headquarters, and my home, it was once proposed by the City Fathers that Revenue Sharing funds be used to give rebates to utility companies.

At any rate, our three organizations: Operation PUSH, the National Welfare Rights Organization and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, represented here today and supported by many other organizations, are registering our concern with various features of this legislation, which I understand is commonly known as the General Revenue Sharing Act of 1972 (public law 92-512).

As President of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, an organization which over the past 18 years has some record of involvement in the struggle to end racist practices in our country, I want to call particular attention to that section of the General Revenue Sharing Act dealing with the problem of discrimination. This is Section 51.32 in the Rules and Regulations covering the handling of Revenue Sharing funds. This Section of the General Revenue Sharing Act correctly adopts some of the language of Title VI of the Civil Rights of 1964, which was a landmark piece of social legislation prohibiting discrimination in the handling of federal funds.

However, Part 4-E in this Section of the Revenue Sharing Bill, dealing with the important point of guaranteeing compliance with the anti-discrimination clause, is very weakly and loosely worded. This Section, if it is to be of value, must be strengthened to require that the secretary monitor and determine compliance not only of "recipient government" as now stated in that bill, but also private banks, loan agencies, and other institutions receiving such federal Revenue Sharing funds. Given the long history of racist practices of the banking and other financial institutions in our country, any serious compliance and review procedure must make these agencies directly accountable to the federal government and on a regularized basis.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, we strongly urge that Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 be incorporated in letter and spirit into the General Revenue Sharing Act in order to guarantee much-needed safeguards against discriminatory practices. Under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 the range of employment practices in which discrimination is prohibited include such things as hiring, firing, lay-off, recall, and promotional opportunities on the job. Furthermore, state and local governments, employment agencies and labor organizations are subject to the anti-discrimination rule under Title VII. The General Revenue Sharing Act of 1972 needs such provisions.

Mr. Chairman, the long dark night of discrimination is not yet over in our country and we are fully aware that there are those in high places who wish to increase and prolong the darkness. Yet, the millions in our country who have known poverty and discrimination are determined to share in the abundance which the gross national product of this country represents. This is a right which we are committed to see become a reality. And our movement to secure these rights is in no mood to put up with the kind of trickery and cruel deception which was the experience of our people when Reconstruction was brutally ended 100 years ago.

Blacks, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, together with millions of whites (who, by the way, are the majority of poor in Amer-

ica) pay billions of dollars in taxes to the federal government each year. "Revenue Sharing" is a mockery if the needs of this population are ignored or under-represented in the distribution of these funds.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

EULOGY TO STANLEY E. WAYMAN

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

MR. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, Stanley E. Wayman, one of the Nation's outstanding photographers and a fifth generation Floridian, died here in Washington. Only 45 years old, Mr. Wayman had an outstanding career in the field of photography and was a staff member of Life magazine from 1957 until 1971. He won numerous awards, including the White House Press Photographers' Association Award, of which he was a member. Mr. Wayman's career carried him all over the world. He once lived for weeks in the Baffin Bay area of the Arctic photographing the white walrus, and on another occasion he swam with Jon Lindbergh under water off the coast of Peru to photograph whales. I would like to insert in the Record comments on Mr. Wayman as carried by the Miami Herald, the Washington-Star News, and the Washington Post:

[From the Miami Herald, March 1973]

STANLEY WAYMAN, 45, NOTED PHOTOGRAPHER
(By Earl Dehart)

Services for Stanley E. Wayman, 45, a former photographer for The Miami Herald and for Life magazine until it folded in 1972, will be at 10 a.m. Tuesday in the Metropolitan Methodist Church in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Wayman, a native of Moore Haven, Fla., who got his first camera when he was 12, died Saturday of a heart attack in Washington while driving a babysitter home.

Police said the car went out of control and struck a utility pole in Northwest Washington. The babysitter was not seriously hurt.

Mr. Wayman had worked for The Miami Herald from 1950 to 1955 before becoming a fulltime free-lance photographer for national magazines through the New York agency of Ralph and Guillmette.

During his Herald career he covered many big news stories and gained both state and national awards for some of his outstanding pictures.

John Walther, the Herald's chief photographer, said Mr. Wayman came to the newspaper from Pan American World Airways, where he was a public relations photographer.

"He was just about the first photographer (at The Herald) to use 35mm cameras," Walther said.

"He really enjoyed outdoor stuff like fashion and nature assignments."

Mr. Wayman received national coverage in Newsweek in 1954 after taking pictures of the arrest and jailing of a local bookie suspect. The magazine used his photographs as a peg to review the gambling situation in Greater Miami and the part The Herald played in helping drive out big-time gambling operations.

After leaving The Herald, Mr. Wayman was named first prize winner in the series division of a nationwide contest conducted by the University of Missouri School of Journalism.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

At Life, he worked in Washington, Moscow, Paris and Bonn until the magazine closed operations.

He had covered four presidents and was known for his cover stories and photo essays on wildlife.

Mr. Wayman was born 10 miles west of Moore Haven and was graduated from Moore Haven High School.

When he was 12, his dad bought him a camera and darkroom equipment. The trouble was, there wasn't any darkroom. The imaginative young Wayman looked about and set up his darkroom in a nearby abandoned outhouse.

The local newspaper said, "Despite these primitive surroundings, Wayman has done quite well with his photography."

He was the only official photographer correspondent assigned to Moscow by Life for several years, and was one of Life's photographers who covered Nikita Khrushchev's visit to the United States.

"Khrushchev is a good subject to photograph from any angle," Mr. Wayman said in 1960. He added that the Russian leader could be readily recognized, even from the back of his head.

"Most of Life's pictures are editorially honest," he once said.

"A photographer must be editorially honest and lean over backward so as not to inject his personality into the picture."

Mr. Wayman is survived by his wife, Diane; three children, Seth, Sara, and Katherine Ann; his mother, Rena; and a brother, Tom.

The family requests memorials be sent to the Heart Fund.

[From the Sunday Star and Daily News, Mar. 11, 1973]

STANLEY E. WAYMAN, 45; PRIZE-WINNING
LENSMAN

Stanley E. Wayman, 45, a prize-winning photographer best known for his work with Life Magazine, died Friday after a heart attack. He lived on 44th Street NW.

Police said Mr. Wayman was driving his car in the 2100 block of Foxhall Road NW when he was stricken. The auto then struck a utility pole.

Mr. Wayman, highly acclaimed for his nature photography, joined Life in 1957, serving in Chicago, Paris, Bonn and Moscow. His picture of one of the National Zoo pandas appeared in the final issue of Life in December.

Mr. Wayman's career carried him literally to the ends of the earth. Once he lived for weeks in the Baffin Bay area of the Arctic with only wolves as his companions. On another assignment, he swam with Charles Lindbergh under water off the coast of Peru to photograph whales. He covered four presidents with his camera.

A native of Moore Haven, Fla., he took up photography at the age of 12.

He leaves his wife, Diane, and three children, Seth, Sara and Katherine Ann; his mother, Mrs. Rena Wayman of La Belle, Fla., and a brother, Tom Wayman, of Palm Beach, Fla.

Services will be at 10 a.m. Tuesday at Metropolitan Methodist Church, New Mexico and Nebraska Avenues NW.

The family suggests that expressions of sympathy be in the form of contributions to the Heart Fund.

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

STANLEY WAYMAN, EX-'LIFE' LENSMAN

Stanley E. Wayman, a former photographer with Life magazine whose last assignment was in its Washington bureau, died early Saturday following a heart attack. He was 45.

Police said Mr. Wayman was driving a baby-sitter home when he apparently suf-

fered the attack. The car went out of control and struck a utility pole. The babysitter was not hurt seriously.

Mr. Wayman was born in Moore Haven, Fla., and by the age of 12 he had decided to be a photographer. He bought his first camera with the proceeds he received from shooting squirrels and selling their pelts to Sears & Roebuck. When he finally bought the camera, he threw away the gun and never fired one again.

He joined Life magazine in 1957, after working for newspapers in Florida, and remained with Life until it folded last December. At the time of his death, he was free lance out of Washington.

Mr. Wayman's specialty was nature photography and his pictures of wild animals from various parts of the world appeared numerous times on the magazine's cover. During his tenure with Life, he was assigned to bureaus in Paris, Bonn and in Moscow before coming to Washington. The family resided at 3212 44th St. NW.

He received numerous photography awards, including six first-place awards from the White House Press Photographers Association, of which he was a member.

He is survived by his wife, Diane, his children, Seth, Sarah and Katherine Ann Wayman; a brother, Thomas, of Palm Beach, Fla., and his mother, Rena Wayman, of La Belle, Fla.

VETERANS: THE TRUE WELCOME HOME

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

MR. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, in all the hoopla and ballyhoo over our returning veterans, we must not lose sight of what so many men are coming home to: unemployment and welfare. The situation in New York City is particularly serious, with few job openings and veterans with minimal job training. In this light, I commend Eleanor Holmes Norton, chairman of the City Commission on Human Rights, for initiating hearings on this subject. A New York Post editorial of March 6 entitled "Unheralded Veterans" is quite relevant and timely. I now submit the editorial for your attention and the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

UNHERALDED VETERANS

A warm national welcome has been accorded the men from the Vietnamese prison camps in recent days and it is assured those who will follow them home; the country has been far less generous to another kind of veteran—to whom POW could mean Put Out of Work.

As Chairman Eleanor Norton of the City Commission on Human Rights observed yesterday, "thousands of ordinary soldiers" have returned home without any recognition comparable to the reception for the captured men; on the contrary, they are no better trained for civilian jobs than they were when inducted, 4000 of them are now on welfare in this city alone and there may be many more added to the rolls in the coming months.

The CCHR plans to conduct hearings on the subject later this month. It is a matter of national interest—in common with the new report from the Center for the Study of Responsive Law which describes the many failures of the nation's veterans' hospitals in

meeting the needs of the men home from Vietnam. The difficulty, very often, is budgetary and administrative, not professional.

It has been noted frequently that the return of the Vietnam GI has often gone unnoticed—or even been guiltily ignored. The reception for the prisoners cannot compensate for the broader negligence.

ABORTION

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to insert again excerpts of medical evidence from the Massachusetts criminal abortion trial Commonwealth against Brunelle. As I said, it is tragic that the U.S. Supreme Court decided such a grave constitutional issue with an incomplete record because the trial court hearings, in the case decided, consisted only of oral arguments; no medical experts testified and no depositions were taken by the trial courts.

In the Massachusetts case, factual evidence was taken.

The excerpts follow:

CROSS EXAMINATION OF MALKAH T. NOTMAN, M.D., BY MR. IRWIN

Q. (by Mr. Irwin) How about when the surgeon removes the fetus? Is that killing a human being, in your judgment?

A. (Dr. Notman) I don't know that the issue of a human being comes into it.

Q. You don't?

A. It is a fetus.

Q. It is, and is it nonhuman, in your testimony?

A. The whole consideration of what is human, I think, is not really a medical issue. Is a tumor non-human?—because it grows. Is a toenail nonhuman because it is removed from a toe?

Q. Does a toenail breathe and think and have a pulse?

Q. Does a tumor?

A. No, not independently.

Q. A fetus does, doesn't it?

A. Breathe and think and have a pulse?

Q. Yes.

A. It depends on what age.

Q. Even as early as 12 weeks, does it not?

A. Think?

Q. Think.

A. No.

Q. At what age does it think?

A. After it is born.

Q. Does it react if it is touched in the womb of the mother?

A. I don't know.

Q. To stimuli?

A. I think it rarely has the occasion to do that.

Q. Have you ever heard of transplacental uterine transfusion?

A. Yes.

Q. That is a medical procedure whereby the fetus in the womb of the mother is transfused directly?

A. I don't know that it is the fetus.

Q. What is it at that point?

A. It may be the fetus. I am not familiar with the exact procedure. It is a transfusion of—sometimes it is fluid and sometimes it is blood.

Q. Into a human being?

A. It is into the fetus.

Q. With restoration?

A. Not necessarily.

Q. In 90 percent of the cases, does [it] have restoration?

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A. I don't know.

Q. You're an M.D.

A. Yes. When I was training, this was not a procedure that was done, and it is not my area of specialization.

Q. Do you concede to the Court that this zygote—are you familiar with the term "zygote"?

A. Yes.

..... if left in its own state and unhindered by any intervention except spontaneously, will mature into a human being?

A. No. Can I explain?

Q. You are not aware of that?

A. It won't. Not necessarily.

Q. Let's forget abortion.

A. Or fetal illness or maternal illness or maternal nutrition?

Q. Let's talk about abortionists. If we can keep abortionists away from the fetus, and all the other natural illnesses that kill fetuses, will you tell us whether or not that zygote will eventually be a human being?

A. I don't think that is a question I can answer, because the whole basis of the question is a misconception.

Q. Why don't you let me decide, or the Court decide, whether the whole basis of my question is a misconception.

Do you know what a zygote is?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you think it is relevant to the whole question of whether or not the law should allow somebody to invade the womb and kill this thing—and that's what you people refer to as a thing—do you refer to this as a "thing" or a growth?

A. Yes.

Q. Or a witless tapole, or something like that?

A. We don't call it names. We call it a fetus.

Q. You are not quite prepared to say to the Court whether or not that fetus is living or human or capable of existence, are you?

A. I think your form of the question is not answerable, because there are many, many things that are living that are not human.

Q. We understand that, but the abortionists are not working on that.

A. The surgeons may be.

Q. Do you want to tell us, if you would, please, whether or not you have an opinion as to when that growth becomes a human being, or do you have no opinion?

A. I think the concept of human being is not a medical concept.

Q. It becomes human only after the child is born, is that right?

A. That's right.

Q. You have no trouble labeling an infant two months old out of its mother's womb or two minutes old out of its mother's womb as a human being?

A. That's correct.

Q. What is it that makes it at that point a human being?

A. His capacity of existence.

Q. He has that capacity at five months, if you want to go in surgically and take him out of his mother's womb?

A. At six or seven months. I haven't heard of any at five or six.

Q. You haven't heard of any at six months who have lived?

A. It depends on the weight.

Q. Have you heard of any prematurely born infants who were five or six months old who lived outside of their mother's womb? Is it your testimony you don't know of that?

A. My testimony is that I don't know of that.

Q. Of anybody, any youngster who ever lived at that age, five or six months, outside of his mother's womb. How about seven months?

A. Seven is possible.

Q. Is it a human being?

A. After it's born.

Q. Only after it is born. Will you tell the Court what it is that makes this miracle of

passing from the womb out to this world, what is it that transforms that fetus, as you call it, into a human being at that point.

A. I think these are extremely vague kinds of things to answer. They are answered by different people in different ways. This is not medical.

Q. I understand; where the child is born dead naturally, and so on and so forth, because the nutritional . . .

A. Or mentally retarded.

Q. Let's suppose the case of the healthy woman who has no illness, who has a healthy zygote and eventually a healthy fetus, and has great nutrition: Will that eventually be a human being she gives birth to?

A. After she gives birth.

Q. Not until the moment she gives birth?

A. That's right.

Q. By that, do you mean 36 weeks?

A. Do you think this is something really relevant to my area of expertise?

Q. Do you know that, if uninhibited by natural disease to the mother or itself or without the intervention of an abortionist, will that zygote eventually mature into a human being?

A. It depends on the nutritional state of the mother, and there are large parts of the world where . . .

Q. Why don't you answer?

A. This is not a medical question. It is a religious one or . . .

Q. You said medically it is a human being at seven months?

A. After it is born. It is capable of independent existence.

Q. And it is capable of that long before it is born, is it not?

A. Not long before it is born.

Q. Is it a day before?

A. I don't know. I would like to make a comment about . . .

Q. I know, you would like to make a lot of comments. Mr. Oteri will allow you to make whatever comments you feel are necessary, and the Court will decide whether or not he feels they are appropriate.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION OF MALKAH T. NOTMAN, M.D., BY MR. OTERI

Q. (by Mr. Oteri) Now Doctor, at one point Mr. Irwin was talking to you about the difference between humanity or human beings and the fetus, and he asked you about the day before the birth it was a human being, and you attempted to answer him and were stopped.

Is there anything you want to add to that?

A. (Dr. Notman) I don't think the issue when the fetus is a human being, I don't think that I can answer and attempt to pin it down to the day before birth or six days before. I would have to say the same thing: There are many things in medicine there are no clear answers, or many things in biology where there is no clear answer, such as sometimes the difference between living and not living, and I don't feel that I can answer this issue of humanity.

Q. Is it your opinion that the issue of humanity is not a medical decision?

A. That's right.

Q. Mr. Irwin asked you at one point was the zygote a human being, and, if allowed to develop without interruption by the spontaneous abortion and nutrition failures and many other things which result in the fetus being expelled, it would develop into a human being.

Would you please tell us your feeling on the development of the zygote and its potential for birth?

A. My best informed judgment is that this concept of letting a zygote develop, or letting a fetus develop, is a misconception; that in order for a normal pregnancy, an ordinary role of pregnancy to occur, there has to be a very intimate relationship, nutritionally and many other ways—circulation, excretion of wastes and other ways—between the moth-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

er and fetus. It is a misconception to consider it developing on its own, let alone. The mother has to have adequate nutrition, adequate psychological resources, in order for the pregnancy to go along in the ordinary way.

It is not that you water it and it grows like a plant. I think it is part of that concept, and I don't think it is a proper way to conceive of pregnancy.

Q. At least the pregnancy, until the seventh month the fetus is incapable of sustaining life?

A. That's right.

Q. And the fetus is attached to the mother and lives or does not live, depending on the mother sustaining it?

A. That's right.

Q. And it is attached in the same form, basically, as any other kind of tumorous growth or medical malfunction would be?

A. It is not attached, but it depends on her for nutrition.

AN EXAMPLE FOR THE NATION

HON. L. A. (SKIP) BAFALIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. BAFALIS. Mr. Speaker, in these days when practically everyone is demanding that the Federal Government solve their problems, it is extremely pleasing to learn there are still some Americans who can and will take the initiative in attempting to solve their own problems.

It is particularly heartening for me because the problem-solving Americans of whom I speak are residents of Florida's 10th Congressional District.

But let me tell you exactly why I am heartened.

A few months ago, a group of Martin County, Fla., residents became worried over the rapid development along the ocean beaches of their area.

They had always enjoyed the beach and had considered unlimited access to the sand and surf as a way of life which would never change.

But expanding resorts and developing condominiums—not to mention the soaring cost of oceanfront real estate—threatened the public's access. The beach itself is public but, without access routes, it might as well be hidden behind high fences.

Determined to save for their children and grandchildren that great pleasure of life—enjoying miles of seashore—these residents formed the Martin County public beach fund.

First, they won a pledge from the county commissioners that the county would match, dollar for dollar, any amount which the group could raise through a public drive.

Next, they approached State and Federal officials and asked them to match the amount raised by the public and the county.

With these firm commitments, the public beach fund launched a "save our beaches" campaign.

It was truly a community effort. Businessmen gave willingly. So did professional men and women. Civic groups dipped deep into their treasuries. House-

wives went door to door with their appeal.

Even Martin County schoolchildren did their share. Classes were rearranged so youngsters could go into the community and work to raise funds for the "save our beaches" campaign.

They washed cars, ran errands, held bake sales, sold "save our beaches" sweatshirts, anything to raise money for this community effort.

By the time the campaign ended, the Martin County public beach fund had surpassed its \$200,000 goal by more than \$12,000.

That money, coupled with matching funds from the county, State, and Federal Governments, will mean eight more access strips, insuring that Martin County residents and visitors will be able to enjoy Florida's beautiful beaches for generations to come.

I am immensely proud of these citizens. And, I am convinced this type of "people in action" program is one which could, and should, be emulated throughout the Nation.

THE WORKPLACE ENVIRONMENT IS THE MOST POLLUTED

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, a new paperback book is becoming a minor classic among working people and the environmental movement. It is called, appropriately, "The American Worker: An Endangered Species" and is billed by the publisher, Ballantine Books, as—

The first book to examine our most dangerous habitat—the workplace and the million occupational illnesses it causes every year.

The author of this new book, which goes into a second 30,000-copy printing on April 1, is Franklin Wallick, who spent productive years in Wisconsin as a labor editor and has been editor of the United Auto Workers' Washington Report since 1963.

This new book has been an eye-opener to many who still think of the environment as polluted skies and rivers, because for the first time our attention is directed toward the environmental horrors which beset millions of our fellow Americans at their place of work, be it a factory, an office building, or a public institution.

A thoughtful and comprehensive review of the book has been written for the March 1973, issue of *Not Man Apart*, the excellent publication of Friends of the Earth, and I include it in the RECORD along with comments from other reviews:

THE AMERICAN WORKER: AN ENDANGERED SPECIES

(By Franklin Wallick and reviewed by Jeff Stansbury)

During the stripmining debate in Congress last year, Representative Ken Hechler (D-W. Va.) pondered his primary election triumph over an entrenched foe, Representative James Kee, who had long done the coal

March 26, 1973

lobby's bidding. Kee had been heavily favored to win. Their mountainous election district had been gerrymandered in his behalf, and Kee had exploited Hechler's tough stand against the strippers as an alleged threat to the jobs of thousands of West Virginians.

Nevertheless, Hechler whipped Kee by a stout margin, ended a petty dynasty in West Virginia politics, and went on to reclaim his House of Representatives seat in November. After his primary upset, I asked this eloquent maverick why he thought he had won.

"The job issue never cut any ice," he said. "I told voters I was against the exploitation of land because it was also the exploitation of people. They saw the truth of it."

As tersely as that, Hechler offered up the ultimate environmental insight! And it was no mere piece of rhetoric. Over the years, Hechler had fought the strippers with deadly eloquence, had equated the ravaging of mountainsides with the economic blight of mountain people, had exposed the hidden subsidies which a few rapacious corporations extracted from West Virginians: subsidies of lost wildlife, lost streams, lost villages, lost economic futures, and lost freedoms. But just as forcefully, Hechler had also exposed the subsidies of flesh in the deep mines where men stooped, sickened, and died.

The 1969 Coal Mine Health and Safety Act was largely his work, and only Hechler and Senator Harrison Williams (D-N.J.) had kept the Nixon Administration's flabby enforcement of this law from becoming a pure farce. West Virginians knew this and voted accordingly.

The exploitation of land is the exploitation of people: Where is this truth raised to a higher pitch of tragedy than in the work places where millions of blue-collar employees spend half their waking hours? By conservative estimate, 25 million workers (mostly blue collar) suffer on-the-job injuries each year. Three hundred thousand cope with job-induced diseases of the lungs, heart, liver, brain, eyes, skin, stomach, intestines, and other organs. At least 18,000 die on the job, and countless millions more die from occupational diseases contracted years, even decades, earlier.

Just as surely as West Virginians subsidize the strippers, these men and women subsidize US corporations through doctor's bills, hospital fees, and shortened lives. Most industries could prevent most of the occupational injuries, diseases, and deaths that now occur, but it is economically sounder for them to pay workers or their widows a few crumbs in "compensation" than to prevent such mayhem in the first place.

Two years ago, for the environmental column I was then co-authoring with Stewart Udall, I visited the home of Robert C. Ferdinand in Hazleton, Pennsylvania. Ferdinand was 43 years old and had worked at the Kawecki-Berylico Industries' beryllium plant in Hazleton from 1957 to 1968. He had not worked a day since.

"It is fair to say," we later wrote, "that KBI used Ferdinand's skills as a maintenance mechanic to increase its profits, and in return it gave him a modest wage and a death sentence. Pale, hazel-eyed, still stocky, Ferdinand cannot even do the dishes without sitting down to rest. He can barely climb a flight of stairs. He cannot roughhouse with his five kids. . . . Ferdinand has chronic systemic beryllium disease.

"That plant was a rat hole and still is," he says. "The maintenance mechanics got the worst of it. We cleaned beryllium off the machines with sulfuric acid—what a combination that was. The company never let us know the results of its air-monitoring tests. After a bad leak or spill, they'd tell us to go back into the area before any new tests were run. When we complained, the safety director got angry and told us to wear our safety glasses, respirators, and hard hats. But we could still taste the beryllium."

In 1970 Ferdinand lost 40 pounds. A biopsy—or more precisely an *assay*—found 139 milligrams of beryllium in his lungs for every gram of lung tissue. Yet KBI refused to pay him workman's compensation.

Now comes a book written in homage to all the Robert C. Ferdinands of this country, the millions of men and women who endure American's most polluted environment: the industrial workplace. No environmentalist who has not made some pilgrimage, intellectual or literal, to this fume-ridden, dust-ridden world can consider his or her education complete—and Frank Wallick's *The American Worker: An Endangered Species* is an excellent place to start.

Wallick has been doggedly writing about—and lobbying against—the ravages of workplace pollution for years. As the editor of the United Auto Workers' "Washington Report," he has also covered plenty of conventional conservation issues and is one of the few living, breathing bridges between unions and environmental groups. He writes the following more in sorrow than anger:

"Most environmentalists who properly decry the fouling of America are oblivious to that more concentrated and hazardous pollution found at the workplace. . . . The books, the articles, the list of legislative priorities, the speeches, the conferences which bring the American environmentalists together and represent so much in the restoration of balance—all these efforts to redo and remake America's environment still bypass the most neglected environment of all. Only two current environmental books, *Our Precarious Habitat* and *Earth Tool Kit*, have given any mention to the workplace environment. The skills and insights of the environmental leaders of America are needed to . . . clean up and make safe the workplace environment."

Most of Wallick's criticisms rap other institutions, however. The medical profession, for one:

"It is a rare physician, indeed, who will take into account occupational exposures when making a diagnosis or even determining cause of death in an autopsy. The schools of medicine in the United States have not regarded occupational medicine as legitimate study . . . [and] the company doctor all too frequently is a castoff from the practice of medicine." In Hazleton, Pennsylvania, Ferdinand's company doctor told him: "The presence of beryllium in the lungs has no diagnostic significance."

The press, for another:

"The press coverage of the fight for the Occupational Safety and Health bill during 1970 was incredibly poor. The *Washington Post* spent more time discussing the perils of smog over Tokyo during 1970 than it did in reporting on the smog in America's own workplaces, including its own pressrooms."

The "safety" establishment, for another:

"Howard Pyle, the National Safety Council's director (and now chairman of the advisory committee to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration . . . believes that the path to worker safety lies in more slogans, more pep talks, more safety clam-bakes, and more protective clothing. Governor Pyle does not intend to ruffle any corporate feathers."

And, above all, the U.S. Department of Labor:

"The way Labor Department officials have tried to shunt most of the [1970 Occupational Safety and Health] law back into the hands of the states is another example of Labor's haphazard attitude toward worker safety and health. The prime reason for passage of a national law was the utter failure of states to act. Yet the Nixon Administration has moved heaven and earth to put as much of the program back into the laps of the states as they could get away with. . . .

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

There is no passion, no sense of vigilance, no flash of humanity which marks the behavior of most Labor Department personnel hired to protect the lives of millions upon millions of workers."

Wallick's *The American Worker* is no diatribe, however. It is a reasoned, surprisingly temperate essay on the causes and potential cures of occupational disease. Here the environmental reader will find ample evidence of the carcinogens, the suspected mutagens and teratogens, the pneumocomoses and other destructive agents that abound in the industrial workplace. Between 100,000 and 450,000 chemical compounds have been released into the environment since 1900, Wallick says. "Some eight-thousand chemicals are commonly used in modern industry. So-called safety limits (Threshold Limit Values or TLVs) have been set on 450 chemical substances used in the work environment. It is estimated that at least 600 new chemical compounds are introduced each year. . . . Little testing as to the human health effects is made; workers who use new chemicals are treated as human guinea pigs."

Here, too, readers will find guideposts along the path toward reforms: a worker's bill of rights, a fledgling coalition between radical doctors and workers, and a second needed coalition between workers and environmentalists to secure honest enforcement of the 1970 Occupational Safety and Health Act. In particular, I recommend Wallick's chapter, "Toward a Worker-Student Alliance," to environmentalists. Though written for students, its message about tactics, goals, and psychology applies just as well to environmentalists who may intellectually grasp the continuity of all pollution—inside the workplace and out—but whose class origins may poorly equip them to approach workers without hangups.

There is every reason for environmentalists to make common cause with workers and no good reason for them to forfeit the advantages of such an alliance. [See story elsewhere in this issue about FOE's support of Oil Workers' Strike.] In support of this brief, I offer the following evidence.

The environmental movement has been strong on momentary shifting coalitions (such as those lobbying for the 1970 clean air and 1972 clean water amendments) but weak on forging long-term alliances with other economic-political groups.

The hidden subsidy—whether of open space, clean air, or workers' flesh—lies at the root of all pollution, and it unites workers and environmentalists whether they perceive it or not.

Workplace pollution is the source of conventional outdoor pollution—but it is more deadly.

A deliberately restricted access to information, mostly corporate information about the degree and kinds of pollution, hampers both environmental groups and unions.

The Nixon Administration is attempting to hand both occupational health and environmental (especially water pollution) enforcement programs back to the states, who have demonstrated their incompetence to handle them.

Just as environmental groups have lost faith in the *ambient quality* approach to air and water pollution controls, so have unions lost faith in the ambient, or Threshold Limit Value, approach to workplace pollution. What is indisputably needed in both cases is a rigorous check on effluents—i.e., a performance standard.

The "economic infeasibility" argument is pushed by industry to slow down both workplace performance standards and effluent controls on air and water pollution.

Industry often tries to drive a wedge between workers and environmentalists on the "job issue"—real or threatened plant shutdowns following pollution cleanup orders.

Divided, workers and environmentalists cannot reform industry or break industry's control of the political process. United, they can handsomely increase their clout. This is not romantic daydreaming; it is a hard political fact.

FROM THE BOOK

Mike Lavelle in The Chicago Tribune says: "When anybody talks to me about the environment, I ask what environment? Mine, theirs, outside, inside, mines? And I recommend that all environmentalists read 'The American Worker: An Endangered Species' by Frank Wallick which tells it like it is and then some."

Harry Conn, Press Associates, Washington news service for the labor press: "It's about time someone came along and put the serious problem of a healthy workplace in perspective. Someone has come along—Franklin Wallick, the editor of UAW's Washington Report. His handy paperback book, *The American Worker: An Endangered Species*, looks at the problem squarely from the standpoint of worker."

From Capitol Stuff, Jerome Cahill, New York Daily News: "President Nixon—meet Frank Wallick. With an assist from friends like Carl Carlson, Steve Wodka, Anthony Semeraro, Don Corn and Maurice Veneri, he is the driving force behind an effort to get Uncle Sam off dead center in the field of industrial health and safety."

Bill Becker, President, Arkansas AFL-CIO: "This book should be must reading for every local union officer and staff representative in the country."

Leonard Zubrensky labor lawyer in Milwaukee, Wisconsin: "I never dreamed that anyone could write such a fascinating book about occupational illness."

Gus Lumper in The Missouri Teamster: "The greatest value of Wallick's book seems to be that he demonstrates that the cleanup of the workplace environment is not a task too big to tackle."

Pulitzer Prize Winner Nick Kotz in The Washington Post: "Frank Wallick has written a stirring, persuasive, fact-filled book about a mostly ignored national problem which should concern us all—health and safety in the workplace. If this book receives the attention it deserves, it will rank with Ralph Nader's 'Unsafe at Any Speed' and Rachel Carson's 'Silent Spring.' But it may well be ignored, as the problem has been, because most of us are thoroughly ignorant about what goes on within factory walls or about the quality of air circulated in air-conditioned office buildings."

IUE News: "For only \$1.50 Frank's book can show you how to become an expert on saving your life, your health, your limbs—and those of your shopmates."

Steel Labor: "The book is a call to arms of the 80 million persons employed in and on the nation's factories, stores, service industries, and farms to get involved in the fight against unhealthy and unsafe conditions on the job."

American Teacher: "A comprehensive, thoughtful, highly readable book, it can be used as a resource in the classroom and in the union hall and central labor council."

The Nation: "An excellent account of occupational illnesses among American workers; factual, informative, well-documented."

Longshoremen Dispatcher: "The book tries to simplify some of the bureaucrats gobbledegook which has kept workers in the dark about occupational safety and health."

The Machinist: "Wallick's book provides the guidelines for workers and unions to get more leverage within the limit of the Occupational Safety and Health Act. He breaks down into shop language, terms like 'threshold limit values,' decibels, and others."

PERSPECTIVES ON IMPOUNDMENT

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it has been charged that the administration is impounding funds largely in the human resources area, yet the following figures attest to the invalidity of that claim: Thirty-seven percent of all impoundments came from the highway trust fund alone, another 25 percent of all impoundments are accounted for by the Defense Department; and an additional 6 percent of total impoundments are comprised of funds in the veterans' benefits and services, general government, and space research and technology areas. Thus, over 70 percent of all impoundments being made are not from human areas, but from defense, space, and highway funds. I find it somewhat ironic to note that these are precisely the traditional targets of attack by the very same group of liberals who are now decrying the impoundments being made.

To be sure, there have been impoundments of health, manpower, housing, and environmental funds. But when one examines the rationale for these actions, one sees that they are not deliberate policy maneuvers designed to thwart Federal aid to those in need, but generally wise and responsible policy decisions arising out of sound estimates of national needs and priorities.

INCOME MAINTENANCE IMPOUNDMENTS

Only 2 percent of total impoundments comes from income security funds—welfare, food stamps, social security, and so forth. Moreover, such impoundments constitute only 0.23 percent of the total outlays made for such programs: Put another way, less than one-fourth of 1 percent of expenditures designed to help those in need are currently being withheld by the administration.

Moreover, over 90 percent of the impounded funds under the income security category are attributable to the food stamp program. While it is tempting to cry that the administration is heartlessly withholding funds from the starving poor, it turns out that Congress ordered that impoundment in the appropriation act: It specifically instructed that \$158 million be placed in a contingency reserve to be used when needed (7 United States Code 2011-2025, Agricultural-Environmental and Consumer Protection Appropriation Act, 1973). The specific authority for holding this money in reserve (31 United States Code 665) specifies that if it is determined that such reserve funds are not needed to carry out the program, a rescission of the appropriation should be requested. The fiscal year 1974 budget contains no such revision request, so it appears that the administration fully expects such funds may still be obligated—though not at this particular time.

Of the remaining \$17 million impounded by the administration out of the income security category, \$12 million is to be used for Social Security Administration construction trust fund purposes. Here again, the intent of the adminis-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tration is not to halt the use of these funds, but to spread them evenly over the years: This \$12 million will be available for expenditure after this fiscal year ends; it would be foolish for the administration to spend such a multiyear authorization all in 1 year and leave the remaining years high and dry.

Finally, \$4.8 million of the remaining \$5 million impounded from income security programs are Railroad Retirement Board funds. Here again, the motive is not malice or indifference, but fiscal responsibility. Every year the Railroad Retirement Board receives \$0.25 percent of the taxable payroll of railroad workers from the unemployment trust fund. This money is to be used for administrative expenses, but if the total amount is not required, the remainder is merely held in reserve—to be returned to the trust fund at the end of the year.

This is exactly what has happened: The board did not use its full allotment, so the rest goes back to the trust fund. In such a situation, is the President supposed to issue an administrative directive to require the board to spend the full amount, whether needed or not, just so he can avoid criticism for impoundment?

HEALTH ASSISTANCE IMPOUNDMENTS

Health is another vital human resource program area, yet the data indicate that in this case the administration is withholding a staggering 0.04 percent of the total health budget. Moreover, almost 67 percent of all the funds impounded under health services are from the Indian Health Service; and once again, it turns out that these funds are to be available for expenditure next year to build hospitals which are now only in the planning stages. As an alternative to impoundment, should the President have just committed funds to build hospitals without blueprints?

The other one-third—\$2 million—was for National Institutes of Health buildings and facilities—again withheld, because it will be available for expenditure next year. A hint of the administration's intention is shown in its request for a revision of budget authority for some funds under this same program. The amount of the revision request was only \$500,000, but it could have easily been \$2 million. If the administration really wanted a funding cutback on this program and was presently withholding funds with the intent that they should never be spent, why did it not simply make a slight increase in its revision request rather than bear the brunt of criticism for impounding such funds? An alternative and more likely explanation is that the administration does intend to spend the funds, but with over a year left to spend them, why should it be in any hurry?

EDUCATION AND MANPOWER IMPOUNDMENTS

In the area of education and manpower, the administration has impounded a rather minuscule 0.74 percent of total outlays. Moreover, 82 percent of the \$78 million impounded in this category is accounted for by National Science Foundation salaries, expenses, and activities. While it is not my purpose here to debate the merit of such expenditures, it should be pointed out that such reductions can hardly be said to

somehow penalize the poor. After all, it is primarily affluent upper middle-class professors, scientists, and technicians who receive the preponderant share of direct benefits from NSF outlays.

The administration gives three reasons for these NSF impoundments: First, to save money by greater operating efficiency; second, to await the completion of plans, designs, and specifications; and third, to allow the President to meet the budget ceiling. These funds will be available next year, so they are not in jeopardy of expiring due to impoundment. The administration has specifically stated that impoundment for these particular funds is a temporary deferral of expenditure, and only if such funds continue to be impounded at this time next year, for example, does it seem fair to question the administration's good faith in this regard. The action to impound these funds only occurred on January 18 of this year.

Roughly 5 percent of education and manpower training funds now being impounded come out of the Howard University fund. On the surface this appears to be a delight to critics of the administration since they can simply point to the impoundment and say, "In spite of the crying need for more black education in this country, look what the administration has done."

However, to do so would be to ignore three important facts: First, the impoundment is temporary and is for purposes of allowing administrative mechanisms to be set up so that once funds are expended they will not be wasted; second, funding for Howard University by the Federal Government already constitutes 61 percent of total academic program operating costs; third, despite the President's alleged insensitivity to the needs of disadvantaged black Americans, Federal funding for Howard University was up 46 percent over last year.

The final 15 percent of impounded education and manpower training funds is accounted for by various Office of Education higher education programs. Of this about \$2 million is being withheld to be expended next year. The other \$10 million cannot be spent after June 30, but it should be underscored that the budget reflects no estimated lapse of budget authority under this program. If the administration intended to withhold these funds until the authority for expenditure expired, this would appear in its estimate of lapsed authority at the end of fiscal year 1973. Since it does not, it seems fair to believe the administration when it says that deferral is temporary and that the funds will be spent this year. The final proof of this lies in the fact that the administration has asked Congress for a budget amendment to allow an additional \$1.1 billion for higher education: A completely inexplicable action if one assumes that the administration is out to gut the higher education budget.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING IMPOUNDMENTS

Of the projected total fiscal year 1973 outlays for community development and housing, 13.4 percent are being held by the administration as reserves. Of this

amount, 99.5 percent is being held for two purposes: To control inflation, and to keep within the budget ceiling. However, all of these funds will be available for expenditure in the upcoming year.

Roughly 75 percent of all community development and housing funds now being withheld are for the basic water and sewage facilities grants program. I must admit that it would be a distortion of fact to imply that the administration intends to spend these funds, despite the fact that obligational authority will carry over in future years. In this case, it is the administration's view that this program has aided relatively few communities, yet all communities have an obligation to provide such services. The administration does not see why one community should benefit at the expense of another community by being fortunate enough to receive a grant while the other community, which perhaps has equal or greater needs, pays Federal taxes to provide that grant. As an alternative, the administration would like to see urban revenue sharing enacted so that all communities have Federal money to spend on this and other worthwhile projects. If Congress is concerned about the freeze on funds for this purpose, it should expeditiously approve the administration's community development revenue share bill—a legislative proposal made about 3 years ago.

Close to 9.5 percent of impounded funds for community development are accounted for by the rehabilitation loan fund, and a further 4 percent by public facility loans. Here again, the administration does not see the merit of aiding a select few—especially when subsidies have been disbursed without regard to income. Even so, the administration has left itself the option of continued financing of such projects since these funds will still be available next year. Finally, a little over 1 percent of community development funds which are now in reserves were drawn from the Housing Production and Mortgage Credit program—specifically, nonprofit sponsor assistance funding. This action is a temporary one, pending review of the entire Federal housing subsidy operation.

Before concluding in this area, I want to also emphasize that the administration's impoundment actions should be viewed in the wider context of its record during the entire last 4½ years. If you look at the budget data you will see that in fiscal year 1969 total outlays for community development and housing were \$2.3 billion. However, even allowing for the \$529 million that is being impounded in the current year, fiscal year 1973 outlays will still total almost \$4 billion—a 71-percent increase above the level which prevailed when the Nixon administration took office.

So I do not think it can be very accurately argued that the administration has been niggardly when it comes to the problems of our urban areas or the housing needs of low-income Americans. Indeed, its current efforts to force a review of some of the programs in this area are motivated by a genuine desire to do even more by restructuring these programs with a view to obtaining a greater return on each dollar of Federal outlay.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

Nearly \$1 billion has been impounded out of close to \$7 billion appropriated for natural resources and the environment. Twenty-nine percent of this amount comes from the Forest Service program to construct forest roads and trails, and is being kept in reserve to achieve the most effective and economical use of the funds, as they will be available for expenditure in fiscal year 1974.

I might make the parenthetical comment here that the primary beneficiaries of such forest roads and trails are not campers, tourists, and nature enthusiasts, but logging companies who have leases to cut timber on Federal lands. There is some question in my mind, therefore, as to why general taxpayers should be footing the bill for outlays which accrue to the benefit of profitmaking concerns in the first place. Perhaps some of my liberal friends on the other side of the aisle concerned that these funds be spent immediately can help me with an answer on that particular question.

In total, 35 percent of all resources and environment impoundments are being withheld for the purpose mentioned above. Only 2.8 percent of all impoundments in the resources and environment category will not be available for expenditure after June 30. Moreover, 80 percent of these nonavailable funds come from the Forest Service's forest protection and utilization program, yet these impounded funds represent only 6 percent of total funds already expended under this program. Clearly, then, these impoundments do not represent an attempt by the administration to eliminate entire programs in the natural resources area.

AGRICULTURE PROGRAM IMPOUNDMENTS

One of the more controversial areas of impoundments has been for agriculture programs. Sixteen percent of the Department of Agriculture outlays have been impounded by the administration, and this includes impoundments for programs which the administration fully intends never to reinstate. Fifteen percent of agriculture impoundments will not be available for expenditure beyond June 30, so the administration need only withhold such funds for a few more months to achieve its objectives.

Yet it should also be noted that the majority of such funds are in programs for which large outlays have already been made—evidenced by the fact that total impoundments in programs with funds not available beyond June 30 represent only 12 percent of outlays already made under these programs during the current fiscal year. In addition, in the case of three of the most controversial programs being eliminated by the administration, funds will be available in fiscal year 1974, so that there is a long leadtime for congressional reform of such programs as Rural Electrification Administration, rural environmental assistance, and the rural water and waste disposal programs.

It should be pointed out that the REA program is not being phased out: it is being restructured to reflect the change in the economy over the past 30 years.

The 2-percent interest rate formerly used in that program was set in 1944, when the Treasury bill rate was below that figure. Today, the Treasury bill rate is over 5 percent, and the administration has made the frank admission that it cannot see the necessity for continuation of the 2-percent rate when rural electric cooperatives for the most part can afford a 5-percent rate. The impoundment of funds under REA was done only because it was illegal to use REA funds to make 5-percent loans.

Moreover, the \$450 million in REA funds withheld will be more than matched by a net increase in loan authority next year of \$200 million above the amount of loans which would have been made under the old REA program in fiscal year 1973. The same is true of rural water and waste disposal grants, which have been shifted to the rural development insurance fund. While it is true that no separate authorization for this program is desired by the administration, the fact is that even now—despite impoundments—money is available for carrying out these projects: it is simply coming from another source. Finally, the rural environmental assistance program is being phased out, because the administration does not see the need for subsidizing practices which are profitable to farmers anyway. I strongly support its position on this program.

IMPOUNDED FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR FUTURE EXPENDITURES

A final point which should be made concerns the total amount of funds now impounded which will eventually be spent. It has been claimed in many quarters that present impoundments are far more insidious now than in the past, since they are allegedly being used to reorder priorities contrary to congressional intent. Somehow this perception does not square with the fact that less than 5 percent of all impounded funds will not be available beyond June 30, 1973, a total of less than half a billion dollars.

Yet even this is not a true reflection of the administration's intent, as authority for many programs will expire simply due to program savings and unneeded funds left over at the end of the year. Of all the rationales used for impoundment, the two dealing with inflation control and remaining within the debt ceiling have been the ones used to eliminate programs thought to be unneeded by the administration. Yet it turns out that only \$40 million of all impounded funds have been impounded for those two purposes alone and which, at the same time, will not be available for expenditure in the upcoming year. This represents 0.02 percent of all budget outlays.

Vietnam and Misused American Power

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, there will be discussions for many years to come about

the role of our country in the war in Vietnam.

I am confident that historians will conclude that this commitment was one on behalf of freedom and self-determination for the people of South Vietnam, and one against aggression.

It was an effort to show the world that such aggression would not be permitted to succeed and not to repeat the blunders of a previous generation which believed that peace might be achieved through appeasement. Munich showed conclusively that it could not.

Yet, if our goals in Vietnam were valid, and our purpose unselfish, the unfortunate fact is that the manner in which the war was conducted, from its very beginning, insured that the result would be less clear than the cost should have justified.

Discussing the conduct of the war, Charles J. Stephens, who visited Vietnam three times, once as a member of the Citizen's Committee for Peace With Freedom in Vietnam to study Vietnamese and report on its progress to President Nixon, notes that—

The tragedy of America's involvement in Vietnam is not that the U.S. chose to stand and fight against Communist aggression, but that we chose to stand and fight so badly.

Mr. Stephens points out that—

First, we virtually guaranteed the enemy that his homeland would not be invaded. Second, we did nothing, until the very end of our involvement, to deny the enemy continued access to vital imports through Haiphong harbor. Third, we foolishly delayed many years before cutting the enemy's supply lines in Laos and Cambodia.

In addition, states Mr. Stephens—

... we misused the only offensive element of our strategy, American airpower, by largely limiting it to "reconnaissance" rather than "strategic" bombing, and by unilaterally halting it in the midpoint of the conflict without securing any concessions in return.

It is the future which is important at this time. What have we learned from Vietnam? Charles Stephens expresses the view that—

Vietnam showed we lacked the will to use American power decisively. Vietnam has apparently also drained us of the will to maintain American power. In the next confrontation with the Communists we may not be able to safeguard even our survival.

If Americans learn the proper lessons from the war in Vietnam, we will be in a position not only to safeguard our own survival but also to fulfill our worldwide commitments. If we do not learn such lessons, the situation may be far more perilous.

I wish to share with my colleagues the thoughtful statement of Charles J. Stephens, which appeared as a letter to the editor of the New York Times on February 11, 1973, and insert it into the RECORD at this time.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 11, 1973]

VIETNAM: FOLLY OF MISUSED POWER
To the Editor:

The tragedy of America's involvement in Vietnam is not that the U.S. chose to stand and fight against Communist aggression, but that we chose to stand and fight so badly. Never have such self-defeating restrictions been placed on the use of American military power.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

First, we virtually guaranteed the enemy that his homeland would not be invaded. What greater incentive could we have possibly given Hanoi to continue the battle? Second, we did nothing, until the very end of our involvement, to deny the enemy continued access to vital imports through Haiphong harbor, imports constituting about 80 per cent of North Vietnam's war material. Third, we foolishly delayed many years before cutting the enemy's supply lines in Laos and Cambodia. Finally, we misused the only offensive element of our strategy, American airpower, by largely limiting it to "reconnaissance" rather than "strategic" bombing, and by unilaterally halting it in the midpoint of the conflict without securing any concessions in return.

It was argued that this was a "limited political objectives. Why then was it logical to bomb the docks at Campha and not the docks at Haiphong? Why was it right to cut the supply lines in Cambodia and Laos in 1970, '71, but not right in 1965, '66, '67, '68, '69? Why was it right to bomb certain strategic targets intermittently and not all continuously? Why was it right to mine Haiphong harbor in 1972, but wrong from 1965 on? These were the years when the Chinese were skirmishing with the Russians. This was also the time of the "Cultural Revolution" which plunged China into near anarchy. If ever there was a time when China was less prepared to bail out North Vietnam, this was it.

Not the "arrogance of power" but the hesitant and timid use of it created the U.S. fiasco in Vietnam. The polarization of our people, the new isolationism, the folly of thinking that we can build a beautiful America while small nations are engulfed in the flames of totalitarian aggression—these are the more ominous repercussions of our Vietnam folly.

For while it is true that President Nixon is extricating America from Vietnam, he cannot extricate us from the world in which we live. And this world will be a perilous one if we abdicate our international responsibilities and fail to reverse the alarming decline in our military power engendered by the disparagement of all things military which was bound to follow the protracted Vietnam agony. By grim contrast, the Russians are forging ahead of the United States in all categories of strategic weapons.

Vietnam showed we lacked the will to use American power decisively. Vietnam has apparently also drained us of the will to maintain American power. In the next confrontation with the Communists we may not be able to safeguard even our survival.

CHARLES J. STEPHENS.

SOMERS, N.Y., February 7, 1973.

CANCER CONTROL MONTH SEES ROSWELL PARK NEARING 75TH

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller of New York has proclaimed April as "Cancer Control Month."

In his proclamation, the Governor very properly has cited the outstanding research and treatment work on cancer by the Roswell Park Memorial Institute in Buffalo, N.Y.

This great institution is world-renowned and one of the oldest of its kind.

Indeed, in just a couple of weeks, on May 2, Roswell Park Memorial Insti-

March 26, 1973

tute will be marking its 75th anniversary.

There has been great progress in the fight against cancer. As a result of research, there are many, many patients who can be cured today when diagnosis and treatment is timely. For many, many more patients, cancer can be controlled by continuing treatment.

But there is much yet to be learned. We must continue with full vigor and support the all-out backing of research and treatment such as goes on daily at Roswell Park and at other research centers around the world.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has given its support to the fight against cancer. We have enacted progressive enabling legislation and we have backed it up with necessary appropriations.

That medical science is making significant and effective progress is quite evident. Hopefully, a broad-scaled answer is closer at hand.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include the text of Governor Rockefeller's proclamation.

PROCLAMATION

Cancer is one of mankind's most vicious scourges. It strikes, in its many forms, both young and old. Currently, it ranks as the second leading killer disease in New York State.

New York State has long been committed to an unrelenting campaign to vanquish this destroyer. One of the primary weapons employed by the state is its world-renowned Roswell Park Memorial Institute, the State Health Department cancer research and treatment center at Buffalo. The Institute and its staff of 2,000 dedicated professionals have been responsible for numerous scientific breakthroughs.

The Institute, employing the latest surgical and technological advances, provides treatment in its 313-bed hospital to more than 4,000 cancer sufferers and outpatient services to an estimated 75,000 people each year. Its director, Dr. Gerald P. Murphy, is a member of the National Cancer Board and chairman of the National Prostate Cancer Task Force.

The American Cancer Society is playing a significant part in the war against cancer in New York State. In addition to numerous educational programs aimed at alerting the public to cancer's seven warning signals, the Society provides invaluable rehabilitative services to cancer patients and the financial support so crucial to the work of researchers and clinicians.

This fine organization deserves the support of every New York State citizen.

Now, Therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the month of April, 1973, as Cancer Control Month in New York State.

Given under my hand and the Privy Seal of the State at the Capitol in the City of Albany this seventh day of March in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and seventy-three.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, 55 years ago, on March 25, 1918, the proclamation of independence by the people of Byelo-

russia took place. I am honored to join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying tribute on this occasion to the brave Byelorussians.

The history of Byelorussian statehood goes back to the ninth century when several Slav tribes founded independent principalities on the territory of what is today Byelorussia. The Byelorussians were forced to live under czarist rule for several centuries until they seized the opportunity afforded by the Russian Revolution of 1917, and proclaimed their independence on March 25, 1918.

They then formed their own democratic government in the capital city of Minsk and began to rebuild their war-torn country. Unfortunately, the Byelorussians did not enjoy their richly deserved freedom for very long. In December of 1918 the Red Army overran Byelorussia, annexed it to the Soviet Union, and all Byelorussians became the Soviet Union's helpless victims.

Since that time, for over five decades, the Byelorussians have been living under the oppressive yoke of the Communists. Present Moscow-Byelorussian relations are strictly colonial in nature and have two distinct aims. One is to exploit the Byelorussian natural resources for the benefit of Russian imperial expansion, and the other is to eradicate Byelorussian nationalism in the hope of fostering a homogenous Soviet empire. The Byelorussians are forced to endure the same bondage which shackles many other eastern and northern European states.

Today, all Americans join with citizens of Byelorussian ancestry in renewing our commitment to the principles of freedom. It is our deeply felt hope that the day is not far off when the people of Byelorussia will be able to enjoy the blessings of liberty.

AN INVITATION TO IMPROVE A GOVERNMENT SERVICE

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, complaints have raised about the delay in obtaining final decisions from the National Labor Relations Board due to the backlog of cases pending before the Board.

Various proposals have been made to correct the situation. Two administrative law judges for the NLRB have collaborated on an article in the winter issue of the *Administrative Law Review*. These judges make some very far-reaching suggestions and I submit the article for printing in the *Record* so that my colleagues in the Congress may be apprised of this recommendation:

AN INVITATION TO IMPROVE A GOVERNMENT SERVICE OR HOW TO MAKE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS LAW MORE EFFECTIVE AT LESS COST

(By George L. Powell and Lowell Goerlich)*

Lest the reader think that the blunt challenge set forth in the title and the body

* The authors are administrative law judges on the staff of the National Labor Relations Board.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

of our article reflects any disrespect to anyone on the payroll of the National Labor Relations Board, be he a member or any other employee, he should know at the outset that such thoughts should be put aside, for the contrary is the truth. Our years of experience in all aspects of the Board's operations have distilled the following essence.

The problem with which this discussion is concerned is obscured and compounded because the published concepts of the workings of the National Labor Relations Act do not always conform to what actually takes place. To illustrate the point, we have set forth immediately below a description of the National Labor Relations Board such as one might find in a government manual or an advanced civics book and thereafter a description of how the Board actually operates in dealing with unfair labor practices.

STATEMENT FOR PUBLICATION

The National Labor Relations Board, an independent federal agency established in 1935, administers the nation's principal labor relations law. This statute, the National Labor Relations Act, generally applies to all employers and employees in interstate commerce except the railroads and the airlines and their employees, which are under the coverage of the Railway Labor Act.

A complex statute, the NLRA has a simple purpose: to serve the public interest by promoting the free flow of commerce through encouragement of collective bargaining, protection of employees' participation or non-participation in employee organizations, and prohibition of specified unfair labor practices by employers or by unions. The achievement of this aim through administration and enforcement of the Act is the overall job of the National Labor Relations Board.

As an agency, the NLRB has five Board members and a General Counsel, each appointed by the President subject to Senate confirmation. The Board members are appointed to five-year terms, the term of one member expiring each year. The General Counsel is appointed to a four-year term. Reappointments may be made and have been made.

Headquartered in Washington, D.C., the NLRB has 31 regional offices and 11 smaller field offices throughout the country, with a Washington and field staff numbering approximately 2,400. The General Counsel has general supervision of the regional offices.

The NLRB has no statutory independent power of enforcement of its orders, but it may seek enforcement in the United States courts of appeals. Similarly, parties aggrieved by the orders may seek judicial review. Attorneys under the supervision of the General Counsel represent the Board in the courts of appeals in these cases.

In its statutory assignment, the NLRB has two primary functions: (1) to prevent and remedy unfair labor practices, by unions or by employers, and (2) to determine by conducting secret-ballot elections whether workers wish to have unions represent them in collective bargaining. The NLRB does not act on its own motion in either function. It processes only those unfair labor practice charges and petitions for employee elections which are filed with it at the 31 NLRB regional offices. Anyone may file—individual, employer or union.

This article concerns itself only with how the Board handles and should handle unfair labor practices.

BLUNT TRANSLATION OF ABOVE STATEMENT

By statute the National Labor Relations Board is established as an "agency of the United States." In this role through its General Counsel it prosecutes unfair labor practice complaints, and through its members it adjudicates unfair labor practice cases and proposes remedies which "will effectuate the policies of the Act." It then may be called

upon to defend its disposition of a matter in a case in a court of appeals. Thus the agency in respect to unfair labor practices acts as both prosecutor and judge. It is similar to a system which would provide that the Attorney General of the United States would be both the prosecutor and district judge in cases arising under the statutes of the United States—or a system under which the district judge handled the prosecution of cases before himself and thereafter defended himself before an appellate court. For the agency to judge, as it does, the cases which it has instituted seems offensive to the maximum. *In quum est aliquem rei esse judicem*: "It is wrong for a man to be a judge in his own case." While this procedure, antithetical to most concepts of due process of law, is sometimes justified under the guise of administrative efficiency and competence (or expertise), it often achieves neither of these.

The obvious evils of this system have no doubt been tolerated because in actual practice the Board members never hear unfair labor practice cases and in a substantial number of cases perform acts only ministerial in nature which are acts tantamount to signature endorsement of the recommendations of their legal staffs. Such circumstance may not be laid to the fault of the members of the Board but results from the physical limitations beyond which five men cannot operate. Thus the Board members never hear an unfair labor practice case, seldom preside over an oral argument or read a record, and only infrequently do they actually review exceptions and briefs of counsel or actually write decisions.

What actually happens is that unfair labor practice cases are tried before administrative law judges, who hear the evidence, weigh it, decide the case and issue a written decision, fitting the facts they find into the previously decided case law and policy.

As for administrative efficiency, the system allows little. Delay is inherent in the system as it has evolved, since a case is never in the first instance submitted to the members of the Board. As a result, the Board members' decisional duty is delegated, in the first instance, to an administrative law judge. On appeal to the Board, his work, except for the taking of testimony, is duplicated for the greater part by the Board members' legal assistants, who operate anonymously and thus bear no responsibility for Board decisions. Moreover, Board decisions and orders are not self-enforcing, but must be enforced in the courts of appeals, a lengthy process.

As for expertise, many past members have become actively associated with labor-management affairs for the first time upon their appointment to the Board. Prior to their appointment few have ever actually represented either management or labor; few have actually negotiated a labor contract or tried or heard a labor case. For those members expertise has been a matter of academic vicariousness.

Thus the agency has been cloaked with a fiction because the system under which it operates is repugnant to administrative expediency or expertise. If there exists any administrative expertise it is lodged in persons who perform the Board members' prime functions for them. And to the extent that the system operates efficiently it can only be by this delegation of functions to others.

The statute provides that the Board is to issue complaints. The General Counsel has final authority "on behalf of the Board" to exercise that function. The statute provides that the Board or a member thereof shall hear unfair labor practice cases, but this function, as noted, is always performed by an administrative law judge as the trial judge. At this level some expertise has crept into the system, for of late the Civil Service Commission has certified for appointment only those persons who have possessed some

March 26, 1973

experience in the field of labor-management relations.

The statute also provides that the Board shall state its findings of fact and shall issue orders and grant affirmative relief in unfair labor practice cases, but in reality these functions, performed in the first instance by the trial judges, are for the most part administratively approved by the Board members. It is plain, therefore, that the administrative law judge is a necessary functionary in the system and is the very foundation on which the whole administrative process for the trial of unfair labor practices must rest. Without him the whole system would fail, for five members cannot physically perform the functions which presently require the endeavors of almost 100 administrative law judges. Moreover, if the Board members are to fulfill their total duties, they must devote some time to other than unfair labor practices cases.

STATISTICAL EVIDENCE

According to information obtained from an official letter of the Board, the administrative law judges issued 980 decisions in the fiscal year 1971.¹ The parties were satisfied with these decisions in approximately 30 percent of the cases, and no appeals from them were taken to the Board. Therefore, approximately 294 cases went no farther than the initial decision. (That this figure almost equals the total number of cases that went to the courts for enforcement of Board orders will be noted below.)

Comparing these figures to the success the Board has had in enforcing its decisions before the appellate courts, there is found a striking similarity. In cases decided in fiscal 1971, 371 Board orders were before the courts for enforcement. Of these 74 percent or 275 percent of the appeals the Board agreed with the judge's decision but added some comment; in 12 percent of the appeals the Board reversed in part; and in 8 percent the trial judge was completely reversed. Thus, 80 percent of the original decisions were completely affirmed by the Board and 92 percent were affirmed in whole or in part.

In cases that were appealed to the Board, 65 percent of the decisions of the judges were adopted *in toto* by the Board; in another 15 were enforced in full; 12 percent or 46 were enforced with modification; 4 percent or 15 were remanded; one was partially affirmed and partially remanded; and 9 percent or 34 were reversed and the Board order set aside. A comparative table shows:

FISCAL YEAR 1971

[In percent]

	Initial decisions on appeal to the Board	Board decisions on appeal to the courts
Adopted in full	80	74
Reversed in part	12	12
Reversed in full	8	9
Remanded	4	

Statistics are not available to show the percentage of cases wherein the appellate courts reinstated a decision of the administrative law judge that had been reversed by the Board.²

¹ Letter to Robert P. Weil from Acting Chief, Division of Judges, Charles W. Schneider, dated June 5, 1972.

² The great respect that the courts of appeals have for decisions of NLRB trial judges is illustrated by the recent decision in *Ward v. NLRB*, 68 Lab. Cas. ¶12,759 (5th Cir. June 5, 1972), *reversing* Everett Construction Co., 186 N.L.R.B. No. 440 (1970). In that case the trial examiner (as he was called) found that the Act had been violated. The Board reversed and dismissed the complaint, and the in-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DOES THE BOARD DUPLICATE THE WORK OF THE TRIAL JUDGE AND IS IT PROFITABLE?

If no appeal is taken from an NLRB trial judge's order within 20 days, a Board order is issued automatically affirming the initial decision. Thus with respect to 30 percent (294) of the 980 decisions in fiscal 1971 issued by the trial judges, the parties did not exercise their right to appeal.

The corollary is that 70 percent of trial judges' decisions were appealed to the Board. A Board member simply does not have time to review each such appeal. Indeed it is doubtful that the record alone in an average case can be thoroughly reviewed in one day, much less the exceptions and the briefs of the parties and the judge's decision.³ The Board seldom hears oral argument.

Therefore, the Board members' statutory functions on appealed unfair labor practice cases must be assumed by other persons. That the Board can fulfill or is fulfilling its statutory function without substantial assistance is sheer fiction. Who then actually performs the statutory functions of the Board, which are to "state its findings of fact" and "issue and cause to be served an order requiring such person to cease and desist from such unfair labor practice, and to take such affirmative action as will effectuate the policies of the Act" where an unfair labor practice is found, and to "state its findings of fact" and "issue an order dismissing the complaint" where unfair labor practices are not found after the case has left the trial judge? These functions are performed with *statutory approval* by legal assistants to Board members who review the transcripts and prepare draft opinions. Here lies one of the vices in the system, for these assistants, lacking statutory decisional responsibility, are neither certified by the Civil Service Commission as competent, experienced persons in the field of labor-management relations, as are the administrative law judges, nor generally possessed of expertise in the field. Many are youngsters in the profession.

On appeal, the work of the trial judges is essentially duplicated by these legal assistants except that those reviewing the cases do not have the added benefit of actually hearing the witnesses testify and "feeling" the trials. A time factor is added in that the case is prolonged for many months on review, during which period the irritation from which the case springs continues to seethe.

Moreover, the Board members are exposed to the whims and caprices of this group of assistants, since the Board members, unable to make personal reviews of the record, must rely upon their presentations. Under this system, a litigant may never have his point of view actually submitted to a Board member. Thus the litigant never really has a day in court before the Board members, who by statute are commanded to make the decision. To a lawyer, practice before the Board is filed with frustrations and anxieties; the lawyer never knows whether his client's case has been heard by those who decide.

At the present time even after the duplication of effort set out above, the Board reversed the trial judges, in full, in only 8 percent of all the cases in fiscal 1971! And think of the months of delay that were needed to accomplish this!

Individual involved appealed at his own expense. The court of appeals concluded its opinion reversing the Board by saying that the trial examiner's result "is . . . the only result which the evidence permits."

"The petition for review is granted. The order of the Board is vacated and the case remanded for further proceedings consistent with this opinion and with the original findings and decision of the Trial Examiner." *Id.* at 24,427.

³ Transcript pages averaged 331 per case in fiscal 1971.

The legal assistants who did the review work for the Board members in fiscal 1971 numbered 105 and were specifically attached to individual members for payroll and supervision, with each member having approximately one-fifth of the total. The money spent for the Board members and their staffs was \$3,672,000 in fiscal 1971. Thus, \$3,480,000 was spent for Board staff and support services in addition to salaries of the Board members of \$192,000. (The annual salary of each of the four members is \$38,000 and that of the Chairman is \$40,000.) It is arguable that the very presence of Presidential appointees looming over the shoulder of the trial judge, and available to the parties themselves, tends to "keep in line" an independent judge, but it also is arguable that a competent person rises to fill his responsibilities. It is also arguable that people like to appeal from adverse decisions. But, as in all things, a compromise usually is struck in order to get "the most for the money." Isn't \$3,000,000⁴ really too much to pay for 78 decisions (8 percent of 980), a substantial number of which are themselves reversed by the circuit court of appeals?

SOLUTION TO DUPLICATION AND EXPENSE

Shorn of the fiction which surrounds the Board, the truth is that the only day in court a litigant may be assured of is the presentation of his case before the trial judge. Fiction therefore ought to be renounced and the judge's function should be recognized for what it has become and should be separated from the frustrations of the system. In view of the nature of the review and his certified competence in the field, it seems sensible that the decision of the judge who hears the testimony, makes findings of fact which as to credibility are final, finds and states the law and contrives the remedy, ought to be final and reviewable only in the court of appeals. If his decisions were final, they would patently constitute a more efficient and informed achievement of the purposes of the Act and contribute to the furthering of peaceful and harmonious relationships between management and labor. These administrative law judges, equipped with the know-how in the field and permitted personal contact with the litigants and enjoying a recognized status, may better promote settlements and render decisions with a rational understanding of the problems which face management and labor.

Administrative law judges are presently appointed from a roster furnished by the Civil Service Commission in conformity with Civil Service practices. They gain admission to the roster because they are seasoned lawyers, are qualified experts in the field of labor-management relations law, have had practical experience in the field and satisfy the prerequisites for decisional responsibility. No other persons who deal with the decisional process in connection with unfair labor practices are or must be so qualified. Considering the competency of the trial judges ensured by the Civil Service Commission, it is unreasonable that his decision should be subject to review by members of a Board who cannot do it or by legal assistants whose expertise and competency have not been accredited by the Civil Service Commission.

Moreover, the system has developed the proceedings before the judges to the point where they are akin to trials in district courts. They are no longer administrative proceedings conducted with the laxity or informality of an administrative agency. This has come about because the cases are of a type which require a strict observance of the well-established courtroom procedures. They deal with the guilt or innocence of the charged party and the consequences of error may have serious impacts not only on the litigant but

⁴ Not all of the \$3,480,000 was spent on unfair labor practice cases.

also on the entire field of labor-management relations. In these cases, in order that fair play and due process can be achieved, trials must follow the basic standards which regulate trials in district courts. The courts of appeals so require.

OUR PROPOSAL

We propose that what is practice should be acknowledged in theory. We propose that the administrative law judges become labor judges, whose decisions are final, subject to review by the appropriate appellate courts; *that these judges shall be appointed by the Board from a roster of qualified personnel furnished by the Civil Service Commission*; that these judges shall have exclusive jurisdiction over other labor-management cases except where a jury is involved; that the jurisdiction of the judges shall be nationwide; and that they shall be assigned to hear the case in the place where the cause of action arises. All other jurisdiction under the Act will be retained in the Board.

Our proposal not only gives legal effect to what in part is now practice but abolishes a fiction which has caused concern, turmoil and frustration among litigants and lawyers. It will propagate the purposes of the Act, one of which is to "provide orderly and peaceful procedures" in that:

(1) If labor courts with the jurisdiction suggested are established, able lawyers experienced in the field of labor-management relations, from both management and labor, will be encouraged to participate in labor-management affairs on judicial level, and thereby a greater experience, competence and understanding will be brought to the field, all of which will contribute to the lessening of tensions between management and labor, an objective of the National Labor Relations Act.

(2) The additional expense to the government incurred as a result of the present duplication of the trial judges' work will be eliminated, resulting in substantial savings to the government.

(3) The time lag between the trial judges' decisions and the Board's decisions will be avoided and pending uncertainties and contentions will be more speedily resolved, with the result that the causes of labor disputes affecting interstate commerce will be more expeditiously removed.

(4) Expertise, indigenous to a blue ribbon type judge, will be available to litigants in all branches of labor-management relations.

(5) Decisions will result which will have a more compatible relationship with the problems of the litigants who appear before the labor judge, for, because he has been personally exposed to the litigants, his interests will not be wholly academic.

(6) The case load of Board members will be decreased, which will allow them a greater personal participation in the affairs of the Board and a more active surveillance of the administration of the Act.

(7) The Board will no longer be affected with a split personality which causes it to act as prosecutor and judge in the same case. Thus it may concentrate on the enforcement of the Act's purposes and policies unrestrained by its own past judicial pronouncements.

(8) Labor-management cases may be instituted before labor judges, experts in their field, whose knowledge of labor-management affairs will enable them to suggest rational settlements and render more speedily meaningful decisions.

(9) Relieving the district courts of significant labor-management jurisdiction will allow district judges more time for consideration and adjudication of the cases with which the district courts are more generally concerned.

(10) By reason of the expertise of the labor judge, an empathy may be created between the judge and the litigants which

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

will contribute to the settlements of disputes and issues before him.

(11) Confidence in the competence and impartiality of the adjudicating forum will be enhanced by the knowledge that the labor judge is chosen for his merit and achievements in the field of labor-management relations and not as a political accommodation.

(12) The Labor Court system will contribute to an appropriate consideration of stare decisis and to a stability and reliability in the field of labor-management relations now generally in doubt.

(13) The policy of the Labor Board is now a matter of decisional law as interpreted by the courts of appeals and the Supreme Court. Should the Board wish to establish new policy it can do so in either of two ways, i.e., by using its rule-making power, or by issuing a complaint based upon its new theory and testing the theory before the administrative law judge and the courts of review—just what it does now in total effect.

(14) The appointment of judges will be exposed to a minimum of politics with its attendant problems in that the judges will be chosen from a roster of qualified personnel furnished by the Civil Service Commission, yet the appointment of the judges by the Board will credit current public opinion as it is reflected in the Board.

SPECIFIC PROPOSALS

We propose that:

I. The Judges Division of the National Labor Relations Board shall be continued as an independent agency of the United States Government and shall be known as the Labor Court of the United States, the members thereof to be known as Judges of the Labor Court or Labor Judges.

II. The Labor Court shall have exclusive original jurisdiction of all actions involving unfair labor practices arising under Section 7 and 8 of the National Labor Relations Act, and original jurisdiction concurrent with the district courts of the United States of any civil actions arising under the National Labor Relations Act or involving a labor dispute as defined in Section 2(9) of the Act, or in which a labor organization is a party. The Labor Court shall also have original jurisdiction concurrent with the district courts of the United States and courts of the states of civil actions arising under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, as amended.

III. Trial in the Labor Court shall be a labor judge without a jury. Civil actions within the jurisdiction of the Labor Court in which the right of trial by jury is preserved as declared by the Seventh Amendment to the Constitution, or as given by a statute of the United States, may be removed to a district court of the United States having jurisdiction of any party (other than the party who instituted the action who is deemed by instituting such action to have waived trial by jury) prior to the time required for him to file his responsive pleading in the Labor Court.

IV. Until rules of procedure are promulgated by the Labor Court and approved by the Board, the Court shall apply the Rules of Civil Procedure for district courts of the United States and the statutes of the United States relating to district courts of the United States, so far as practicable.

V. Appeals from final orders and judgments of the Labor Court shall be as provided in the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and the relevant statutes of the United States governing appeals from district courts of the United States.

VI. The labor judge, in respect to the administration of his duties and the enforcement of his orders, shall possess the same powers as the judges of the district courts of the United States, including the power to punish by contempt and to issue and enforce subpoenas *ad testificandum* and *duces tecum*.

VII. The Board, subject to the civil service laws, and upon certification for expertise by the Civil Service Commission, shall appoint as many additional judges of the Labor Court as the Board from time to time finds necessary for the proper performance of the Labor Court's duties, and they shall hold office during good behavior. Initially administrative law judges holding office may serve as labor judges for a period of two years, after which they may be reappointed by the Board, subject to the civil service laws and upon certification for expertise by the Civil Service Commission.

VIII. Judges of the Labor Court may be removed by the Board after notice and opportunity for a public hearing, for inefficiency, neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause. Appeal from such removal may be processed through the civil service procedures.

IX. Labor judges shall not engage in any other business, vocation or employment.

X. An administrative office of the Labor Court, under the direction of the Board, shall be maintained in the District of Columbia, where a director of administration of the Labor Court, appointed by the Board, shall be stationed. Deputy directors of administration of the Labor Court, appointed by the Board, may be stationed in such other cities as the Board may determine. The director shall receive and preserve pleadings and other papers filed with the Labor Court and shall maintain a docket of cases pending before the Labor Court. He shall assign cases to each labor judge for trial or other proceedings, secure suitable courtroom accommodations for the trial, publish and distribute the decisions, orders and judgments of the labor judges, provide clerical services generally for the Labor Court and perform such other duties as are from time to time required by the Court or the Board. The Board shall furnish the director and the Labor Court such personnel as will be adequate to meet their needs and functions. In assigning a case to a labor judge, due consideration shall be given to the geographic area of his assignment and to his current caseload with the objective of equalizing geographic assignments and caseloads among the several judges. Trials shall be conducted in the judicial district where the unfair labor practice in question was alleged to have been committed.

XI. Unless there is a controlling Supreme Court precedent, a labor judge shall follow and be bound by the precedent established by the court of appeals for the circuit where in the unfair labor practice was alleged to have been committed or other cause of action arose.

XII. The National Labor Relations Board shall retain all other jurisdiction under the National Labor Relations Act.

A distinguishing feature of our proposal is that it contemplates that labor judges will be appointed for competency and expertise in the field without political intervention, except as it may be reflected in current public opinion as it is currently represented in the appointments of the Board members. Such appointments have generally been bipartisan.

DRUG TESTING PROGRAM

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 26, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the military is increasing the accuracy of its drug testing program, but much more improvement is needed before the program

is really a success. I recently released new statistics revealing an upward swing in the accuracy of the program. But the military still has a long way to go before the program successfully identifies all drug users within the military. For example, within a recent week at Tripler Army Medical Center in Hawaii, only 40 percent of the heroin users were correctly identified in its accuracy sample. Hundreds of GI's are still probably slipping through the drug testing screen.

Low accuracy ratings have also been recorded in recent weeks by the Air Force in San Antonio, Tex., the U.S. naval hospital in San Diego and Oakland, and one private laboratory—Washington Reference Laboratory in Washington, D.C. At present, the worst situation exists at the Air Force Base in San Antonio where only 62 percent of the heroin samples, 68 percent of the barbiturate samples, and only 40 percent of the amphetamine samples, are correctly identified.

However, the overall success rate has been improved in the last year.

The Pentagon has exceeded its goal of correctly identifying 90 percent of the samples of heroin and amphetamine users. But the drug testing program still incorrectly identifies 19 percent of the barbiturate users.

While progress has been made, more is needed until the drug screening program correctly identifies all drug abusers and offers them help.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, March 27, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Be of good courage and He shall strengthen your heart, all ye that hope in the Lord.—Psalms 31: 24.

Almighty God, unfailing source of light and life, whose glory is in all the world and who calls us to walk with Thee that we may truly live, prepare our hands and hearts for the work of this day. Help us to turn from the errors and mistakes of the past, treasuring only the wisdom and the humility they may have taught us.

Deepen within us a love for goodness, truth, and beauty. Renew in us the spirit which enables us to really live all our lives and which helps us to lead our citizens toward a more abundant life together.

Bless our Nation with Thy most gracious favor. Keep her firm in her faith in freedom, just in her exercise of power, generous in her protection of weakness and wise in her activities on behalf of mankind. May righteousness and good will mark our national life and may our deepest trust ever and always be in Thee.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. 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.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 21. Joint resolution to create an Atlantic Union delegation.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 91-510, appointed Mr. HELMS as a member of the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations in lieu of Mr. WEICKER, resigned.

THE HONORABLE CORINNE C. BOOGS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Louisiana, Mrs. CORINNE C. BOOGS, be permitted to take the oath of office today. Her certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to her election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOOGS appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

PROJECT VIETNAM

(Mr. HALEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, in these hopefully closing days of U.S. involvement in the war in Vietnam, I would like to pay tribute to two outstanding Americans from my congressional district who performed so well during this war although they were not wearing military uniforms at the time of their service. I am referring to Al and Del Ettinger who gave birth to an idea in 1966 called Project Vietnam which eventually was responsible for sending 12,175 gift packages to soldiers from the Sarasota County area who were stationed in South Vietnam.

Anyone who has ever served the Nation in wartime on foreign soil appreciates most fully the importance of mail call and will readily agree it was usually the most effective morale boosting event of their days in combat. Al Ettinger remembered this fact of service life from his experience during the First World War in the famed Rainbow Division and later in the Second World War as a marine. He became determined to make as many soldiers as possible know that they were remembered and appreciated during this country's most recent war. He and his wife started Project Vietnam alone, but as the months passed they began receiving help from volunteers, local civic organizations, and private contributors. Their humanitarian gesture stands proudly alongside the many other patriotic acts carried out by Americans during the war in Southeast Asia.

In recognition of their unselfish efforts, these two very special Americans were

named Citizens of the Year in Sarasota and became recipients of a national award from the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge. I would personally like to thank Mr. and Mrs. Al Ettinger, who with many others went beyond the call of duty to relieve some of the heavy burden our men in uniform were called upon to shoulder during the long Vietnam war.

IMPOUNDED FIRE CONTROL FUNDS RESTORED

(Mr. RARICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inform our colleagues that I have been advised that the \$4 million previously impounded from the cooperative forest fire prevention program has been restored by the Office of Management and Budget.

This will allow the fire protection program to continue at the \$20,027,000 level already contracted for in current fiscal year.

I have been assured by the Chief of Forest Service that the money will now be made available to State foresters for this vital program; and that the proper State authorities have been so informed.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN GIVEAWAY TO ALGERIA

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, while we sit here earnestly delving into means to tighten the reins of Federal spending—while the Office of Management and Budget cuts the heart out of needed domestic programs—the administration has the temerity to approve a foreign giveaway of monumental proportions to a country with which we do not even have diplomatic relations.