Tone, Dennis Alden, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Torgerson, Christopher Allan, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tornquist, Emanuel M. III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Torpey, James Mark, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Torres, Nelson Eddy, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tracy, Mark Morgan, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Travis, Kenneth Lynn, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Trettin, Thomas Kermit, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Trotti, Paul Wiles, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tully, Robert Busill, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tumblin, Philip, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Turnicky, Ronald Peyton, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Twitty, Theophilse Lee, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Twomey, John Joseph, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tyner, David Walter, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Valant, John Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Valcourt, David Paul, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Van Zetta, Michael Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vanek, Craig Alan, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Varner, James Hugh, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vaughan, David Bruce, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vea, Roldan, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Venable, Charles Joseph, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Venske, Mark Douglas, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Venters, Harley Eugene, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Victor, James Gerard, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vidlak, Michael Douglas, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vincent, Mark Edward, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vogler, Gary Louis, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Volz, Clifford Christian, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vorselen, Craig Douglas, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vuksich, John Masich, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wachter, David Jeffrey, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Waite, Harold Glenn, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walker, Grant Humiston, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walsh, John Craig, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walters, Henry Arnold, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wamsley, Rex Eugene, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Warehime, Dana Lynn, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Warren, Douglas Edward, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wartner, Randall Jay, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Waters, Steven Frederick, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Watson, Joseph Franklin, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Watt, Lawrence Andrew, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weeks, Richard Thomas, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weiderhold, Fred E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weightman, George William, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weinberg, Harold Edward II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weinstock, Richard Mark, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weiss, Francis Edward, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Welo, Robert Lars, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whalen, John Francis, xxx-xx-xxxx.
White, Norman Joseph, xxx-xx-xxxx.
White, William Taylor, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Widlak, Andrew Julius, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weise, Terry Eugene, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilcomb, Michael David, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wildrick, Craig Douglas, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilkerson, Ricky Duane, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, Murray Winn, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, Thomas Emery, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williamson, Robert Jason, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williamson, Roger Lee, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Willis, Jay Christopher, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilson, Bennie Keith, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilson, Richard Charles, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilson, Robert David, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilson, Thomas John, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilson, William David Karl, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wineland, James Delbert, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Winklbauer, David, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wiswell, Thomas Edward, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wood, Thomas Russell, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Woodrow, Charles Eugene, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Woodruff, Barry Wayne, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Workman, Keith William, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Worland, Alan Dana, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wotell, Matthew Jon, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wright, Daniel Vincent, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wright, Kim Ray, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wroblewski, Walther Rowland, xxx-xx-xx...
xxx-...
Yamashita, Harold Eichi, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Young, James Elmer, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Young, Richard Stephen, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Yunker, Stephen Francis, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zapka, Frederick Anthony, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zegley, Raymond David, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zieske, Thomas L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zukauskas, Bruce Edward, xxx-xx-xxxx.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"THE CRISIS WON'T WAIT FOR THEM," SENATOR JACKSON ASSERTS; ENERGY PROBLEMS GROW WORSE WITH WHITE HOUSE DELAYS AND INDECISIVENESS

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, our able colleague from the State of Washington, Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is a leader in our national fuels and energy policy study. He spoke with accuracy at the National Press Club on March 22, 1973 when he asserted that the administration is caught in a paralysis in coping with the energy crisis.

This Senator, who cosponsored the Senate resolution (S. Res. 45, 92d Congress) with Senator JACKSON to provide the basic authority for the fuels and energy policy study, is in full accord with the Interior Committee chairman. His declaration that "this Nation must move forward immediately to deal with a critical shortage in our strategic reserve and to avert gasoline shortages this summer," is a solid fact.

Mr. President, I believe, as does Senator JACKSON, that emergency action by the White House within the next 4 weeks on a wide range of measures will be necessary to avert critical shortages of gasoline and other fuels this summer and next winter."

Calling attention last Thursday to the fact that "The White House has time and again put off forwarding an energy message—to Congress," Senator JACKSON emphasized: "We cannot find a piece of paper from downtown to indicate where they stand," and he made the timely declaration: "The crisis will not wait for them."

As to the urgency of the energy crisis and the need for prompt actions to roll back its consequences, this Senator is in full agreement with the knowledgeable Senator from Washington. And I stand side-by-side with him in support of the actions he recommended—actions which must be taken if we are to avert a domestic disaster.

It is my belief that the Interior Committee chairman is thinking and acting with foresight in the preparation of legislation to establsh a National Emergency Energy Board which, he said,

> Would be granted extraordinary powers over Federal agency programs and the energy industries.

It is granted that such an action would be an extraordinary one and, under less critical conditions, should not be necessary. But, as Senator JACKSON said:

> If early action is not taken by the Administration to deal with the critical questions inherent in the energy crisis, the Congress will act.

He added that the powers he has in mind for the proposed National Emergency Energy Board would be built upon the precedent of the War Production Board of World War II and other major Federal interventions into the realm of private enterprise in times of emergency.

Indeed, Mr. Presdent, our colleague's speech was a significant development in the war that must be waged against the eroding effects of the energy crisis. I take it to mean that we now see hopeful signs that the battle against the energy crisis is about to be joined from the ramparts of Capitol Hill if it is not soon joined by the man with very real powers of leadership at the White House.

I am ready and willing to work aggressively and diligently with both the leadership of the executive branch and the leadership of the Congress to bring the energy crisis under control—and to an ending, at the earliest time possible. But, like Senator JACKSON, I have little patience remaining for the procrastination, indecisiveness, and delay in the executive branch with respect to the worsening energy situation. If the Congress must strike without any solid recommendations from the Executive, I stand ready to join with Senator JACKSON and his colleagues of the Interior Committee and those of us who are ex-officio members for the national fuels and energy study in taking positive and decisive actions of the nature so capably conceived and enunciated by the committee chairman last week.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from Senator JACKSON's address before the National Press Club on March 22, 1973—excerpts released by his office.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY SENATOR HENRY M. JACKSON

If there are any lingering doubts about the kind of energy problems we face, consider these facts:

Between 1940 and 1965, the consumption of energy in the United States doubled. If present trends continue, consumption could double again by 1980. The rate of energy consumption increased twice as fast in 1972 as it did in 1971.

In 1965 we consumed nearly 12 million barrels of oil a day; in 1972 we consumed more than 16 million barrels a day. In 1965 we had three million barrels a day spare producing capacity; in 1972 we had none.

In 1972 we imported some 30 percent of our oil requirements. That figure will double by 1980.

At a time when energy demand is greater than ever, there is not one single new refinery under construction in the United States.

At a time when our need to develop domestic oil and gas is greater than ever, we have seen a sharp decline in all kinds of drilling. For example, the number of natural gas wells drilled declined from a high of 5,459 in 1961 to 3,225 in 1970.

The greatest potential for new oil and gas discoveries is on the Outer Continental Shelf. But less than two percent of the OCS to the

200 meter water depth has been leased for development.

Since 1968 we have been using twice as much natural gas as we can find. With current drilling trends, we could be short ten trillion cubic feet of gas in 1980. Potential gas users were denied service in 21 states in 1972. Curtailments of deliveries in every part of the U.S. are forecast for 1973 and thereafter.

The shortage of natural gas has shifted the burden and caused an extraordinary increase in demand for other fuels. The demand for heating oil in the current winter season has been up over 12 percent.

Today crude oil stocks are down almost 50 million barrels from the high of May, 1971. Gasoline stocks were down at the end of February almost 30 million barrels below this time a year ago as gasoline demand heads for new highs in 1973.

As the nature of the energy crisis becomes painfully apparent, the public has been bombarded with explanations about who caused it. In the midst of all these charges and countercharges, it's time to challenge the conventional wisdom with some plain talk about what this crisis is—and what it is not.

The energy crisis is *not*, as some would have you believe, a conspiracy by the oil lobby, the gas lobby and the coal lobby to milk the American consumer. The energy industries are not conspirators—but they are not blameless either. Many of them have failed to meet new and vital environment responsibilities. All too often, they have been short-sighted and self-serving in their attempts to influence national energy policy. Opposition to responsible surface mining legislation is a case in point.

The energy crisis is *not*, the creation of a small band of environmental extremists blocking nuclear power plants, OCS leasing, and the trans-Alaska pipeline. Environmental concerns *have* played a major role in slowing construction of vital energy facilities. But even if every one of these facilities had been built on schedule—schedules which, by the way, were overly optimistic—the energy crisis would still be upon us. The fault lies, I believe, not so much with the environmentalists as with those in industry and government who have either failed to respond to legitimate concerns or failed to develop effective institutions for resolving environmental controversies.

The energy crisis is *not*, the exclusive product of short-sighted government regulation, a crisis which will disappear as soon as free market forces have full play. Government policies in such areas as oil imports and natural gas pricing have, of course, contributed to our energy problems. But the sources of the energy crisis are too varied and complex to yield to the demon theory of analysis.

The fact is that our national energy system as a whole is no longer functioning effectively. We are facing real shortages and higher prices. We are entering a period of dangerous dependence on foreign sources of oil.

What has been the response of this Administration to these problems? To put it bluntly, the Administration's response to the growing energy crisis has been characterized by delay, indecision and confusion of purpose.

The Congress has had two years of "crisis talk" from Federal officials and industry representatives. But we have had no action. We have seen no recommendations for legislation. We are still awaiting the transmittal of a Presidential Energy Policy Message.

Meanwhile, schools have closed, factory gates have been shut, and transportation systems have been disrupted.

World oil prices continue to spiral upward and the stability of the Mid-East grows more and more insecure.

The proposed FY 1974 budget recommends only incremental and clearly inadequate changes in priorities and policies for energy research and development.

The prospects of serious regional shortages of gasoline this summer now appear virtually certain.

This list could be lengthened at will but that is not necessary. The point it proves is obvious: The energy crisis we face is a crisis in leadership.

Indecision has been the hallmark of the past four years.

After years of trial balloons on deregulating natural gas, on increased incentives to industry, on rolling back environmental standards, and on other controversial proposals we have yet to see a single concrete recommendation.

Instead we have had a series of timid, *ad hoc* adjustments in the oil import program, in oil leasing policy and in other areas.

The country deserves better.

I propose an end to indecision. It is time we had some real, concrete initiatives to deal with the critical problems we face.

In an effort to focus Congressional attention on key issues and stimulate Administration action, I have made a number of specific proposals and recommendations in recent months.

I have proposed new initiatives to unify the major oil consuming nations and lay the foundation for a North American continental energy policy.

I have urged action to preserve the independent sector of our oil industry which is threatened by current oil import policy and other recent developments in the national energy picture.

I have proposed an Energy Facility Siting Act to resolve the bitter conflicts surrounding the siting and construction of refineries, power plants, pipelines and other energy facilities.

I have urged a deepwater port policy that will pave the way for construction of ports to receive the supertankers required to import 60 percent of our oil needs by 1980.

I have proposed a new national conservation policy to end widespread waste and reduce demand in a country that uses one-third of the world's energy.

Specifically, I have proposed a tax on weight and horsepower to reduce the use of wasteful, gas-hungry, superpowered automobiles.

I have asked for a strong, statutory energy import policy which sets forth import policy for the next decade, designed to speed the development of domestic resources and hold reliance on insecure foreign sources to a bare minimum.

I have urged the adoption of specific measures for the creation of a national strategic petroleum reserve, using resources on public lands, including Naval Petroleum Reserves, to the fullest extent possible for this purpose.

I have proposed new approaches to regulating natural gas which will channel gas to the most efficient uses at reasonable prices and generate new supplies.

I have offered a massive 10 year $20 billion research and development program to unlock new energy sources and better utilize existing sources with the aim of achieving energy self-sufficiency in ten years.

The Administration's response to the growing energy crisis facing the nation has been characterized by paralysis, indecision, delay, uncertainty, and confusion of purpose.

If we are to avert critical shortages of gasoline and other fuels this summer and next winter emergency action must be taken by the White House within the next four weeks on a wide range of measures. Actions which must be taken if we are to avert a domestic disaster include:

1. development of contingency plans and a national standby rationing system for the allocation of gasoline and other fuels in short supply to public service agencies (hospitals, fire departments, schools), to residential consumers, and to essential industries;

2. establishment of a clear Federal policy to govern the conditions and circumstances under which sulfur dioxide and other air quality standards will, if necessary, be relaxed to deal with critical energy shortages;

3. promulgation of an oil import policy which will meet current demands, provide adequate crude oil stocks for idle refinery capacity, and insure the economic survival of the nation's independent oil producers, refiners, marketers and distributors;

4. establishment of a program to avert this summer's projected gasoline shortages by importing petroleum products, by guaranteeing upland and OCS royalty oil to refineries operating below capacity, and by exercising all existing authority to allocate available supplies of crude oil and petroleum products to areas of need;

5. requiring the oil industry, as a condition for receipt of oil import licenses, to immediately undertake the establishment of a 90 day petroleum storage supply;

6. implementation of a Federal energy conservation policy designed to maximize energy efficiency and reduce waste;

If early action is not taken by the Administration to deal with these critical questions the Congress must and will act.

I have directed my staff to prepare legislation to establish a National Emergency Energy Board which would be granted extraordinary powers over Federal energy programs and the energy industries. The Board's powers would be built upon the precedent of the War Production Board of World War II and other major Federal interventions into the realm of private enterprise in times of emergency.

The Emergency Energy Board would, at a minimum, be equipped with legal authority, personnel, and funding to:

1. allocate all fuels, regardless of how produced, to meet essential public requirements and to avert shortages;

2. implement emergency measures for energy conservation;

3. preempt State law if it is determined that State or local policy frustrates or prevents any action necessary to protect the larger public interest in adequate and secure energy supplies;

4. initiate oil and gas exploration and development by the appropriate Federal agencies on unexplored, but promising public lands, on the Naval Petroleum Reserves, and on the Outer Continental Shelf—including offshore areas of the Atlantic Ocean; and

5. untangle the procedural delays and cut the red tape which frustrates the siting of any electrical power plant, refinery or superport facility which is determined to be necessary and essential to meet regional or national energy requirements.

WHY ARE WE PAYING HIGHER PRICES FOR FOOD?

Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, I received today from the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco its "Business & Financial Letter" written by Dean Chen, which presents some important information on the causes for the steep rise in food prices.

I would like to share this article with my colleagues and hope that it contributes to our understanding of this complex, but vital, issue:

HOW MUCH FOR THE FARMER?

The average housewife won't believe this, but American farmers are liable to wind up with less net income this year than in 1972. A strong increase in cash receipts is all but certain, because of both an expansion in output and favorable prices for farm products, but much of this increase may be offset by a decline in government payments. Then, the expected gain in gross income from these sources may be wiped out completely by the continued inexorable rise in production expenses.

The resultant of all these factors could be a decline of almost 5 percent in net farm income, to about $18 billion for the year. But to put this in proper context, we should realize that last year's net of $19 billion was 19 percent above the 1971 figure and 12 percent higher than that of any earlier year, including the halcyon period of 1947.

ALL-TIME RECORDS

The nation's farmers set all-time records in practically every sector last year, because of the strong and accelerating demand for farm products at home and abroad. Gross returns thus rose substantially, helped along by a 12-percent rise in farm prices and a 27-percent jump in government payments to producers. The burgeoning demand for agricultural products reflected the strong expansion of the domestic economy, which supported a 10-percent increase in GNP—and it also reflected an upsurge in overseas demand, which is a story in itself.

The picture was distorted by the tight food-supply situation, which came about largely because of several weather-related production setbacks, including freeze damage to West Coast fruit and vegetable crops as well as harvest delays affecting Midwest feed grain and soybean crops. These difficulties led to an explosive late-year rise in prices, and the price problem was accentuated—and government payments sharply increased—because of 1972's restrictive feed-grain program and the substantial set-aside of wheat acreage. Thus, wholesale prices of farm products jumped 25 percent within the past twelve months alone, with such hefty increases as 24 percent for fibers, 27 percent for livestock, and 38 percent for grains.

SPECTACULAR EXPORTS

Farm exports, after reaching the $7-billion level two years ago, then went on to approach $9½ billion in 1972, with the final six months accounting for the bulk of the increase. This sharp gain reflected increased livestock production in Western Europe and Japan, declining grain shipments by major competitors, and the improved competitive position resulting from the Smithsonian monetary agreements. Shipments of grain and products rose about 40 percent to $3½ billion, in the process accounting for nearly two-thirds of the overall increase in exports, and shipments of soybeans and products passed $2 billion, a record for a single commodity.

Exports in 1973 could exceed $11 billion—a goal which the Administration originally had not expected to reach until the end of the decade. Prospects in this sector became exceptionally favorable last summer, when foreign countries turned to the U.S. market for more grains because of their reduced crop prospects and tight exportable supplies. Not only did regular customers increase their buying, but the U.S.S.R. signed up for its historic $1.1-billion grain purchase and China added a small but psychologically important order for 19 million bushels of wheat.

Foreign demand is likely to remain at a high level, reflecting the relatively short supply situation in many foreign countries and the impact of recent dollar devaluation on the export market for U.S. commodities. This stimulus may weaken later on, however, if major producing countries abroad respond as anticipated to the current high level of prices. The Soviet Union, a country which has shown the ability in the past to recover rapidly from crop failures, has targeted a 12½-percent increase in farm production this year. (Indeed, that country has been a net exporter of food for most of the past decade.) But the U.S.S.R. may remain a major customer over the long run, because of its desire to rebuild its grain inventories and to upgrade family diets to include more red meat. Also, according to latest reports, the Soviet crop year is starting poorly because of dry weather in European Russia and shortages of seed-grain reserves.

EARNING HIGHER PRICES

Given the prospects for higher farm prices and increased marketings, cash receipts of U.S. farmers could rise from the 1972 record of $58½ billion to a new peak of $62 billion. In other words, the strong expansion of demand that has provided the underpinning for the nation's industrial boom should continue to provide support for the farm economy as well.

Supplies of major commodities should rise sharply this year, in response both to the high level of prices and to the relaxation of the government's cropland-control program. Altogether, perhaps 30 to 40 million acres of idled land will be brought back into production. Livestock supplies also should increase, as beef, poultry and (after midyear) pork supplies begin to reach the market in increasing quantities. Price pressures thus should begin to ease; although rising perhaps 10 percent for the year, prices received by farmers should increase at a somewhat slower pace than in 1972, and they may actually decline in late 1973 and 1974.

The wheat crop (1.7 billion bushels) is now estimated at 12 percent above the 1972 record, while the corn crop (5.8 billion bushels) is 4 percent above last year, and the soybean crop (1.5 billion bushels) is about 17 percent above the 1972 record. The projected expansion in supplies of feed grains and soybeans fits in with the Administration's plans for increased production of cattle, hogs, broilers, milk and eggs. Government payments could drop from $4 billion last year to $3 billion this year—the same level as in 1971. Payments jumped last year for the wheat program and (especially) the feed-grain program, reflecting both larger acreage set-asides and higher rates per acre. These factors will be largely missing this year, however, because of the drive to get more acreage back into production.

PAYING HIGHER PRICES

Production costs should continue to rise from the 1972 level of $47 billion to perhaps close to $51 billion, reflecting the use of more production inputs at higher prices. Some cost pressures were already evident in 1972, despite controls on prices of many farm inputs. Over the past twelve months, farm-equipment prices rose 2½ precent at wholesale, while agricultural chemicals rose more than 3 percent and petroleum products jumped 12½ percent. These price pressures should intensify this year, in view of the rapidly growing need for machinery and materials, not to mention land and labor.

The 1973 farm picture is clouded by the fact that policymakers must deal with two conflicting goals—curbing the food-price inflation on the one hand, and maintaining farm prosperity on the other, in the Administration's eyes, the upsurge in farm prices is due not so much to cost-push factors as it is to the rapid expansion of demand relative to supply. In view of that analysis, certain policy moves are inevitable: the relaxation of production restraints on 1973 crops, the sales of grain from government stocks, and the lifting of import quotas on meat and dairy products.

In this connection, it should be noted that price determination for agricultural products differs somewhat from that for non-farm products. At any given level of demand, sudden changes in marketable supplies tend to cause wide fluctuations in farm prices. Thus, policy actions to increase supply (or reduce demand) can be an effective means of farm price control. But the output of most farm commodities cannot be increased over a very short time-span, so that the price impact of recent policy moves will not be felt at the present time, but rather in late 1973 or 1974.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE SOUTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY REGARDING TERMINATION DATE OF DAYLIGHT SAVINGS TIME

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) and myself, I bring to the attention of the Senate a concurrent resolution passed by the South Carolina General Assembly.

On March 20, 1973, the South Carolina General Assembly passed a concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress to enact legislation that will terminate daylight saving time on the fourth Monday of September of 1973, and each year thereafter. Senator HOLLINGS and I jointly endorse this concurrent resolution.

Mr. President, current law provides that daylight savings time ends on the fourth Monday in October. This scheduling of daylight savings time results in a severe hardship for many persons who begin work or must travel long distances to school in almost total darkness in the morning hours of early fall.

Mr. President, on behalf of Senator HOLLINGS and myself, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

To Memorialize the Congress of the United States to Take Necessary Legislative Action to Terminate Daylight Saving Time on the Fourth Monday in September of 1973 and Each Year Thereafter

Whereas, the control of standard and daylight saving time schedules has been preempted by the Congress of the United States and daylight saving time now begins on the last Sunday in April and ends on the fourth Monday in October; and

Whereas, this scheduling of daylight saving time results in a severe hardship for many persons who begin work or must travel long distances to school in almost total darkness in the morning hours of early fall; and

Whereas, this situation creates a very serious safety problem for young children who, by bus or on foot, must go to school in darkness; and

Whereas, this problem is particularly acute in the early fall and could be solved at least

partially by ending daylight saving time in late September. Now, therefore,

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

That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is memorialized to take necessary legislative action to change the termination time of daylight saving time to the last Monday in September.

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and to each member of the South Carolina Congressional Delegation.

A SERIOUS SECURITY THREAT

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in March 1970, the late Director of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover, testifying before a House Appropriations Subcommittee, referred to the serious security threat posed by Chinese ship jumpers, many of whom belong to the Communist-dominated Hong Kong Seamen's Union:

The approximately 40,000 Hong Kong based seamen, many of whom actually reside and have families on the mainland, continue to be an investigative problem. The majority of these seamen belong to the Chinese Communist-dominated Hong Kong Seamen's Union. Thousands of these seamen enter the United States each year when their ships dock here. A high number of them desert while here and constitute a serious security threat.

On April 25, 1972, along with extensive remarks on Red China's illicit drug trade, I inserted a Washington Post article by Jean Heller and Mark Brown which reported that approximately 4,200 aliens from Communist China sneak into the United States each year, some of whom are on espionage missions while others are involved in narcotics traffic.

Recently, the New York Daily News carried two articles by Frank Faso and Paul Meskil which also dealt with Chinese ship jumpers, the Hong Kong Seamen's Union, and illicit drugs in the form of heroin. Just how serious is the security threat referred to by Mr. Hoover can be ascertained from the two articles appearing in the New York Daily News on March 20 and 22 by Frank Faso and Paul Meskil which follow:

COLOR NEW DRUG EPIDEMIC HONG KONG HUE

(By Frank Faso and Paul Meskil)

At 2:43 a.m. last July 8, a prosperous Chinese businessman named Hong Moy entered the Rickshaw Garage, across the street from the Elizabeth St. police station, in Chinatown.

President of the 2,000-member Moy Family Association, Moy was one of Chinatown's most influential business and civic leaders. He had about $2,000 cash on him, the receipts of the supermarket, book store and two coffee houses he owned in the Chinese community.

He intended to drive home to Port Washington, L.I., where he lived with his wife and four children. As the night attendant went to move a car that was parked in front of Moy's 1972 Cadillac, three young Chinese men slipped into the garage and seized Moy from behind. Pressing a gun muzzle to his head, they made him kneel on the floor and handcuffed his arms behind him.

They went through his pockets and took his wallet and bankroll. When the attendant returned, they pointed pistols at him and told him to stand still. Then one of the men pulled a hunting knife and calmly stabbed Moy in the back. As the three departed, the stabber wiped the knife handle clear of fingerprints and dropped the weapon near the garage door.

ROBBERY WASN'T THE MOTIVE

Moy died an hour later in Beekman Downtown Hospital. A detective called the killing "a routine robbery murder," but it was far from routine. The unarmed victim offered no resistance, made no outcry. There was no need to kill him to get his money. And if the stabber was some sort of homicidal maniac, why didn't he also kill the only witness?

"Robbery was not the motive," a high-ranking police official said recently. "This was a carefully planned execution."

Pressed for details, he said: "I can't say anything more. It's a federal case now."

The FBI, which normally has no jurisdiction in a city homicide investigation, has been quietly checking Moy's background. So has the federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs.

SEEN WITH SUSPECTED DRUG DEALERS

Federal agents told reporters that Moy had been seen with several suspected drug dealers who came from China and were in this country illegally.

Since President Nixon went to Peking, the official Washington line is that China is not involved in the global dope trade. Still, the rumors and charges persist.

The latest accusation against China was made by two veteran New York crime fighters—Frank Rogers, citywide prosecutor of narcotics cases, and Brooklyn District Attorney Eugene Gold.

At a January press conference announcing the bustup of a smuggling ring that brought hundreds of pounds of heroin into the U.S. last year, Rogers showed reporters a plastic bag on which the words "People's Republic of China" were printed in English and Chinese.

BAG CONTAINED HEROIN

He said the bag had contained "brown rock heroin" from mainland China. Rogers added that he had additional evidence of a Chinese connection, including tape recordings of phone conversations between dope smugglers and dealers.

"This is the first clear and substantive evidence we have that mainland China and Hong Kong (a British colony) are being used as a means of getting heroin into the United States," Gold said.

The boss of the smuggling ring, The News learned, is an important Chinese national who makes frequent trips between the U.S., Canada and Peking, where he confers with top government officials. He has not been arrested.

Of the 36 persons arrested during the five-month investigation of the smuggling ring, 24 were ship-jumping members of the Hong Kong Seamen's Union. A secret report prepared by the Strategic Intelligence Office of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs confirms that Hong Kong seamen are deeply involved in the international dope traffic.

The report states, "The smuggling activities of Chinese seamen imply a loose but rather extensive arrangement between the seamen and their United States contacts to carry out the movement of narcotics from Southeast Asia on a continuing basis. . . .

"Sensitive sources also reveal frequent communications between Chinese heroin traffickers in New York, Seattle, San Francisco, Portland (Ore.), and Vancouver (Canada), suggesting that an extensive wholesale mechanism exists."

Other recent Narcotics Bureau and CIA reports on the Asian dope trade mention "ethnic Chinese" and "Chinese seamen." These reports say the opium poppies are grown in Burma, Laos and Thailand, and that opium, morphine base and heroin are transported from Bangkok, Thailand to Hong Kong, the main transfer point for shipments to the U.S.

A secret CIA report on narcotics operations in Southeast Asia states that tons of opium and morphine base, from which heroin is made, are carried from Bangkok to Hong Kong in fishing boats. The report says: "One trawler a day moves to the vicinity of the Chinese Communist-controlled Lema Islands—15 miles from Hong Kong—where the goods are loaded into Hong Kong junks.

Chinese army and navy units guard the Lema Islands and no boats pass there without inspection. The opium fleet could not possibly operate off these islands without Peking's knowledge and consent.

MAJOR DRUG CENTER

So much Asian heroin is flowing into New York that Chinatown has become a major drug center. Over the years, detectives and federal narcs have made sporadic raids on Chinatown dope dens, but the addicts and sellers there were members of the Chinese community and the traffic, mostly in opium, did not amount to much.

In 1971 there was only one big case here involving Asian heroin. But last year there was a virtual deluge. Of the 273 pounds of heroin seized by the Federal Narcotics Bureau here in 1972, nearly a third originated in Asia. Additional seizures of Chinese heroin were made by police and customs agents. Among the major heroin hauls of 1972:

Jan. 28—Customs agents raided an apartment in Sunnyside, Queens, and caught two Chinese seamen with 18 pounds of pure heroin, worth about $4 million on the addict market.

April 11—Narcotics Bureau agents arrested seven Chinese men and one woman in an apartment at 60 East Broadway and confiscated 11 pounds of heroin, part of a 100-pound shipment.

April 26—Eighteen pounds of heroin, hidden in a teakwood trunk, were seized in Port Washington, L.I. Two Chinese were arrested.

June 27—Four more Chinese seamen and three pounds of heroin were seized at the Sunnyside building raided earlier.

July 21—Six pounds of "pure brown rock heroin" from China were confiscated by federal agents; three Chinese were arrested.

Aug. 23—Four Chinese, including the self-style unofficial mayor of Chinatown, were grabbed by federal agents while completing a deal to sell 20 pounds of heroin for $200,000 cash.

Oct. 6—A Westchester dope dealer was arrested after selling "brown China" to an undercover agent. The evidence was described as "brown, granular, rocklike crystals of heroin from Communist China."

Dec. 29—Bureau agents recovered 18½ pounds of heroin and arrested two suspects—a Danish seaman who allegedly brought the dope from Hong Kong and a Chinese restaurant owner.

Of the 23 Chinese involved in these cases, all but two were present or former members of the Hong Kong Seamen's Union. Daniel P. Casey, regional director of the bureau, said Chinese seamen are "attempting to become the key suppliers of heroin in the United States."

Jerry Jenson, deputy regional director, said the amount of heroin smuggled into this country from Asia does not yet equal the dope imports from Europe and Latin America, "but if the growth continues as it has in the past year, it will catch up."

KWA LIN: THE DOPE TRADE'S DEALER IN DEATH

(By Frank Faso and Paul Meskil)

This is the story of Kwa Lin, a Hong Kong hatchetman who littered New York's Chinatown with corpses.

Kwa Lin is probably not his real name, but it's the one that investigators know best. He has used a score of aliases and has worked at many jobs—on freighters as a seaman and oiler, in restaurants as a cook and dishwasher, in offices and shops where he was self-employed.

His principal occupation, according to investigators, is enforcer and executioner for a Peking-based Hong Kong-based network of seagoing spies and smugglers.

He is only 5-2 and 140 pounds, but his tiny frame ripples with muscles, and his hands are deadly weapons. He has been trained in Oriental hand-to-hand combat. Moreover, he is equally adept with gun, knife or hatchet.

A member of the Hong Kong Seamen's Union, he sailed to Canada in 1970, jumped ship in Vancouver and slipped into the U.S. illegally. He rented a small apartment on Delancey St. in Newark, obtained a social security card in the name of John Lee and started a small business dealing in Chinese herbs and spices.

His first New York target, investigators said, was a fellow Hong Kong seaman, Sing Hop, 27.

TWO MORE TARGETS

At sunset on Aug. 5, 1970, Sing Hop was walking along Park St., a short, narrow street that runs downhill from Mott St. to Mulberry St. in Chinatown, when a small neatly dressed man approached and fired three rounds from a snub-nosed revolver into his head. Sing Hop fell dead near the rectory of the Church of the Transfiguration. His killer hurried down Park St. into a crowd.

Sing Hop lived in a furnished room at 28 Chatham Square. A search of his meager possessions turned up a forged passport and documents including what investigators described as classified material.

These investigators believe he was killed because he disobeyed orders to return to Hong Kong or China for a new assignment.

A month after Sing Hop was murdered, a man named Kuee Tang was shot to death outside a Chinese social club on Canal St. A police intelligence report describes the club as "a known gambling establishment frequented by illegal aliens, including seamen involved in smuggling operations."

The same report describes Kuee Tang as a ship-jumping member of the Hong Kong Seamen's Union, an illegal alien and "a Communist courier involved in smuggling operations."

Jerry Ginn and Larry Wong also were Hong Kong seamen who entered the U.S. illegally and entered the dope trade. They sold samples of pure Asian heroin to Cuban and Puerto Rican drug dealers here and offered similar wares to Mafia narcotics racketeers. But instead of sending the profits to their bosses in Hong Kong and Peking, they kept some of the money and dope. Ordered to return to Hong Kong, they refused.

September 1970, Ginn and Wong decided to cool off at an air-conditioned movie house. A federal agent tailed them to the Sun Sing Chinese Theater, 75 East Broadway, under the Manhattan Bridge.

They left the theater at 6:30 p.m. and started walking west on East Broadway toward Chatham Square. The glare of the setting sun was in their eyes and they did not notice the little man until he was directly in front of them, an automatic pistol in his hand.

ESCAPES WITH HELP OF FRIENDS

Shot three times in the head, Ginn fell dead near the intersection of East Broadway and Market St. Wong was hit once in the jaw and survived. At least 30 persons witnessed the shooting, including the federal agent. He was unable to intervene, lest he blow his cover.

The agent and several other witnesses followed the killer, believed to have been Kwa Lin, down Market St. one block to the headquarters of I Wor Kuen, a militant Maoist organization, on the southeast corner of Market and Henry Sts.

The gunman opened the door to the I Wor Kuen club and shouted to those inside. Several young men rushed out. Some of the youths held back the witnesses to the shooting. Others walked away with the killer.

Later that night, Kwa Lin boarded a bus. FBI agents kept him under surveillance all the way to Montreal, where the Royal Canadian Mounted Police took over.

On Oct. 18, 1970, Kwa Lin returned to the U.S. in a car driven by another man. They carried Candian identification papers and crossed into Washington State without incident. The following day, a 23-year-old Hong Kong seaman named Choy Lung was shot to death in Seattle's Chinatown.

According to an intelligence report on the Seattle murder, Choy Lung was a Peking courier who was supposed to have delivered $18,000 to a Maoist youth group in Seattle. When he kept the money for himself, an enforcer believed to have been Kwa Lin, was ordered to kill him.

Kwa Lin's last New York mission was accompanied at 9:32 p.m. June 1, 1971, when Hong Kong seaman Lee Wing Sun, a suspected dope dealer, was shot dead at Chrystie and Division Sts. Two weeks later, Kwa Lin flew to Vancouver, where he visited a travel agency known to intelligence agents as a center for Chinese ship-jumpers, spies, smugglers and couriers.

As Kwa Lin left the travel agency, Mountie agents arrested him. The New York City Police Department was notified. The department asked Canada to hold Ywa Lin for New York authorities. However, he reportedly was turned over to the Central Intelligence Agency.

What happened to him is a closely guarded CIA secret. But members of other agencies say Kwa Lin has turned informer and provided the first major intelligence breakthrough concerning Peking's undercover operations in North America.

Interrogation of Kwa Lin led to the arrests of at least 20 other members of his narcotics ring, a federal source says. All were ship-jumping seamen. U.S. agents also seized forged documents, Communist propaganda, narcotics and classified information, the source says.

The Nixon administration insists that Peking is not sending drugs or spies to the U.S. But agents of the FBI, CIA, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs and other federal agencies are still trying to find out what all those ship-jumping seamen are up to.

The official Washington explanation for Chinese operations here is that the Hong Kong seamen caught selling heroin and committing other crimes are professional criminals, not Peking agents. Yet investigators have tailed several of these ship-jumping felons to secret meetings with members of China's United Nations mission here and the Chinese Embassy in Ottawa. There is no official explanation for the conferences between Peking's diplomats and Hong Kong's extraordinary seamen.

INEQUALITIES AMONG SCHOOL DISTRICTS FOR PROPERTY TAX PURPOSES

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, on March 21, the U.S. Supreme Court, ruling in a Texas case, rejected the theory that inequalities among school districts resulting from financing through property taxes violate the Constitution.

Strict constructionists of the Constitution will applaud the words of Justice Lewis F. Powell, Jr., who in the majority opinion said:

It is not the province of this court to create substantive constitutional rights in the name of guaranteed equal protection under the law.

On March 23, two Virginia newspapers published excellent editorials analysing and endorsing the majority opinion of the Court. In each editorial, there is the caution against predicting that the decision in the Texas school case indicates a change of thinking on the part of the majority of the Supreme Court which will be reflected in future decisions. Both editorials express the hope—in which I join—that the Constitution will be more strictly interpreted in the future.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorials, "The Effect May be Far Reaching," from the Northern Virginia Daily, and "A Great Decision," from the Richmond Times-Dispatch, be included in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EFFECT MAY BE FAR REACHING

The U.S. Supreme Court's ruling on Wednesday that there is no constitutional right to education, and thus no constitutional remedy for disparities between rich and poor school districts, concerned itself primarily with methods employed by states in financing schools and the proper use in providing for "equal education."

Wednesday's ruling apparently says that a state law does not violate constitutional guarantees of equal protection because it conditions education on the wealth of local school districts through property taxes rather than on the wealth of the state as a whole.

Justice Powell, speaking for the majority said:

"It is not the province of this court to create substantive constitutional rights in the name of guaranteed equal protection under the law."

"Education is not among the rights afforded explicit protection under our Constitution. Nor do we find any basis for saying it is implicitly so protected."

This ruling is likely to have far-reaching effects and will doubtless come as a shock to those who, since the 1954 decision on school desegregation, have labored under the impression that "education" has stood on a separate pedestal as being virtually unassailable, protected by an impregnable constitutional shield.

It is too early, and too legally complicated,

to say that the decision may open up a Pandora's Box of new concepts, or a rethinking of old concepts, regarding the separateness of state and federal powers.

It will be interesting to watch as the new breed of Supreme Court jurists asserts itself in heading off the trend of legislating by judicial decree.

A GREAT DECISION

The local property tax is no prize, but the 5–4 U.S. Supreme Court decision upholding the tax's constitutionality as a tool of state school finance is pure gold.

The majority decision, delivered by Justice Lewis F. Powell Jr., goes far toward restoring perspective to the grossly-politicized slogan, "Equality of Educational Opportunity." It may prove to be one of the landmarks on the Nixon Court's return to judicial restraint in reviewing the laws of a majoritarian democracy.

In Rodriguez v. Antonio Independent School Board, a three-judge federal court had decreed that heavy reliance on the proceeds of local property taxes in Texas made per-pupil spending dependent on local wealth—with "rich" districts able to spend more than "poor" districts—and that the system thus violated the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment. Similar verdicts had been rendered in California, Minnesota, and New Jersey courts, and if the Supreme Court had agreed, all states except Hawaii—which has full state funding—would have had to change their finance systems drastically to equalize statewide spending.

But the Powell majority keenly analyzed the Rodriguez doctrine and perceived serious legal and logical flaws. There were basically two questions to resolve regarding intrastate disparities in school expenditures:

(1) Did there exist a definable class of "poor" persons whose right to equal protection was demonstrably being denied by the variations in school spending?

(2) Is education a fundamental "right" accorded to an individual under the federal Constitution?

The answer on both counts was "no."

On the first query, the majority cogently observed that the poorest families are not necessarily clustered in the poorest property districts. A Connecticut study, in fact, documented that the largest numbers of poor persons were living in commercial and industrial centers—the very areas that have the most lucrative property bases with which to finance schools. In this metropolitan area, we might add, Richmond has the largest tax base and spends more per pupil than the suburban counties, but it also has the largest concentration of families below the poverty line and the lowest scores on standardized tests of pupil achievement. It does not follow, therefore, that educational "quality" would be "equalized" by leveling spending throughout this region or state.

The court did not directly speak to this next point, but it needs to be noted that many of the nation's leading social scientists have discovered since the publication of the epic 1966 Coleman Report, "Equality of Educational Opportunity," that student learning is not a function of per-pupil spending—or, for that matter, of integrated classrooms. Prof. James Coleman (Johns Hopkins) found that family background accounted for much more of the variation in achievement than differences between schools. Prof. Arthur Jensen (Berkeley) found that heredity explained more of the differences in individual IQs than did environment. Prof. Daniel Moynihan (Harvard) concluded that "it is simply not clear that school expenditure is the heart of the matter." And most recently, Prof. Christopher Jencks (Harvard) found that, "The character of a school's output depends largely on a single input, namely the characteristics of the entering children. Everything else—the school budget, its policies, the characteristics of the teachers—is either secondary or completely irrelevant."

If conclusions such as the above have shaken the liberal's faith in the power of the almighty education dollar to remake society, the Supreme Court's answer to the second question above will shake the faithful even more. Education not a constitutional right? To some egalitarians, that's like saying God didn't make little green apples and FDR didn't make a New Deal in Depression-time.

But it is true that, under our Constitution, providing for public education is a power not granted to the central government but reserved to the states and the people. And it is good—it is so wonderfully good—that a Supreme Court majority at last is honoring the principle of local control of education, which has served Americans well.

It is possible (although no predictions are risked here) that the high court will use the Rodriguez reasoning to uphold the Fourth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals' opinion that the state of Virginia is not required to consolidate the Richmond area's school districts for equal protection purposes. There are differences between the cases, but the Fourth Circuit's opinion that a federal judge may not compel a state to restructure its internal government for the purpose of attaining racial balance—in the absence of evidence that school lines had been drawn for illegal segregation—doesn't seem too far from the Supreme Court's finding that a state may not be compelled to restructure its school financing in the name of "equalizing" opportunity.

THE TRAGIC PERSECUTION OF SOVIET JEWS

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the American people are frequently made aware of the injustices that are endured by the Soviet Jews. Personal stories of individuals attempting to get exit visas so that they may leave Russia for Israel have been related to us many times. Yet we do not tire of hearing them, but instead, continue to build opposition to the infamous and outrageous exit fees demanded of these people. This is why so many of us in Congress joined in cosponsoring the most-favored-nation amendment.

Rabbi Harvey J. Fields, of the Anshe Emeth Memorial Temple, New Brunswick, N.J., and Mr. Samuel Landis, president of the Jewish Federation of Raritan Valley, have sent me a letter written and signed by 34 Leningrad Jews. In their letter, addressed to the U.S. Congress, they speak of the life of the Soviet Jew, filled with material and spiritual difficulties. However, they do not pursue this line because they—the difficulties—will never be fully understood in the West.

Once a year, the Soviet Jew can reapply for an exit visa, never knowing when the application will be accepted, but life goes on, children go on growing. In order to live such a life and not lose heart or dispair—sic—an unlimited belief in success is necessary.

One thing that does convince them to continue this strong belief is American and world public opinion. This public opinion "helps us to exist, to endure, and surmount our lives." These courageous people are grateful for the American people's thoughts and activities to aid them. "It must be said—that without your support we would never have been able to stand ground."

Mr. Speaker, let us continue to give the Soviet Jews the support they deserve and need. Let us not forget the injustices they suffer. I urge that my colleagues read the following letter that should be an inspiration to us all, and let us all do what we can to help Soviet Jews. The letter follows:

A GROUP OF LENINGRAD JEWS ADDRESSES THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

We are not able to fulfill our wish—to leave the Soviet Union and to settle forever in the State of Israel. We are conscious of the fact that this, our wish, is an elementary right of contemporary civilized men—nevertheless, we are deprived of it. The Soviet authorities do not allow us to arrange our own fate and the lives of our children.

We do not lead an easy life, but one that is full of assorted material and spiritual difficulties. We are not writing about them because they will never be fully understood in the West—no matter how much is written or said about them. We live a life which kills the spirit, moreover, we bear our present time only so that it might pass quickly; but after all the present life is that only life we have. We want the future to arrive as quickly as possible, our indefinite future.

We are striving for fairness from the Soviet authorities. In our argument what can we say to them?

The only stand we can take to show our lack of fear of their monstrous power; to show our agreement to make sacrifices; and by our being prepared to go to prison. This latter is a preparedness which the authorities unfortunately use all too often. It is turned out that after the camps and crematories of the War—there still remains Jews for whom it is necessary to go to prison in order to reaffirm their right to leave the Soviet Union forever and live a national life in their homeland in the State of Israel.

The official laws which regulate the issuance of exit permits for the State of Israel are unknown to us. Jews to whom exit visas are refused do not know when they will be able to receive a visa; they do not know on what the reasons for refusal are based; they do not know in particular which organizations or officials are blocking the issuance of the visa; they do not know in which instances it is necessary to appeal the refusal; and above all, they do not know if they will ever receive permission to depart. The only thing that they know is that a year after the refusal they once again may submit all of the documents together with their request for an exit visa. And it is possible once again to receive a refusal. And again in another year to submit documents . . . and this can go on without end.

But life goes on, children go on growing. Specialists are disqualified. In order to live such a life and not lose heart or despair an unlimited belief in success is necessary.

We complain about the absence of laws but when they appear the situation by no means gets any better. The notorious education tax has only the appearance of legality;

indeed it emphasizes still more the lack of rights of those who wish to leave. The unprecedented sums of the tax which were called for in the beginning have so affected public opinion that, when they were slightly reduced (albeit remaining excessively large), it was possible to point out that the situation had improved. But no, it had not improved. The education tax continues to remain a monstrous absurdity and a mockery of common sense. The evil of the education tax lies not only in itself but also in the fact that it diverts public opinion in the West from more important issues to do battle against it. Progressive people in the West may think that if the tax is either surmounted, lowered or completely rescinded, then the main obstacle on the path for Jews going to Israel will have been eliminated. No, no, no! This just isn't so! The main obstacle on the path for Jews going to Israel is not the education tax but the absence of free exit for all who wish it.

The Jews and non-Jews of the Western world have rendered us invaluable aid. The support of public opinion and of various organizations in the West helps us to exist, to endure and surmount our lives. It may be said straight-forwardly that without your support we would never have been able to stand ground.

Therefore we are turning to you: remember us!

We are living people just as you are; we know the same joys and the same pain that you do. We do so love our children and fear for them as you do for yours; and we too want to make them happy.

Help us in this! Remember about this during the negotiations with the Soviet government over political and economic questions.

Do not agree to compromises and half measures.

Do not trade the bodies and souls of Soviet Jews for tons of grain or fertilizer.

Don't delude yourselves about the apparent legality of the tax on education and similar measures.

We beg you to strive for one thing alone:

Free exit from the Soviet Union for all Jews who wish it.

No concessions or compromises! Only free exit for all who wish this—this is the position we are expecting from you; and it is for this that we have hope.

LIST OF SIGNERS

Israel Warnewitzkij, Ave. M. Tareza #102, Court 2, Apt. 1, Leningrad.

R. Zisman, Krenotschublowskaja #117, Apt. 54, Leningrad.

Vladimir Geisberg, Svetlanouskij, #101, Apt. 176, Leningrad.

Ludmila Warnewitzkij, Ave. M. Tareza #102, Court 2, Apt. 1, Leningrad.

Nikolai Iovar, Svetlanovskij, #101, Apt. 47, Leningrad.

Michael Gurwitch, Mairova #33, Apt. 16, Leningrad.

Sergeij Luri, Novorossijskaja #22, Court 1, Apt. 4, Leningrad.

David Kripkin, Nekrasova 1/38, Apt. 55, Leningrad.

Isaac Ptchiskin, Leningrad.

Alla Iaver, Svetlanovskaja #101, Apt. 47, Leningrad.

Violetta Betaki, Nevskij #170, Leningrad.

Boris Golubev, Grazhdanskaja #20/22, Apt. 1, Leningrad.

M. Peourovskaja, Zhukovskago #27, Apt. 13, Leningrad.

Pojakov, Nevskij #76, Apt. 40, Leningrad.

Boris Rubinstein, Galziskaja #11, Apt. 1, Leningrad.

Henry Mirkin, Kosmonotov #48, 1–186, Leningrad.

Sima Tschermak, Povarskaja #10, Apt. 14, Leningrad.

Leonid Taranok, Nevskij #98, Apt. 6, Leningrad.

Haifitz, Leningrad.

Boris Starobinetz, Ryleeva #1, Apt 40, Leningrad.

Julia Dymshitz, Tsmaissovskij #81, Apt. 64, Leningrad.

Elena Oliker, Basseijnaja #105, Court 1, Apt. 158, Leningrad.

Ludmila Mirkin, Kosmonotov #48, Court 1, Apt. 186, Leningrad.

Mark Karnovskij, Tschaikovskogo #55, Apt. 4, Leningrad.

Stanislav Perlov, Nevskij #141, Apt. 27, Leningrad.

Galina Inelman, Nauki #41, Apt. 24, Leningrad.

Iosfin Girsh, Basseijnaja #103/4, Apt. 205, Leningrad.

Solomon Rosin, Sovetskaja #36, Apt. 17, Leningrad.

Boris Singerevitsh, Dalnevostotshnij #44, Apt. 19, Leningrad.

Vladimir Tsyvkin, Hersonskaja #7, Apt. 6, Leningrad.

Paul Braz, Losanowaja #7, Leningrad.

Lazar Liberman, Gallinskaja #6, Apt. 30, Leningrad.

M. Liberman, Gallinskaja #6, Apt. 30, Leningrad.

Lev Reis, Toreza #40, Court 6, Apt. 28, Leningrad.

EXPLANATION OF POSITION AGAINST H.R. 3298

HON. PETE V. DOMENICI

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, on Thursday, March 22, I voted against H.R. 3298 which would have required the Secretary of Agriculture to spend the full amount appropriated for rural water and sewer systems. I cast that vote with a great deal of reluctance because I am acutely aware that the smaller towns and cities of this Nation, particularly those of under 10,000 population, are in dire need of improved and enlarged water and waste disposal systems. To me, then, this bill had great merit, but I am also acutely aware of a need which is greater than the individual needs addressed by this and similar legislation.

That greater need, Mr. President, is the exercise of overall fiscal responsibility which by virtue of the Constitution rests on Congress. This must take priority over individual pieces of legislation, regardless of their individual merits.

I am pleased to make it part of the RECORD that the legislature of my own State of New Mexico, foreseeing the definite possibility of a curtailment of Federal funding for rural water and sewage programs, passed legislation during the last several weeks to enable the State to carry out these programs at a much lower level of Federal assistance. To my mind this is the correct attitude and is a vast improvement over some proceedings in this Chamber which are simply confined to finding fault with funding changes proposed by the President without regard to the impact of individual appropriations on the overall fiscal situation.

I will continue to urge that we approach our fiscal duties in a responsive and responsible manner. Passing costly, though meritorious legislation, without regard to the overall budget is neither responsive nor responsible.

SOUTH VIETNAM'S POLITICAL PRISONERS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, while we in the United States are rejoicing at the return of our prisoners of war from North Vietnam, we should remember the 200,000 political prisoners still held by the Thieu government in South Vietnam. Subject to unspeakable tortures and brutalities, these patriotic Vietnamese—students, priests, monks, lawyers—bear the brunt of the Saigon regime's attacks on "traitors and enemies of the Republic." The following articles by Mary McCrory and Nicholas Van Hoffman appearing respectively in the March 20 Washington Star and the March 21 Washington Post, draw attention to these atrocities, witnessed firsthand by two Frenchmen who themselves were victims of Thieu's repression. On their present visit to Washington, Andre Menras and Jean-Pierre Debris are calling the American people to use their influence to see that these unrepresented people are not forgotten and left to rot and die in tiger cages. I urge my colleagues to read these articles and think seriously of the burden of responsibility we in the United States bear for these prisoners:

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 20, 1973]

SILENCE GREETS POW'S TALE

(By Mary McGrory)

A pair of recently released prisoners of war have come to Washington. Little is being made of them. For one thing, they are French. For another, they have a tale of ongoing horrors in U.S.-supported South Vietnamese jails that nobody wants to hear.

Andre Menras is 27. Jean-Pierre Debris is 27. They are both schoolteachers who chose to go to Vietnam as an alternative to military service. They spent 2½ years in Chi Hoa prison in Saigon after staging a two-man peace demonstration in Saigon on July 27, 1970.

"To create a shock" against the corruption and tyranny of the regime, they climbed up on a statue waving a Viet Cong flag and scattering leaflets urging immediate peace. They were beaten unconscious. The scene was filmed by CBS and American MPs. They were sentenced to three years for "lessening the morale" of the South Vietnamese army.

They were unexpectedly released on Dec. 29 of last year, to prevent, they think, their witness of horrors to come—the systematic extermination of political prisoners hostile to President Nguyen Van Thieu. They put the number at 200,000.

Under the auspices of Amnesty International, they are making a world tour, hoping to arouse public opinion about the plight of the "brothers" they left behind, and who will, they say, surely die unless pressure is brought on the Thieu regime.

Menras says ruefully that it is hard to awaken Americans. "I find you are only concerned about the return of your 600 prisoners."

The pair, who are too earnest to be doubted, saw a few dove legislators, among

them Sen. Goerge McGovern, who learned from them that the people who attended a peace meeting he addressed in Saigon in August 1972 are now behind bars.

Menras and Debris were invited to speak here to a luncheon of congressional aides.

Under the terms of the Paris accords, "civilian detainees" are supposed to be released by both sides. But Thieu, they charge, is shuffling them off to other "rehabilitation centers" so their relatives lose track of them and converting their status to "criminal" so the accords won't apply.

They are also being beaten and tortured to death by means detailed in a grisly document the two teachers distributed to the audience.

Women, children and babies are in the crowded cells. They were told of peasant women from the Quang Tri province, rounded up after the April offensive, who bore babies in jail. The babies died and the mothers carried corpses around with them to protest.

American officials know all about and acquiesce in the treatment accorded prisoners. In Chi Hoa jail, an American colonel was a supervisor, occupying a special adviser's office. A representative of the U.S. consulate made weekly visits to the 10 American soldiers jailed there on criminal charges.

One American, they reported, burned his cell in protest of the daily beatings of the Vietnamese political prisoners. He was himself beaten up, with American officials present, in the "torture room," which was easily transformed during official inspections into a movie hall by the lowering of a screen.

Survivors of Con Son, site of the notorious tiger cages, told them that new and worse—that is, smaller—tiger cages were being built on the island with American funds. AID officials say no American funds have been used to build prisons since 1970 when two congressmen exposed the tiger cages.

"It has to be said," said Menras, "without American dollars there would be no prisons."

After the one-man election of 1971, a new wave of arrests brought a new class of prisoners—Buddhist monks, Catholic priests, students, lawyers.

"The bourgeoisie," said Debris, "who because they are obviously non-Communists and have standing, would be believed by the people in the political struggles that are to come. Thieu regards them as more dangerous than the Communists."

Representatives of the International Red Cross visited Debris and Menras in July 1971 and filed a report of "good conditions"—well-ventilated cells and adequate diet. It was just after they had been on a 27-day hunger strike and had been beaten daily. Recently, they took up the report with the IRC directors in Geneva and were told that a critical report might have denied them all prison access.

The only thing that helped was a flood of letters addressed to them in prison by indignant Frenchmen. The beatings ceased and the exercise period was extended. Debris and Menras hope to stimulate a worldwide letter-writing campaign to those they left behind. They have names. Similarly after press reports, prominent political prisoners were better treated for a brief while. When the stories ceased, abuse was resumed.

In the silence that fell after their harrowing recital, one pretty congressional aide asked, "What should Congress do?"

"They should ask Thieu when he comes about the political prisoners," Menras replied. "He will say he has none, but we have lists of names, and he should be asked about each one."

The chances of President Nixon's putting such embarrassing questions to the guest who comes next month are practically nonexistent. For him, Thieu comprises the "honor" in "peace with honor."

Nor is the prospect likely that an outraged Congress will put conditions on the almost $3 billion in military and economic aid the administration proposes to send to Thieu this year.

One aide explained, "My guy just wants out all the way. He says the Vietnamese should settle this among themselves. Besides, he doesn't think he should talk about South Vietnamese torture without talking about North Vietnamese torture too."

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 21, 1973]

BETWEEN THE HALVES AND THE HAVE-NOTS

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

When one of the POWs walked onto the red carpet the other day and did the patriotic obeisances that have been repeated until they have become near litany, he did say one thing we hadn't heard before. He thanked the pro-war portion of the American populace for their support, citing in particular the minutes of silence at the football games and the bumper stickers.

Maybe those moments of civic religion between halves did help. For all outward appearances, the POWs held in North Vietnam were treated about as well as felons in our penitentiaries back home. (The treatment accorded their captives by the Viet Cong in the South needs more learning about.) But confirmation that public opinion—if it's the right public in the right nation—may help comes from two young Frenchmen.

In the summer of 1970, Jean-Pierre Debris and Andre Menras committed an act of imbecilic courage by unfurling a Viet Cong flag in front of General Thieu's National Assembly building in Saigon. They were slammed into the Chi Hoa prison/concentration camp where they languished until three months ago.

Menras says, "If we are still alive, it is thanks to thousands of people who sent us letters, who were concerned about us. From the moment thousands of French people decided to pressure the Saigon fascists, from that moment on, we saw a difference in the attitude of our jailers. They stopped beating us," and ultimately freed the two young men who'd come to Vietnam in the French equivalent of one of our Peace Corps operations.

That takes care of the occidentals. They go first class. In captivity or out, Americans and Frenchmen get treated better than the natives even when their jailers are natives. Most reports indicate both the North and the South Vietnamese treated each other's prisoners with a harshness which bordered on and sometimes reached barbarism.

Maybe we can dismiss it by saying that's what happens in a civil war, but there is still another class of prisoners in South Vietnam, the thousands and thousands who are referred to as "politicals." They're a mixture of Communists, Catholics, Buddhists and war-hating, home-loving neutralists, not to mention a miscellany of miserables such as old, anti-French colonial patriots, students and shoe shine boys who didn't have the requisite 50-cents to bribe the cops.

As it became clear that the combatants were moving toward some sort of cease-fire agreement, Menras reports, the Saigon authorities took steps to hide the political prisoners: "They divided each cell into tiny groups, separating people who had known each other for years. During this separation and change of cells a lot of prisoners disappeared completely. They even mixed Catholic students with members of the NLF so they could be classified as Communists; and all the political prisoners were mixed with the ordinary ones. They took away the files of these prisoners so that no one will be able to prove that there were political prisoners, and not ordinary criminals."

According to both Frenchmen, the treatment dished out to these politicals meets the highest standards set by the Gestapo. While they themselves suffered beatings and semi-starvation, they spoke to prisoners who saw and endured all manner of torture, some straightforwardly brutal and some done with calculated preparation as when "needles were inserted under the fingernails (and) a sheet of tissue paper was attached to each needle after which the ventilator just opposite was turned on. The breeze from the ventilator set the tissue paper in motion and this, in turn, made the needles move under the nails." Women captives were routinely raped and otherwise sexually abused.

At the same time that we're learning about these horrors, Michael D. Benge, an American civilian official captured in 1968, has been released from prison with stories about North Vietnamese cruelty toward himself and other captives. This will allow people to say if they do it, why shouldn't we? But that's the kind of question that answers itself merely by being asked.

Beyond that, our people, no matter how badly treated and tortured, are getting out. The people whom Debris and Menras met in prison aren't. They have no one to bargain for them unless it is the NLF who presumably will concentrate on getting their own people freed, and not the other thousands who're imprisoned although they were never members of the Viet Cong. Furthermore, of all the warring parties in this mess, the NLF have the weakest power position and the least leverage on the Thieu government.

So these wretches will have to cling to life as best they can. Lost in the concentration camps and tiger cages, their names are on no lists of repatriation, nor will they be memoralized on any bumper stickers. For them there will be no moments of half time silence, no candles lit, no prayer.

GEORGIA SENATE HONORS PILOTS FOR THEIR SKILL AND BRAVERY

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on February 26, 1973, an aircraft flying over a heavily populated section of the Atlanta area collided with a flock of birds which caused both engines to fail.

Pilots Ernest Selfors and David Phillips struggled with the aircraft and successfully avoided crashing into apartment complexes below. Both pilots and their five passengers died, but no one on the ground was killed. The Georgia Senate adopted a resolution honoring them for their skill and bravery, and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

A RESOLUTION

Whereas Mr. Ernest Selfors and David Phillips were distinguished pilots and a credit to their profession.

Whereas on the morning of February 26, 1973, on a routine flight over a heavily populated area of Metro Atlanta their aircraft encountered a total malfunction in both engines due to a freakish encounter with a flock of birds.

Whereas Mr. Selfors and Mr. Phillips spent the last seventy (70) seconds of their life wrestling their aircraft in a successful attempt to avoid crashing into any of a number of apartment complexes below them.

Whereas they gave their life for their fellowman and crashed their aircraft in a

pit thus avoiding any injury to others due to their tragic misfortune.

Therefore be it resolved that the Georgia Senate expresses its sincere regrets at their passing and expresses its most sincere admiration and affection for their heroism and service to mankind above and beyond the call of duty.

WELFARE SCANDAL III

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the evidence of failure in our Nation's welfare system continues to mount.

Yesterday our distinguished colleague from Michigan, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, released a study from the General Accounting Office showing the vast duplication and inequity in application of our present welfare system.

Today I am submitting the third installment of a series of articles in the Milwaukee Sentinel resulting from a 3-month investigation of the Milwaukee County welfare department. The authors allege that $28 million was wasted last year alone through fraud and mismanagement.

This installment deals with the lax supervision and maladministration which runs up the cost of distributing welfare benefits. There are, no doubt, many dedicated caseworkers in Milwaukee and other cities across the country. But the abuses chronicled in the Milwaukee Sentinel series raise serious questions about the "nonsystem" of caseworker supervision of welfare clients.

The welfare scandal cannot be eliminated by ignoring it. The Congress must act soon to reform its welfare assistance program, eliminate duplications which allow some families to receive more than they could earn in the job market and more than other wage-earning and taxpaying people.

The articles follow:

HOW CASEWORKERS CHEAT

(By Gene Cunningham and Stuart Wilk)

Some workers for the Milwaukee County Welfare Department pick up extra money by cheating on mileage and overtime, and extra time off by cutting short their workdays.

A department administrator who was concerned about the situation was told not to do anything about it because he would be "opening Pandora's box."

Supervisors supposedly watchdog mileage claims and overtime and know whether their workers are on the job or on the town.

The administrator said that he had complained about the mileage claims that were being submitted in one division. He said he told a supervisor that he intended to investigate.

"I was told not to—that I'd be opening Pandora's box," the administrator said.

Incidents of employes taking off for workouts at the North Central branch of the YMCA, afternoons at the movies and loafing at home are slipping through the system that discourages "opening Pandora's box."

"Everything you have heard about the department is true regarding inefficiency, loafing and cheating," another administrator said.

Some of the supervisors and administrative staff, as well as workers, take two and three hour lunch periods, he said. Arriving late and leaving early are commonplace, he added.

Once, he said, he complained to a superior about one person who was habitually arriving late for work, leaving early and doing little work while he was there. Nothing was done about it, he said.

Loafing on the job is apparently as big a problem as disappearing from the job.

One worker told a reporter that a friend of his in the department had boasted that from the end of May until early October she had read 10 novels during working hours.

Some workers in his section, he said, have as few as 6 cases and others have as many as 25.

The person with only six cases doesn't have enough to do, so he may read a novel rather than just sit at his desk idle, the caseworker said.

Others, he said, loaf even if they do have work to do.

Meanwhile, the department is doling out untold thousands of dollars for time that isn't being worked and mileage that isn't being driven.

Employes in one division who make home calls "commonly file 38 or 39 miles a day because you can file up to 40 miles without explaining where you drove to," a former division worker said.

"If you file 40 miles or more, you have to detail where you went that day," she said.

A check of monthly mileage claims filed by employes in the division turned up quantities of 39 mile days.

A number of employes consistently listed 39 miles as the distance they drove each day, occasionally mixing in a few days of 38 or a few less miles.

But the requirement of an explanation for 40 miles or more a day failed to discourage some workers. They reported trips of 90 to 100 miles on which they did not leave the city.

One reported driving 94 miles one day and carefully listed by address exactly where she had gone. The 94 miles added up to $11.28 for mileage.

A Milwaukee Sentinel reporter clocked the trip exactly as the worker had listed it.

The distance—including extra blocks caused by some wrong turns—was 50.2 miles, which would have cost the department only $6 in mileage.

Another trip listed by the worker as 47 miles was also checked by a reporter. It was 20.5 miles—less than half the distance the worker had claimed, which means she collected more than twice the mileage she should have from the county.

Although caseworkers and case aides said mileage in excess of 40 miles or more a day must be explained on monthly mileage claims, Arthur Silverman, director of the department, said the requirement varies depending on the work the person does and the driving involved.

He made the statement after quoting from a mileage claim form that "any mileage in excess of the usual average should be explained below."

Of the hundreds of mileage claim forms checked by Sentinel reporters, each had used the 40 miles a day figure as the point at which an explanation had to be given.

If the mileage is over the usual average, employes "must specify their destination" on their mileage claim form, Silverman said.

While some employes pinpointed their destinations, other gave such explanations as "househunting" for a recipient and "stamps, shopping for all my people."

The responsibility for mileage claims rests with the workers' supervisors, Silverman said.

"If on observation there appears to be something wrong, they (the supervisors) can call in the person and ask that he explain," he said.

The department work day is eight hours long—from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.—with half an hour for lunch, Silverman said. It adds up to a 40 hour workweek.

Some employes, however, seem to be either scheduled for overtime or are free to work specified overtime on a regular basis.

Many of them actually do work, but others simply file overtime for loafing and visiting in the department on Saturdays or they claim that they were "visiting clients" on weekends, caseworkers said.

One caseworker told Sentinel reporters that when he was in a unit that made emergency calls, workers there padded their overtime.

Workers in the unit get an automatic four hours of overtime for night calls regardless of how long the calls take, he said.

"Some of the visits take no more than an hour," but they would pad the four hours to five or six anyway, he said.

On an individual basis, the overtime situation in the department is probably better than it was in 1971 when a halt in overtime was ordered by County Executive Doyne.

Then, "one caseworker was going around bragging that he was earning as much money as the director of the department," several employes said.

A check of the overtime claimed that year by the caseworker revealed that he had filed 56 hours of overtime most pay periods.

"We had to crack down on overtime. The control should have been in the department, but it wasn't," said Anthony P. Romano, Civil Service chief examiner.

A number of department reports over the last few months indicated that overtime had been totaling more than 2,000 hours each two week pay period, with the majority of it filed by workers in financial assistance and by those doing case reviews.

Worker accountability and supervisor responsibility—or the lack of it—apparently allow caseworkers and aides to loaf or take off during working hours.

A number of workers and others in the department complained of the lack of accountability in the homemaking section by aides assigned to go into the homes of the disabled, assist them and do cleaning and housework.

"Sometimes the aides show up and sometimes they don't," a former employe in homemaking said.

One aide told a client, "If I like you, I'll clean your house. If I don't, I'll sit and watch TV," another department employe said.

A Sentinel reporter arrived one morning at the home of one welfare recipient while the assigned aide was there. The aide was sitting at the kitchen table drinking coffee.

"If you don't need anything, I'll leave," the aide said, and she left. The apartment was littered and needed cleaning.

Another welfare recipient said that for two years the department had furnished her a homemaking aide to come in one day a week and do her housecleaning, laundry and grocery shopping.

In the two years the aide came to her home she never put in much more than three hours of work a day, the recipient said.

The aide always "rushed through, hit the high spots and then said she was going home and go back to bed because she had a night job she had to get to," the woman said.

Some of the homemaking aides are good, some are bad and some of them just don't show up if they don't want to, a worker said.

Asked who knows where caseworkers and aides are when they are not at the department, Silverman said, "At a given time of the day it is usually not known where they are." But they can tell their supervisor, write their destination on their time card or tell the

person who takes their telephone calls, he said.

Later, they write a report that shows who they called on, he said.

At least that's the way the system is supposed to work.

AIDE'S DAY OFTEN MEANS LEISURE

One caseworker goes to Chicago for baseball games while he is supposed to be visiting his clients.

Another goes to the beach during the summer and to a health club during the winter while the Milwaukee County Welfare Department pays him to make home visits.

Groups of caseworkers have card games—some lasting 90 minutes—during their "30 minute" lunch breaks.

To many caseworkers, the Welfare Center at 1220 W. Vliet St. is a place to read the paper, socialize, cheat on mileage and overtime and do as little work as possible.

One caseworker charged that "there is more fraud by the workers than there is by the clients."

Interviews with caseworkers and observation by Sentinel reporters revealed that:

The half hour lunch period is regularly abused by workers, some of whom stretch it into two or three hours.

Many employes leave the department several hours before quitting time for recreation and personal business.

Employes commonly put in for more mileage than they actually drive on departmental business. The department pays them 12 cents a mile.

Some workers get by doing one or two hours of work in an eight hour day.

One caseworker told The Sentinel that he does "less than an hour of work a day."

"I try to read a lot," he said. "I've tried to read books but it's hard to concentrate. Usually I read magazines."

He is supposed to make home visits to 50 of his clients each month.

"The last time I made a home visit was two months ago," the worker said. "I just put down names on the reports. I have 180 cases to pick names from. I talk to some of them on the phone."

The same caseworker files mileage claims of about $30 a month.

"I don't drive on business," he admitted. "I just go to work and back home."

When he arrives at 8 a.m., he reads a newspaper for about an hour and then spends most of the day reading magazines and socializing.

LUNCH BREAKS

He generally takes about 90 minutes for lunch, but said he would take longer lunch periods if he didn't have "a strict supervisor."

"Most could leave at 10 a.m. and come back at 2 p.m. and the supervisors wouldn't notice," he said.

He regularly leaves work about two hours early, but he said, "I know people who leave at noon and don't come back at all."

When he leaves, he goes to health club, plays tennis, goes to the beach, runs errands or goes home.

"The golden rule is not to answer your phone (at home) until just after 4:30 or 5," he said.

MEMBERS OF "Y"

Some of his fellow workers have taken out memberships at the North Central branch of the YMCA at 2200 N. 12th St., a few blocks from the Welfare Center, he said.

They commonly go there to work out during the afternoon, according to the caseworker.

Another caseworker told a reporter that caseworkers in the department's medical division once held "contests" to see who could put in for the most mileage each month.

There are other "contests" at the department, he said.

"Every morning about a half dozen guys read the paper in the men's room. I had the record of one hour and five minutes to read the paper," he said.

"But another guy broke it with one hour and 11 minutes."

DEPARTURE TIME

This caseworker also commonly cheats on mileage and overtime and leaves work two hours early each day.

"I get more than I should be getting," he said of his mileage. "There's a significant majority of people who are doing it. It's easy money."

The caseworker said that, if he gets an emergency call at night, he will sometimes pad his overtime.

"When called at an ungodly hour, they (caseworkers) add an hour or two," he said.

Describing himself as an "average" caseworker, he noted that he did about three hours work a day.

During his lunch period, he plays cards, generally starting at 11:45 a.m. and quitting about 1 p.m.

GAMES WATCHED

Sentinel reporters watched workers playing cards in conference rooms during the noon hour on several occasions. One game lasted 45 minutes, another 50 minutes and another game lasted more than an hour.

Some caseworkers play cards in full view of their supervisors—and their clients—while others play in conference rooms with frosted glass, to keep from being discovered.

"My friends all cheat on mileage," said another caseworker. "Once I put down mileage for a day I didn't even work. They sent it back with a card that said 'correct and return.'"

There were no other repercussions from the department, she said.

When she was transferred to a different division in the department several months ago, she said she "spent a week without doing anything."

READ MANUAL

She said for five days she did nothing except read a manual.

"Now I just fill out forms," the caseworker said.

"I usually don't take more than an hour for lunch," she said. "I've left at noon a couple of times and just left for the day."

On several occasions she and other workers have gone to movies during the afternoon, she said.

"I would do work if there was work to do," she said. "I'd like to be busy, but the way department is set up I just can't."

The caseworker said she leaves an hour early each day, adding that "everyone else does the same thing."

She described the department as "one continuous social hour."

THE REASONS

Why do the caseworkers cheat the department?

"It's kind of a crummy job," said one caseworker. "And this is one way to get even."

He said that most caseworkers are willing to work and are enthusiastic during their first weeks, but that the enthusiasm gets knocked out of them. They get bogged down in paperwork, several caseworkers said.

Diligent caseworkers "are more likely to step on toes and get into trouble," said one of the caseworkers.

Or, as another caseworker put it, "I'm going to get my $200 a week either way. So why should I work? I'd rather read a magazine."

"THE IRISH FORTNIGHT" OF THE IRISH AMERICAN CULTURAL INSTITUTE

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Irish American Cultural Institute, whose international headquarters are located in St. Paul, Minn., is again bringing to American audiences its unique concentration on Irish culture and civilization termed, "The Irish Fortnight." This 2-week program, which brings scholars, writers, musicians, and performers directly from Ireland to the United States, started 2 years ago in St. Paul. In 1973, the program will be held in five U.S. cities: St. Paul, Cleveland, Washington, New York, and Newark. Recently, Dublin's Irish Independent newspaper stated that the Fortnight is by far the "most important" cultural link between Ireland and America.

As a Senator from Minnesota and a long-time friend of the institute's honorary chairman, Mr. I. A. O'Shaughnessy, I am genuinely proud of the invaluable contribution to international cultural understanding made by the IACI. Not only those of Irish descent but all citizens of Minnesota are benefited by the initiative and vision of the institute, its international chairman, HSH Princess Grace of Monaco and its president, Dr. Eoin McKiernan, the IACI's distinguished leader from our State.

This year, in a program which concludes this weekend, the Washington division of the IACI was able to add several new elements to the Fortnight, notably the first U.S. performance of Sean O'Riada's Irish People's Mass as sung by the Congregational Church choir of Fairfax, Va., and a special program at Constitution Hall by the Air Force Band, Sesame Street's Bob McGrath, and Academy Award winner, Mercedes McCambridge.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on the Washington Irish Fortnight from the Irish Echo and several biographies of Fortnight participants.

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

[From the New York Irish Echo, Mar. 17, 1973]

IRISH FORTNIGHT

The Irish American Cultural Institute has done it again. As a matter of fact, the St. Paul-based Institute may have surpassed its most admirable ventures with its spectacular Irish Fortnight which will be featured at five locations beginning on March 18.

The Fortnight, a two-week schedule of programs devoted to aspects of Irish culture and heritage, will be presented at five sites in the United States. Outstanding lecturers and performers from Ireland will be featured in the programs. Programs will be given on college campuses in St. Paul, Cleveland, Washington, South Orange, N.J., and New York.

Here in the east if you are in the vicinity

of Manhattan College in the Bronx, Seton Hall University in South Orange, N.J., or Georgetown University in Washington you have an opportunity to attend one or all of these programs which will discuss the art, literature, music, history, politics and architecture of Ireland.

We strongly recommend these programs to anyone who seeks the real Ireland and its culture. Once again Dr. Eoin McKiernan and his colleagues have put Ireland's best foot forward. They, Manhattan, Seton Hall, Georgetown and all involved are to be congratulated.

[Irish Fortnight, March 18 to 31, 1973]

BIOGRAPHIES OF MAIN PARTICIPANTS

DESMOND RUSHEE

Since 1960 has been theatre critic for Irish Independent newspaper. As columnist he has reviewed Broadway plays of Irish interest, was the Irish reporter for Sen. Robert Kennedy's funeral and the Apollo 12 moon flight. In Dublin, he has been a regular lecturer at the Communications Centre on aspects of journalism, and at summer schools for foreign students on aspects of theatre. Has been Irish correspondent for the New York Times in its Arts Abroad series and has written a number of special articles for the Times including a lengthy article on writer Christy Brown.

MICHAEL HARTNETT

Major Irish poet. First collection, "Anatomy of a Cliche," published by Dolmen Press in 1968, although he had contributed poetry since 1962 to Poetry Ireland and in 1963 was editor of the now extinct but then thriving Arena. In 1969 published "The Hag of Beare," a translation of the old Irish poem and in 1970 his Selected Poems were acclaimed. In 1971, his poem "Tao," a long religious poem based on 5th century B.C. Chinese classic of same name, was published. He has translated extensively from Irish and has read in centres in Ireland and England. At present is working on a very long poem which he calls "a psychological history of Ireland."

CHRISTOPHER WARREN

A harpist in the ancient tradition. Has built a replica of the ancient Irish harp. Has created tremendous interest in the rediscovery of this ancient tradition of playing the harp as the old harpers did play it. He is Church of Ireland rector at Miltown, Co. Kerry, rector of Kilcoman. Has lectured on ancient harp tradition in Irish universities and is the one man responsible for interest in this revived art.

ÉAMON DE HÓIR

Chief Placenames Office, Ordnance Survey, Dublin. Secretary of the Placenames Society and editor of its journal Dinnsseschas since its inception in 1964. Member of Interrational Committee of Onomastic Sciences and Council for Name Studies in Ireland and Great Britain. Author of "Seán o Donnabháin agus Eoghan o Comhrai" (1962) and numerous articles on placename research. Wrote the placenames section of "Encyclopaedia of Ireland," 1968.

RUAIDHRÍ DE VALERA

Distinguished Irish archaeologist, Chairman, National Monuments Advisory Council and corresponding member of the German Archaeological Institute. Principal research and publication work deals with Ireland in Netholithic times and especially with megalithic tombs. Responsible for the establishment of the Megalithic Survey of Ireland at the Ordnance Survey in 1949. Three volumes, covering about one-third of the whole of Ireland are in print under the joint authorship of Ruaidhrí de Valera and Sean O Nullain. Son of the president of Ireland, Eamon de Valera.

JAMES WHITE

Director, National Gallery of Ireland; council members of Irish Arts Council, Dublin Regional Tourism, Foras Forbartha, Friends of National Collections of Ireland, many others. Formerly was art critic, Standard (1940–50); Irish Press (1950–59); Irish Times (1959–62). External lecturer University College, Dublin and Trinity College Dublin since 1955. Curator, Municipal Gallery of Modern Art, (1961–65). Has published books on Irish Stained Glass (with M. Wynne) and The National Gallery of Ireland. Has lectured and made television appearances in Ireland, England, the Continent and the United States.

SÉAMUS Ó'NÉILL

Irish historian, dramatist, and novelist (in both Irish and English). Professor of History, member of Consultative Committee of Irish Historical Society. Summer school faculty at Harvard University. His novel "Ionn Tulle" was highly praised by Seán O'Casey. An Utlatch proclaimed his "Maire Nic Artain" the "best novel in Ulster Irish." His Oireachtas prize-winning play, "Inion Ri Dhun Sobhairce" was performed in Maynooth, Galway, Dublin and on Radio Eireann. He has had two short story anthologies published. Has contributed to many English and U.S. publications. Much of his fiction is on the syllabi of Irish universities.

RICHARD KAIN

Interest in Irish literature and culture is of long standing. In 1944 he gave one of the first university courses on the work of James Joyce. He has written numerous books and articles in the Irish area, the best known being "Fabulous Voyager: James Joyce's "Ulysses" (1947), now in paperback, and "Dublin in the Age of W. B. Yeats and James Joyce" (1962). He has lectured at many American universities and at the Yeats Summer School in Ireland. In 1972 he was a visiting lecturer at University College, Dublin.

His most recent books are contributions to the Bucknell University Irish Writers Series. "Susan L. Mitchell" was published in 1972, and A.E.: "George William Russell" (with James O'Brien) is now in press.

BASIL PAYNE

Poet, playwright, radio-tv personality. For 10 years has done extensive radio-TV work on Radio-Telefis Eireann as guest editor, presenter, scriptwriter. Has scripted and presented critical studies of American and Irish writers; is editor and presenter of series of 10 talks by professors of English literature, poets and writers; has 60-minute one-man TV-radio production, "In Dublin's Quare City," featuring his own Dublin impressions, poetry and fiction. Original dramas and films include, "Don't Call me Honey;" "The Onlooker," a dramatic poem for 4 voices; "A Trip Down the River," a new television play; and "Missing, Believed Dead," 30-minute film featured twice on RTE with enthusiastic response. Has lectured in USA, Canada, throughout the Continent, and Ireland. His poetry has been featured on RTE, B.B.C. 4, Radio Holland and Radio Helsinki. Poetry publications include two collections of poems, "Love in the Afternoon" and "Sunlight on a Square." Literary awards include Guinness Poetry Prize Cheltenham Festival, 1964 and 1966.

STEPHEN M'GONAGLE

President, All-Ireland Congress of Trade Unions. During 30 years as a trade union and labor activist was engaged as Northwest District Secretary of the Irish Transport and General Workers' Union. Member of the Northern Ireland Economic Council and Northern Ireland Training Council and was Vice Chairman, Derry Development Commission until August, 1971, when he withdrew due to internment policy. Formerly Director of Irish (Republic) Sugar Company. Was Chairman of Peace Conference, Northern Ireland in August, 1969. Last visit to USA in 1962 as guest of U.S. State Department.

SEOSAMH Ó HÉANAI

One of the best known singers in the authentic traditional manner, Seosamh Ó hÉanai was born fifty-two years ago in the Irish-speaking Parish of Carna County, Galway. Bert Lloyd once described the area as "An isolated district of bog and stones that at first sight evokes a landscape of the moon." Since his first entrance in open competition in singing, in 1939, he has placed first or second in the major competitions while in Ireland.

His songs span the centures from the classic "Rocks of Bawn," which can be dated back to the Cromwellian terror of 1652, through one of the most moving versions of the "Patriot Game," or the more modern songs from the Catholic communities of Northern Ireland. Interspersed are love songs in the moving and compelling native tongue of Ireland, as well as stories and music hall songs. Ó hÉanai's recordings are popular with folk music collectors on both sides of the Atlantic.

RISTEÁRD Ó GLAISNE

Writer, radio and TV personality, teacher, spokesman for contemporary Protestant thought in Ireland, Risteárd Ó Glaisne is one of the better-known figures on the Irish scene. Graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, Ó Glaisne edited Focus, a monthly review of current affairs, until its demise in 1966. A frequent traveler to the Continent, he has first-hand experience with virtually every European country.

Two of his recent books are "Ian Paisley agus Tuaisceart Eirean" (an examination of the socio-political situation in Northern Ireland) and "Raon Mo Shiuil" (a study of issues in contemporary Europe). Work in progress includes a critique of Irish language literature from the earliest times. Mr. Ó Glaisne also edited a do-it-yourself text for modern Irish, "Bun-Ghaeilge."

BENENICE REED

Born in Memphis, Tennessee, of Irish descent, Miss Reed coordinates art programs for the National Park Service, and serves as project liaison officer between the National Park Service and the National Endowment for the Arts. She represents the National Park Service on the executive committee of the "Parks, Arts and Leisure" project, which is co-sponsored by the National Park Service, the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Recreation and Parks Association.

After receiving her Baccalaureate in Fine Arts from St. Mary-of-the-Woods College, Indiana, she pursued her art studies in Florence, Italy for two years at the Instituto Pio XII, Villa Schifanoia, where she was awarded a Master of Fine Arts degree. The thesis for this degree was concerned with Italian synopie and frescoes and was directed by Renzo Chairelli, librarian of the Uffizi Gallery. She is a member of the Washington D.C. chapter of the Artists Equity Association, a member of the Arts Advisory Board of the National Recreation and Parks Association, and the Museum Educators Roundtable. In 1971, she was a delegate to the Associated Councils of the Arts conference "Washington and the Arts", and was listed in "Outstanding Young Women of America" 1966.

Before joining the National Park Service, Miss Reed directed art festivals and taught art privately and in high schools, college and art institutes. She has held eighteen one-man shows of her paintings in the United States and Europe, has juried and

judged art exhibitions and competitions, lectured before educational and professional, community, and social groups, and presented television programs besides participating in discussions and interviews on art and art programs. She appeared on the NBC–TV program "The Irish Imagination" presented this January. Her figurative expressionist drawings and paintings have been shown in over twenty five juried competitions, receiving awards that include the "Medal of the Mayor of Rome" (Viareggio, 1964) and the "Bronze Medal for Drawing" (Florence, 1964). Her works have been exhibited in over fifty group shows including "Nine Women Artists" at the Brooks Memorial Art Gallery, Memphis, Tennessee, and may be found in public and private collections in eleven foreign countries and twenty-seven states of the United States. In private life she is married to the architect Ronald Dickson.

SALUTE TO BOB WILSON

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, as you know, our good friend and colleague, Congressman BOB WILSON, will be stepping down as chairman of our Republican Congressional Campaign Committee within a few days, after serving nearly a dozen years in that grueling job.

Although BOB has received—and will continue to receive—the warm tributes and praise of his colleagues for a job well done, I think the Congressional Committee's newsletter sums up as well as anything I have read the high regard in which we all hold BOB WILSON.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the newsletter's "Salute to BOB WILSON," published in its March 26 edition:

SALUTE TO BOB WILSON

Kahlil Gibran: "You give but little when you give of your possessions. It is when you give of yourself that you truly give."

Since he became Chairman of the Republican Congressional Committee in 1961, California's Bob Wilson has given much of himself to the job. And the committee and the Republican Party are the better for it.

Under Wilson's chairmanship, which spanned nearly a dozen years for the longest such tenure in the committee's 107-year-history, fresh programs and projects were undertaken and far-reaching advances made. He was the first to change the old order if the new was better.

In professionalizing the committee, Wilson also firmed up its financial footings. He stabilized staffing to a year-round basis. He set up fund-raising programs which were pacesetters for the party and which erased the committee's "feast-or-famine" status. He established the GOP Congressional Boosters Club which provided the financial underpinnings for hundreds of challengers' campaigns.

Under Wilson's direction, the committee beefed up its communications to help get its message to the public and its Congressmen's words to the voters. Its biennial candidates' conferences, also a Wilson innovation, were expanded into broad and effective training programs for fledgling challengers. Campaigning candidates were linked by teletype to committee headquarters in Washington to keep them abreast of daily developments and provide them with ammunition.

In giving of himself, Bob Wilson traveled hundreds of thousands of miles to appear at party gatherings and to help Congressional candidates raise funds and conduct their campaigns. He spent hundreds of hours on "red-eye specials," the late night airplane flights, to enable him to get back to the capital from these rallies and from his district a continent away to tend to his constituents' business. He kept an aggressive legislative schedule, serving as third-ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee and "fathering" such vital legislation as the Nation's oceanography program.

Altogether, 211 Republicans have been elected to the U.S. House since Bob Wilson became RCC Chairman. We think just about all would share in the application of Gibran's views quoted above to the indefatigable Californian who gave so much of himself. We think they would also join in President Nixon's salute. "As you lay down the heavy burden of leadership which you have borne so ably," Mr. Nixon wrote to Wilson, "you can be proud of the service which you have rendered to your party, to your State and to the Nation."

THE INTERNAL SECURITY CUTS THREATEN AMERICAN PEOPLE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the announcement that the Nixon administration has abolished the Internal Security Division of the Department of Justice should be greeted with great exultation by the enemies of our constitutional Republic here at home as well as in Moscow, Peking, and Hanoi.

Apparently, the President's advisers have either told him that there is no longer a subversive that to overthrow our Government, or that the Supreme Court will not allow society to stop subversion, or that our country has already been infiltrated to the point that internal security is ineffective, or that our country has already been taken over.

Had Kennedy or Johnson pulled such a coup, they would have been tarred and feathered and exited from the country as dangerous collaborators.

It is truly remarkable what an anti-Communist image can do in advancing the goals of international communism.

While the administration presently entrusted with the security of the American people acts to abandon confrontation with the enemies of free man, the Military Order of World Wars meeting in Washington on January 31, received a report from its Internal Security Committee outlining the serious threat from subversives in our country and adopted the following resolution:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the internal security program of this nation has been found by the Congress to be inadequate and ineffective; and

Whereas, the first duty of any government is to protect itself and maintain itself as a secure and stable institution under its constitutional authority; and

Whereas, the people of this nation are constitutionally entitled to government which is dedicated in its entirety and without exception to the interests of this nation above all others;

Be it hereby resolved, by the General Staff of The Military Order of the World Wars, in midwinter conference assembled, that the United States of America is ill-served by government officials and government employees who fail in any degree to do their utmost to maintain a high degree of internal security in our government against all enemies, both foreign and domestic, as required by oath of office and lawful official responsibility.

Be it further resolved, that the President of the United States and all members of the Congress be hereby most strongly advised that a comprehensive new and thoroughly effective program of internal security, backed by federal statutes containing high standards and severe penalties, is essential to the national security and general welfare of our nation and should be put into effect at the earliest possible time.

I include a news clipping and report of the Internal Security Committee of the Military Order of World Wars in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 27, 1973]

INTERNAL SECURITY DIES QUIETLY AT JUSTICE

(By Sanford J. Ungar)

The Kennedy administration tried it, the Johnson administration came close to doing it, but it finally took the Nixon Administration to abolish one of the most controversial divisions of the Justice Department.

A cause celebre at both ends of the political spectrum, the Internal Security Division went out of eixstence yesterday morning.

There was no partying, protesting or philosophizing to accompany the apparently momentous occasion, which would have sparked both angry opposition and delighted applause just a few years ago.

But then there hadn't been much time to plan as reaction—the event was only announced last Thursday.

Death came not because of any act of Congress, a cutoff of funds or a federal court decision, but rather by a stroke of Attorney General Richard G. Kleindienst's pen.

According to the official Justice Department press release on the matter, the abolition of Internal Security and the transfer of its duties to the department's Criminal Division—where they originally were until 1954—was merely "in keeping with the administration's program of streamlining the Executive Branch."

Justice Department sources said that is a euphemism for the fact that the administration needed to shake loose a sub-Cabinet slot to house its new overall narcotics-enforcement agency.

Formal establishment of that agency is expected to be announced within the next few weeks, and its director will hold the "assistant attorney general" title dropped yesterday morning by A. William Olson, the Southern California lawyer who had been head of Internal Security for the past year.

Administration strategists hope that internal security watchdogs on Capitol Hill won't notice, but there is also a substantive reason for doing away with the division: it was running out of business.

With American participation in the Vietnam war virtually over and with draft calls down to zero, there will be no need in the foreseeable future for vigorous enforcement of the Selective Service Act.

Speaking somewhat with the wistful tone of men who have outlined their usefuliness, Internal Security veterans also note that domestic terrorism—considered a major problem in the heyday of the Weatherman militants—has greatly subsided.

Some suggest that the division is a casualty of the same winds of change which have reduced the Subversive Activities Control Board to a shadow of its former self and which make the House Internal Security

Committee (formerly the House Un-American Activities Committee, or HUAC) fight for its life and funds every two years.

It is perhaps a sign of the times that federal officials no longer seem vitally concerned about the threat of subversion and the need to fight it.

Even the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Central Intelligence Agency are said to be making cutbacks in the area of domestic intelligence and counter-intelligence.

It was not always thus, especially in 1954 when President Eisenhower's Attorney General, Herbert Brownell, elevated the internal security section of the Justice Department's Criminal Division to the status of a separate division. By 1956, it had 94 of its own attorneys.

By the early days of the Kennedy Administration, the division was being called into question and its chief, J. Walter Yeagley, was forced by congressional committees to justify its appropriations.

The Washington Post reported on April 1, 1961:

"The internal security division of the Department of Justice . . . has almost come to the end of its line. For several years, its work load and its personnel have been decreasing. Now, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy is farming out some of the remaining personnel to other divisions in the department because there is little for them to do."

But Kennedy and other Democrats who followed him as Attorney General, including Ramsey Clark, never managed to do away with the division.

In 1970, Yeagley, who had only 42 lawyers left under his command, was relieved of his vigil and appointed by President Nixon to be a judge of the newly strengthened District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

Then Attorney General John N. Mitchell used the occasion to beef up the Internal Security Division under a new leader, Robert C. Mardian, who had worked in Sen. Barry M. Goldwater's 1964 Republican campaign and Mr. Nixon's 1968 effort.

Mardian took his mandate seriously, building his staff (there were 65 attorneys and 75 other employees in the division yesterday) and launching grand jury investigations of radical activities across the country.

Under him, the Internal Security Division was assigned jurisdiction over a number of controversial cases that would ordinarily have gone elsewhere, including the Harrisburg, Pa., conspiracy trial of the Rev. Philip Berrigan and other Catholic militants and all litigation growing out of disclosure of the top-secret Pentagon papers.

Justice Department officials insist that the division's work "will not be downgraded" because of the transfer, but sources said that many of its personnel will be promptly shifted to other, non-security related tasks.

It was not immediately clear what would become of some of the division's most disputed responsibilities, including its secret "security index" of so-called potential subversives.

While those at Internal Security sought yesterday to minimize the importance of the change, one official of the Criminal Division summed up the inheritance there as "a big headache."

REPORT OF INTERNAL SECURITY COMMITTEE

Mr. Commander-in-Chief and companions of our Order, I submit to you this report on the present state of internal security in our nation.

Despite political propaganda to the contrary, the state of internal security in the United States continues to worsen rather than improve. The recent murders of police officers and innocent people in New Orleans by suicidal communist revolutionaries is a ready example of what we face today and will face with even greater frequency in the future. After one of the New Orleans snipers was killed by gunfire from a helicopter, his companion is reported to have shouted repeatedly the Communist slogan "Power to the people." A black chambermaid in the New Orleans hotel was told by one of the gunmen that she was "safe," that they only intended to "kill white people." This pattern demonstrates a very successful Communist tactic of combining the communist goals with racial hatred and so-called "Black Nationalism." The organizations presently most representative of this pattern are "The Black Panther Party" and the "Nation of Islam" or Black Muslims.

There are other communist revolutionary groups offering violence and terrorism to our nation, including the "Weatherman," which uses explosives and narcotics as weapons and states that it will use "the classic guerrilla tactics of the Viet Cong." Weatherman members are equally fanatical and suicidal with the Black Panthers and certain elements of the Black Muslims. I recommend to all companions the special report in "U.S. News and World Report" for Nov. 13, 1972, entitled "Behind the Rise in Crime and Terror" for an excellent analysis of this subject matter.

It is an ominous fact that the Black Panthers are expanding their successes. They have now ready access to certain federal funds through the "Berkeley Community Development Council," the program which distributes the federal poverty funds in the Berkeley, California, area. In June, 1972, the Black Panthers gained effective control of the Board of Directors of the BCDC by electing four of their members to seats on the board. All BPP members are pledged to obey without question the instructions of the central party authorities.

The purpose of communist terrorism is, as always, the progressive demoralization of our society and the causing of a loss of faith by the public in our basic free institutions.

Unfortunately, there are other aspects of the internal security situation even more dangerous to our nation than communist terrorism. An increasing segment of our population is becoming alienated from the ideals of freedom upon which our nation was founded. In the recent election, the candidates of "The Socialist Workers Party," a trotskyite-communist organization, received 65,290 votes for president of the United States. Gus Hall, of the CPUSA, received 25,-222 and to these figures should be added the vote of 78,801 for the "Peoples Party" and 53,614 for the "Socialist Labor Party." All these votes must be considered votes of people desiring to change the basic form of government of the United States. Such alienation indicates a substantial failure of the political and educational leadership of our nation to "sell" the honest values of freedom under our present constitutional and economic system.

Another extremely critical problem of internal security is the almost total cessation of any effective loyalty program in the civil service of our government. A shocking expose of this incredible situation is contained in a very recent report of the "Committee on Internal Security" of the U.S. House of Representatives released this month and entitled "The Federal Civilian Employee Loyalty Program." The report is extremely well documented and researched and states in part as follows:

"In this historic period the principal threat to the security and free-functioning of our national institutions in general, and to the integrity of the Federal civil service in particular, stems from the Communist movement and its ramifications. This threat is both external and internal.

"Communist tacticians have long regarded the penetration of the civil service of non-Communist governments as a prime objective, for it is obvious that in the civil service itself they may most directly and effectively influence and effect the execution of policy on a national scale and hence generally accelerate the process leading to the undermining and ultimate destruction of the society whose institutions they seek to transform. Their opportunities for subversion are by this tactic incalculably multiplied.

"A loyal civil service is thus basic to the overall efficiency of the Government.

"The Subcommittee finds that the departments and agencies (of the U.S. Government) have virtually abandoned the practice of post-appointment dismissals on loyalty grounds.

". . . it is apparent that whatever remains of the loyalty program is principally confined to preappointment exclusions, and hence to applicants for sensitive positions only . . ."

The report continues in its conclusions to recommend to Congress that the entire personnel security program presently in effect be completely scrapped and replaced with a new comprehensive and hopefully much more effective program.

It is almost inconceivable that the leadership of our nation, particularly the executive leadership, has allowed this state of affairs to exist. It is a fact, not a conjecture or a claim, but a fact, that there are a considerable number of high and middle level employees of our Department of State whose personal backgrounds are such as to raise very serious and reasonable doubts as to their personal fitness or their ultimate loyalty to the interests of the United States! This is despite an unequivocal campaign pledge four years ago to "clean out" this very situation. Our Order has already protested this matter by resolution of our national convention to no avail and to no satisfactory response from the government. No more serious problem of internal security exists in our nation at this time.

As a likely result of the above stated problem, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has recently shown by the testimony of the Director of the Passport Office of the Department of State that some 50,000 valid U.S. passports reported as lost or stolen have evidently found their way into illicit channels. The director, Miss Frances G. Knight, courageously continues to fight for more funds and personnel to substantially tighten the passport security of our nation, but she has been persistently thwarted in this goal by her superiors in the Department of State. Consider the potential danger to our internal security of the ready access into our country of 50,000 illegal foreign nationals.

A final serious problem of internal security is the terrible impact upon our society of the illegal drug traffic. A September, 1972, report of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee entitled "World Drug Traffic and Its Impact on U.S. Security" analyzes this situation in depth. The report is in several parts and clearly demonstrates that Communists, primarily Chinese, are directly responsible for much of the drug traffic in the free world and in the United States. This is substantially denied by the executive branch of our government, but the evidence is convincing that it is a fact.

In only one area of internal security can I report favorable news. There have been certain minor successes in the fight against organized crime by the Department of Justice. However, the annual report of the FBI for the year 1972 does not report one single conviction for the crimes of "sedition" or "treason."

I suggest that our Order can and should demand by resolution that a full and complete disclosure of the actual state of internal security affairs in this nation be made by the executive branch of our government

to the people through the Congress so that the people might correctly assess the blame for the present sad situation and demand its improvement. The facts of the situation are well known but are utterly worthless in locked files. It is by no means impossible that full disclosure and adequate remedy could come too late and it is clear that the longer the day of reckoning is postponed the more traumatic will be the necessary remedies.

This committee has made certain recommendations to the Committee on Resolutions.

JACK N. ROGERS,
Chairman, Internal Security Committee.

LEGISLATION TO SUSPEND THE PRESENT DUTY ON ZINC

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past several years seven out of 14 U.S. zinc smelters have shut down. Zinc smelting capacity has been reduced from about 1,300,000 tons in 1969 to about 700,000 tons by the beginning of 1974. As smelters have shut down, our imports of zinc ores and concentrates have decreased while our imports of higher priced zinc metal have increased, to the detriment of our balance of payments.

Today, joined by colleagues in the House, I am introducing a bill to suspend for a period of 2 years the present duty on zinc contained in ores and concentrates.

This duty is 0.67 of a cent per pound on contained zinc. The duty works a direct hardship on the zinc smelting industry and indirectly on our declining zinc mining industry, whose production is insufficient to meet the full requirements of the domestic smelting industry.

The zinc smelting industry must compete with smelters in Europe and Japan in purchasing ores and concentrates from Canada, Australia, and Latin America. Since Japan and European countries do not impose duties on imports of zinc ores and concentrates, their smelters have a competitive advantage over American smelters in purchasing ores and concentrates.

The American zinc mining industry depends overwhelmingly on domestic smelters as market outlets and as processors of the mines' ores and concentrates. The strength of the domestic zinc smelting industry is directly related to the strength of the domestic mining industry. If the domestic zinc smelting industry is regenerated, then the domestic zinc mining industry will be a partner in the smelting industry's growth.

The bill I am introducing today should encourage investment in American zinc production facilities. Zinc production in this country creates jobs and adds to our technological base. And, as we know, increased zinc production in the United States will help our balance of payments.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that many Members of the House will support this measure.

SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HON. CLAIR W. BURGENER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. BURGENER. Mr. Speaker, many Members of this body represent districts which contain some or many school districts which derive a substantial portion of their operating budgets from Public Law 874 moneys—Federal impact aid. The rationale for this Federal support comes from a condition in which large numbers of military personnel or civilian personnel in direct support of the military, congregate in a given school district. As a result, either a large portion of the land is not on local tax rolls, or the concentration of military connected families place an unusual burden on the local school district, or both.

Now we come to the administration policy of eliminating category B under Public Law 874, that is school support for those military connected families whose breadwinners work on, but live off the military reservation.

I differ with the administration on the elimination of category B support, and even though I wholeheartedly support the President's budget control efforts, it is my opinion that category B support can be continued within the overall budget ceiling of $269 billion for fiscal 1974.

If, however, the administration holds firm on the elimination of category B funds, as appears to be the case, I am strongly urging the administration to give careful consideration to:

First. Preparing and proposing a several year phaseout for category B funds. This would permit a local school district to adjust to the loss of funds over a gradual period of time. Reduction of program, change in priorities, or alternative sources of funding could be considered during this time period.

Second. Preparing and proposing an alternative method of permanent Federal impact support for those areas which leave an immense portion of their land under Federal ownership. One method of doing this would be in the form of an "in lieu" tax to the local school district, paid by the Federal Government. Other Members of Congress have examples of this kind of need in their district, but in the district I am privileged to represent, the Oceanside and Fallbrook areas in San Diego County are classic examples of such need.

Mr. Speaker, I have, over the years tried my best to be a strong supporter of the public schools. As a new Member of Congress I intend to do my utmost to continue that support. We all seek equity and fairness in support of our schools. I believe my Public Law 874 suggestions may contain some elements of such equity.

A RECOVERY IN KANSAS CITY

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Paul Hume has written a heartening story about the Kansas City Philharmonic, which appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday, March 25. The article follows:

A RECOVERY IN KANSAS CITY

(By Paul Hume)

Life has not been easy for the Kansas City Philharmonic lately, but the orchestra is staging a remarkable recovery from what many diagnosed as a fatal illness only two years ago.

The Kansas City orchestras got an asterisk and a gloomy footnote when the Ford Foundation recently announced the results of its historic grants to the nation's orchestras. In the entire United States it was the Kansas City Philharmonic alone (apart from a pair of New York City-based, non-community-supported orchestras) that was dropped from the Foundation's program for failure to raise the designated funds.

First of all, this sad situation was no fault of the players. It was rather the end result of one of those situations that have existed in too many cities in this country. A board of directors drawn from wealthy but not musically alert citizens rather enjoyed playing the role of benevolent patrons until the tab began to grow larger than they cared to keep on covering. When their musicians, like reasonable people anywhere else, decided that they needed year-round employment, things began to deteriorate.

This was coupled with a conductor who all but asked "Children's concerts! What for?" and who then suggested an entire season of all-Beethoven concerts, and nothing but Beethoven for the season. So it is not hard to see how, two years ago, the Kansas City Philharmonic, having also mismanaged what funds it had on hand, simply went out of business.

But few cities with the artistic intentions of a Kansas City are likely to go without an orchestra for very long. There is, after all, a notable museum of art in the city and several universities are there. One of them, the University of Missouri in Kansas City, is also the home of the Kansas City Conservatory, for many years one of the progressive music schools in the country.

Thus it was not surprising that last year, some determined supporters of the defunct Philharmonic gave practically all their time for a year to restoring both money and solid planning to a reborn orchestra. They made the right moves in several directions.

For artistic advisor and principal conductor they engaged Jorge Mester who is not only the conductor of the Louisville Orchestra, but also in charge of the music program at the Aspen (Colo.) Music Center in the summer. He is both a consummate conductor and a notable teacher of conducting.

Moreover, Mester has a feeling for repertoire that has led him to outstanding programming in both cities whose orchestras he now heads. In Kansas City this new season of the revived orchestra, for example, he has conducted Mozart's Symphony No. 26, a work rarely played anywhere; a Purcell Chaconne, the exquisite "Bourgeois Gentilhomme" music of Richard Strauss, which would be a distinct pleasure any time someone played it in Washington, and such large works as the Scriabin "Poem of Ecstasy" and Mahler's

Fifth Symphony. To these, he added, in the solo vocal area "Les nuits d'ete," by Berlioz, which would be another welcome visitor on Kennedy Center programs.

That he can program these with an orchestra in which one of the Kansas City music critics often laments the lack of a larger body of strings, is due both to Mester's awareness that a huge orchestra is not always the necessity some people think it to be and that he has a string body that produces a fine, eloquent sound.

In recent hearings the Kansas City orchestra showed how much it has gained in being able to engage as its concertmaster Marc Gottlieb, for many years the leader and first violinist of the Claremont Quartet, a musician of the finest instincts and abilities. Its first stand of cellos are also excellent, while the violas are headed by a young man of special gifts.

Its winds are equally smooth and able, including a horn player who moved to Kansas City directly from the Cleveland Orchestra where he had played under George Szell. A family situation requiring his moving atturned to Kansas City's benefit.

Already the budget which the orchestra's new manager, Howard Jarratt, has proposed to the new board, is close to the million-dollar mark. Jarrett was another fortunate move for the Missouri city, coming to them after years of experience and outstanding management of the Dallas Orchestra, which has, for the moment, landed in troubled waters (of the between-conductors kind).

In an interview some years ago, a former mayor of Kansas City gave me what may be the clue to that city's determination to revive and give renewed health to its orchestras. Then Mayor Davis noted that, as an industrial center of considerable variety and vitality, Kansas City was continually on the lookout for ways of attracting new businesses.

Nothing, he stressed, was more important to companies looking for a new location than the leisure-time, cultural activities offered by a prospective city. Transportation, open space, housing and other physical matters are often relatively equal in a number of possible sites, he said. But in his opinion, the conclusive factor was the presence of cultural opportunities in one community that were superior to those in another.

That is only one more reason, among several good ones, that the Kansas City Philharmonic, having survived a difficult illness, is now mended and back in business again, probably becoming stronger than ever.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN THE WAR AGAINST DRUGS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, we, in Congress, certainly know that the fight against drug addiction and trafficking will not be won here in Washington, D.C. More important than creating agencies, spending money for various programs, or making speeches is the hoped-for involvement of citizens in aiding law enforcers in the narcotics fight. Such involvement is taking place in my home city of New York. The Daily News, a major city newspaper, has instituted a "bust-a-pusher" program. The program encourages the public to report the existence of suspected drug-trafficking in their neighborhoods. In a recent 5-day period, the New York police have apprehended 22 narcotics suspects "fingered" by concerned citizens contacting the News.

This is a promising and important step in the involvement of citizens helping to promote safety, and communities without fear. I sincerely hope that many other newspapers across the country will establish antinarcotics programs along the lines of New York's "bust-a-pusher" program.

U.S.S. "FALL RIVER" TO BE DISMANTLED

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, 28 years ago this summer the U.S. Navy commissioned a heavy cruiser name the U.S.S. *Fall River*. That ship, having served with distinction, is now about to be dismantled.

It was a pleasure for me to intercede last year on behalf of the Fall River Maritime Museum, to obtain the ship's bell and other memorabilia from the Navy Department. I met with the museum's officials last week, in the city for which the ship was named, and I am delighted that this proud ship will not be forgotten—that its memory will be honored by the people of Massachusetts.

The city of Fall River has a distinguished maritime tradition; indeed, Fall River is the permanent home of the retired battleship *Massachusetts*, and next month we will officially dedicate the retired submarine *Lionfish* as a memorial to the men of the 52 U.S. submarines that were lost in World War II. In addition, the city's history as a port, and its potential for future maritime activity are well known.

I submit for the RECORD, and for the further edification of my colleagues, the lead editorial in the Fall River Herald News of Wednesday, March 21, 1973—a tribute to the U.S.S. *Fall River*.

[From the Fall River (Mass.) Herald News, March 21, 1973]

U.S.S. "FALL RIVER" SERVED NATION WELL

The USS Fall River, a heavy cruiser named for this city, is about to be dismantled. The 675-foot cruiser is waiting demolition in Portland, Oregon, and with it will go many memories for Fall Riverites who followed its career from the time it was commissioned in the summer of 1945, just before the close of World War II.

A year later it served as the flagship for Rear Admiral F. G. Fabrion during nuclear weapons tests in the Pacific. In 1947 it was the flagship of Cruiser Division I in Pacific maneuvers. During the crucial years just after World War II the Fall River served as an effective symbol of the U.S. presence in the Pacific area at a time when this country symbolized the only remaining strength in the entire Free World.

News of its dismantling recalls to thousands of persons in Greater Fall River the pride this community felt at learning the heavy cruiser bearing its name was about to be commissioned. At the time it seemed probable that the Fall River would see action in the projected invasion of Japan. Certainly at the time of its commissioning it bore many gifts from the city and civic groups here. There was attached to it the natural sense of identification any locality or person feels for a namesake.

As the Fall River passes into the history books, it will take with it the affectionate recollections of this city, together with the knowledge that it served its country well in all the commissions it received.

TRANSFER SUBMERGED LANDS TO TERRITORIES

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to transfer from Federal to local jurisdiction certain submerged lands in the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

My bill would grant these islands the same privilege of ownership of offshore land areas now possessed by all coastal States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. This includes "all lands permanently or periodically covered by tidal waters up to, but not above the line of mean high tide and seaward to a line 3 geographical miles distant from the coastlines." The legislation would enable the residents free use of submerged lands adjacent to their coastlines inhibited only by applicable Federal and local environmental restrictions.

At present this is not the case. In order for residents to make any use of these lands, such as the construction of a small dock, a time-consuming maze of redtape must be waded through. Local governments must give building permits and sanction use, after environmental considerations are weighed. Additionally, the resident must petition the Department of the Interior for approval. Interior cannot act, however, until it has the approval of the Environmental Protection Agency.

I can conceive of no reason why this unwieldy process cannot be simplified to a procedure that would less impede orderly use of the submerged land. It can take the better part of a year for a simple request to be acted upon.

In essence, my bill would eliminate the unnecessary steps in the process. Use of land would still be subject to environmental scrutiny and building permits, of course, would have to be secured. However, the nonproductive function of Interior's middleman paper shuffling would not have to occur.

The legislation I have introduced has provisions that exempt from the transfer those submerged lands that are important for the United States to retain. Among these exceptions are:

First, all deposits of oil, gas, and other minerals—this does not refer to coral, sand, or gravel;

Second, submerged land adjacent to propertly owned by the United States;

Third, all lands acquired by persons other than United States;

Fourth, all lands designated by the President within 120 days of the enactment of this legislation; and

Fifth, lands previously determined by the President or Congress to be of scientific, scenic, or historic character and warrant preservation and administration under the National Park Service Act.

Mr. Speaker, my proposal is quite reasonable and uncontroversial. Simply put it gives the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa the same right to use their adjacent submerged lands that other American jurisdictions have excepting only those lands which for some overriding reason should be retained by the Federal Government.

I ask that my colleagues favorably consider this measure and give residents of these islands possession of these submerged lands.

V. J. SARTE NATIONAL HYDROCEPHALUS RESEARCH FOUNDATION

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, when V. J. Sarte, of 23 Sulliman Road, Edison, N.J., was born about 2 years ago with hydrocephalus—commonly called "water on the brain"—his mother, Mrs. John "Athena" Sarte, suffered deep anguish.

She knew that an estimated 50,000 families in America experience the same suffering each year because of this devastating birth defect. But Athena Sarte did more than just suffer—she went to work and with her organizing ability, strong leadership, and dynamic personality, established the V. J. Sarte National Hydrocephalus Research Foundation, in Edison, N.J.

Hydrocephalus is a congenital disease, with 50 percent of those afflicted dying before their first birthday, and of those who survive, 75 percent suffer severe mental and motor retardation. Mrs. Sarte's son, V. J., is blind and has little motor ability.

When I first read of this tragedy, I wrote to Dr. John F. Sherman, then Acting Director, Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health—NIH—asking for expansion of the Federal programs that attack and hopefully, will eventually cure and prevent hydrocephalus. NIH is active in this fight, but more research is needed, and this inevitably means that more funds are required.

Mrs. Sarte is both founder and national president of the V. J. Sarte National Hydrocephalus Research Foundation. What kind of person is she? This is what Winifred I. Cook, staff writer of the Home News, of New Brunswick, N.J., wrote about Mrs. Sarte and her son's tragedy, which some day may end in triumph:

As a newspaper woman for some 25 years, I have covered many different kinds of stories—some very touching. However, I don't think any story affected me as deeply as this one has. I did not know Mrs. Sarte before I went to her home in Edison to talk with her. Now I have only the highest admiration for her and for what she is attempting.

Mr. Speaker, with the hope that my colleagues in Congress and those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, will have a greater understanding of the problems and goals of this foundation, I hereby insert in the RECORD the most recent newsletter written by Mrs. Sarte:

Cerebro-spinal-fluid, fluid accumulating abnormally in and expanding the yet unwelded cranial bones of a frail, helpless child. Yes, this is hydrocephalus (water on the brain). Hydrocephalus has been known for centuries, as revealed in Biblical writings.

This ancient affliction is relatively unknown to the lay person except to those touched by this tragedy and heartbreak. It is one of the top birth defects in our country, yet because of insufficient funds for concentrated research, remains an unknown shadow in our society.

Why???

. . . do afflictions of this kind forever hang over our society?

. . . do these "Angels Unaware of God" crying for help in their mentally deteriorating, physically imperfect bodies, plead to a forest of darkness?

. . . because of lack of funds for research.

National awareness, education and funds to find the answers to this tragedy of life must be materialized. . . . with your help.

The "V.J." Sarte National Hydrocephalus Research Foundation is dedicated to this cause. We have no payrolls to meet or offices to maintain. Everything we do is on a voluntary donation basis.

Our national goal is ½ million membership at $3.00 per year, tax deductible. The reward for helping is knowing that you are instrumental in shaping and directing the destiny of approximately 50,000 lives.

Who knows if the child you help to be born normal will be your own or that of a loved one? Reach for the tiny hands of these fragile infants. Don't turn away. Donate now! Funds will be used for expanded research. Experience a lifetime of satisfaction in giving thousands of newborns the chance to come into the world as normal functioning humans in our society.

A. M. SIMON, DEAN OF LAWYERS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the city of McKeesport, Pa., last month lost one of its foremost citizens, Mr. A. M. Simon, dean of the city's lawyers, a cofounder of the McKeesport Chamber of Commerce and the recipient of untold numbers of awards, honors, and accolades.

This fine gentleman, blessed with a keen legal mind, served most of the community's major financial and business institutions, was the legal adviser for many prominent citizens and served in the same capacity, but without pay for numerous community and civic organizations. Despite his richly deserved reputation as an attorney, Mr. Simon continually referred to himself as "simply a smalltown lawyer."

Mr. Simon died at the age of 93, ending a legal career which spanned 67 years. His death has left a void in the profession as well as in the community which will never be filled.

MANY TOWNSEND PLAN FEATURES NOW IN SOCIAL SECURITY LAW

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, for several years I have been a sponsor of proposed legislation known as the Pay-As-You-Go Social Security and Prosperity Act, designed as an alternative to our present program of social insurance.

It would apply the basic principles of the original Townsend plan, but with modifications to meet the problem of inadequate social security benefits, welfare, and hopeless poverty that unfortunately surrounds a large segment of our population.

Recently I introduced H.R. 4018, containing certain changes from the legislative proposal which was before the 92d Congress, in order to reflect today's circumstances.

Although proposals of the original Townsend plan and its revised version were considered too advanced by many only a few short years ago, it is interesting to note that a number of these suggestions now have been incorporated into our present social security system, significantly changing its structure and objectives. We have made considerable progress during this period, but much remains to be done.

At this time I would like to include in these remarks an assessment of where we are and the goals still remaining to be achieved from the standpoint of a man who has spearheaded this effort over the years, Mr. John Doyle Elliott. Mr. Elliott is the Washington representative of the Townsend organization. His views are his own, of course, but I believe the Members would appreciate the following analysis he has prepared:

PROSPEROUS RETIREMENT FOR ALL

(By John Doyle Elliott)

Just as certain labor unions have prosperous retirement for long-term workers by contract, H.R. 4081 will establish a universal "contract" covering all businesses and occupations, all the people, all the time and providing just such prosperous retirement for all.

If there is a flaw, or wrong, in this "contract" then existing contracts are just as wrong, as well as being discriminatory by abolishing the problem only for some.

In the retrospect of history, I find the well informed recognizing that the Townsend Plan contributed mightily to focusing public conscience on these critical needs. This plan for prosperous instead of impoverishing retirement as the inherent right of all Americans has been a tremendous influence on the shape of present legislation and its constructive improvements.

HISTORY REPEATING

I sense history repeating itself. In the Townsend Plan—where we have found the guiding ideas for improving Social Security—I believe we will find the guidelines for its

perfection, in the future. The Social Security and welfare measures adopted by the 92nd Congress confirm that conviction even more firmly than the many previous instances.

1. Widows' and dependent widowers' Social Security benefits are to be 100 percent of the workers' primary benefits. A cardinal principle of the Townsend Plan, equality for women, adamantly, constantly opposed from the very beginning, now receives full acceptance.

2. Social Security's "retirement test" is now dot for dot and cross for cross as the Townsend Plan bills proposed it. Now, the $1 benefit-loss for each $2 earned will operate until the entire benefit is exhausted, thus ending the punishing $1 loss for each $1 earned over an arbitrary limit. Of course, the present system's benefits still impose a seriously regressive impact, because it will wipe out the smaller benefits more quickly than the larger, leaving the poorer people completely dependent on meager earnings. However, the move is under way to advance benefits towards more realistic levels, which will progressively lessen this regressive impact, ultimately cancelling it.

3. Benefits are automatically to be adjusted in step with Consumer Price Index advances of at least 3 percent. After over 35 years of rejection, this Townsend Plan principle is honored. However, advancing standards of living also must be matched. Only half the need is presently met by enacted law.

PAST VIEWS REVERSED

4. A $170-a-month, special minimum primary-benefit for those with 30 years coverage under Social Security ($200 was approved by the Senate) is adopted. This completely reverses past views of minimum benefits. This is a presumed entitlement to a much higher benefit not related to past earnings! It is positive turning towards the basic Townsend Plan concept. Both in dollars and principle, it is a revolutionary reversal of view.

Note that Townsend Plan testimony starting in 1954 hearings on Social Security Amendments, advocated a presumed wage in "covered employment" to be inherently vested in every individual, sufficient to provide a minimum benefit which would bar poverty (hence, eligibility for welfare) even for individuals caught with no other resource. That advocacy is mirrored in this presumed entitlement of at least $170 a month ($200 by the Senate), to advance with living costs. The Townsend Plan principle is in the process of enactment.

5. The same concept is reflected in the new welfare reform for Federally financed and administered guarantee of a minimum income of $130 a month for the aged, blind and disabled. This is a uniform national standard replacing State-determined standards of aid and eligibility. It is a repudiation of past principles, even by their own, former advocates. Along with this new concept of such aid, welfare will allow, without deductions, other income resources such as certain Social Security benefits and earnings—amplifying the reversal of views and changes now emerging. Social Security is changing into a provider of prosperous instead of impoverishing retirement for the American people. The new views and attitudes inherent in these changes, right along Townsend bill guidelines, are unmistakable.

SHAPED 1972 LAW

The great, national pension is an image which shaped the 1972 law and debate. Its realization is on the way.

Since fulfillment is the real, final test of prophecy, the Townsend Plan may well prove the most accurate and prophetic vision and principle of our century.

6. Another profound manifestation of Townsend Plan principle is embedded in what Congress has done. We have not, for some time, been hearing about vast Social Security Trust Fund reserves—frequently estimated by "experts" at ¼ trillion dollars shortly after the turn of the century for OASI alone. Those "actuarial" visions have faded.

Instead, we now receive assurances that OASI is adequately funded with reserves representing benefits for a year to a year and a half. It's now a program and is exactly what the Townsend Plan originally proposed and constantly urged.

7. The very people and authorities who instituted, championed and defended the payroll and self-employment tax on the gross earnings of middle to lower income workers to support Social Security, are now branding it regressive, unjust, oppressive to the poor—in whose rescue and benefit our whole Social Security and misnamed welfare system found birth and justification! This is what the Townsend Plan said from the vey start.

Has there ever been so tremendous a reversal of view and action? I suggest that, in the future, we should most seriously bear in mind that this whole movement of reversal of views on Social Security and welfare is, virtually count by count, towards some feature, or principle of the Townsend Plan bill, H.R. 4018.

PAYROLL TAXES CONDEMNED

8. Ways and Means. While payroll taxes on the gross earnings of workers are being condemned as unfair and involving intolerably high tax rates (now crowding 12 percent), they are financing but a mean part of what the 1972 debate clearly admits ought to be provided. It is another echo of 38 years of Townsend Plan testimony. Now, what is proposed? Simply that "general revenue" be tapped to augment the present Social Security payroll taxes, to help finance improvements. This does not remedy criticisms of the present system! It leaves the present evils intact, only adding "progressive income taxes," based on ability to pay like our established income-tax system.

The above is coupled with a program to raise the payroll tax-base progressively into the future.

The Townsend Plan bill always has and does propose a very different mechanism, known as the Gross Income Tax (based on gross receipt of all persons and companies). The payroll tax is on the gross income, total earnings, of workers from the first dollar up to the prescribed (constantly rising) ceiling—$19,800 for 1973.

H.R. 4018 would exempt personal gross incomes up to $400 a month. All gross receipts of companies (all legal persons other than individual people) will pay. It is the broadest possible tax base and involves, for any given revenue yield, the smallest possible tax rate. The present tax requires the largest possible tax rate.

Putting no direct tax on individuals with less than $400 a month, H.R. 4018 overcomes the regressive, soak-the-poor character of present Social Security taxes.

Many have—and doubtlessly will—claim the proposed tax on businesses will pass on to consumers and hit the poor. They miss this reality: This pass-along will bear proportionately more heavily on those better off. It will not cancel the advantage of the exemption on persons up to $400 a month at all.

Next, clearly, Townsend Bill benefits favor the poor and are sufficient to bar poverty even for those caught with no other resource. (The new Social Security special minimums and the new welfare income guarantee favor the poor, moving towards the Townsend Bill standard.) Thus, in proportion to contributions, these benefits will be of the greatest possible value to the poorer, while of relatively less value to the more fortunate and insignificant to the rich. The higher their income level, the less the relative value of the benefit to them. The rich will get less for their money than the poor, specifically abridging the criticism and faults of the present system.

FOR PEOPLE-SPENDING

Further, let it be remembered that Social Security (whether under the Townsend Plan, or the present program) calls for taxes to support benefits, not burdens. It's for people-spending, not for government-spending. The same tax can't be right for financing both benefits and burdens! The proportionate tax of the Townsend Bill is the just tax for benefits for remedying these flaws in our prosperity and freedom, for improving human living. It is the "general revenue" mechanism that is needed justly to finance all Social Security improvements until it becomes the system we ought to have. It is defined in sections 214 and 229 of H.R. 4018.

In view of the series of facts enumerated above in which by witness of time's distillation of truth, the Townsend Bill has been right from the start. I believe good sense dictates that Congress entertain the serious suspicion that it is very likely to be right on this critical issue of financing, between now and the time we achieve the just Social Security program America ought to have.

In fact, I believe it all properly raises this question. How can the prosperity with freedom, justice and happiness successfully pursued—which ought to be this country's crowning achievement—ever be a reality without the provisions and benefits of this bill?

MINIMAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

HON. DAN DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, in these days when there is so much discussion of budgetary matters, much of the press coverage has given little emphasis to the tremendous job which confronts Congress in dealing with this problem.

The fact is that 535 Members of Congress and their committees and personnel staffs are charged with digesting a mammoth budget prepared by thousands of members of the executive branch in a time frame which is most restrictive. In many instances, the executive departments have spent months in preparing their estimates and back up information and the whole operation consumes far more time than is ever available to the congressional committees.

Appropriations for the legislative branch are minimal when compared with the tremendous operating costs of the budgetary division of the major executive departments and the Bureau of Management and Budget. This point is well stated in an editorial which appeared in the March 21 edition of The Register of Danville, Va. which is published in my Congressional District. The newspaper takes account of the fact of the disproportionate costs in the executive and legislative branches and it commends us for the job we try to do.

Modesty does not permit us to "toot our own horn" unduly but we can take satisfaction in knowing that there are those in the press who recognize the problems with which we are confronted and look with favor upon the relative low cost of our operations.

It is often said that the staff of a Member of Congress is really an extension of his own right arm and those who work for us are in a large respect simply allowing our efforts to be multiplied. Considering the job we are called upon to do, the cost is far less than many other activities of Government today.

I commend the editorial to the reading of the Members of the House.

The editorial follows:

SENATORS AT $390,000 EACH

Compared to the cost of the executive departments and regulatory agencies, the government's expense for maintaining the Congress is peanuts. It sounds big when applied to individual members but not when it is totalled as the cost of making the nation's laws.

To keep each of the 100 Senators in Washington, the payroll for all his office staff, the necessary allowances for the business of representing his state, and the expenses of other duties of his office the total is about $390,000. For each of the 438 Representatives and delegates, the cost is $188,000 each.

A member of Congress who devotes his talents to his job is worth all the help he can get. This maintenance cost goes largely for making his job more useful to his constituent and to the nation. Besides the basic cost of $62 million for salaries of House members' office staffs and $20.4 million for salaries and travel allowances of members, the appropriation for senators' office staffs was $34.2 million and $4.7 million for senators' salaries and mileage. Fringe benefits include franked or free mail for official correspondence, and stationery, telephone and telegraph allowances.

It all goes to relieve the member of routine duties so that he can devote the bulk of his time, thought and effort to legislation. All that the taxpayers ask is that he does just that, and the cost will be accepted without question. Perhaps it is subsidizing Congress. If the product is good for the country, it will be well spent. If not, any sum is too much.

BILDERBURGERS MEET IN AMSTERDAM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the new détente between the created powers recently resulted in a gathering of big shot European and American financiers, industrialists, and politicians in Amsterdam at what was billed as the "Europe-America Conference," and reportedly financed by the International European Movement.

But, behind all the new slogans and movements, the names and faces are the same, that is, the Bilderburgers.

I insert the following news clipping at this point:

[From the Washington Post, March 27, 1973]

EUROPE, U.S. NOTABLES WARN OF THREAT TO UNITY

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

AMSTERDAM, March 26.—An all-star gathering of American and European officials from the past two decades warned today that Atlantic unity is threatened on both economic and military fronts.

They expressed their fears over the "euphoria of detente" in East-West relations; talk of American troop withdrawals from Europe; floating currencies; rising trade protectionism; and the growing economic strength of Middle East oil producing nations.

Although the degree of alarm varied from notable to notable, virtually all saw dangers, and only a rare figure took any delight in the way the world is moving.

The three-day "Europe-America Conference" here, attended by some 50 eminent persons, is sponsored by the International European Movement, which is thought to get most of its funds from large corporations.

The European delegates included NATO Secretary General Joseph Luns, two former presidents of the Common Market executive commission, Germany's Walter Hallstein and Belgium's Jean Rey, and two former chancellors of the British Exchequer, Roy Jenkins and Reginald Maulding.

The high-powered American group included John McCloy, former Under Secretary of State Eugene Rostow and two former deputy defense secretaries, Cyrus Vance and David Packard.

Many had played central roles in creating or operating postwar landmarks like NATO and the European Economic Community.

Prince Bernard of the Netherlands, a serious royal consort, set the keynote by viewing "with great concern . . . a deterioration of the relationship" between the United States and Western Europe.

He observed that Europe is increasingly anxious over the "reliability" of the American nuclear commitment, but European nations "refuse to consider what a real sharing of the burden means."

It was the address by New York Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, who was accompanied by three advisers, that embraced virtually all the worries dominating the talks here.

He deplored the Democratic Party's proposal to reduce the 300,000 American troops in Europe and traced it to "the combination of prosperity, detente and the resulting trend toward isolationism."

He was fearful that "a proliferation of East-West negotiations and the conduct of independent foreign policies with the U.S.S.R.—in areas of mutual involvement—can only increase the vulnerability of the West and, in the final analysis, destroy the Atlantic community."

The present balance of nuclear strategic force, he indicated, meant that the United States could no longer be counted upon to respond to an attack on Europe. He suggested that the French and British combine forces to develop a deterrent of their own, a propect that is already a gleam in the eye of Prime Minister Edward Heath.

On the economic front, Rockefeller saw the "monetary framework" collapsing and the "doctrine of free trade being eroded . . . on both sides of the Atlantic." He was concerned about the "ingeniously aggressive expansionist trade policies" of Japan and the growing Western dependence on imported oil. He urged common policies to deal with both.

For the most part, other leading figures who spoke today quarreled little with Rockefeller's gloomy balance sheet. Packard, now once again boss of an electronics firm with big defense contracts, insisted that an Anglo-French nuclear deterrent would pose "unthinkable" problems. The United States commitment could not be shaken, he indicated, as long as Europe kept up its spending on conventional weapons.

Almost alone, Jens Otto Krag, former prime minister of Denmark, welcomed the growing thaw in East-West dealings. He saw the preparatory talks for a European security conference as "the dawn of the day (for) a realistic East-West dialogue."

Krag said he expected "fairly modest" results from the conference which is expected to open later this year. But he viewed it as part of "a lengthy process of gradually bringing East and West in Europe closer to each other."

The pessimists were most notable on the economic side of the equation.

Henry H. Fowler, former American secretary of the treasury, called floating currencies "the easy way out".

If the world did not return to a system of fixed exchange rates, Fowler said, it would "encourage protectionism and trade wars between blocks, refashion more tightly controls on capital . . . and weaken or drastically alter the alliances that have served the cause of peace and prosperity since World War II."

Fowler is now a partner in Lehman Brothers, the investment banking house.

SEX DISCRIMINATION IN CREDIT OPPORTUNITY

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, a particularly paralyzing form of discrimination against women in this country is that of denial of credit solely on the basis of their sex.

During last year's hearing on this subject before the National Commission on Consumer Finance, a parade of witnesses offered documentation of numerous instances wherein the sex of the applicant was the sole basis for denial of a loan. A study on banking practices conducted by the Department of Human Rights in St. Paul, Minn., for example, concluded as follows:

Approximately 39% of the banks interviewed revealed discrepancies in the loan policies stated to males and females: Two banks allowed the male interviewed to obtain a loan when under the same set of circumstances they would not make any statement or commitment to the female interviewed. Three banks that had a policy of requiring both signatures on a loan would make an exception for the male interviewer but not the female interviewer. Two banks would allow the male interviewer to receive a loan without his wife's signature, but would not allow the female to receive the same loan without her husband's signature. Two banks would grant a loan to a married man but the same loan is an exception to policy for married women.

My three bills on this subject—H.R. 246, 247, and 248—would outlaw such discrimination in both personal or consumer and business loans. I understand that the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the Banking and Currency Committee plans to hold hearings on this subject in the near future, and I look

forward to a full presentation of the great magnitude of this problem at that time.

Last Sunday's New York Times carried an excellent article on sex discrimination in the credit field, and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

WOMEN EQUALITY GROUPS FIGHTING CREDIT BARRIERS

(By Marylin Bender)

A revolt against what many women and civil rights lawyers perceive to be sex discrimination in the extension of credit is gathering momentum.

Under the slogan "Give credit to a woman where credit is due," the assault takes two forms: a search for legal redress and well-publicized pressure tactics against the business community.

Some barriers are buckling more quickly than expected with support from politicians seizing "a nice clean issue, not abortion" (as one feminist put it), and from retailers and bankers aware that the female 53 per cent of the population dominates the consumer economy. There have been these developments:

Sex discrimination in the granting of credit is under attack in bills pending in both houses of Congress and at least half a dozen state legislatures, including New York's. The first state law specifically banning sex discrimination in credit and insurance transactions has just been passed in Washington.

The community property law was amended last year in the State of Washington to make wives equal managers of the property. A lawsuit soon to be filed in United States District Court in Louisiana will challenge "the arbitrary designation of the husband as sole manager of the community property." Such changes would give creditors additional protection and have profound implications for women's credit opportunities in the eight community property states.

The National Commission on Consumer Finance, which held hearings on the subject last May in Washington, D.C., recommended in a recently released report that states review and amend laws that inhibit the granting of credit to women.

Hearings by state commissions have since been held in Pennsylvania, California, Idaho and New Hampshire and by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Government investigations have been started in Wisconsin, Virginia, Missouri and Michigan.

The Center for Women Policy Studies in Washington, D.C., has received a grant from the Ford Foundation to study the problem.

The National Organization for Women has produced a manual for groups wanting to set up a credit project. Two to three dozen NOW chapters already have.

Such projects by women's groups in Dallas, Minneapolis and St. Paul and Baltimore against department stores and other retail grantors of credit have made it easier for women to open charge accounts in their own name. The Baltimore Credit Bureau Inc. agreed to set up independent credit records for women.

"Discrimination in credit deprives women of participating in the major American way of life and denies them equal access to the same opportunity men enjoy," asserts Barbara Shack, director of the women's rights project of the New York Civil Liberties Union. Like many other experts in this new area of civil rights, she acknowledges that reluctant merchants and lenders do not act necessarily out of male chauvinism.

Many are intimidated by the confusion surrounding the legal property rights and liabilities of women in the United States.

Still, three areas of inequitable treatment have clearly been identified in the hearings, investigations and surveys: retail credit, mortgages and bank loans. Women have "second class status" in stores and banks, according to the most thorough survey on the subject of women and credit, which was published last month by the Oregon Student Public Interest Research Group, an offshoot of Ralph Nader's consumer movement.

CLASS DOES NOT MATTER

That status cuts across age, race and economic class, although those of child-bearing age, the separated and divorced and those who most need credit to survive, show the greatest bruises.

Mrs. Eddlene Bloom of Oak Park, Mich., who was divorced last November, has sole title to a new Volvo, to a home valued at $38,000, more than $30,000 income in alimony and child support, and a savings account of $3,000 in the same bank where she and her former husband had a joint checking account for 10 years. She also works part-time.

Yet last January when she applied to the J. L. Hudson Company for a charge account, she was asked for the names of her former husband and her lawyer. "Just to be safe, so we can verify your ability to pay," she was told. She received the charge plate, marked Ms., in two weeks. Last month, though, her application for a Master Charge account through her bank was turned down.

What disturbs Mrs. Bloom and other divorced women is to be "automatically" classified as a credit risk. "For years, I handled all the bills for the household," she said. "I am the one who insured our excellent credit rating, except that it turned out to be 'his' not 'our.'"

Indeed, while the married woman "is a nonperson when it comes to credit," as Representative Bella Abzug, Democrat of Manhattan, has said, the divorced or separated woman runs into what the Oregon study terms "the catch 22." The store will not extend credit "because the credit check will frequently find that she has no credit rating at all. The entire credit history belongs to the husband." The report recommended that wives be given separate files in credit bureau records.

ALIMONY OFTEN DISREGARDED

Many credit managers and lenders refuse to consider alimony or child support as income, moreover, because they do not regard it as a steady and certain source.

On the other hand, they are also reluctant to count the salary of the young working wife.

Take the case of Paul Wintjen, 27, of Milford, Del., and his wife, Marjorie, 25. Last year they were told their combined income of $14,000 a year was too low to qualify for a Veterans Housing Administration mortgage with which they wanted to finance a $19,900 house with a 10 per cent down payment.

Mr. Wintjen was earning $9,500 a year as manager of a fast food restaurant. The bank refused to count the $4,500 salary of Mrs. Wintjen, a hospital technician. However, the bank lending officer suggested that one half of her income would be computed if she would submit a medical certificate of sterilization. If her husband were to have a vasectomy, though, her income would not be counted "because you can still get pregnant."

Mrs. Wintjen bitterly reflects that "my income is counted 100 per cent by the state of Delaware and the United States Government for income taxes."

Proof of inability to bear children has customarily been demanded of young wives by bankers, who seem to regard the age of 38 as the frontier of safety. They are also biased in favor of nurses and teachers (as opposed to secretaries and assemblyline workers) on the theory that they are likely to go promptly from childbirth back to the job because their services are so much in demand.

A survey by the United States Savings and Loan League showed that 72 per cent of 421 banks queried said they would ignore part or all of a working wife's income. Only 28 per cent said they would count all of it.

Since 1965, the Federal Housing Administration's official policy has been to disallow a young wife's income only if she has no definite record of employment. In 1971, the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) repealed its guidelines of counting 50 per cent of a wife's gross earnings.

But the present determination of whether the joint income is likely to continue has been criticized by women's rights group as being too subjective. And even when guidelines are loosened, they say, word does not necessarily filter down to the loan officers in the field.

Particularly vexing to women's rights groups is what they view as the inconsistency of credit policies as well as the "wide gap between policy and practice" (as the Women's Equity Action League found in its Dallas project).

In February, 1972, the St. Paul Department of Human Rights tested 23 banks by sending a man and a woman with identical credentials to apply for a $600, 18-month auto loan. Both were 24 years old, married, earning $12,000 a year as research analysts and the sole support of their student spouses. Both had good credit histories. Thirty-nine per cent of the banks revealed discrepancies in their loan policies (such as requiring a co-signature only in the case of the female), and nine banks were found to discriminate.

Most of the practices used in extending credit "are based on outmoded assumptions about the status and role of women in society," said Senator Harrison A. Williams Jr., Democrat of New Jersey in introducing his credit discrimination bill.

He pointed out that nearly 43 per cent of the female population worked and more than 44 per cent of married women living with their husbands were employed. Three out of 10 married women with children under 6 are in the labor force.

Feminists argue that there is no valid evidence to support the assumption that women are bad credit risks. A 1941 study by David Durand for the National Bureau of Economic Research offered statistical proof that women were better credit risks than men. A few more recent studies, as summarized in the Oregon report, either confirm this or conclude that marital status is not a reliable determinant of credit worthiness.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which introduced the sex discrimination ban into Federal law, is addressed to employment. There is no Federal law or constitutional court interpretation to protect women in credit transactions. Some feminists argue that the Equal Rights Amendment, if ratified, would be a powerful tool against credit discrimination.

In Congress, three bills introduced by Mrs. Abzug would bar discrimination by sex or marital status in federally-related mortgage transactions, by federally insured banks or by creditors through an amendment of the Truth in Lending Act. A bill by Representative Margaret Heckler, Republican of Massachusetts, is also drawn to cover consumer lending.

Senator Williams's bill is broadly written to extend the Consumer Credit Protection Act. It also contains a provision for individual suits in a civil action, with damages equal to the amount of credit refused.

STATE LAWS DEFINITIVE

It is in state law, however, that property rights are defined and that creditors try to cover their risk. The Married Women's Property Acts, prevailing in 42 states, give women the right to contract in their own names. However, state laws also make husbands responsible for their wives' support. The am-

biguous word "necessities" is often stated in connection with support and it gives some creditors pause.

In 11 states, there are some limitations on the liability of a wife for the contracts she signs and creditors fear she might disclaim her obligation.

So it is that creditors ask for information about a husband's income or demand his cosignature because they want double protection in collecting the debt. "They have no right to it," says Mrs. Shack, of the New York Civil Liberties Union. She advises women who refuse to give it that they are within their rights, in New York at least. Furthermore, Mrs. Shack says, creditors should realize that the wife's earnings are free from her husband's claims so "she is really a better credit risk than he."

In the eight community property states, the wife is supposed to own half the property acquired after marriage. But until amendments like the one passed last year in Washington, the husband is sole manager of the community property.

Recent attempts to write a ban on sex discrimination into state or municipal law have usually proceeded on oblique courses. Washington has just passed the first law that flatly gives the right to engage in credit transactions without discrimination by sex or marital status.

CONSCIOUSNESS STRESSED

Most other efforts have been directed toward amending a public accommodation law to include a sex discrimination ban and then have a court or agency construe a bank or a retail store as a public accommodation. Such a bill just passed the New York State Assembly. Mrs. Shack has also filed a complaint under a sex discrimination ban in the state human rights law relating to loans for housing, land or commercial space. A bill signed and passed by the New York City Council is similarly related to housing.

Ira M. Millstein, a New York lawyer who served as chairman of the National Commission on Consumer Finance, is one of those who believe that legislative change is not the most important tactic.

"A lot of women are still not aware they should be entitled to credit," he said. "Until they are conscious that a woman with income is a person entitled to credit, period, that marital status shouldn't interfere, that she should be judged as any wage earner for better or worse, what good will it do to put another law on the books?

"As soon as women start stamping their feet and raising hell and getting to the right person in the credit granting office, it will get done," he declared.

"FORT WORTH FIVE"

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on March 13 Subcommittee No. 1 of the Judiciary Committee held a public hearing on the status of the "Fort Worth Five."

As chairman of the subcommittee, I asked the Department of Justice to explain why these five Irish Americans had been imprisoned in Texas, 1,500 miles from their families and homes in New York City for 8 months with no prospects of release in the near future.

The most we could learn was that these men had been imprisoned for refusing to answer questions about unnamed persons who allegedly were connected with a vague plot to buy arms in Mexico for shipment to Northern Ireland. The spokesmen for the Justice Department also admitted that no witnesses from Texas had been called and that probably no one from that area would be asked to testify in the foreseeable future.

I recently received a letter from Thomas Laffey, one of the "Fort Worth Five." In it he comments on the hearings and on the Justice Department's testimony.

Additionally, I received a letter from John M. Elliott, cochairman of the Greater Philadelphia Southern New Jersey Region of the National Conference of Christians and Jews who has some very pertinent and interesting comments about this case.

At this time I enter the two letters into the RECORD:

SEAGOVILLE, TEX.,
March 18.

Congressman JOSHUA EILBERG,

DEAR SIR: I had a letter from my wife Eileen on Friday, she said she met you on March 13th during the Congressional hearing on our case. She told me you were a real gentleman in every way. I want to express to you my sincere thanks for the courtesy shown my wife and the others. It is rare for her to go to such a historical meeting, it has left a very good impression.

From reading *Newsday*, March 14, 73 (Long Island, N.Y.) it states the following:

"The Justice Dept. did finally offer an answer yesterday, stating that it possessed information indicating that certain New Yorkers had been in Fort Worth to buy guns from persons in Mexico to ship illegally to Ireland, and that it believed the five New Yorkers knew something about that."

This really burns me up, we stated time and time again that we never knew anybody here (in Texas) or never had contact with anybody here we will now add to that we never knew anyone who contacted anyone else here.

We have received mail from all across the country, ordinary people who read about it in the paper. They can hardly believe we can legally be held.

What I have told you above we are willing to swear before God, judge and jury.

Thank you sincerely for your kind and humanitarian interest.

Very sincerely,

THOMAS LAFFEY.

DILWORTH, PAXSON, KALISH, LEVY & COLEMAN,
Philadelphia, Pa. March 12, 1973.

Re Irish-American, "Fort Worth 5" Prisoners, H. Res. 220

Congressman JOSHUA EILBERG,
Chairman Subcommittee No. 1, House Judiciary Committee, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

"We live in a free and open society; that is where our strength and greatness lies. We do not hide our faults behind a wall; we do not try to bury our mistakes. . ." Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EILBERG: As Co-Chairman of the Greater Philadelphia Southern New Jersey Region of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, I appreciate the opportunity of outlining some legal, moral and social concerns relative to the Fort Worth, Texas* grand jury investigation of 12 American Irish-Catholics, residents of the New York area, allegedly involved in gunrunning to Northern Ireland. By investigating this Fort Worth incident, Congress vindicates the best traditions of an open and free society.

A glaring threshold issue is the chilling effect of having American citizens subpoenaed thousands of miles from their homes, their families, their communities, and their resources (financial and spiritual.)

Political forum-shopping was condemned by Thomas Jefferson two centuries ago.[1] It assumes even more sinister dimensions today when citizens of a minority group are taken into an area of Texas[2] with a rural and conservative disposition.

This procedure is as suspect as taking black urban residents from the North before a grand jury in Alabama or Mississippi, or taking Jewish urban residents into areas where the KKK or the Bund flourish. The trials of the Scottsboro Boys, the Molly Maguires,[3] and Sacco and Vanzetti already clot American jurisprudence with questionable political trials. Yet instead of learning from past inequities, five men now languish in Texas jails without trial and without even being charged. This raises serious questions of fundamental fairness and due process.

The impressions of justice go far to cause citizens to believe in a fair judicial system. However, an examination of the facts of this secret Fort Worth grand jury, *which has to date not accused anyone of a crime,* reveals an unhappy and discriminatory pattern of misuse of the grand jury process. Briefly, the background facts are: On June 12–15, 1972 blank subpoenas were issued commanding 12 Irish-Catholic American citizens residing in the New York area to appear before a Fort Worth, Texas grand jury on June 19. Prior to the hearing, 4 subpoenas were cancelled by the government. The nature of the investigation was not revealed until June 19, at which time the grand jury was advised of alleged violations of the Gun Control Act of 1968; of the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970; of the Foreign Agents Registration Act, and that "other federal crimes might be involved too." One of these eight citizens was a disabled, decorated Korean War veteran with a known heart condition. After traveling to Fort Worth, he was advised that he did not have to testify. However, the strain caused a stroke, and he was hospitalized in critical condition. Two (2) others were questioned but not called as grand jury witnesses.

Finally five (5) witnesses, *all working men with families and without any prior criminal records,* were brought before the grand jury. A growing body of legal literature analyzes the legal aspects of (1) due process relative to the grand jury, which many legal scholars have criticized as degenerating into a rubber stamp for ambitious prosecutors; (2) the broader "use" immunity v. a narrower "transactional" immunity; (3) the use of wiretaps[4] (which has been admitted by the government); and (4) the lack of representation by counsel before the grand jury. I will not dwell on these issues. Instead, I focus upon the common sense questions concerning the civil rights of these men.

Albert Camus reminded us that justice fills a land where a people are motivated by a sense of injustice—a concern for the rights of others. We must all stop to ponder the dark and sinister fate of a person subpoenaed to appear before a grand jury anywhere in the nation where the government feels it will have an advantage.

The Justice Department has loosely applied Article III, § 2, Clause 3 of the Constitution[5] to get these men out of New York and into Texas. All five of the accused men have filed affidavits with Congress denying that they have ever been in Texas, ever spoken to anyone in Texas, or ever conducted any business in Texas.

What redress can be offered to witnesses dragged from their homes and employment* under adverse clouds of suspicion and forced to travel thousands of miles to in fact not be asked any questions? What about their right of association and expression?

The federal Justice Department's ability to convene a grand jury anywhere, with broad

investigatory powers, can be too easily abused to intimidate and harass anyone who incurs a government's disapproval. Such fishing expeditions, with their inevitable headlines, have a "chilling effect" on a citizen's questioning policies contrary to government orthodoxy.

These five men alleging wiretap and potential foreign prosecution [7] violations of their civil rights took the 5th Amendment, after they were denied assurances that they would not be extradited [8] to any foreign country (e.g. England or Northern Ireland) for trial. They were cited for civil contempt, and they have spent over five months in Texas jails with no criminal charges pending against them. They are not even allowed telephone rights with their attorneys.

All the legalisms of this unhappy incident have been cut through by the common sense of Father John J. Keaveney in his recent letter to President Nixon concerning his incarcerated parishioner Matthew Reilly:

"He may be found guilty of breaking laws. For which he should be punished. But when a man of his reputation is in jail without trial or prospect of trial and bail is denied, I and others wonder if the 'radicals' are really radicals to all—maybe injustices are being committed. Maybe everything in this country is not as fair as we thought".

To remove any apprehension of religious and economic prejudice, which is damaging to our national fabric, the government should heed Father Keaveney's wisdom, and promptly bring these men to trial in the Southern District of New York. If they have violated a law, let them be judged quickly by a jury. Their present Texas incarceration of indefinite tenure is an open sore which will inflame rather than heal this extension of the current trouble in Northern Ireland. Margaret Truman's recent book on President Harry S. Truman reveals that British authorities attempted to pressure President Truman to act to stop Jewish patriots support of Israel's fight for freedom. President Truman wisely withstood this pressure. Foreign relations cannot be effectively conducted through Star Chamber proceedings. Justice delayed is surely denied, and the Justice Department should act with candor and dispatch to honorably terminate this Fort Worth fiasco.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. ELLIOTT.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Claude Bowers, *Jefferson in Power* (Houghton-Mifflin, 1936, p. 89).

[2] This distance, not the situs in Texas *per se*, is a primary objection. Texans are as capable of fairness as Georgians, Pennsylvanians, or Alaskans. It is, however, suspect that the Justice Department having chosen a Northwestern venue (Leslie Bacon) and a rural venue (the Berrigans) has now opted for a Southwestern venue.

[3] 20 Irish-Catholic miners were hanged in 1877–78 upon the perjured evidence of a Pinkerton detective in America's largest mass execution, Wayne Broehl, *The Molly Maguires* (Harvard Press: 1965). Catholics were systematically excluded from these juries.

[4] *Tierney* v. *U.S.*, 41 U.S. Law Week 3408, cert. den., dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Douglas.

[5] All criminal trials "shall be held in the state where the said crimes have been committed.

[6] Some of the five were in fact fired from their jobs.

[7] The United States Supreme Court in *Zicarelli* v. *New Jersey State Commission of Investigation* 406 U.S. 472, 481 raised the possibility of testimony for which a witness has been granted immunity under § 18 U.S.C. § 6002–6003 later being used against the witness in a foreign prosecution. When visiting relatives and friends in Ireland, these American citizens might conceivably be detained for prosecution.

[8] The Justice Department admitted this investigation was in response to official British requests to act against alleged IRA activity. See *New York Times*, July 17, 1972; *Dallas Morning News*, June 23, 1972.

LEGAL SERVICES

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the past week, I have received two resolutions from persons in my district regarding the continuation of some form of legal services for low-income people.

These resolutions were sent to me by the Dade County Bar Association and the Board of County Commissioners of Metropolitan Dade County. The contributions which legal services has made to our communities by providing low-income people with access to the courts is both recognized and commended by both organizations.

Rich or poor, each person deserves the right to have his day in court. The establishment of legal services within the Office of Economic Opportunity recognized that need, and clearly the need still exists.

I commend the attention of my colleagues to both resolutions:

RESOLUTION URGING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO CONTINUE TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR LEGAL SERVICES OF GREATER MIAMI, INC.

Whereas, the County has learned that the Office of Economic Opportunity is refusing to fund Legal Services Programs presently eligible for 1973 fiscal grants throughout our country, despite the fact that the Congress of the United States appropriated moneys to continue Legal Services Programs nationwide; and

Whereas, the Legal Services Program of Greater Miami, Inc., provides valuable legal assistance and service to 10,000 impoverished citizens of Dade County annually, which legal assistance and service cannot or will not be provided by any other source, public or private; and

Whereas, the County Commission of Dade County firmly believes that Legal Services of Greater Miami, Inc., has provided and is providing an important and valued service to low-income people in this county by increasing their respect for law through its endeavor to truly bring equal justice to all.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Board of County Commissioners of Dade County, Florida, that it recommends to the Congress of the United States that the Congress immediately take such appropriate steps as are necessary to insure the continuation and viability of Legal Services of Greater Miami, Inc., and the Deputy Clerk of this Board is hereby directed to send a certified copy of this Resolution to the Congress of the United States of America.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the President of the United States has indicated that the Office of Economic Opportunity will be abolished, and,

Whereas, the continuance of the Legal Services Program as a National Legal Services Corporation will be a recommendation of the President, and,

Whereas, members of Congress are equally concerned with the continuation of Legal Services as a National Legal Services Corporation, and,

Whereas, lawyers nationwide are concerned about the degree of political independence and maintenance of professional standards for the future of Legal Services, and,

Therefore be it resolved: That the Dade County Bar Association respectfully petitions President Nixon and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation that will provide for a National Legal Services Corporation in accordance with all professional standards and free of political interference;

It is further resolved, That in the event a Legal Services Corporation is created by the joint efforts of the President and the Congress that this Body urges that this enactment shall not discriminate upon the right of an individual to have his day in Court against any defendant, so long as he or she is eligible for the services provided.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT HELPS GLASS INDUSTRY IN KINGSPORT, TENN.

HON. WILLIAM C. WAMPLER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, ASG Industries, Inc., of Kingsport, Tenn., has completed a new float glass facility at Greenland, just outside of Kingsport, which will provide some 400 additional jobs. This plant was constructed, in part, by funds made available under the trade adjustment assistance provision of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. This act provides financial assistance to firms which have been injured as a direct result of imports.

The following news release, under date of March 9, 1973, from ASG Industries, Inc., clearly demonstrates the value of such a program: It helps American industry survive and it also helps to create more jobs.

The newsletter follows:

ASG INDUSTRIES, INC., FIRES NEW MULTI-MILLION DOLLAR FLOAT GLASS INSTALLATION AT GREENLAND, TENN.

KINGSPORT, TENN., March 9.—At 3:00 pm on Friday, March 9, 1973, Mr. J. C. Knochel, President and Chief Executive Officer of ASG Industries, Inc., and James H. Quillen, Congressman from Tennessee's First Congressional District, "lit the torch" on ASG's new 450 ton per day capacity float glass melting tank at its Greenland, Tennessee, glass-making complex. The new float unit will come to full capacity around April 1, 1973, and will employ some additional 400 people.

This ceremony took place less than one year after the official ground-breaking ceremony. This latest addition makes ASG's Greenland plant one of the most versatile glass manufacturing centers in the world.

The glass produced in the new float unit is destined to serve ASG's own processing centers as well as trade requirements in the automotive, mirror, industrial, and residential and architectural construction markets. The new line was built under license from Pilkington Brothers, Ltd., creator and world licensor of the float process. This involves the floating of molten glass on molten tin to achieve flatness; thus eliminating grinding and polishing operations required in the production of plate glass.

DAY CARE: IT'S FINE FOR MOTHER, BUT WHAT ABOUT THE CHILD?

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD an article by Andrea Chambers appearing in the March 24, 1973 issue of the New York Times. It summarizes the views of four mothers who are competent researchers. Basically, each agrees that a child is better off with its mother until age 3. I commend the article to my colleagues:

DAY CARE: IT'S FINE FOR MOTHER, BUT WHAT ABOUT THE CHILD?

(By Andrea Chambers)

Andrew and his pint-sized architectural cronies build a tree house in a Bronx day care center. Ellen molds clay animals at home with her mother. Who is better off?

The question of putting a child in a center with others at an early age will be under debate again as the 1973 day care bill, included in the Comprehensive Child Development Act, weaves its way through Congress.

Last year's far-reaching version was vetoed by President Nixon, who expressed concern that excessive emphasis on day care center could "diminish both parental authority and parental involvement with children—particularly in those decisive early years when social attitudes and a conscience are formed, and religious and moral principles are first inculcated."

Four mothers with some special qualifications to discuss day care from both sides—as parents and as psychiatrists who have devoted a large part of their career to the psychological development of children—recently discussed the issue in separate interviews.

They were in general agreement on one point—a child under 3 years of age is better off at home with its mother. But beyond that the views became disparate.

By the age of 3 a child needs some opportunity to be with friends, said Dr. Eleanor Galenson, whose own children are now in their 20's and who is an associate professor in the department of child psychiatry at Albert Einstein College of Medicine and director of the department's nursery division.

"It's a healthy thing at this age," she said. "Much can be learned in a day care center about children of other races and economic backgrounds. And such exposure at this age will have a lasting effect."

Dr. Muriel Laskin, who has two young daughters, took a more cautious view.

"A child at an early age needs to establish a permanent relationship with its mother," said Dr. Laskin, who is a faculty member in the department of psychiatry at Downstate Medical Center, Brooklyn, and a visiting instructor of psychiatry at Einstein College.

Dr. Helen Meyers, an associate professor of psychiatry at Columbia University (she is also director of the Riverdale Mental Health Center), and mother of a 9-year-old boy, said that one reason she favors day care centers is that "it's very bad for a child to be with a mother who is always angry, bored or depressed and resents staying at home."

On the other hand, the overload experienced by a working mother, and its effects on her child in a day care center, give Dr. Judith Kestenberg pronounced reservations about such centers.

Dr. Kestenberg, who has two children, is a director of the Social Center for Parents and Children in Port Washington, L.I., and associate professor of psychiatry at Downstate Medical Center.

"A child can sense the tension in a working mother and it breeds anxiety," she said. "A mother usually drops off her child at a day care center on the way to work, often in a rush. That evening, very tired, she picks up the child and has to dash home for grocery shopping, dinner and housework. What benefit can this pressure have for a child?"

It's the early years—the pre-3 years—that worry the doctors. They agree that for an infant, day care has more cons than pros, with perhaps the greatest peril being the possibility of long-term psychological damage.

"It's best for a child's development that he or she learn to trust one person and identify with one person in the early years," Dr. Laskin emphasized. "Otherwise, as a teenager, the child may trust no one. Teen-age character problems are influenced by the fact that a child did not learn strong values and feelings for others as an infant."

Dr. Galenson said giving a child the security of living-room "landmarks" is vital.

"I've seen infants who were cared for away from their homes begin having trouble eating and sleeping," she said. She added that she suspects that many physical illnesses common in children in group situations are rooted in fear and anxiety.

The Einstein child development specialist said she also believes that an infant placed with numerous others in a center may react badly to the sheer numbers of the group and that in later life this may carry over into an inability to adapt to group situations.

Few psychiatrists are as strongly opposed to day care centers as Dr. Kestenberg, who said she is bothered by forcing an infant to adapt to two different worlds, the familiarity of home and the day care center.

"Day care can result in permanent damage to an infant's emotional development," she insisted. She said she feels the damage is less permanent in a child above 3 years of age, but still warns that day care may be dangerous for older children.

Dr. Meyers, on the other hand, said she feels most children can adapt easily enough to the shift from a home to a center environment. The important thing, she and the other doctors insist, is that definite standards should be sought.

The most important considerations, the doctors hold, are the quality of personnel ("warm, affectionate teachers . . . not likely to be just out for a job"); the size and time span of the center ("Small groups are best . . . a half-day program . . . permits the child more time to get to know his mother"); the number of rest periods ("Certainly there should be toys, music and games, but . . . a child needs time to rest and indulge his reveries"), and age grouping (by age most of the day, but intermingling at times to allow younger children "some chance to learn from their elders").

For some mothers, finding a day care center that meets their standards may be impossible, or they may have hesitations about enrolling their child in a center. Then what?

Dr. Kestenberg suggests an Israeli kibbutz-type center where a mother works nearby and comes in periodically during the day to visit and care for her child. Another approach, she said, would be for the Federal Government to subsidize a mother for child care duties in cases where she cannot otherwise afford to stay home.

Dr. Galenson suggests the alternative of a family member who can attend to a child in its own home or, for infants, family day care. (Under the family day care system, one trained child-care specialist takes several children into her home for half- or full-day periods.)

And both Dr. Meyer and Dr. Laskin stress the value of the "extended family." They said they feel an aunt, grandmother or other relative can best care for a child and, in fact, strengthen a family unit.

But day care for the visible present at least appears to be the only choice for most working mothers. And while the centers may pose many problems to family life, Dr. Galenson holds that "we should have day care centers for mothers who need them." And, to make them better, she added, an injection of Federal funds should be considered a priority item while a search goes on for a more adequate, satisfactory substitute.

GOLDEN YEARS FOR THE ELDERLY

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, during the past few years, the country took major steps toward meeting the needs of our elderly citizens. Programs had been established and funds made available to provide much needed services for persons on limited incomes. These retired couples and individuals finally had some hope for more than a meager existence during what are supposed to be the "golden years."

During the campaign, the President promised to increase these benefits and to do even more for the elderly. He even took credit for increasing social security benefits when, in fact, he had fought these increases until the last minute.

Unfortunately, he has reneged on all of these promises, and in fact is drastically cutting back on services to the elderly.

At this time, I enter into the RECORD an article in the Philadelphia Bulletin which details this situation:

BULLETIN NEWS ANALYSIS: NIXON RENEGES ON VOW TO EASE LOT OF ELDERLY

(By Linda J. Heffner)

WASHINGTON.—Last year, about seven months before the election, President Nixon said of the nation's elderly:

The best way to help people in need is not by having government provide them with a vast array of bureaucratic services but by giving them money so they can secure needed services for themselves."

Now, four months after the election, Mr. Nixon is whistling a different tune and trying his best to cut deeply into the meager budgets of older Americans.

Recently by a vote of 329 to 69, the House passed a bill authorizing $1.4 billion over the next three years to continue numerous programs to relieve the poverty and boredom of the elderly and to work for an increased use of their skills.

The President is now expected to veto the bill just as he did a similar bill last year.

PREVIOUS VETO

Last year's vetoed bill was for $2 billion. It included a $150 million job training program for the elderly which the Administration opposed. Although that has been eliminated from this year's bill, a $250 million senior citizens corps for community work, also opposed by Mr. Nixon, is still included.

"There's very little chance that the President is gong to have a change of heart this year, especially since the election is over," said one Capitol Hill spokesman instrumental in moving the bill through the Senate last month.

The story of another Nixon broken promise

is not a new one, but it affects, the elderly in a unique way.

As one Senate spokesman puts it, they are "virtually helpless," since they are so widely dispersed, with little means of communication among themselves, and having neither the money nor the organization to mount a protest in Washington.

Nelson H. Cruikshank, president of the National Council of Senior Citizens, the largest and most effective lobbying group for the elderly, said people are slowly awakening to the problems Mr. Nixon has posed for them.

The biggest stopgap, he explained in an interview, is the lack of communication.

Although his council distributes a newsletter to its 3,000 clubs, he says "not nearly enough" senior citizens know what they face.

Mail protesting the Nixon proposals on increased Medicare costs is plentiful, but Cruikshank admits it is primarily feedback from the newsletter and does not indicate a widespread dissatisfaction with plans contained in the presidential budget.

COSTS TO RISE

The 70-year-old council president said most of the elderly simply are not aware of the proposals.

Before the election, Mr. Nixon said he would ask Congress to abolish the $5.80 monthly premium charge for Medicare Part B (doctor) insurance.

Now he proposes to keep the charge—due to rise to $6.30 July 1—while cutting deeply into Medicare benefits.

The Administration also proposes to:

Make Medicare patients pay actual room and board charges for the first day of hospital care, plus ten percent of all subsequent charges. Medicare patients now pay only $72 for the first 60 days of hospital care.

Raise initial out-of-pocket payment under the doctor insurance part of Medicare from $60 to $85 and increase the patients' additional out-of-pocket charge from 20 percent to 25 percent of the remaining doctor expenses.

The Administration argues that such moves would encourage people to use less expensive hospitals and, in fact, to use hospitals less often.

The elderly, however, seldom can shop around for hospitals. They usually go where their doctors send them.

In addition, the argument is a deterrent to the whole concept of preventive medicine since it tells the aged basically to hang on and only go to the hospital as a last resort.

"Just think" said Cruikshank, "smart guys like Caspar Weinberger (secretary of health, education and welfare) actually say things like that with a straight face."

While calling the Nixon proposals a "shameful repudiation" of his promises, Cruikshank admitted that "from the beginning there was something phony about dropping Part B costs."

During the campaign, however, Cruikshank said the Nixon forces put out "lots of propaganda," including a reelection committee pamphlet which gave the impression the Part B charge actually had been abolished.

MISLEADING NOTE

Cruikshank maintains that a major influence on the majority of older Americans voting for Mr. Nixon was a note attached to 28 million Social Security checks last July pointing out that the 20 percent rise in their payments was due to a bill signed by the President.

In actuality, the President opposed the increase and only approved the legislation because it was attached to a debt ceiling bill he wanted to sign.

"It was a telling piece of propaganda," said Cruikshank, the retired director of the AFL-CIO Social Security department.

Although sympathetic Democrats on Capitol Hill had warned Cruikshank and others that Mr. Nixon would use the rise for his own benefit, the council president said there was no excusable way to stop the extra $6 billion in benefits for the aged just because the President would take credit.

"We had to ask ourselves," he said, "are we representing older people or are we playing politics?"

ADMINISTRATION BACKS "911"

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, along with 17 cosponsors, I introduced H.R. 1308, a bill that would establish a nationwide emergency telephone number—911. With this easily remembered number, a person could call for police, fire, rescue or other emergency assistance, without confusion and regardless of where he is.

The Nixon administration, I am pleased to note, now has added its support to this vitally needed emergency communications system, and established a Federal Information Center on 911 within the Office of Telecommunications in the Department of Commerce. This office will assist State and local communities in establishing a 911 service.

The Bell System and the Independent Telephone Association have given strong support to the 911 concept and implemented it in 250 communities which have requested the emergency number. The advantages of 911 are now available to about 20 million Americans, and daily this quick and convenient number is proving its worth.

However, 911 should be available to all Americans no matter where they are. In a tourist area such as my home State of Florida, for example, millions of visitors would know how to secure emergency assistance without having to fumble through a telephone book.

Congress should act promptly to adopt H.R. 1308 and implement 911 nationwide.

For the consideration of the Congress, I am making available the bulletin of Clay T. Whitehead, Director of the Office of Telecommunications Policy, Executive Office of the President, on Emergency Number 911. The bulletin follows:

OFFICE OF
TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1973.

Subject: National Policy for Emergency Telephone Number "911"

1. Purpose. This Bulletin sets forth the policies that will be followed by executive departments and agencies with respect to the development and improving of emergency communications using the emergency telephone number 911. It provides information and guidance to assist state, local and municipal governments in implementing this emergency communications program expeditiously.

2. Background. A clear need that all citizens be able rapidly to summon help in an emergency situation has long been recognized. A communications system which is immediately available and easy to use can help to meet this need. A person should be able to call for police, fire, rescue, and other emergency aid promptly and without confusion, and without regard to his familiarity with a particular community. A system which is uniform nationwide will enable a citizen to do this.

For several years, numerous governmental commissions, legislative bodies, private organizations, and citizen groups have recommended the establishment of a single, nationwide emergency telephone number to meet this need for improved emergency communications. The 911 concept provides a single number which is easy to remember and to use. Moreover, the 911 system encourages those providing communications services and those providing emergency assistance to coordinate their efforts and facilities, and work together. The United States Independent Telephone Association and the Bell System have supported this concept, and have taken steps to implement it. Since 1968, over 200 communities with a combined population of 20 million have adopted and demonstrated the value of the 911 emergency telephone number concept.

The lack of a clear focal point in the Federal Government, and the absence of an overall national policy in this area, however, has slowed implementation of the 911 concept in many other communities. This Bulletin is issued to clarify the Executive Branch's position supporting the 911 concept as the means to achieve a single nationwide emergency telephone number.

3. Policies and Planning. These are important points which should be borne in mind by all cognizant agencies with respect to the implementation of 911 service nationwide:

(a) It is the policy of the Federal Government to encourage local authorities to adopt and establish 911 emergency telephone service in all metropolitan areas, and throughout the United States. Whenever practicable, efforts should be initiated in both urban and rural areas at the same time.

The primary purpose of 911 emergency telephone service should be to enable citizens to obtain law enforcement, medical, fire, rescue, and other emergency services as quickly and efficiently as possible by calling the same telephone number anywhere in the Nation. A secondary objective should be to enable public safety agencies to satisfy their operational and communications needs more efficiently.

(b) Responsibility for the establishment of 911 service should reside with local government. This is the level of government closest and most responsive to the beneficiaries of this service, and at which the need for most emergency services arises. At the local level the coordination of the responsibilities and functions of public safety agencies can best be accomplished, and consideration of special local needs undertaken most effectively. Since the areas served by telephone company central offices generally are not coincident with local political and jurisdictional boundaries, planning and implementation of 911 service should proceed through the cooperative efforts of all affected local agencies and jurisdictions.

The character of 911 service is essentially local and intrastate; Federal regulation or legislation in this area, accordingly, is not appropriate. States are encouraged to assist localities in their planning and implementing of 911 service.

(c) The cost for basic 911 telephone service arrangements should not be a deterrent to its establishment. The direct cost to local governments generally includes only the charge for local lines and terminal equipment needed to answer and refer 911 calls.

Planning and implementation of basic 911 service should not be deferred pending evaluation of proposed additions to basic 911 service. A number of 911 service enhancements (automatic call routing to particular jurisdictions and agencies, automatic number identification, etc.) have been proposed. These service enhancements should be con-

sidered with regard to their cost-effectiveness. Local authorities should, however, proceed to implement basic 911 service, to which enhancements can subsequently be made if desirable.

4. *Federal Information Responsibility.* A Federal Information Center on the emergency telephone number 911 will be established within the Office of Telecommunications in the Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230. The information to be available will include material on the techniques and methods of service and a comprehensive handbook on 911. Advice and assistance will be available through this center to local governments wishing to initiate 911 service in their communities. The center will also act as a clearinghouse for information concerning Federal assistance programs that may be available for the establishment of basic 911 service.

The availability of this Information Center on 911 service should be considered by Federal departments and agencies which have responsibilities in this or affected fields.

CLAY T. WHITEHEAD,
Director.

A FARMER'S VIEWPOINT ON THE RISING COST OF FOOD

HON. GENE TAYLOR

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Congress is now deliberating over ways to alleviate the soaring costs for agricultural products. We are hearing the voice of the housewife who is faced with the responsibility of feeding a family on a limited budget. As we contemplate the plight of the American housewife, I submit, for consideration, the suggestions to housewives from a farmer, Mr. Joyce E. Bartelsmeyer of Mount Vernon, Mo. I found Mr. Bartelsmeyer's suggests to be very thought-provoking and worthy of congressional attention. His remarks follow:

THE ANSWER TO THE HOUSEWIVE'S FOOD PROBLEM

(By Joyce E. Bartelsmeyer)

I want to make a suggestion to you housewives about the food prices in America. There has been a shortage of all resources in the United States. We are going to send 1,000 calves a month to France. If you think our food prices are high here in America go to some of the other countries and price meat there; for example, $3 a pound in France, $4 a pound in Italy, and $5 a pound in Japan. My suggestion to the people of America would be to cut down on their cigarettes and alcoholic beverages and buy more nutritional foods for their bodies. This just might cause them to live a little longer and have a few less doctor bills.

I have been a farmer for 25 years and lost money for a number of years on the farm and it is not too good yet. Our milk is high enough, but our feed prices are rising considerably to where it is cutting our profit down; therefore, we are not making the profit the city people think we are. I suggest that you look into the matter more before you speak. Visit some of these farmers, talk to them, see how many debts they have, how many hours they labor a day, and how much interest they pay a year. I would like for you to have a bargain in food, but I cannot see any way. We have given you a bargain for the last 30 years. That time has ended. Before you make these statements, I would like for you to investigate the farm situation and visit the farmers.

FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION ACT

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I have filed today a bill to guarantee the free flow of information to the public.

Subcommittee 3 of the Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, began consideration of this matter when hearings on the newsman's privilege or shield laws were opened on September 21, 1972.

After many weeks of testimony both in the last Congress and in the 93d Congress, I find that I have come to the conclusion which journalists and many others have; namely, that there should be an unqualified an all-inclusive law which would give to individuals who are professional disseminators of information that complete freedom of the press which is guaranteed in the first amendment.

I reproduce here for the benefit of my colleagues the bill which I have filed today:

H.R. —

A bill to guarantee the free flow of information to the public

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Free Flow of Information Act."

SECTION 2. [*Definitions.*]

As used in this Act:

(1) "During the course of his professional activities" does not include any situation in which the claimant conceals the fact that he is a professional disseminator of information. The term does not include any situation in which the claimant participates in any unlawful activities unless the claimant's participation consists solely of observing the conduct of others or receiving documentary or other information.

(2) "Give evidence" means testify, provide tangible evidence, submit to a deposition, or answer interrogatories.

(3) "Information" includes but is not limited to documents, expressions of opinion, films, photographs, sound recordings, and statistical data.

(4) "Professional disseminator of information" means a person who either,

(i) at the time he obtained the evidence that is sought was earning his principal livelihood by, or in each of the preceding three weeks or four of the preceding eight weeks had spent at least twenty hours engaged in the practice of, obtaining or preparing information for dissemination with the aid of facilities for the mass reproduction of words, sounds, or images in a form available to the general public, or

(ii) obtained the evidence that is sought while serving in the capacity of an agent, assistant, or employee of a person who qualifies as a professional disseminator of information under subparagraph (i).

(5) "Source" means a person from whom a professional disseminator of information obtained evidence by means of written or spoken communication, personal observation, the transfer of physical objects, or otherwise. The term does not include a person from whom another person who is not a professional disseminator of information obtained evidence, even if the evidence was ultimately obtained by a professional disseminator of information.

SEC. 2. [*Privilege to Withhold Information.*]

A professional disseminator of information is privileged to decline to give evidence concerning the source or contents of information that he obtained during the course of his professional activities if he states under oath either

(1) that the information in question could originally be obtained only by reaching an understanding with the source that the contents of the information or the identity of the source would not be disseminated to the public and would not be given in evidence in any official proceeding except under compulsion of law, or

(2) that serious harm to a particular ongoing disseminator-source relationship is likely to result if the contents or source of the information is required to be disclosed.

SEC. 3. [*Appeals.*]

A claim of privilege under this Act shall not be denied on appeal unless the appellate court independently determines on the basis of the trial record that the claimant is not entitled under the provisions of this Act to decline to give evidence.

SEC. 4. [*Burden of Proof.*]

In all disputes concerning a claim of privilege under this Act, the claimant of the privilege has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that he qualifies as a professional disseminator of infromation to the public and that he obtained the evidence that is sought during the course of his professional activities.

SEC. 5. [*Waiver.*]

The privilege provided by this Act may be waived by the professional disseminator of information whose evidence is sought or by the source of the evidence. The source waives the privilege only by appearing in person during the course of the proceeding for which the evidence is sought and describing the facts concerning which the professional disseminator may be required to give evidence. When either the professional disseminator of information or the source waives the privilege with respect to particular facts, the professional disseminator of information may be cross-examined on the evidence he gives concerning those facts. A professional disseminator of information or a source does not waive or forfeit the privilege by disclosing all or any part of the information protected by the privilege to the body that is conducting the proceeding for which the evidence is sought, to any other tribunal, to the public, or to any other person.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREEK REVOLUTION

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday we marked the 152d anniversary of the Greek Revolution which led to independence for the Greeks from the oppression of Ottoman rule.

From then until the present military regime seized power 145 years later, the Greek people flourished in a nation which derived its strength from the principles of freedom and democracy that we Americans too often take for granted. Our own Nation was founded on those same great principles that are the timeless gift of ancient Greek heritage. Americans long ago rejoiced with the Greeks when victory enabled their people to practice at long last the teachings of ancient Greek philosophy.

A patriot flag raised in the village of Kalavryta on March 25, 1821, began the 8-year struggle for liberty. Great

courage matched by an intense desire to be free led the Greeks to final victory, culminating in the Treaty of Adrianople and the London Protocol of 1830. The people of a young nation in the New World, the United States, and the people of an ancient land new to freedom, Greece, shared a deep friendship built on a common goal: to insure the strength and growth of democracy.

For three-quarters of a million Americans of Greek descent, March 25 is a special day of pride and honor. All Americans join with them in looking forward to the day when freedom and democracy will again prevail in that troubled nation.

OBSCENE RADIO BROADCASTING—VIII

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, over the last several weeks I have inserted into the RECORD several items relating to controversial broadcasting by Station WERE in Cleveland, Ohio, and on how this appears to be part of a national trend in programing by radio.

Members of this body who have a similar problem in their own congressional districts might wish to check the RECORDS of February 5, 6, 7, 8, 21, 26 and 28 for material leading up to the insertion I am making today.

The latter is an exchange of correspondence between me and the Department of Justice, which is self-explanatory. For purposes of clarity, I am inserting these letters in the RECORD in chronological order, starting with my original communication to the Attorney General of the United States and concluding, finally, with the most recent letter I have received from his office, dated March 23, and my reply to that, which is dated today. The letters follow:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., March 2, 1973.

Hon. JAMES V. STANTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your letter to the Attorney General of February 7, 1973, concerning offensive radio transmissions has been referred to this office for reply.

We are presently compiling statistical information concerning the number of prosecutions arising under 18 U.S.C. 1464. Upon receipt of this information, we will correspond with you in detail concerning the subject matter of your letter.

Sincerely,

HENRY E. PETERSEN,
Assistant Attorney General.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., March 23, 1973.

Hon. JAMES V. STANTON,
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in further response to your letter of February 7, 1973, to the Attorney General concerning certain programing on Radio Station WERE, Cleveland, Ohio.

The statistical information referred to in my letter to you dated March 2, 1973, concerning this subject, has now been compiled. United States Attorneys are required to furnish the Department with caseload reports on a regular basis. According to the information we have received, there have been a total of 15 defendants involved in cases arising under 18 U.S.C. 1464 from and including Fiscal Year 1969 through January, 1973. Cases involving six defendants were disposed of on pleas of guilty or *nolo contendere*; seven defendants were convicted. Three convictions were affirmed on appeal and one was reversed; and cases against two defendants were dismissed.

The paucity of cases arising under this statute illustrates the difficulties involved in enforcing the Federal obscenity laws. As these laws have been interpreted by the Supreme Court, material, to be obscene, must (1) have as its dominant theme an appeal to a prurient interest in sex, (2) offend contemporary community standards in the representation of sexual matters, and (3) be utterly without redeeming social value. Consequently, speech which has as its dominant theme a discussion of an issue or presentation of an idea, however controversial or offensive that idea may be, is protected by the First Amendment against a charge of obscenity. Needless to say, most radio broadcasting falls into this category.

We have reviewed certain investigative reports prepared by the Federal Bureau of Investigation concerning the activities of Radio Station WERE. While certain of that station's programs focus upon discussion of sexually oriented topics, we do not believe the programs could be considered violative of 18 U.S.C. 1464 for the reasons set forth above. Nevertheless, because these programs are certainly controversial and undoubtedly offensive to some individuals, we are requesting the Federal Bureau of Investigation to furnish the Federal Communications Commission with the results of its investigation of this station so that agency may determine whether or not this programing is in the public interest.

I trust this satisfies your inquiry. If I can be of further assistance, please contact me.

Sincerely,

HENRY E. PETERSON,
Assistant Attorney General.

AID FOR NORTH VIETNAM

HON. DAVID C. TREEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. TREEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters from concerned constituents on the question of postwar aid to North Vietnam. And I must say I can understand their concern.

As President Nixon pointed out in a recent press conference, it takes two to heal wounds; it also takes two to make peace. I have yet to see signs from North Vietnam indicating that the leadership of that country expects the present settlement to lead to an enduring peace.

A recent editorial in the New Orleans Times-Picayune directs itself to the question of aid to North Vietnam and I believe it raises some pertinent points.

I am inserting, therefore, the editorial in the RECORD at this time so that these thoughtful comments can be shared with my colleagues:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Feb. 3, 1973]

AID FOR NORTH VIETNAM

With Presidential adviser Henry A. Kissinger off to Hanoi later this month to discuss postwar financial aid to North Vietnam, anticipatory resistance-rumbles in Congress, and President Nixon's press conference argument for reconstruction aid, it is clear that any kind of "Marshall Plan" for North Vietnam is soon going to be a hotly debated issue.

It is not a new idea. Indochinawide economic development aid was the rejected carrot once offered by President Johnson instead of the stick of more war. And American aid to former enemies has been so generous that no end of *mots* have been coined on the desirability of losing a war with us.

American aid to Germany and Japan after World War II is not the precedent for the present case, however. We gave it not to the wartime governments but to Allies-approved governments that took their place after their utter defeat. There was no aid to North Korea after that conflict, but it is still technically at the cease-fire stage with no expectation, as in Vietnam, of a formal settlement.

The President seems to be basing his intentions not on precedent but on projection. He seems to see it as something of a whole carrot patch the North Vietnamese would be so busy tending they would have no time to study war.

Thus aid will offer "incentives to peace," arranging for Hanoi to "have a tendency to turn inward to the works of peace rather than turning outward to the works of war." Aid will be, for us, "a potential investment in peace."

We cannot hazard a guess on whether this will actually work out that way. The men in Hanoi, so long determined in poverty, may be no less in relative affluence. And if they continue their attempts to conquer South Vietnam, by fair means or covert foul, could we continue aid? And if they do take over the south with the post-American-withdrawal speed some foresee, what then?

As the financial "peace dividend" to be provided by the end of war spending dwindles and attention is centered on domestic programs war critics have long charged were short-changed because of the war, it is going to be hard to argue that aid should go to North Vietnam, whether as guilt money, humanitarianism or "peace investment."

TRIBUTE TO PAUL WINCHELL

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the contribution Paul Winchell has made to the world of entertainment. Jerry Mahoney is known to every American child through the magic of television, and Winchell's acting talents are displayed on the screen, over the radio, and on television. Just his voice is familiar to many, as Tigger, for example, in the delightful Walt Disney Winnie the Pooh full-length cartoon features.

But little is known of Paul Winchell's magnificent contribution to medical science, and it is on this phase of his illustrious career as a humanitarian that I wish to direct my remarks.

Paul Winchell's inventions have do-

nated much to one of California's chief industries, entertainment, for he created innovative techniques for making dummies move and for animating films. But he has also entered the more universal realm of medicine by designing and patenting a mechanical heart. On July 16, 1963, he was awarded U.S. Patent No. 3,097,366 for this invention. When the American Medical Association and the American Heart Association turned down the opportunity of developing his invention, because he did not have a working model, he filed his patent away and forgot about it. He simply did not have the funds to pursue the matter further.

Then, almost 10 years later, Winchell was contacted by Dr. Willem J. Kolff. Dr. Kolff is not very well-known outside the medical community, yet he is the man who invented the first practical artificial kidney, the first artificial lung used in human surgery, and the first heart assistance pump. As head of the Artificial Organs Division at the University of Utah College of Medicine, Dr. Kolff had been working on an artificial heart since 1957. Coming across Winchell's patent, Dr. Kolff realized that all of his research was dovetailing with Winchell's original design.

The outcome of their meeting was the following letter sent late last year to all those involved:

This letter is to inform anyone concerned that the University of Utah and Mr. Paul Winchell have entered into an agreement dated January 26, 1972, for a joint effort in artificial heart research. It has been agreed that Mr. Winchell and Dr. W. J. Kolff of the University of Utah have independently developed artificial hearts based on the same principles as described in a patent applied for by Winchell in 1961.

By the agreement mentioned, Winchell has assigned his patent to the University and the University will make available to him access to University laboratories and hospital facilities for joint efforts in further research. Also by this agreement, it is our belief that Mr. Winchell can make positive contributions to the artificial heart as demonstrated by his prior research and patent.

Although Winchell is not a medical doctor, he has been allowed to scrub in and assist in the operations due to the fact that the experimenting is done on calves, and not on humans.

In the first week of March 1973, the medical team made a breakthrough, one that now assures eventual success for implanting the artificial heart in a human. It is for this reason, and the fact that Paul Winchell officially donated his patent to the artificial organs division of the University of Utah College of Medicine on Thursday, March 22, 1973, that I feel it is a fitting time for this legislative body of the country he has served so well to pay him official tribute.

TRIBUTE TO COL. ROBERT CRANSTON

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Col. Robert Cranston, commander of the American Forces Radio and Television Service in Hollywood, on his retirement from the Army after 30 years of active duty.

When servicemen and women overseas hear their favorite recording, or view a popular television program on an AFRTS radio/TV outlet, it is largely due to behind the scenes efforts by Colonel Cranston. Through discussions with leading executives of the entertainment industry, he has made major breakthroughs in securing the release of first-rate, current broadcast fare for airing by 166 radio and 55 television stations on land and ship around the world.

Now serving has second tour as chief of the AFRTS nerve center, Colonel Cranston is viewed with esteem by his colleagues in the Pentagon. But perhaps more impressive is the high regard in which he is held by key figures in the Hollywood professional community.

He is a rare man—compassionate and concerned, and yet tough enough to cut through redtape in order to get quality programing shipped overseas. I congratulate Colonel Cranston for all that he has done. But I am confident that his civilian career will prove fruitful as well. Thank you, Colonel Cranston, and the best of luck.

THE PRAEGER REPORT ON THE WEST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the House of Representatives will probably soon be asked to decide the fate of the west front of our Capitol Building, I believe that the following letter which introduced the report to the then Acting Architect of the Capitol from the firm of Praeger-Kavanagh-Waterbury on that subject would be instructive.

The Praeger firm of New York City was asked to perform a feasibility study to determine whether in fact the west front central wall of the Capitol could be restored, and to estimate the cost of such restoration. I am unable to include the complete report on this matter because of its length, but I refer those who would like to read the report in its entirety to the entry of Senator PROXMIRE in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 118, part 7, page 9039.

The letter follows:

PRAEGER KAVANAGH WATERBURY,
ENGINEERS—ARCHITECTS,
New York, N.Y., December 21, 1970.

Re: Restoration of the West Central Front U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C.

Hon. MARIO E. CAMPIOLI,
Acting Architect of the Capitol, U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CAMPIOLI: Submitted herewith is our report on the feasibility of restoring the west central front of the United States Capitol. Included are descriptions of our investigations, analyses, cost estimates and conclusions.

Prior to undertaking the investigation of the existing condition of the wall, we held discussions with you and your associates concerning various details of your experience related to construction and maintenance of the Capitol. We examined photographs, drawings and sample materials of the wall; made a detailed inspection of the interior and exterior of the structure, and carefully read and studied the reports of Thompson & Lichtner and Moran, Proctor, Mueser & Rutledge.

We also studied histories of the construction of the Capitol and the major changes made over the years, the printed deliberations of the Commission for the Extension of the U.S. Capitol, the reports in the Congressional Record concerning the project, and numerous other historical documents.

As part of our study, a detailed structural analysis was made of the walls and floor systems. Stresses in the walls and other component parts of the building, as well as in the foundation soils, were determined.

In addition, plans and specifications were prepared, proposals were invited and a contract was awarded to perform on-site tests of various techniques to strengthen and repair the walls. This research work included drilling holes into the exterior wall; injecting materials into these holes to fill voids, using neat cement, sand cement, epoxy and monomer grouts; and drilling test cores of the grouted walls. The work also included removing exterior paint from typical wall areas and applying stone preservatives. Test borings were made and samples of soil adjacent to the wall were recovered for laboratory testing.

The contract for this exploratory work was awarded to Layne-New York Company, Inc., and work progressed over a period of 10 weeks. During this period our office supervised the work with a full-time resident engineer and assistant. Senior personnel from our New York office made frequent visits to the site to observe and direct the work. One of our staff architects visited England to research restoration projects there.

The firm of Woodward-Moorhouse & Associates, Inc., was retained to conduct laboratory tests of soil samples, and the National Bureau of Standards prepared laboratory tests of grouts, stonework and preservatives. Mr. A. J. Eickhoff and Mr. Jay S. Wyner were consulted on painting and paint removal techniques. Mr. Norman Porter, Geodesist, was retained to prepare a detailed survey of control points which had previously been set in the west wall, and Mr. Thomas W. Fluhr, Engineering Geologist, surveyed the Aquia Creek Quarry and reported on both the quality of stone and the feasibility of developing the quarry as a source of stone for restoration work.

Our studies indicate that while the Capitol is over one hundred and fifty years old and has been exposed to many adverse conditions, it survives in relatively good condition, attesting to the excellence of its builders and to the concern of those responsible for maintaining this, the national monument to our Republic.

Based upon a detailed investigation of the west front walls, we conclude that under conditions indicated in the report, restoration of the west central front of the Capitol is feasible. Further, the restoration can be accomplished within the general guidelines set forth by Congress as a directive to the Commission for Extension of the Capitol.

EXECUTIVE ARROGANCE

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I have refrained from saying much about

the Watergate caper because it seemed that the news stories carrying almost daily revelations reflecting on the corruption of our political process were enough to impress upon the public the seriousness of the threat to our Government. Yet the public, and the Congress despite its protestations, have remained strangely quiescent. Today, I am inserting two articles, by Mr. Joseph Kraft and Mr. Marquis Childs, printed in the Washington Post, which make important points about the implications of the Watergate case. These points must be kept in mind as the Congress considers legislation basically affecting its role in Government.

First, the Watergate case graphically demonstrates the contempt with which the President views the other branches of Government—both the Congress and the courts. His advisers have been directed not to say anything about the conduct of the public's affairs, under the guise of a novel doctrine called by some "Executive privilege" but in reality a new idea about the inviolability of the confidences of those in the executive branch who conduct the public's business. Even when perchance, some of those advisers are obliged to appear, they have been directed to lie. We have seen the spectacle of the administration's nominee for Director of the FBI stating that, in effect, he regarded lying as sufficiently within the normal course of business that he continued to pass the most sensitive information to that Presidential adviser, whom he knew had lied to him. It almost appears that the Congress and the courts were some foreign powers, not coequal branches in the cooperative business of governing this country.

The implications for the structure of Government are alarming. The treatment of issues basically affecting the role of Congress will soon be considered by us, and it will then be important to remember that the executive branch is not composed of persons who have any sense of the traditional values of the constitutional scheme of government. "Executive privilege" is one example. As asserted by the Executive, the privilege is not what it has been believed, but a novel theory under which it has spread like an oil slick to blanket all those in any way connected with the administration. Those who are thought to come within it—who feel their personal knowledge is more important than the public's business—should be treated as personal consultants: they should be cut from the public payroll. The Congress could do that, if it would.

The second point is one that I raised recently before the House Judiciary Committee on newsmen's privilege bills. The administration is preoccupied with control over information. Of course, one can expect them to be chary of revealing information about such embarrassing matters as the Watergate case, regardless of the public's right to know. The attitude of hostility toward public knowledge, however, has been carried to extreme lengths in this case. It reinforces concern over the administration's evident fear of criticism from any quarter, and its insistence on political control, direct or inferential, over the flow of news to the public. That attitude bears on shield legislation for news reporters who otherwise would have to depend on the good graces of the Executive, and on broadcast license renewal legislation. It also bears on amendments to the Freedom of Information Act and on protection of information sources for the Congress in the aftermath of the Court's decision in Gravel against United States.

When we have to make important decisions on these legislative matters, the evidence of serious and continuing danger to the effectiveness of Congress as a significant factor in the Government cannot be ignored. The steady slide into impotence will continue otherwise; we must care about that. The following articles inserted at this point set forth some of the reasons why time is so significant now:

THE WATERGATE AND THE WHITE HOUSE . .

(By Joseph Kraft)

A flurry of developments has suddenly transformed the Watergate affair from a sideshow to a political bomb that could blow the Nixon administration apart. For the first time suspicion is beginning to gather around the one person almost everybody hoped was not involved—Richard Nixon.

At the outset, to be sure, Watergate seemed pure nuttiness—half-a-dozen dubious characters caught in the act of breaking into Democratic Party headquarters for the apparent purpose of tapping telephones. The freakish character was not much changed when it became known that two of those involved had connections with President Nixon's re-election campaign—James McCord, a former CIA employee who was security chief for the campaign committee; and E. Howard Hunt, another former CIA official who had a White House office.

The case took on a deeper character when The Washington Post disclosed that there was a general Republican fund to penetrate and sabotage the Democratic campaign effort. According to The Post, the White House chief of staff, H. R. Haldeman, and former Attorney General John Mitchell both had access to the fund. One beneficiary was said to be Donald Segretti, a California lawyer hired to undertake the sabotage mission by Mr. Haldeman's chief assistant and President Nixon's appointments secretary, Dwight Chapin.

Even so, sabotage could be laughed off as a kind of prank. The Post's charges were disparaged by Nixon Republicans as the work of liberal Democrats. But there is nothing partisan or prankish about the latest developments.

Consider first the letter sent by Mr. McCord, the security director of the Nixon campaign, as he faced sentencing by Federal Judge John Sirica for his part in the original Watergate break-in. In that letter, McCord stated flatly that "perjury occurred during the trial in matters highly material to the structure, orientation and impact of the government's case."

He said that "political pressure" had been "applied to the defendants to . . . remain silent." He said: "I cannot feel confident in talking with an FBI agent, in testifying before a Grand Jury whose U.S. attorneys work for the Department of Justice or in talking with other government representatives."

Then there is the role of John Dean III, the young lawyer who is the President's counsel. Mr. Dean was assigned by the President to investigate Watergate last summer and emerged with a report that there was no involvement by any White House staff members.

But there is now evidence that Mr. Dean himself lied to the FBI about Watergate. Acting FBI Director L. Patrick Gray testified to the Senate Committee considering his confirmation as director, that Dean told the FBI he did not know that Howard Hunt, one of those involved in the original Watergate break-in had a White House office.

In fact, Dean had earlier taken into his own possession materials in Hunt's White House office which he acquired by having the safe forced open. Moreover, according to the Los Angeles Times. McCord told Senate investigators that Dean had prior knowledge of the Watergate break-in.

Finally, there is the stand taken by President Nixon himself on testimony by White House officials before a bipartisan Senate committee set up to investigate Watergate. The committee has been eager to question Mr. Dean, and Dwight Chapin, the appointments secretary who resigned after being named in The Post stories.

But their appearance is being blocked by the doctrine of executive privilege. Normally that doctrine is used only to protect confidential advice given the President by his advisers against congressional prying. On March 12, however, the White House threw the "executive privilege" blanket over Mr. Chapin with a statement which extended the doctrine to "former" presidential aides. At his press conference of March 15, Mr. Nixon said of Mr. Dean: "I am not going to have the Counsel to the President of the United States testify in a formal session for the Congress."

What all this means is that the issue is no longer political sabotage by low-level operators. The issue is obstruction of justice by a systematic cover-up at the highest levels. A cloud has been cast over the Justice Department and the FBI. A time honored doctrine—the doctrine of executive privilege—has been perverted.

Moreover, the finger of guilt is no longer pointing merely at persons high up in the administration. It is not merely a matter of Mr. Haldeman, or former Attorney General Mitchell. The man in the middle is now President Nixon.

TIME TO MAKE A PUBLIC ACCOUNTING

Two months ago Richard Nixon was inaugurated for the second time as the 37th President of the United States. After a near-record landslide this was the crown of perhaps the most remarkable comeback in American political history. Everything looked rosy with the President himself predicting for 1973 one of the best years of our lives.

The transformation occurring in these two months is the difference between day and night. With the second devaluation of the dollar and the swift drop in the stock market the economic picture looks far from bright. Inflation is pushing prices to levels not only for food but for almost every item in the household budget so high that consumers are in open revolt.

Most deadly of all is the Watergate scandal. The latest revelation by James W. McCord Jr., one of the convicted defendants in the bugging case, indicates that far more individuals were involved and that every effort was made from close to the top to put the lid on this odorous mess.

Everything The Washington Post reported, as coming from anonymous sources, seems about to be proved out. Repeated denials by the White House and denunciation of the newspaper have been shown to the futile in the attempt to hush up the whole matter. The trial of the seven, as forthright Judge John J. Sirica said at the close, was a farce.

The scandals of the Harding administration were crude money scandals. Warren Harding himself was a bumbling incompe-

tent who had insisted before his nomination that he was unsuited for the presidency. Proved tragically correct he died before the men he had chosen for his cabinet were unmasked as bribe-takers and betrayers of his trust.

In the Truman administration the gift of several deep freezers to one of the President's aides was blown up into a national issue. Under President Eisenhower, poor Sherman Adams was driven out of office because he was found to have accepted a vicuna coat and a rug from an acquaintance with a petition for help from the government.

These, even the Harding scandals, were minor compared to what is coming to light today. They were examples of simple greed. The Watergate scandal and the reported scheme to sabotage Democratic candidates in their primaries was aimed at subverting the political process itself.

Directly related are the shenanigans in gathering in the $47 million for the campaign to re-elect the President. Merely on newspaper reports the law appears to have been repeatedly violated. If prosecutions do not follow, the Department of Justice may be considered part of the conspiracy of silence.

Of the Republican Presidents of this century no two could be more unlike than Warren Harding and Richard Nixon. Harding's private weaknesses—women, whiskey and poker—contributed to his public downfall as in his amiable way he surrounded himself with dubious friends whose standards were lower than his own.

Mr. Nixon is the soul of probity. In his own private life and that of the members of his family he has sought to set an example to the country of propriety; a counter to the lowering of standards in so many areas of society. This surely contributed to the landslide.

But for all his personal righteousness the time has long passed when it is enough merely to deny that the White House is in any way involved in the Watergate scandal. Stretching the cloak of executive privilege to cover not only present but past members of the President's staff serves merely to feed the suspicion that something really rotten is at the heart of the whole wretched business. Nothing short of a complete and documented disclosure with the President's imprimatur will suffice.

It was all so needless. As the President said in his interview with the Washington Star-News the election was decided the day the Democrats nominated Sen. George McGovern. Why then the amassing of such vast sums of money by sly and highly questionable means? Why the folly of the Watergate and the vicious effort to undermine the Democratic primaries?

DR. WILLIAM J. VYNALEK

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, half a century of service to humanity as physician, teacher, and soldier ended last Sunday when one of my most distinguished constituents, William J. Vynalek, died in Berwyn, Ill. Dr. Vynalek, a resident of Riverside, also in Illinois, was a man to whom one could truly say, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

A graduate of the University of Chicago and Rush Medical College, he devoted the remainder of a long life to the practice of surgery. His service to the people of Chicago's western suburbs was interrupted only by the call to a higher duty, service as a colonel in the Army during World War II.

Doctor Vynalek was chief of surgery at what was reputed to be the largest Army medical facility in the world, the 108th Army general hospital in Clinchy, France. This establishment was sponsored by Loyola University.

Doctor Vynalek's great ability was recognized on both sides of the Atlantic. Not only was he a member of Phi Beta Kappa and Alpha Omega Alpha medical honorary, he was also the first American to become a member of the French Academy of Urology in Paris. Other affiliations included membership on the American Board of Surgery, the American and Chicago Urological Societies, the American College of Surgeons, the American Medical Association, and the Chicago Surgical Society.

Vynalek was one of the founders of MacNeal Memorial Hospital in Berwyn, where he served for a time as chief of surgery and chief of the medical staff. He was also a professor at the Stritch School of Medicine of Loyola University.

As a lifelong resident of the area where this dedicated physician labored, I am familiar with the great efforts that he made on behalf of his patients. Truly the world is a better place because of the untiring service of such men as William J. Vynalek. May his life inspire others to take up the burden that only the passing years compelled him to relinquish.

It is good to know that his family has established the Dr. William J. Vynalek Memorial Lecture Fund at MacNeal Memorial Hospital, thus helping to perpetuate the memory of this great and good man.

ADMINISTRATION SELECTIVE ON WHAT LAWS TO BE OBEYED

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we have all, I think, heard it said that the current administration is one which highly prizes law and order. I yield to no one the desire to see that all laws are obeyed and all statutes enforced. However, as the enclosed commentary by Mr. Ralph Nader indicates, it would appear that the administration is selective in what laws should be obeyed and what statutes enforced. I commend to our colleagues Mr. Nader's commentary on the manner in which the administration is treating legal aid agencies throughout the country.

The commentary follows:

RALPH NADER . . . IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST—LEGAL AID AGENCY RIPPED WITHOUT RESPECT FOR LAW

WASHINGTON.—What can Congress do when a government official purposefully and systematically breaks the law, as the acting director of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), Howard J. Phillips, is doing with White House approval?

Ideologically fueled by hatred for government programs to Americans who are poor and helpless, Phillips is pursuing the dismantling or subversion of OEO's legal services program and other OEO activities undeterred by a chorus of objections and charges of illegality from prominent law firms, OEO employes, and both Democratic and Republican members of Congress.

Under the smokescreen of taking politics out of the legal services program and returning control to locally-elected officials, Phillips and his crony-consultants are using every bureaucratic means to restrict and harass the legal services lawyers. This is being done pursuant to turning over the programs to local reactionary lawyers and politicians.

The law and proper procedures are pushed aside with fierce determination. Phillips had hardly gotten into his job on January 31, 1973, when he violated his agency's own regulatory procedures designed to protect legal services grant recipients around the country.

These rules included: (1) 30 days public notice before any changes in grant procedures; (2) notice to grantees of when they will receive funds held up by processing delays; and (3) notice of intent to terminate with reasons and continued funding until opportunity for hearings on termination.

When House Education and Labor Committee members raised these questions before Phillips on February 27, he had no answer and lamely passed the questions to his counsel who embarrassingly tried to gloss over these oversights.

SETS RESTRICTIONS

Now Phillips has retrenched by pursuing the same purpose of undermining legal services through political action and restrictions from his Washington office. Rather than uniformly cutting off funds or not renewing grants, he is placing restrictions which suppress thorough legal representation of the poor and turn the local boards of directors to his ideological allies.

This is precisely what has occurred with the effective Indianapolis Legal Services program. Ignoring the recommendations of local officials, including the mayor's office, as well as reports by local and federal evaluators, Phillips cut a fifth of the program's funding, imposed seven "special conditions" on the program, and turned control of the program over to its local enemies.

The Indianapolis situation shows that Phillips is not concerned with giving local officials more of a say.

OUTSPOKEN ENEMIES

He is concerned with turning legal services over to its outspoken enemies by edict and continuing controls from Washington—at least until the entire national legal services program can be permanently scuttled. The young oligarchs now running OEO also want to destroy the national "back-up centers."

These centers, which are affiliated with universities, conduct research into poverty law relating to consumer, housing, health and other areas and respond to information requests by legal services attorneys.

In turn, these attorneys have served millions of Americans and pioneered in the courts. They have won law-suits against local and state lawlessness and commercial exploitation of the rights of consumers, tenants and workers. It is the stopping of this modest strengthening of the poor against the powerful that Phillips has directed his policies of illegality, deliberate bureaucratic snares, hostility and arbitrary dismissals of OEO employees who would uphold the law.

As acting director of OEO, Phillips' name has not been sent by the President to the Senate for confirmation, as required by law. He will now have to defend against the

charge in court by a group of Senators seeking to remove him that he is holding his very office illegally.

SAIGON'S PRISONERS

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday evening, March 23, a thousand people at historic Faneuil Hall in Boston heard about the intensification of the reign of terror which has come about recently for the political prisoners and the opponents of the government of President Thieu.

Two young citizens of France, M. Andre Menras and M. Jean Pierre Debris, both of whom spent 2½ years in a South Vietnamese prison, told of the 200,000 or more South Vietnamese citizens who are being detained by the Government of South Vietnam simply because they are deemed to be hostile to the present authoritarian regime.

The signatures of 40,000 citizens of Massachusetts protesting continued help to this situation by the U.S. Government were presented to me and my colleague, Congressman JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY.

Mr. Speaker, it was precisely the plight of South Vietnamese political prisoners that brought me to South Vietnam 3½ years ago as a member of an American team to investigate this situation. The number of political prisoners at that time totaled about 30,000. That number has escalated sharply.

There is little likelihood that President Thieu will be anxious to release these prisoners. Inevitably they would form political opposition for General Thieu. On the other hand, the North Vietnamese are not pressing for the release of the 200,000 South Vietnamese political prisoners because their presence in the general population of South Vietnam would complicate the political ambitions of the North Vietnamese.

The thousand American citizens present on March 23 at Faneuil Hall in Boston protested the continued funding in huge sums by the U.S. Government of the police state of President Thieu in South Vietnam.

The citizens af Faneuil Hall also expressed the gravest misgivings about the implications of the visit to the United States by President Thieu planned for April 2–5. It was the overwhelming conviction of these Americans that the United States should extricate itself from all intervention in Indochina and that any continued support of the Thieu regime could only result in more disaster for all parties concerned.

A document of 109 pages entitled "Hostages of War: Saigon's Political Prisoners" by Holmes Brown and Don Luce has recently been published by the Indochina Mobile Education Project at 1322 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20036. This devastating document expands on the information which the two French teachers told to the audience at Faneuil Hall on March 23.

Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith for the benefit of the Members of Congress a summary of the situation with respect to political prisoners in South Vietnam. This summary is taken from a document entitled "Saigon's Prisoners" issued by the Indochina Peace Campaign, 67 A Winthrop Street, Cambridge, Mass. 20138. The thrust of this article is that the U.S. Government has organized, financed, equipped and trained the personnel to run Thieu's programs for getting rid of his political opposition. The article follows:

SAIGON'S PRISONERS

The fate of the political prisoners in the jails of the Saigon government has is a major issue of contention in the implementation of the Ceasefire Agreement. The Agreement states:

The question of the return of Vietnamese civilian personnel captured and detained in South Vietnam will be resolved by the two South Vietnamese parties . . . within ninety days after the cease-fire comes into effect. (Article 6).

One of the things that makes this a major problem is the large number of political prisoners held by Thieu. Estimates are as high as 200–300,000. These estimates are based, in part, on the rate of arrest in South Vietnam, which was 14,000 civilians per month since April, 1972 and rising (*Time* magazine, July 10, 1972). The *Far Eastern Economic Review* reported that 50,000 people had been arrested throughout South Vietnam during the first two months of the Spring offensive (July 18, 1972). Over four years ago, in July, 1968, the *Saigon Daily News* reported that there were over 100,000 political prisoners in Saigon's jails.

Who are these prisoners? Why were they jailed? Will they be released?

WHO ARE THE PRISONERS?

General Thieu has ordered the arrest of anyone who is critical of his regime: According to two French schoolteachers who had been arrested by the Thieu government in 1970 and held in various prisons until December, 1972, the jails hold all kinds of people who in any way opposed Thieu, worked for peace, or spoke out against corruption:

"Chi Hoa (Prison) is like South Vietnamese society in miniature. There is everything from former presidential candidates, Buddhist monks, women and children who have never committed any offense, to the most hardened criminals and drug addicts. There are countless children in South Vietnam's prisons. Often a mother is arrested too quickly to find anyone to care for her children, so the children are arrested and imprisoned, too." (Press Conference, January 2, 1973.)

Thieu has always sought to jail his political opponents. Right after the presidential election of 1967, Thieu jailed the runner-up in the election, Truong Dinh Dzu for inciting "neutralism." Dzu is still in prison. Since then, most of those who have been in any way outspoken in their criticism of his government have been arrested. On November 11, 1972, Thieu's nephew Hoang Duc Nha, claimed that the Saigon government arrested 50,000 political opponents and killed 5000 (CBS Evening News). The Saigon Ministry of Information reported that the police made 7200 raids against political critics between November 8 and 15, 1972.

THIEU'S LAWS

Under laws decreed by Thieu over the past several years, citizens can be arrested for a wide variety of reasons and held without trial for long periods of time: Most of the decrees are aimed at what Thieu calls "pro-communist neutralism" whereby neutralism is equated with pro-communism.

The *Washington Post* reported on January 18, 1973 that "President Thieu has given his province chiefs a wide latitude to make political arrests after the coming cease fire and has also empowered them to 'shoot troublemakers' on the spot." To handle the new arrests Thieu has begun a crash program to increase his police force from its present level of 122,000 to 300,000 (*Le Monde*, September 8, 1972). U.S. government officials confirmed, in an interview before the Ceasefire Agreement was signed, that "Thieu has ordered the arrest and 'neutralization' of thousands of people in the event that cease-fire negotiations with Hanoi are successful . . . The term 'neutralization' can mean anything from covert execution to a brief period in detention." (*Los Angeles Times*, January 1, 1973).

Thieu has not only arrested his non-communist political opposition, but he does not intend to release them. Andre Menras, the French schoolteacher recently released from Thieu's prisons, explained why in his press conference:

"If the Thieu regime is going to have a chance to survive after a cease-fire, they've got to get rid of everyone who has lived in his prisons and who could tell what they've experienced, what they've seen in the camps, especially the Catholic students, the Buddhist monks, who refused military service. Obviously they can't be called 'Communists.' they're from well-known Saigon families, well-known to the upper classes there. It could snowball if they begin to tell what they've lived through, what they've seen, the tortures they've undergone. Because of their religion and their social standing, people will believe them. Thus it is a matter of survival for the Thieu regime to get rid of these people. Also there are some prisoners they haven't been able to break. Even if they've broken their bodies, they've not always broken their spirit." (January 2, 1973)

TREATMENT OF PRISONERS

The Saigon government has ordered systematic use of torture as a policy: The two French schoolteachers are not the only people to have witnessed or spoken out about the treatment given to political prisoners in Thieu's jails. A Saigon judge, Tran Thuc Linh denounced it publicly:

"I have seen with my own eyes persons fastened to benches, into whose mouth and nose interrogators poured sewage water, soapy water and even latrine water until their stomachs swelled to the bursting point . . . I have been eyewitness to the scene of prisoners with bleeding wounds half-carrying other prisoners more battered and bloody than themselves as they emerge from interrogation rooms on their way to their cells or to court." (Publication of the Catholic Movement for the Edification of Peace, Saigon, November, 1972)

THIEU'S PLANS

Despite the provisions in the Ceasefire Agreement, Thieu has no intention of releasing very many political prisoners: He has recently ordered that in the new wave of arrests, "Those arrested are to be charged with common crimes instead of political ones," so that the prisoners will not fall into the category of political prisoners whose release is provided for in the Ceasefire Agreement. (*Washington Post*, January 18, 1973). Many political prisoners were arrested under Decree No. 004/66 by which Thieu empowered himself to imprison anyone "for a maximum period of two years, which is renewable." No specific offense concerning political activity and no trial are necessary. There have also been reports that Thieu is beginning to reclassify some prisoners who were arrested long ago for political activity as common criminals (*Washington Post*, January 23, 1973.)

Already the North Vietnamese and the Provisional Revolutionary Government have lodged very strongly worded protests to the International Control Commission claiming that the lives of these prisoners are in great

danger. Their claims appear to be at least partially borne out in increasing number of reports that the Saigon government may be transporting prisoners out to sea and executing them. "Fishermen in the south have noted many bodies floating in the sea near the island of Hon Rai . . . off the western part of South Vietnam." (*Boston Globe*, March 4, 1973.

U.S. GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBILITY

The U.S. government has organized, financed, equipped, and trained the personnel to run Thieu's programs for getting rid of his political opposition: The major program by which Thieu's opponents are killed, arrested and sometimes tortured was called "Project Phoenix" and is now called "F–6." The Phoenix or F–6 program is largely staffed by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and is directed by 637 U.S. civilian personnel (Hearings on U.S. Assistance, House Foreign Operations Subcommittee, July–August, 1971, p. 242). According to Ambassador Colby, in his testimony before the House Foreign Operations Subcommittee (July–August, p. 183) 20,587 South Vietnamese civilians were killed and 46,695 persons had been imprisoned under Phoenix between January, 1968 and May, 1971. Funds for the program came from American tax dollars—$732 million for this period according to the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID), Office of Public Safety, through which much of the money is channeled (USAID publication, 1969).

The U.S. government also funds and supervises Thieu's prisons and U.S. corporations have constructed many of his prisons. American tax dollars provide materials and services to the prison system and pay the salaries of six U.S. Public Safety Advisors on loan from the U.S. Federal Bureau of Prisons to maintain security and supervise construction and training programs (Hearings, pp. 225–6). When two U.S. Congressmen were shown the "tiger cages" on Con Son Island where dozens of prisoners were confined in cells that could barely accommodate a few, were periodically doused with lime and fed only small amounts of rice with no salt or water, U.S. prison advisors first protested their ignorance of such facilities but later awarded $400,000 to the RMK/BRJ (Raymond, Morrison, Knutson/Brown, Root, Jones) American construction combine to build additional "tiger cages" at Con Son Island (Hearings, p. 46).

THE FUTURE

For the future, it appears that the U.S. will continue to finance Thieu's police force and F–6 program despite the Ceasefire Agreement and that this will severely jeopardize the peace: U.S. AID has asked Congress for $18 million and the Defense Department has asked for roughly twice that much just to train 20,000 of Thieu's police annually, to supply arms and ammunition to Thieu's police, and to pay the salaries of 200 U.S. Public Safety Officers, assigned as advisors to Thieu's police command. Since these men are not in the armed forces, the U.S. government has no plans to remove them. They are part of the 10,000 civilian advisors that the U.S. has kept in or sent to South Vietnam since the Ceasefire (*Washington Post*, February 2, 1973).

Only American aid, in the form of men and money, enables Thieu to continue jailing, holding, torturing and killing political prisoners. Only an end to American aid will see the beginning of the end to these practices. If the aid continues, if Thieu, with our support, continues these policies, then the Ceasefire will surely break down. Already the North Vietnamese and the Provisional Revolutionary government are protesting strongly Thieu's treatment of the prisoners. The Agreement is very weak in that all South Vietnamese are to have full democratic rights; political prisoners are to be released; there is to be freedom of the press and free elections. How can any of this happen if Thieu continues his policies of jailings?

THE NEW SOCIAL SERVICE REGULATIONS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the newly proposed HEW Social and Rehabilitation Service regulations have awakened the social consciences of concerned individuals and organizations all across this country. Day care groups, working mothers, research centers, and political groups have joined millions of other Americans in protest of the new regulations.

I now submit a letter from the noted educator Kenneth B. Clark, president of Metropolitan Applied Research Center in New York, to Philip J. Rutledge, the Acting Administrator of Social and Rehabilitation Services in HEW. Dr. Clark's eloquent statement represents the anguish and concern of Americans everywhere:

METROPOLITAN APPLIED RESEARCH CENTER, INC.,
New York, N.Y., March 7, 1973.

Mr. PHILIP J. RUTLEDGE,
Acting Administrator, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RUTLEDGE: In accordance with the official procedure, comments on the new HEW Social Service Regulations listed in the February 16th *Federal Register* are mandatory at this time. As president of the Metropolitan Applied Research Center, an organization dedicated to the protection of the interest of those groups in our society whose interests are usually ignored or subordinated, the following statements are made.

The new HEW Regulations undermine any possibility of providing quality developmental centers for those children who are the victims of poverty in the United States. It is our understanding that these regulations will act to:

Reduce funding drastically by limiting the States' ability to raise funds, concurrent with a Federal suspension of open-ended matching of state funds;

Minimize breadth of services provided;

Minimize provision for adequate standards for child care;

Restrict provision for local and consumer involvement in program policy and development; and

Restrict eligibility to only the very poor who have registered for work or job training.

Our concern, of course, is with the implications of these regulations. We see them as an international aborting of any attempt to achieve nation-wide comprehensive child care. In limiting day care to the very poor and making registration for work or job training a prerequisite for day care services, the Regulations have the effect of creating forced labor at less than minimum wages and promoting the warehousing of children. They force mothers of small children to choose between giving up their children or giving up their means of support. This is a choice no mother should be asked to make.

Furthermore, they neglect the working poor for they are not eligible for child care, thereby creating a dependency on welfare and an anti-work incentive. Certainly this on its face is inconsistent with President Nixon's espousal of the value of a "work-ethic" over a "welfare-ethic."

They also undermine the possibility of providing quality child care for anyone, thus denying children of a basic right to quality care and development, and they negate any attempt to achieve integrated education from the beginning level of early childhood education.

Regulations which have such devastating effects must be amended. It is incredible even to think of the possibility that in the 1970's our government will resort to using the children of our nation as a means of controlling the poor.

Sincerely,

KENNETH B. CLARK.

A SEED WAS PLANTED IN PEORIA

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial entitled "A Seed Was Planted in Peoria" appeared in the March 13, 1973, edition of the Peoria Journal Star addressing itself to the problem of proper and tasteful broadcasting policies via the television networks and the efforts of local stations to determine for themselves what should or should not be shown.

I ask that the editorial be placed in the RECORD and commend its text to my colleagues who may be hearing from station managers back home relative to similar problems.

The article follows:

A SEED WAS PLANTED IN PEORIA

Did you happen to notice the Associated Press story that reported a CBS show has been "postponed" after a number of stations refused to carry it "at this time"?

Do you wonder if there is some small connection between this unusual incident and the fuss some weeks ago about a couple of segments of the situation comedy "Maude" being denied air time here in Peoria?

At that time Peoria was the butt of some condescending reaction as the only backward community in the whole United States. Some felt that we were not "with it" enough to swallow what the geniuses in New York sent us.

Now, especially after a balanced report nationwide in TV Guide about that "Maude" affair, it begins to look as if Peoria was just breaking the ice—leading the way to a major revolt of CBS affiliates against a show called "Sticks and Bones."

When CBS scheduled that off-Broadway super-soap opera as a TV drama, the same step taken in Peoria by WMBD-TV on "Maude" was taken by scores of CBS stations all over the country. They refused to air "Sticks and Bones."

In the end, CBS itself cancelled the whole transmission.

CBS described the rejected show as "serious, concerned and powerful tragedy". Indeed, it won some awards and raves in New York. But regardless of the skill of the performers or technical accomplishments, this CBS description is an odd one to apply to a misbegotten mess of crude and cruel propaganda in its substance. It vividly portrays, in fact, a blinded Vietnam veteran returning to his home only to be deliberately harassed into suicide by his own mother and father—and ends with his bloody suicide, itself.

However brilliantly produced, what kind

of twisted mind or morbid imagination conceived a theme like that? Or considered presenting it in the midst of the reality of the returning P.O.W.s, where the real drama so contrasts with that fictional one?

When scores of local station managers took a look and said, "There must be something better than this to use in prime time," the author and producer let loose the usual howls: "Censorship!"

Just as Norman Lear did in the "Maude" case.

This about hits the high point for silliness with people engaged in TV's mammoth program selection process.

Everytime anyone in the business selects a subject, a type of treatment, a cast, a theme, or an idea, he is excluding others. The whole business is one of trying to make the best use of limited time.

There is no possible way to use a mass media without some such selection process. If that constitutes "censorship"—everyone in the business is a censor—especially those producers.

They may prefer to think that when they make the decisions of what goes in and what goes out, it is the exercise of artistic freedom—but when somebody does the same thing to them, they call it "censorship."

If you think everybody has a right to be on a network TV as a kind of constitutional right—just try to exercise it. Selection of material and of people is necessary for a school play and not everybody can get into the act any time he so wishes. National television? It is a physical impossibility.

If the resulting systemization is "censorship", those who profit most from its centralization are in a very poor position to condemn it when they don't happen to get their way just once!

Meanwhile, the whole sequence of events strongly suggests that what happens in Peoria can have a very broad effect. A seed was planted in Peoria.

Some old-fashioned guts in one manager of one station here in Peoria appears to have helped prepare other managers all over the country to step up and exercise their responsibility—to do their job.

Who knows? Maybe this will even lead to some more responsible judgments through a little self-analysis at CBS, itself—instead of the knee-jerk reaction of the "group-think" within their own "set."

COMPUTER IN COURT

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, of all the reasons advanced on behalf of no-fault insurance, one discussion in the March 22, 1973, Christian Science Monitor, is most intriguing to me. The quotation from the Christian Science Monitor states:

Several major insurance companies that previously had backed federal action swung around and decided to seek uniform action by the states. If the states do not act, however, these companies could swing around again. For one thing, the companies that do business in many states have a particular problem: Their data processing equipment cannot cope with very many variations of no-fault, perhaps as few as four. More versions would mean more expensive equipment and more training for employees processing more policies and claims.

It appears that A.P. Herbert's prediction of February 13, 1963, has come to pass. No longer is our litany, "non sub hominem sed sub deo et legem." This should now be revised to read, "non sub hominem sed sub 'deus ex machina'."

The article follows:

COMPUTER IN COURT

(By A. P. Herbert)

Before Mr. Justice Squirrel in the High Court to-day Sir Cyril Tart, QC, opened for the plaintiff in this fascinating action, which is regarded as a test-case on some novel points of law.

Sir CYRIL said: My lord, this is an action for defamation, and the principal defendant is, perhaps, a computer——

The COURT. Perhaps, Sir Cyril? But haven't you made up your mind?

Sir CYRIL. No, my lord. With great respect, we hope that the Court will do that: for here is a new field of life and litigation, and I am unable to find any precedents with which to assist the Court, as I generally do.

The COURT. You are always very helpful, Sir Cyril. Could we now have some approximate outline of the facts?

Sir CYRIL. If your Lordship pleases—as, may I add, your Lordship habitually does. My lord, for many years my client, the plaintiff, has been a client of Generous Bank Limited. In recent years the Bank has been employing a computer.

The COURT. I never quite understand what they do.

Sir CYRIL. My lord, I am instructed, if they are accurately fed with the requisite information they will answer almost any question that is put to them. Moreover, they will answer instantly a question which might occupy twenty expert men for many days. The defendant Computer is also capable of certain mechanical actions, the addressing, sealing and stamping of envelopes, for example.

The COURT. Bless me! Can it predict the weather?

Sir CYRIL. Given the relevant facts and records, I believe it could. But the machine has, in exceptional circumstances, one possible weakness.

The COURT. I am glad to hear that they are human after all.

Sir CYRIL. Yes, my lord. They are run by electricity, and if for any reason the voltage falls below a certain level some error may creep into the answers. My lord, in January last my client was proposing to take a lease of a London flat, modest in quality but not in rent. Asked for references which would show that he was a good and proper tenant, able to meet his obligations, the plaintiff referred the property-owners to his Bank. The Bank, as their custom now is, put certain questions to the Computer, which issued, immediately, a type-written slip, being a carbon copy of its answer, as follows:

"Mr. Haddock's account is overdrawn in the sum of £51,000 7s. 3d."

There followed a second slip:

"The market value of the securities he holds at current prices is £2 0s. 8½d."

A third slip said:

"What is more he owes the Inland Revenue £159,000 6s. 2d."

The COURT. Were these assertions correct?

Sir CYRIL. No, my lord. Later, by painful man-conducted researches with which few of the bank staff are now familiar, it was established that at that moment my client had a credit balance of £1 9s. 4d., and his indebtedness to the Inland Revenue had been cruelly exaggerated.

The COURT. What went wrong, then?

Sir CYRIL. My lord, it was shortly before the mid-day meal. A number of citizens in the neighbourhood had incautiously decided to use their electrical cooking appliances: and the astonished Electricity Board was compelled to reduce the voltage to a level not far above the Computer's dangerline. For a few minutes, it is believed, perhaps less, it must have crossed the line, unobserved by the attendants who had had no warning, and in that brief space of time the questions concerning the plaintiff chanced to be presented.

The COURT. Yes, but the Bank, surely, did not pass the erroneous information on?

Sir CYRIL. No, my lord: but the Computer did. The "top copies" of the answers were placed by it in a sealed, addressed envelope and despatched by chute to the ground floor, where the express messengers waited. The property-owning-company received the message about 3.0 p.m. and at once declined to let their flat to the plaintiff. Moreover, one of the directors of the Company was on the committee of the Royal Yacht Squadron, which has an old-fashioned prejudice against bankruptcy, and at that evening's election my client was blackballed.

The COURT. Dear, dear. But, Sir Cyril, the case seems clear enough. The Bank, by its servant, the Computer, has published a libel, and is responsible.

Sir CYRIL. So, at first, it seemed to the plaintiff—and, I believe, to the Bank. But, having unbounded faith in the powers of the machine, they fed the necessary facts into it and put the question: "What's the answer?" The Computer replied, my lord:

"I am not—repeat not—your servant—for you cannot control me."

The COURT. I see the point. A good point.

Sir CYRIL. It is the point, I am sorry to say, on which the Bank relies. This is a machine, they say, having superhuman powers, and it would be presumptuous and unreal for any association of ordinary men, even a joint stock bank, to pretend to such a domination as is implicit in the relation of master and servant.

The COURT. Yes, but it is *their* machine.

Sir CYRIL. No, my lord, it is not. It is on hire from Magical Electronic Contrivances Limited.

The COURT. What do they say?

Sir CYRIL. They say that they have leased a perfect, infallible machine to the Bank, and they are not responsible for the blunders or negligence of the Bank or the Central Electricity Board.

The COURT. Oh, yes. What about the Board?

Sir CYRIL. They are protected, they say, my lord, by a section in the original Electricity Act.

The COURT. Do they? They would.

Sir CYRIL. At this point in the preliminary argument, my lord, the Bank put a further question to the Computer: "You see the dilemma, don't you? What do you advise?" The Computer replied:

"Try 'the act of God.' "

The COURT. The Act of God? "Something that no reasonable man could have been expected to foresee." Lord Mildew, wasn't it? Something in that, perhaps. But, Sir Cyril, as these superhuman instruments increase in number and power the outlook is grave, is it not, if every mischief they cause is to be dismissed as an Act of God for which no man is responsible?

Sir CYRIL. Yes, my lord. This is, as I intimated, in tLe nature of a test-case.

The COURT. So you may be reduced, you fear, to a single defendant, the Computer? What is the attitude adopted there?

Sir CYRIL. Satisfactory, my lord. On receipt of the writ, the Computer replied:

"Gladly accept service, my solicitors are Bull Stableford and Brown but I shall require legal aid." And, in fact, legal aid has been granted.

The COURT. Interesting, is it not, Sir Cyril, that the only one of these parties to behave with human decency is the machine? But where will this get you? It is a machine of straw.

Sir CYRIL. My lord, the Bank having refused

consent, by order of Master Richards an interrogatory on that point was administered to the Computer. It replied:

"Am earning heavy money. Why not attach my earnings?"

The COURT. But would not that be unjust to Magical Contrivances Limited?

Sir CYRIL. Possibly, my lord. But they did construct and distribute the monster. For the injustice suffered by my client he is not remotely responsible.

The COURT. True. Perhaps, before these instruments go into operation, they should put in a capital sum, like a gentleman seeking to do business at Lloyd's, to ensure that they can meet any unforeseen indebtedness?

Sir CYRIL. That is a question, my lord, which might well be put to the Computer.

The COURT. Perhaps it would care to come up here and try the case?

Sir CYRIL. No, my lord. It is not, I think, a British subject.

The COURT. Do you know, Sir Cyril, I think I shall go into a home for a fortnight and think about this case. One of those fruit-juice places.

Sir CYRIL. If your Lordship pleases.

The hearing was adjourned.

MEAT DILEMMA

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, in the Thursday, March 22, edition of the Washington Post, on page F–1, there is an interesting article entitled "Frankfurters: The Anatomy of a Red-Hot Debate." I call special attention to this article for a variety of reasons, but primarily because it emphasizes once again just how little the consumer is getting for the outrageous price he has to pay.

As high as the prices quoted in the article may seem, there is reason to believe that at some meat counters they may be even higher. Members of my staff have reported to me that in a period of 5 days, hot dogs have risen in price by 40 cents per pound and Italian brand sausage as much as 30 to 40 cents per pound. To add to this, the lowest price available for a pound of franks was $1.15. Hamburger too has jumped some 20 cents per pound, depending on type. The cheapest ground in many stores is well over a dollar. But to further complicate buying stores wrap it in packages heavier than a pound—so if you need just a pound or less, forget it.

At this time I think it is more important than ever to see that the consumer is getting precisely what he is paying for. If the consumer is going to be forced to pay top dollar, then stores have an obligation to give him the very best at that price. The consumer has every right to not only expect it, but to demand it.

Mr. Speaker, I offer the following Washington Post article for insertion in the RECORD:

FRANKFURTERS: THE ANATOMY OF A RED-HOT DEBATE

(By William Rice)

The continuing tug-of-war between consumer advocates and the meat industry has torn apart the hot dog they both have been pulling at. The debate over what it should and should not contain may intensify since the U.S. Department of Agriculture proposed last week to continue the use of byproducts in frankfurters.

Byproducts, or variety meats (the term preferred by the meat industry), include kidneys, sweetbreads and other items often considered delicacies. They also include the snouts, windpipe and skin cited above and many other unappetizing parts.

Byproducts touch personal sensitivities. Whether to use them or not has brought out what the American Meat Institute called "the emotional reactions of members of a vocal minority who have personal esthetic misgivings about variety meats."

To lessen some of the emotion: Byproducts are used in a minority of hot dogs, perhaps 30 percent. Heavy regional sales in the Southeast make the percentage on the Washington market far less than that. Also, under the USDA proposal of last week, future package labels will clearly indicate that byproducts or variety meats are part of the frankfurter. Whether the label also will detail the specific byproducts is unclear.

So, in retail stores at least, the consumer is not going to be forced into playing blind man's buff. What will be served in restaurants or at the ball park, where a good portion of the 16 billion frankfurters we eat each year are purchased, will be harder to determine.

It is easy to determine, however, the remarkable jump in prices for frankfurters. A sampling on the shelves of a local supermarket last week ranged from the house (chain) brand at 89 cents a pound to Oscar Mayer All-Meat Wieners at $1.35 a pound. (Hebrew National Kosher All-Beef brand was $1.03 for a half-pound.) Statistics provided by the American Meat Institute give a 93.3 cents average price per pound for franks in January of this year. That represents a gain of almost 10 cents per pound over a year ago and 22.8 cents (nearly 25 percent) over 1968, five years ago.

When the Agriculture Department announced, in December of last year, a tentative proposal to ban all byproducts from hot dogs, it wasn't difficult for the AMI to find allies in protesting the move.

Herrell DeGraff, president of the AMI, wrote to the USDA hearing examiner that "the United States is not so affluent that it can afford the economic waste inherent in discarding wholesome food products with an estimated value of more than $40 million annually" and enclosed tables illustrating the nutritional value of the byproducts in question.

He proposed the regulation allow for products containing skeletal meat *and* for products containing "variety meats, extenders and binders" under separate labels.

This, in essence, is what has been done. But a USDA official hastened to point out last week that the meat industry's recommendation had been echoed by "lots of educational institutions and research outfits."

"It kind of leads you to wonder," he said.

But the USDA's sweeping initial proposal had led a lot of people outside to wonder what the department, historically sympathetic to industry, was up to. It stimulated a record 2,000 comments on both sides of the issue and, in the minds of some, created a smokescreen that made it difficult to deal with more substantive questions about the contents of frankfurters and sausages.

"Somebody over there was very clever," said the head of one consumer organization. "They never intended it to stick, but the economic issue was one that split consumer interests. It didn't make sense even to us."

"I hate to say this," DeGraff commented, "but the first proposal was seriously ill-considered. It wasn't doing a service to anyone."

According to USDA, the proposal was merely their attempt to go along with a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals last August that the label "All Meat" on frankfurters must be abandoned. Legally, frankfurters need be only 85 per cent meat. That didn't equal "all-meat," the court ruled.

Like tomatoes and chicken, to name only two foods, frankfurters aren't what they used to be. At the time President Nixon spoke out on hot dogs (in 1969), the frankfurter's profile had changed from 19.8 per cent protein and 18.6 per cent fat (in 1937) to a flabby 11.8 per cent protein and 31.2 per cent fat.

Controversy at that time centered on fat content. Consumer groups and AM's DeGraff now say that was the wrong approach and both claim they urged that the emphasis be placed on protein content.

To summarize the consumer viewpoint there are three areas of concern about the use of byproducts.

Nutrition. While industry cites the nutritional value and gourmet appeal of byproducts, those that rate highest in both categories (liver, kidneys, etc.) bring high prices when sold separately and therefore are never used in frankfurter production.

Those that are used (hog lips, beef udder, etc.) do contain an impressive percentage of protein. They also contain a lot of collagen (connective tissue) that ranks as protein but doesn't contribute to human tissue growth or repair as does muscle protein. It's not only the amount of protein, but the value of the protein that counts, consumer groups argue.

They would have a requirement that the hot dog contain a minimum of 12 per cent protein and meet a standard protein efficiency ratio, which can be determined by laboratory tests.

Health. Normally the bacteria counts of byproducts, many of which come from the abdominal area, are higher when processing starts than those for skeletal meats. Therefore, they must be handled more carefully.

Furthermore, although frankfurter meats are cooked in processing, temperatures aren't sufficient to make the emulsion sterile. There is more inherent danger in using byproducts, the antagonists charge, and frankfurters with byproducts may prove to have a shorter shelf life than those made without them.

Labeling. The argument is made that under present proposals the consumer will have to be more, not less, sophisticated to know what he is getting. He or she must read small type to find a detailed breakdown and even then the average consumer lacks the knowledge to compare health values of various byproducts.

Products considered "binders" are a concern here as well. The frankfurter may contain 3.5 per cent binders and extenders. If the binders are non-fat dry milk or soy, they give a big protein boost. If they are dextrose, the boost is mainly in calories. A suggested solution is complete ingredient labeling and complete nutrition labeling with percentages. That approach has been rejected recently by the Food and Drug Administration in revised labeling regulations for products it regulates.

Another concern, of course, is how the consumer eating away from home is to know what is in the frankfurter he is served. "It seems reasonable to assume," a consumer spokesman said, "that as binders and byproducts don't change the taste, the merchant's temptation will be to sell the product that costs him less."

The AMI's DeGraff responded with the following during a telephone interview last week:

Nutrition. "We have no serious objection to a 12 per cent protein requirement. When fat limitation was being argued, we countered with a minimum protein proposal. If

it were 12 per cent, that would be self-limiting—you couldn't reach that with more than 30 per cent fat—and more meaningful.

"The current level, 11.5 to 11.7 per cent protein in all-meat franks, isn't that far out."

He acknowledged the "distinctly lower" protein value of byproducts used in frankfurters, but countered by pointing out that the lacking or limited amino acids could be supplied elsewhere in the diet; that the enriched flour in a bun plus the meat in a frankfurter made a "highly effective" combination.

Health. "Under normal conditions," DeGraff said, "with good inspection in the plants, there should not be any danger from bacteria. But if variety meats are badly handled, there could be." Shelf life of frankfurters with byproducts "should not be different," he added.

Labeling. DeGraff said merely that cartons in which frankfurters are shipped to the institutional trade are labeled "meticulously."

On the subject of costs, DeGraff held out no hope of a downturn. Even when less costly byproducts are used, he explained, other costs of production and distribution don't change. Competition, he thinks, will hold down the amount of byproducts manufacturers will put into the meat emulsion.

As to an enlarged supply of beef, he doubts that will provide more meat for frankfurters. Feed lot beef is not used for this purpose. Domestic cow beef, cows taken from the nation's dairy herds, is used and in recent years imports have provided nearly 40 per cent of the beef used for frankfurters.

DeGraff said the cow herd will increase, but not significantly when compared to demand. He called the price increase of imported beef "fantastic" and said even when that supply grows, the United States is only part of world demand.

In sum, it's going to be expensive to produce frankfurters and it's going to continue to be expensive to buy them no matter whether they contain byproducts or not. The "wholesome, cheap, all-beef, all-American hot dog" is extinct.

HAWAII COUNTIES PROTEST BUDGET CUTS

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, since the President announced his proposed budget for fiscal year 1974, thousands of citizens of this Nation, including myself, have protested the tremendous reductions and elimination of programs, particularly in the area of social services.

I have received numerous letters from Hawaii vigorously objecting to the proposals, including resolutions from the councils the counties of Kauai and Maui which sum up how the President's budget, as proposed, will affect the disadvantaged citizens of those counties.

In the belief that these resolutions will be of interest to my colleagues as additional testimony to the fact that social service programs cannot be arbitrarily reduced and deleted, I insert them in the RECORD:

REQUESTING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND CONGRESS TO RESTORE FUNDS FOR CERTAIN SOCIAL SERVICE PROGRAMS

Whereas, the President of the United States has ordered reductions and deletions of federally funded programs designed to improve the general welfare of the socially and economically deprived citizens; and

Whereas, it is a proven fact that the federal funding provided has done much toward the development and improvement of the socially and economically deprived citizens; and

Whereas, such reductions and deletions include, but are not limited to, the following:

(a) The deletion of federal programs 235 and 236 will result in the denial of housing for the low income citizens. Due to the funding of Section 235 and 236 programs, the County of Maui has provided 194 fee simple homes and 112 rental units for the economically deprived citizens;

(b) The reduction of funding to Maui Economic Opportunity, Inc. will affect 2,400 low income citizens. These economically deprived citizens have been receiving services by way of general community programs and consumer education programs. Noontime meals have been provided for approximately seventy elderly citizens over the age of 60, and transportation for approximately 1500 low income citizens. Due to the lack of federal funds the Haiku Neighborhood Service Center, the Hana Neighborhood Center, the Makawao Neighborhood Service Center and the Puunene Neighborhood Service Center will be closed down. Such denial of federal funds would drastically affect the living standards and social orientation of families who have relied on such aid over the past years;

(c) The drastic reduction of funds to the social services programs of the State of Hawaii will in turn affect the welfare programs in the County of Maui. It is a known fact that the State of Hawaii has ordered a cut in the amount of welfare subsidies to the low income families. This, in effect, would deny the economically deprived citizens on Maui needed income for survival;

(d) The elimination of federal funding to libraries, vocational educational training of personnel, new careers in education, training institutes and summer fellowships. P.L. 815 school construction, programs for strengthening state departments of education, drug abuse education, environmental education, and vocational rehabilitation services; and

Whereas, federal cutbacks will have drastic psychological, social and economical effects on the deprived citizens of the County of Maui; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Council of the County of Maui that it does hereby respectfully request the President of the United States and Congress to re-evaluate the funding for social programs and restore monies proposed to be deleted; and

Be it further resolved that certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, President of the Senate, Speaker of the House, Hawaii's Congressional delegation, Governor of the State of Hawaii, and Mayors and Councils of the counties of the State of Hawaii.

RESOLUTION

The reduction of vital programs for senior citizens including the elimination of dental care for the aging under Medicaid, the stoppage of all research and training under the Administration on Aging, the deletion of expected expansion of the Retired Senior Volunteer Program, the foster grandparent program, the Senior Corps of Retired Executives, and research on aging under the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development;

The shifting to the uncertainty of special revenue sharing of many educational programs, including education for deprived children, supplementary services, bilingual education, programs for the handicapped, vocational and adult education opportunities;

The freezing of water, sewer, and open space projects and public facilities loans as well as grants to small communities for building water and sewer systems;

The elimination, reduction or shifting to the uncertainty of special revenue sharing of numerous manpower programs designed to reduce unemployment, including Concentrated Employment Program (CEP) training programs and Manpower Development Training Programs, public service careers and on-the-job training programs, CEP work support, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Operation Mainstream, and the Emergency Employment Act; and

Whereas, the above federal cutbacks, along with many others, will have a serious social and economic effect on the State of Hawaii and the County of Kauai; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Council of the County of Kauai, State of Hawaii, that it does hereby call upon the President of the United States and Congress to re-evaluate funding for social programs and restore monies proposed to be deleted.

Be it further resolved that certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, Hawaii's Congressional delegation, the Governor of Hawaii, the Mayors and Councils of each other county in the State of Hawaii.

RESOLUTION CALLING UPON THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND CONGRESS TO RESTORE FUNDS FOR CERTAIN SOCIAL SERVICE PROGRAMS

Whereas, the preamble of the Constitution of the United States proclaims that one of our nation's basic objectives is to "Promote the general Welfare"; and

Whereas, the *Council of the County of Kauai* recognizes our duty on a national and individual level to provide and assist the needy and less fortunate members of our society; and

Whereas, recent federal budget announcements by the President of the United States indicate severe deductions and deletions in many programs designed to promote the general welfare of the people of each state, including Hawaii and the County of Kauai; and

Whereas, such deductions and deletions include, but are not limited to, the following:

The complete dismantling of the Office of Economic Opportunity and agencies related to it, including the Kauai Economic Opportunity program, whose 41 employees presently provide services for over 1700 low-income citizens in the County of Kauai, which services include General Community Programs, Consumer Education and a lunch program for the elderly, Transportation for low-income including transportation for the elderly for shopping, and medical and dental services;

The stoppage of housing programs designed to bring relief to the numerous people in our County who live in overcrowded and dilapidated units at prices they cannot afford, including Section 235 and 236 programs which, along with others, are designed to stimulate construction of moderate income housing; and including U.S. Department of Agriculture loans for low-income rural families and credit for farm labor housing and rural rental and cooperative housing;

The cutting of the distribution of social service funds to the states by 40% leading to the probable loss for Hawaii, and proportionately to the County of Kauai, of $9.5 million to $17.5 in federal funds for welfare programs through both public and private agencies, including up to $7.5 million in social services and $2 million to $10 million in food, clothing, and medical care payments;

The elimination of federal funding to libraries, vocational educational training of personnel, new careers in education, training institutes and summer fellowships, P.L. 815 school construction, programs for

strengthening state departments of education, drug abuse education, environmental education, and vocational rehabilitation services;

WORKING FOR THE GOVERNMENT

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, Americans are increasingly paying a higher percentage of their income to the Government in taxes.

Before 1930, Federal, State, and local governments were taking 15 cents out of every dollar earned. By 1950, they were consuming twice as much. Today, in 1973, Government's share of every dollar earned is 43 cents.

If this trend continues, in the near future more than half of the income of the average American will be consumed in taxes. Today, each of us works several months a year for the Government. Unless present trends are revised, the number of months devoted to working for the Government will increase.

Let, although we work part of our time for the Government, we are not given the "advantages" of Government employment.

This point was recently made in an editorial in Industry Week by Editor Walter J. Campbell.

Mr. Campbell recalled a morning when the city in which he lives had a heavier than normal snowfall. He noted that—

> Morning radio and television programs blared out information on the weather, outlined traffic conditions, listed schools that would be closed. Repeatedly, federal employees were advised they could report to work an hour later than usual.

At the same time that Federal employees were given an additional hour to get to work, workers in private industry were given precisely the opposite instructions.

Wrote Mr. Campbell:

> Workers in private enterprise were advised to start work earlier to arrive at the usual starting time.

Mr. Campbell was disturbed by this double standard. He calculated that, as a result of our current tax laws, his salary for the first 5 months of the year went to the Government. He noted that—

> For the first five months, we were working to support the federal government. That makes us federal employees. Right? So we reported for our work an hour late—just like any other government employee.

The double standard discussed in Mr. Campbell's editorial may provide us with some indication as to why the mail never arrives on time, why there are more employees of the Department of Agriculture each year, despite the fact that the number of farmers decreases each year, and why the average American must pay more taxes for less services every April 15.

I wish to share Walter Campbell's editorial from the February 26, 1973, issue in Industry Week with my colleagues, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

WORKIN' FOR GOVERNMENT

(By Walter J. Campbell)

We're in trouble with our superiors at the the office again.

It all came about last week when we had a somewhat heavier than normal snowfall. It was the sort of storm that slows but does not halt traffic.

Morning radio and television programs blared out information on the weather, outlined traffic conditions, listed schools that would be closed. Repeatedly, federal employees were advised they could report to work an hour later than usual.

Workers in private enterprise were advised to start to work earlier to arrive at the usual starting time.

That double standard bothered us.

We had been doing some tax calculations the night before.

We figured that our salary from January through May would go to pay our federal taxes: income, and excise levies on air transportation, automobiles, telephone calls, tobacco, alcohol, gasoline, tires and other things.

We also figured we would work during June and July to pay state and local taxes: state income, city income, real property, intangible, gasoline, state sales, county sales, tobacco, and alcohol, and sundry licenses and fees that none of us can really keep in mind.

But for the first five months, we were working to support the federal government. That makes us federal employees. Right?

So we reported for our work an hour late—just like any other government employee. We were greeted with lifted eyebrows. Very carefully, we explained that by working the first five months for the federal government, we had to consider ourselves employed by the federal government and therefore entitled to arrive an hour late. We also suggested that as a worker for the federal government, we intended henceforth to observe all those myriad holidays to which federal workers are entitled.

Our superior's eyes glazed in perplexity. As he retreated down the corridor shaking his head, he was reported to be muttering, "That damned Campbell."

We hold that our stand for equality for those who work to support the federal government with those directly on the federal payroll is entirely logical. It is a campaign we are going to enjoy promoting.

And who knows? When we die, maybe they'll declare a national holiday. And all of you will get another day off.

WHAT IS RIGHT ABOUT BROADCASTING

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to insert in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues a thoughtful address delivered yesterday at the National Association of Broadcasters convention here by an old friend of mine from Michigan, Ward L. Quaal, president of WGN Continental Broadcasting Co. in Chicago. His theme was "What's Right About Broadcasting!" and he speaks from a somewhat different perspective than we have been accustomed to hearing, one which I believe is deserving of our serious attention at this time.

The address follows:

WHAT'S RIGHT ABOUT BROADCASTING!

(By Ward L. Quaal)

President Wasilewski, distinguished guests, colleagues and friends. This, for me, is a sentimental journey—the highlight of a "love affair" that has been going on for four decades.

Seated before me is my first love, my fine family: my coworkers and my dearest friends.

I am in love with my country—the greatest and freest nation ever evolved in the history of mankind. Unashamed, I admit a heart tug and perhaps a tear when the colors were presented—a tug and a tear that sprang from the inspiration of our founding fathers, but which is not always present these days in our schools, houses of worship and homes.

And I am in love with our profession—the arts and the many fine people who constitute American broadcasting—free enterprise broadcasting that was born, nurtured and matured in these United States.

I regret that some of those of the newer generation, both within and outside our profession, either never learned or have forgotten the basic tenets of free enterprise in our free society. They have lost touch with the spirit, dedication, zeal and wisdom of the architects of what was then known as broadcasting by the American plan, and which since has been adapted in every free nation on earth in toto or in some modified fashion—adapted throughout the world because it is the most solid.

Let us all underscore what is right in broadcasting! There is much that is right about broadcasting. The present and the future offer that grand opportunity to all of us to plan the dynamic decades that lie ahead, decades that will see radio and television achievements that will dwarf even the magnificence of the greatest feats performed since radio's first reporting of a political convention in the early 1920's to the glamour and the drama of the coverage of the moon shots and, more recently, one of the fine "hours" of television in the reporting from the summer games of the Olympiad in Munich and countless other radio and television achievements, locally and nationally.

As the head of a successful organization and happy "shops" wherever we operate, I believe I know the elements that make for success in ours—unique among all services rendered to our many publics. And I think I know the essentiality of teamwork!

Whether it be in government, industry or sports, no executive head is stronger than his "team." Trite as it must sound, this tribute paid me this morning really does belong to the WGN Continental organization, which sprang from the wisdom and foresight of our precursors, the pioneering executives in The Tribune Company organization. So with the gratitude and affection they deserve, I salute them!

If I had been given the option of a choice of locale for today's event it would have been between two "loves": Chicago, where NAB conventions traditionally are held, is my home. It is a vibrant and wonderful, friendly, thriving metropolis—the heartbeat of the heartland of America!

But Washington—the hub of the world, the eyes and the ears and the conscience of our great nation—is my mentor, my school of higher learning in the art of government. It was in Washington that I was inculcated with the philosophy of free enterprise and of tripartite government. For nearly four years, I had been headquartered in the nation's capital as the director of the Clear Channel Broadcasting Service. Hardly a month has elapsed since 1949 that has not seen my presence in Washington—either as an executive of Crosley, which became AVCO Broadcasting, or in the past 17 years for WGN Continental, and, on numerous occasions, for consultations with government agencies or committees of Congress.

Inexorably, we must look ahead as technology advances, styles change, and fundamental philosophies of government and business undergo transitions. Today's extraordinary advances, giving to this country the unquestioned world leadership in telecommunications, can be traced in direct lines to the wisdom of those men who envisioned the dangers of government versus private enterprise—of a free "Radio Press" versus government censorship! Ladies and gentlemen, our only "censor" should be that peerless combination of quality enriched with good taste!

If I were to select one man in the history of communications law who did the most to safeguard those inherent first amendment freedoms, he would be the late Louis G. Caldwell, attorney of Washington and Chicago, and the first General Counsel (in 1927) of the Federal Radio Commission, forerunner of the FCC. A colorful, white-maned, brilliant man whose honesty and integrity were legend, he wrote most of those provisions of the early radio law that were so sound in principle that they remain the keystone of the Communications Act, which otherwise has been so twisted and distorted by Congressional patchwork, and ridiculous FCC interpretations, and outlandish court actions as to make it punitive, as well as contradictory!!!

Louis Caldwell, whose firm still represents our companies, was my mentor and my benefactor! As a young man, a second generation American of Scandinavian descent, from Michigan, who had begun on the announcing and general talent side, I learned from him logic I shall never forget! Mr. Caldwell was aware of our awesome responsibilities as licensees, and he never allowed his clients to forget them. But he never backed away from an encounter where fundamental free enterprise concepts were involved. Louis Caldwell was perhaps the most unforgettable person it has been my good fortune to know. There are others, long departed, who were men of courage and integrity and who had great influence, not only on my life, which is unimportant, but on the development of the broadcast media in the best interests of our nation and our people, and in the American tradition of being entitled to the rewards of their labors and of risking their capital in pioneering radio, and latterly television in which the losses were astronomical during the first dozen years!

I shall mention only a few of these sincere, dedicated men: General David Sarnoff, Edwin W. Craig of WSM, Nashville; Harold V. Hough of WBAP, Fort Worth; James D. Shouse, of CBS and Crosley-AVCO; Earle C. Anthony of KPI, Los Angeles.

We owe an enormous debt to others of that first generation who are still here—stalwart defenders of our system and who are as young in zeal and dedication as they were when it was "fun" to be a broadcaster with the rewards "slim." Among these are such innovators and fine gentlemen as Niles Trammell, Rosel H. Hyde, Frank Stanton, J. Leonard Reinsch, Clair McCollough, John Fetzer—to name only a few.

* * * * *

I will not resort to flaming rhetoric to exhort all of you to defend the freedom and sanctity of American broadcasting! That is why you are here! It is the reason for being of the National Association of Broadcasters!!! It is your obligation to defend that which you and your predecessors fashioned by popular demand—the expressed wishes of a nation of 220 million Americans—including the three percent of self-annointed intellectuals who preach what they seldom practice!

In the words of that fine man of note, Johnny Mercer, let us strive to eliminate the "negative" and accentuate the "positive"—let us all acclaim what is right about broadcasting!

AMNESTY?

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following article is a thoughtful, well-reasoned proposal by the World Without War Issues Center of Berkeley, Calif., regarding the question of amnesty. In the controversy surrounding this issue, I feel that the ideas presented here can add affirmatively to the dialog on the subject, and I recommend that the article be carefully and considerately read by all those concerned about the question.

The article follows:

AMNESTY?* A POLICY PROPOSAL FROM THE WORLD WITHOUT WAR ISSUES CENTER

THE PROBLEM

During the Vietnam years, many young men have left the country, deserted the armed forces, or gone underground to avoid military service. Others have openly refused induction and accepted the penalty of the law. When the war finally ends, the nation must decide, as we have in past wars, whether to bring these men back into the life of our society. National policy toward these men could be an important element in reuniting our society—or it could further divide us.

Competing perspectives on the wisdom of a policy of amnesty rest their case on different values: equal justice under the law, respect for conscience, the requisites of political community, of reconcilation and reunification.

THE ISSUE

Should the policy of the United States be to grant amnesty to men who illegally refused to serve in the military during the Vietnam war? Should alternate service be a requirement for amnesty?

AT STAKE

(1) An opportunity to support conscientious opposition to participation in war, balanced by (2) a concern for the maintenance of political community and a system of law as an alternative to violence in the resolution and prosecution of conflict. Both are key elements in a framework of understandings capable of leading us away from war.

MAJOR CURRENT APPROACHES TO AMNESTY

(1) One approach opposes amnesty on the grounds that those who evaded military service or deserted chose to break with this political community. "They may join another if they choose. Our community owes them nothing." To reward these men with amnesty would be an extreme injustice to those who accepted their responsibilities, many of whom died. (2) Another approach argues that those who refused to serve responded to demands of conscience to resist an unjust and illegal war. Amnesty is their due. They recognized the terrible path this country was pursuing and refused to go along with it. Any attempt to make amnesty conditional would make these young men admit they were wrong when, in fact, the government was wrong. (3) A third position focuses on the need for national reconciliation. It favors amnesty as a step in that direction, but insists on alternate service requirement to be equitable to those who served. (4) The policy WWWIC proposes approaches amnesty in the context of values and goals essential for an end to war.

PRIMARY VALUES AND GOALS OF THE WWWIC AMNESTY PROPOSAL

A concept of political community and responsibility

The United States of America is a political community we wish to sustain. A major goal for those who would end war is the establishment of a transnational political community with effective legal institutions capable of enforcing agreements and providing alternate channels for the resolution and prosecution of conflict. Thus, respect for law and political obligation are essential concerns for those who wish to sustain this political community while working for one capable of ending war.

Respect for conscience

The conscientious withdrawal of consent from unjust laws or policies, if carried out in a manner which does not undermine the authority of the political process, can be a tremendous spur to needed change. It can awaken the latent moral forces in our society which dictate and sustain attempts to end war. Therefore, support for individual conscience is a primary value for those who seek to build the institutions of peace.

Equity

Men caught in the moral vise of this war responded in a wide variety of ways. To be fair to all of those faced agonizing decisions about military service, we must not be vindictive toward those who went outside the law in their refusal to serve, nor should we treat inequitably those who accepted their responbilities under the law by releasing from responsibility those who did not accept theirs.

Concern for reconciliation and reunification

National reconciliation demands attempts to heal the deep divisions in our society which have resulted from the Vietnam war. Amnesty could be one essential element in achieving a unified political community and in reconciling the many points of view involved. Such a renewed sense of community could facilitate a positive American role in the attempt to create alternatives to war.

A perspective on war

The values we have just stated conflict. All are important. We attempt to balance them within our perspective on what is required to end war. That perspective, stated in the World Without War Council publication, To End War, values law and conscience, amnesty for those who conscientiously refused to serve and equitable treatment for those who did; concern for the specific choice to be made and a determination to make that choice a part of a long range policy that can help end war in the world.

A WORLD WITHOUT WAR AMNESTY PROPOSAL

Many young men now stand outside the law because of their response to military service during the Vietnam war. WWWIC urges the adoption of a policy of conditional amnesty which embodies the following principles and procedures.

A. An Amnesty Review Board: should be created and empowered to consider applications for amnesty, to classify the applicant's refusal to serve according to the categories in Section B, and to set appropriate and equitable conditions for amnesty which maximize the chances for national reconciliation and the maintenance of a sense of political community and political obligation. This policy should take effect when a durable cease-fire is achieved or when Americans are no longer being drafted for military activity in Indochina.

B. Who should be granted amnesty? On what conditions?

(1) Those who openly and nonviolently refused to serve and willingly accepted the

---

* "A general determination that whole classes of offenses and offenders will not be prosecuted." *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences.*

penalty of civil or military law for their refusal.

The men in this group have fulfilled the minimum commitment of a citizen in a democratic society; the commitment to obey the law or willingly accept the law's penalty for open and nonviolent civil disobedience. They should be distinguished from those who left the country, deserted, or went underground. Any amnesty policy should make generous pardon provisions for men who went to jail for their beliefs and did not break with this political community.

(2) Those who left the country to avoid the draft and those who went underground and attempted (successfully or unsuccessfully) to avoid the penalty of the law for their refusal to serve.

The men in this group acted for a wide variety of reasons. Some were denied conscientious objector status by their draft boards. Others did not apply because they objected only to this war and therefore did not qualify for CO status. Still others simply denied an obligation to the political community for reasons which may or may not have grown out of conscientious opposition to war. We believe that although these differences in motivation are crucial to the health of a democratic society, they do not lend themselves to bureaucratic determination.

Therefore, the Amnesty Review Board should grant amnesty to all the men in this group (or recommend pardon for those imprisoned) subject to an acknowledgment of the concept of political obligation evidenced by acceptance of an appropriate civilian alternate service assignment.

(3) Those who deserted from the military

We believe that a man may become conscientiously opposed to participation in war after he enlists or accepts induction. Therefore, the Board may grant amnesty to the men in this category subject to a willingness to accept assignment to appropriate civilian or military service.

C. Limitations on the Board's powers:

(1) The Board may grant amnesty only for a failure to fulfill responsibilities under the Selective Service Act or the Universal Code of Military Justice, not for violations of any other civil laws.

(2) The Board may only grant amnesty for nonviolent acts.

(3) The Board may only grant amnesty to those who acknowledge the concept of political obligation by evincing a willingness to perform an alternate service assignment if required by the Board.

D. Alternate Service.

Alternate service should be broadly interpreted to include a wide range of constructive work opportunities.

WHY DOES WWWIC SUPPORT AMNESTY?

Amnesty can heal some of the wounds of war. It can help re-knit an American political community torn asunder by this war. National reconciliation is a prerequisite for a positive American role in establishing the institutions and understandings that can end war in the world.

WWWIC supports those who are conscientiously opposed to participation in war and wish to fulfill their obligation to this political community outside the military. It believes that such individuals can provide a moral impetus to the whole society to pursue the creation of alternatives to war. Amnesty could return many of these young men to this country and offer them opportunities for service consistent with principled objection to war.

WHY SHOULD AMNESTY BE CONDITIONAL?

It is false to assume that men who left the country or deserted are traitors or cowards. It is just as false to assume that they are all moral heroes whose just reward is unconditional amnesty. These men acted in a wide variety of ways for a wide variety of reasons. Equity for those who served and for those who resisted openly and accepted the legal penalty for their acts dictates that those who chose to leave the country or the military perform an alternate service assignment as a condition of amnesty.

Membership in a political community involves obligations as well as rights. One of those obligations is to obey the law or submit to its authority if conscientious refusal to obey is indicated. Unconditional amnesty would tend to undermine respect for law in a country and world that need law if we are to move away from war and violence.

Finally, an alternate service program sensitively and wisely administered is an opportunity: an opportunity to dramatize concepts of conscience and war and of work to end war, and an opportunity to utilize the talents, energies, and moral concern of men who can help lead the way to a world without war.

THE ENERGY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPLY ACT OF 1973

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, on the floor of the House I outlined the incredible pattern of mismanagement, confusion, and blatant abuse which characterizes the Federal Government's "nonpolicy" in energy. It is clear that a matter so critical to the national well-being demands an imaginative response by experts completely dedicated to improving the welfare of all our citizens. We can no longer rely on the private sector to solve a vital public problem.

A central feature of any solution to our future energy needs is research and development. We must begin immediately a comprehensive program of research into alternative energy sources which pose little or no threat to our precious environment.

To conduct the desperately needed program of new energy sources research, I propose the establishment of a NASA-type agency. This agency, the Energy Development and Supply Commission will coordinate the Nation's energy policies and develop new sources of clean, cheap energy.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of rhetoric about the energy crisis and solutions have been offered. But no one has offered solution to the problems of funding the magnitude of research and demonstration projects which are required. No one is saying where the money should come from to finance this national effort. This is the most important aspect of the legislation which I am introducing: It does provide funding. It is responsible legislation which identifies a problem and then provides the funds to pay for the solutions. Through the creation of an energy development and supply trust fund, this legislation provides a regular source of revenue—collected from energy consumers—to finance the development of the energy of the future.

The trust fund will be formed from the revenues gained by the imposition of an energy use tax and will provide approximately $3.5 billion per year for the Commission to solve our Nation's energy problems.

CREATION OF THE FUND

The fund will be developed from a variety of sources. First, there will be a tax on natural gas and electricity use. Each of these taxes will have an exemption level which will free residential and small commercial users from the tax. The tax will generally fall on the largest users of these energy sources who are generally the most inefficient and wasteful users.

Inexpensive fuel has been a boon to American industry, but only now are we realizing the adverse consequences of this policy. With the cost of fuel insignificant relative to other factors of production, there has been little economic incentive for industry to use energy efficiently. Grossly inefficient industrial processes have resulted. In certain phases of the manufacturing of glass, for example, the wastage of natural gas is as high as 50 percent. There is a similar problem in the use of electricity because the larger consumers are given lower rates. The tax I propose on fuel and use would stimulate more efficient consumption of natural gas and electricity by the largest consumer of these resources. This tax will raise $2 billion for the fund.

Second, there is imposed a nominal tax of 0.5 cent a gallon on kerosene, gas, oil, and fuel oil with exemption from the tax on the first 2,500 gallons. This will free the homeowner and small businessman from this tax, but such a tax would stimulate conservation of petroleum in the larger heating and industrial processes, while adding $500 million to the trust fund.

The conservation taxes are supplemented by a new system of imports of foreign petroleum. The ill-conceived import quota system, which has led to severe crude oil shortages among midwestern refineries, will be abolished. In its place will be a flexible tariff structure to control the influx of foreign crude oils. The tariff will be equal to 90 percent of the difference between the domestic price of crude oil and the foreign price plus its shipping costs to the port of entry. The tariff level under this formula will be adjusted periodically.

The revenue raised by this provision will vary as the price of domestic and foreign oil varies, but it is estimated that this will add about $1 billion to the trust fund. Ideally, funds for research would be generated internally from industry. But the large oil companies have found it more profitable to gear their capital expenditures to sales and promotion rather than research and development The Washington Post revealed that the oil industry has spent over $3 million informing the public of the crisis in our energy sources. At the same time, Senator METCALF has compiled statistics which reveal that the electric utilities expend 3.3 times as much capital on promotion as they do on research and development.

One major oil company has just spent millions telling the American people how

they changed two "s" 's to "x" 's. The stripes of the energy industry have not changed: They are more interested in profits and sales today than in meeting the problems of the future. The American people cannot rely on the energy industry for the hard research required. A trust fund is needed; a trust fund is the only way to provide for the high level of steady effort that is required.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE TRUST FUND

Moneys from the trust fund will provide funding for a wide range of activities designed to promote a more coherent approach to energy policy planning. A five-member Energy Development and Supply Commission will direct the Nation's energy effort.

These five Commissioners shall be selected from academic research, and public service backgrounds. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say at this point that we are going to be asking the American people to take on some tremendous new responsibilities in order to meet the problems of the energy crisis. This is an hour in which we have got to see that the most highly qualified people—from every aspect—are in the positions of responsibility. We must have people of unquestioned loyalty to the public interest.

The activities of the Commission can be categorized under four headings:

Data collection;

National security;

Research and development; and

Publication and reports of recommendations.

DATA COLLECTION

The first prerequisite for intelligent policy is adequate information. For too long the agencies of the Federal Government have been mere sound boxes, resonating the industry line. To circumvent the persistent problem of information caps, this bill empowers the Energy Development and Supply Commission to conduct annually an extensive data and survey collection to gage the Nation's energy resources. This comprehensive mineral deposit inventory shall be provided to all other agencies of Government involved in energy matters in order to coordinate planning among these agencies.

NATIONAL SECURITY

The second major function of the Commission relates to the much abused problem of national security. For too long, the oil industry has played on our fears to goad us into policies which are not in the national interest. Each year, industry spokesmen, costumed in red-white-and-blue bunting, come before congressional committees to present their well-orchestrated case for special gifts from the public treasury. Emotionalism of this sort has little place in public debate; it undermines rational approaches to reasonable solutions. The issue of national security should not be used to hammerlock the American people.

In March of 1959, I pointed to manipulation of the national security issue by the oil companies. At that time I presented essentially the same solution I offer today—the establishment of a petroleum reserve for national security. I addressed the House with these words:

If we desire to protect the national security, it would seem more prudent to discover our own reserves and keep them stored in the ground for future emergencies . . . In the meantime it would seem wise for us to consume foreign supplies while they remain easily accessible.

Under the bill I am introducing today, this vital issue will finally be removed from the arena of self-serving, partisan debate. The Commission will be authorized to establish and maintain national defense petroleum reserves. These reserves shall be of sufficient size to protect our country against a 1-year interruption of imported petroleum from foreign countries which the Commission determines to be an insecure source of petroleum.

ENERGY RESEARCH

The third and most important function of the Commission is to supervise and coordinate the conduct of research into all aspects of energy supply, transmission, and utilization. The primary thrust of this research—funded by the trust fund—will be to seek the quality of our environment. Through a truly imaginative energy policy, it may be possible even to halt the present frightening deterioration of the world's environment. Research will be directed in five key areas:

First, the development of all aspects of solar energy.

Second, the development of processes of energy conservation.

Third, the decrease of the environmental impact of energy, generation, transmission, and distribution especially in the area of nuclear fission.

Fourth, the increase of efficiency of energy generation, transmission, and distribution.

Fifth, the exploration of other areas of energy development such as the gasification of coal, oil shale, heat, and energy from solid waste projects.

This research can be carried on either through contract or through in-house research, similar to the type of research conducted at NASA laboratories. It would be my expectation that much of this research would be carried on at existing facilities. For example, the NASA Jet Propulsion Labs at the Lewis Research Center in Cleveland, Ohio, are vastly underutilized. While Lewis continues to carry on a substantial volume of NASA research, it is capable of expanding its research into a wide range of energy development, transmission, and utilization efficiency questions.

ENERGY REPORTS

In conjunction with its activities of data collection, national security, and research and development, the Commission will publish reports and recommendations on the entire range of its findings. These reports will enable not only Congress but people outside of Government to take informed action on energy issues.

The Government is now being held ransom by the energy industry. We who are directly involved with questions of policy are consistently told that the entire issue is too complex for the layman's mind. In matters of tax, we are urged to walk softly; a mistake here, we are told, could precipitate the economic collapse of the industry and the country as well. Confronted with this impressive barrage, most of us have been willing to defer decision to "the experts"—the oil company executive, the natural gas pipeline owner, the petroleum engineer.

This is not—nor can it be—just and responsible Government. We must combat this tyranny of expertise with informed action. The Members of Congress are the trustees of the public welfare, and we must act. We can no longer afford to defer decisions of public interest—decisions which can cost the American consumer billions of dollars and irreversibly injure our environment—to those who would subvert those interests.

The funds provided by this legislation for energy research will help but will not entirely solve the energy problem—a problem which has become so complicated that many things must be done in addition to research. Thus this bill seeks to provide for a comprehensive determination made by public experts of the exact extent of oil and gas reserves in America, which I estimate are understated by at least 50 percent—the suppression of reserves reduces local and State tax assessments and multiplies the value of oil and gas which secretly remains underground. This bill seeks to repeal the oil quota law so as to permit all oil seeking entry into the United States to enter in unlimited quantity under a tariff system. The legislation authorizes the Government to acquire oil reserves of imported oil and—utilizing former producing oil wells—store the reserves in underground facilities for future civilian and military use. Such storage will provide a hedge against even higher prices and provide a reserve defense supply. This legislation seeks to eliminate wasteful usage of oil and gas—and this will require the cooperation of every level of government and all of the people. Local building codes must be established to conserve energy, not waste it. More people must live closer to their place of employment. Automobiles must be more efficient, perhaps smaller with more miles per gallon.

Of course, other, new policies are required.

First, tax policies must be adopted which provide the maximum incentive for the producer and developer of resources and must be designed to eliminate the incentive to hold supplies off the market once they are discovered.

Second, new customers of gas and oil must bear the greater burden of increased needs; established users are entitled to some benefits from early commitment and long-term contracts.

Third, the oil consuming nations must organize into a compact to negotiate with the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries—OPEC—for fair and reasonable prices. Under the coffee agreements, this type of agreement has helped stabilize commodity supplies and prices. The same policy could be helpful in energy supplies.

ELI LILLY & CO. OF INDIANAPOLIS: MEETING RESPONSIBILITIES TO SOCIETY

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, some persons find it fashionable to constantly attack major corporations for their supposed shortcomings in meeting responsibilities to society. Unfortunately, it leaves the impression with many that this is the general rule for American business and industry.

This simply is not true. American industry has been and is fully aware of what these responsibilities should be. For a close look at what one major firm has done and is doing, I am pleased to include the following, from Eli Lilly & Co.'s 1972 report to the shareholders:

LOOKING BEYOND FINANCIAL RESULTS—PRODUCTIVITY, PRICING, AND RESPONSIBILITIES TO SOCIETY

Any major corporation has responsibilities to society that reach far beyond the financial figures contained in annual reports to shareholders. How well these responsibilities are discharged is often unseen and, therefore, unappreciated, partly because such benefits are elusive and difficult to capture in concrete form and partly because business often has not devoted enough attention to communicating this important aspect of economic life. However, these responsibilities and how well they are met need to be recognized because society expects more from business than profitable operations.

In simple terms, industry utilizes society's human and material resources to produce what people want to satisfy their needs. The benefits provided to society in the conversion process are measured by the usefulness of industry's products and by the efficiency—or productivity—of the conversion process.

We believe the discovery and development of new Lilly products represent significant progress in the vital life sciences. These products play a part—a significant part, we think—in improving the quality of living. They do it by preventing or combating illness, reducing the time (and thus the cost) of hospital care, and helping increase the world supply of food and fiber. As our company becomes more productive, its products help many, including the physician and the farmer, also to become more productive.

The company invested more than $360 million in capital additions in the past ten years. Although capital investment is important in improving productivity, such expenditures must be accompanied by an even larger and more significant investment in people. Lilly employees, skilled in many special fields and organized into effective working groups, are considered the company's greatest asset, although they are not included in the listing of total assets that appears in our financial statements.

FIRST PHASE OF PRODUCTIVITY

The company invested $465 million in research and development in the past ten years; however, the productivity of research organizations does not depend on how much money is spent but on how wisely it is administered. The value of output from research depends upon scientists' ability to innovate. Therefore, there is a need to seek out, to employe, and to stimulate men and women with particular skills, to provide them with the proper surroundings and equipment in an atmosphere where established concepts can be questioned, where a broad variety of views can be exchanged and examined, and where the mind is free to explore.

The successful coordination of creative efforts in many disciplines is a particular necessity at Eli Lilly and Company because of the diversity and scope of its research and development activities. Approximately 2,300 employees are assigned to scientific pursuits. While the major research endeavor is carried out in Indianapolis, groups also are at work throughout the world.

Research in the field of human medicine has led to many beneficial products in the past dozen years. These products have included:

Velban® and Oncovin®—two anticancer agents developed in our laboratories and derived from a variety of the periwinkle plant that grows in India and Madagascar.

Keflin® and Loridine®—injectable antibiotics of the cephalosporin family, used widely in life-threatening infections.

Kafocin® and Keflex—orally effective antibiotics, also of the cephalosporin family, for use against respiratory and uninary infections.

Among introductions improving world agricultural production have been:

Tylan®—an antibiotic that protects the health of poultry and livestock and that increases meat production through higher weight gain and feed efficiency.

Treflan and Balan®—herbicides that, by controlling weeds, increase yields in soybean, cotton, tobacco, lettuce, peanut, and other important crops.

Coban®—an agent that protects broiler chickens from coccidiosis, a serious disease of poultry.

In addition, Lilly scientists contribute an average of 320 scientific papers annually that add to the world reservoir of scientific knowledge.

MARKETING COMPLETES THE CYCLE

Products that result from greater research productivity, and that are manufactured with improved production processes, must be marketed effectively for the economic cycle to be completed. Our customers vary in many respects save one—they expect and need to be provided a high standard of technical information and services. Providing these services is the job of Lilly marketing groups around the world.

A surgeon in Houston, a cotton grower in Mississippi, a veterinarian in Japan, a cosmetic buyer in New York, a pork producer in Indiana, a pharmacist in Los Angeles, a poultryman in Brazil, a pediatrician in London—they and thousands like them listen with interest and respect to sales personnel from Lilly, Elanco, and Elizabeth Arden. They learn what a product will do, and—equally important—what a product will not do.

Effective marketing requires sales personnel with special education and skills. It takes intelligence, integrity, and hard work. But when the customer's need is fulfilled, the company and society benefit because our productivity helped someone else become more productive. This means shorter illnesses, less expensive meats, more bountiful crops. Effective marketing also means earnings, which, when reinvested, enable the company to become even more productive.

Further marketing productivity is expected to result from the recent formation of Dista Products Company in the United States, a new organization that will broaden and make more effective our communications with the medical community. The creation of this division reaffirms our belief in the value of personal contact in the sale of our products. By shifting a group of valuable Lilly therapeutic agents to the new Dista organization and staffing the division with our usual professional caliber of personnel, we believe that the needs of medical and allied professions and the public will be better served.

IMPROVING PRODUCTIVITY

Two of the major problems facing the United States today are inflation at home and increasing competition in world markets. One way to deal with both inflation and competition is to step up this nation's productivity. The U.S. citizen cannot prosper in an unproductive and noncompetitive economy. Business must assume an aggressive role in a national effort to stimulate and foster a climate in which the two resources of human effort and technology are best developed.

Improved productivity is not determined by a company's size, how hard employees work, how fast machinery runs, or any other single element. It is achieved by the interaction of many complex factors, including the combination of people and technology; the blending of employees into successful teams; the use of the most effective management techniques; and the generation of new solutions and innovative procedures applicable to research, production, and marketing.

Measuring the productivity that results from all the things Lilly employees do is not an easy task. No firm guidelines have been developed. We cannot really identify the extent to which product discoveries, process innovations, greater effort by employees, better production equipment, high quality of products, or management skills result in improved productivity. It is, in fact, a combination of all these factors that brings about such improvement.

Statisticians and economists experience similar problems in assessing productivity growth of the United States economy. Still, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics uses certain measures that are recognized as standard guidelines. With 1967 as a base year (equal to an index of 100), the index of productivity in the private sector of the U.S. economy for 1972 is expected to be near 113. In comparison, the 1972 productivity index for Eli Lilly and Company is 157. In the past ten years, productivity of the private sector of the U.S. economy increased nearly 3 percent a year, while Lilly productivity increased more than 8 percent a year.

INCREASED PRODUCTIVITY ALLOWS STABLE PRICES

Thus, Lilly productivity increased more rapidly than the industrial average for the United States. This productivity enabled the company to sell its products at declining or stable prices despite steadily increasing costs of raw materials and labor. The chart at right compares the trends of Lilly product prices with the U.S. Consumer Price Index for the past five years.

We feel that one of our important corporate responsibilities is to take the resources entrusted to us and to use them to provide products needed by the public, tax revenues to support government, a reasonable return to our shareholders, and increased compensation for employees.

When we look beyond financial results, one of the company's major objectives was summarized by Mr. Eli Lilly, honorary chairman of the Board of Directors when he said: 'Mere bigness in business is not enough. After all, it is not how big a business is but how good . . . no matter how well anything is being done it can always be done better."

HOUSE PASSES CLEMENTE MEDAL LEGISLATION

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my col-

leagues for their action in passing today H.R. 3841, a bill to strike a gold medal in honor of Roberto Clemente, the great rightfielder of the Pittsburgh Pirates who was killed while on a mercy mission to Nicaragua.

Hopefully the other body soon will act and the President can sign into law this bill honoring a man who not only was an outstanding athlete but also a humane and selfless individual.

Clemente's death has left an indelible imprint on hundreds of thousands who remember his 15 years of exemplary play in the National League.

In 1971, when he lead the Pirates to a seventh game victory over the Baltimore Orioles, baseball buffs across the country readily conceded that Clemente was the best modern day player ever to wear a uniform and certainly one of the alltime greats in baseball history.

He could do everything and well. His play became the standard for others to emulate.

Just last week, the baseball writers of America, waived the normal 5-year waiting period and almost unanimously voted Roberto Clemente into Baseball's Hall of Fame.

H.R. 3841, which I authored, along with seven of our colleagues, Representatives MORGAN, CLARK, DENT, BADILLO, MIZELL, HEINZ, and BENITEZ, calls for the striking of a gold medal and up to 200,000 copies.

The gold medal will be presented to Mrs. Clemente and the copies will be sold by the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh with all proceeds going to the Roberto Clemente Memorial Fund, which is administered by the Pittsburgh Pirates Baseball Club.

All costs connected with striking the medal will be assumed by the chamber. Therefore this legislation does not cost the taxpayers one penny.

The Clemente Fund, established shortly after Roberto's death, hopes to build a sports city complex in Puerto Rico for the children of that country. This was a dream of Clemente's and a project he had begun while still an active player in the major leagues. The fund also will carry out some work with the residents of Nicaragua who were victims of the same earthquake and storms which caused the plane, in which Clemente was carrying relief supplies, to crash.

I think the House took a very long stride today in assuring that an appropriate memorial to the memory of Roberto Clemente will exist.

I would like now to include in the RECORD various articles and editorials on Roberto Clemente, his life and tragic death.

ROBERTO CLEMENTE

Statement by the President Following the Death of the Pittsburgh Pirates Rightfielder on a Mercy Flight to Nicaragua, January 2, 1973.

Every sports fan admired and respected Roberto Clemente as one of the greatest baseball players of our time. In the tragedy of his untimely death, we are reminded that he deserved even greater respect and admiration for his splendid qualities as a generous and kind human being.

He sacrificed his life on a mission of mercy. The best memorial we can build to his memory is to contribute generously for the relief of those he was trying to help—the earthquake victims in Nicaragua.

NOTE: Robert Clemente, 38, died in the crash of a cargo plane off the coast of San Juan, P.R., on December 31, 1972. As head of Puerto Rican efforts to aid victims of the Nicaraguan earthquake, Mr. Clemente was escorting relief supplies to Managua at the time of the crash.

On Wednesday, January 3, the President met with Pittsburgh Pirates president Dan Galbreath and pitchers Dave Giusti and Steve Blass to discuss a proposed Committee for a Roberto Clemente Memorial Fund for Nicaraguan Earthquake Victims.

[From the Washington Star, January 5, 1973]

A MEMORIAL FOR CLEMENTE

Even in the land of heroes that big-league baseball represents, Roberto Clemente was special.

He was like DiMaggio. He could do it all and make it seem effortless—run, field, hit consistently, hit with power, and throw so powerfully that perhaps no other outfielder ever matched the Clemente arm. And he was like Atlanta's Hank Aaron, in that, playing for Pittsburgh, a town where the media is not concentrated, the acclaim he deserved came late in his playing career.

Finally, after he dominated the 1971 World Series, public recognition caught up. Here was a superstar. He hit over .300 in 13 of his 18 years as a Pirate, and won the batting championship four times. Last year he got his 3,000th hit, something only 10 players ever accomplished.

Now he is dead, and the circumstances of his death also were special. In his native Puerto Rico, Clemente was both a national hero and a tireless worker for good causes. And so it was not unnatural that he be named head of a committee to rush relief supplies from Puerto Rico to the victims of the earthquake which practically wiped out Nicaragua's capital of Managua. He didn't just lend his name to the effort. On New Year's Eve, Clemente took off for Managua to make sure the supplies were delivered properly. He and four others were killed when the plane crashed.

It doesn't help very much, of course, to say he died on a mission of mercy. His death in any case is sad and brutally abrupt.

And yet, as President Nixon noted, the mission he was on could well serve as a suitable memorial for him. The baseball writters will quickly take care of getting the Clemente name into the Hall of Fame. The people of Puerto Rico will honor his name in other ways. For anyone else who cares, an appropriate tribute would be a contribution to the homeless and otherwise needy people of Nicaragua.

CLEMENTE ELECTED TO BASEBALL'S HALL OF FAME

(By Ira Miller)

ST. PETERSBURG, FLORIDA.—Roberto Clemente always wanted to be remembered simply as a "player who gave his best."

The epitaph was gentle enough, but hardly befitting a star of Clemente's greatness.

Today, baseball officially gave Clemente what is considered a more deserving remembrance—election to the Hall of Fame less than three months after he died on a New Year's Eve mercy flight.

Clemente's widow, Vera, Baseball Commissioner Bowie Kuhn and officials of the Pittsburgh Pirates, for whom Clemente started 18 seasons, were on hand today for the announcement at a news conference.

Officially, the purpose was to announce the results of the special yes-or-no Hall of Fame vote on Clemente's candidacy, but the fact of his election was not one of baseball's best-kept secrets.

Only the size of the vote had been in question.

A total of 424 members of the Baseball Writers Association of America returned ballots. A total of 393 voted for Clemente's immediate election, 29 against it and two abstained.

Most of those who filed negative votes noted that they didn't vote against Clemente's election but against the relaxed voting system (waiving the five-year wait rule).

He becomes only the second player admitted to the baseball shrine without the customary five-year waiting period. A dying Lou Gehrig was elected by acclamation in 1939.

Clemente died with four other men in the crash of an old, propeller-driven DC-7 airplane in which they were ferrying supplies from Puerto Rico to earthquake victims in Managua, Nicaragua.

The plane, delayed several times before takeoff, crashed into the ocean near the San Juan Airport. Clemente's body never has been recovered.

Clemente, who was 38 at his death, won four National League batting titles—in 1961, 1964, 1965 and 1967. He averaged .317 for his career, won the Gold Glove for fielding excellence a dozen times, was the league's Most Valuable Player in 1966 and the outstanding player in the 1971 World Series.

His final regular-season hit in 1972 was his 3,000th. Only 10 other layers ever got that many.

In the three years before 1972, he batted in succession .345, .352 and 341. He hit .312 in 1972 when he was bothered by injuries.

But Clemente's finest moment by far was the '71 World Series. He batted .414, hit safely in every game, homered to start Pittsburgh's seventh-game victory and was brilliant defensively.

The performance earned Clemente the national recognition he claimed long had been denied him because he was Puerto Rican. When it was over, he said, "I finally have peace of mind."

"Now, everyone knows the way Roberto Clemente plays," he said at the time. "I believe I'm the best player in baseball today . . . and I'm glad I was able to show it against Baltimore in the series."

The formal induction ceremonies for Clemente and five others named to the Hall of Fame earlier this year—Warren Spahn, Monte Irvin, and old timers Mickey Welch, George "Highpockets" Kelly and Umpire Billy Evans—will be held Aug. 6 at Cooperstown, N.Y.

Clemente did not live to see one of his fondest dreams realized—creation of a "sports city" for Puerto Rican youth. But hundreds of thousands of dollars in donations since his death assure the facility will be constructed.

A diamond-studded, gold 1971 World Series championship ring bearing the name of Clemente was presented last night in Bradenton to the Baseball Hall of Fame.

The presentation was made to Ken Smith, director of the Hall of Fame, as part of the 10th annual Manatee County Chamber of Commerce Hall of Fame banquet.

A WORTHY MEMORIAL

Roberto Clemente was a hero to young and old in Puerto Rico. He was particularly revered by the poor, who knew him not only as a baseball star but a man who devoted time and money to programs for poverty-stricken youngsters on his native island.

Clemente died before his ambitious dream of a "sports city" for Puerto Rican children could come true. In death, he may yet contribute what he had planned—a sports and recreation facility which could brighten the lives of thousands of island youngsters. Mrs. Vera Clemente, widow of the Pirate star who died in a plane crash December 31, recently made a heartening announcement. She said a 600-acre site had been selected for the

Roberto Clemente Sports City near San Juan International Airport.

Roberto had envisioned a broad program encompassing numerous sports. He explained: "Lots of kids don't participate in sports because they don't like one sport especially. But if you can have all sports where he can participate, I bet you that he will like at least one of them and keep going."

The project outlined by Mrs. Clemente promises to fulfill Roberto's expectations. She said the sports city, costing about $14 million, would require 2½ years to construct. About 230 acres would be devoted to sports facilities, 50 acres for water sports and 300 acres for passive recreation. Included in the plans are facilities for baseball, soccer, volleyball, handball, tennis, track and field, target shooting, archery, cycling, roller skating, golf, horseback riding and swimming.

The Pirates and a San Juan newspaper and bank already have collected about $500,000 for the project.

The Roberto Clemente Sports City promises to become a fitting memorial to a man who befriended the needy with more than kind words.

OEO CRACKDOWN

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I include the following editorial from the Indianapolis News of Wednesday, March 7, 1973, in the RECORD. I believe this editorial tells the story of OEO very well.

It follows:

OEO CRACKDOWN

Efforts by the Nixon administration to phase out the controversial Office of Economic Opportunity have met with predictable cries of outrage and alarm.

To hear the critics tell it, Nixon and Acting OEO Director Howard Phillips are abolishing everything that is good and holy in government, showing their insensitivity to poor people and the "needs" of the disadvantaged. A glance at the background of OEO, however, and at the Phillips pruning exercise, suggests a different picture: For it is clear on the record that OEO has done very little to abolish poverty, but a great deal to build empires for bureaucrats and interest blocs.

Phillips states the matter well, we think, when he asserts that "some of the projects funded by this agency have kept a lot of people comfortable in their poverty—but this agency has not done enough to lift people out of poverty. Many of the things it did had a negative impact. Some grants tended to foster the welfare ethic, rather than the work ethic. Some programs were premised on a belief that the problems of poverty are political rather than economic . . . Too much of the anti-poverty money has gone into setting up an administrative bureaucracy, rather than into the hands of the poor."

As noted on this page by The News Washington correspondent Lou Hiner Jr., the poverty bureaucrats have responded to Phillips' effort to dismantle some of the more wasteful programs by filing suit to prevent the abolition of their jobs. This is an all-too-typical example of the high-handed attitude of tax-consumers toward the people who have to pay the taxes; these bureaucrats feel they have a vested right to a place on the public payroll and to absorb the energies and resources of working Americans.

Hiner quotes estimates that since 1964 more than $2.8 billion has been poured out for OEO projects and that in some instances up to 85 per cent of money for local programs has gone to pay bureaucratic salaries. The results of this expenditure in terms of generating local effort have been poor indeed, particularly when compared to private self-help programs conducted here in Indianapolis by Flanner House and other agencies. Any way you look at it, OEO has been a wasteful proposition and richly deserves the cutback which Phillips is attempting.

The present danger is that the orchestrated outcry from the welfare coalition, the bureaucrats and the leftward ideologues will weaken the resolve of the administration to back Phillips' hand and to get on with the job of unraveling this bureaucratic mares' nest. Citizens who are tired of seeing their money used for big-spending projects and radical agitation should let their congressmen know how they feel and urge full-scale support for Phillips.

CUBAN EXILES PETITION THE PRESIDENT TO FULFILL HIS PROMISES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, last week I pointed out the possible threat to the American right of political asylum posed by the Pact of Bilateral Agreement on Air Piracy signed February 15 by the United States and Cuba—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 21, 1973.

It is my fear, and the fear of many Cuban refugees in exile in this country, that this agreement will sign the death notices of many thousands of Cubans unable to escape from the Communist-held island. Although I have been assured by the State Department that our traditional policy regarding political asylum has not changed, I was also advised that just because a Cuban desires not to live under communism does not constitute grounds for his being granted political asylum. This most certainly is a change.

Oppressed people the world over, especially those in Cuba, have long looked to the United States as a refuge from tyranny. And now this hope is being taken from them in the name of preventing air piracy. This is piracy of freedom in in its most blatant form.

The antihijacking agreement has been referred to as a "treaty", but it certainly is not. It has never been ratified by the Senate, and is nothing more than de facto law promulgated by Presidential fiat.

The Washington Post, March 27, carried a large paid advertisement placed by many well-known Cuban exiles, petitioning the President to fulfill the promises made to the Cuban people. While they are not opposed to an antihijacking agreement between the United States and Cuba, they do question "the grave consequences that the application of the Agreement might bring in the future."

These people know better than anyone the tyranny that grips the oppressed people of Cuba, and they have a right to be heard in their appeal for help.

I here insert the text to the petition of the Cuban-American Sertoma Club of Coral Gables:

TO THE HONORABLE RICHARD M. NIXON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

TO THE WORLD-WIDE PUBLIC OPINION:

The undersigners, Cuban exiles, because of the consternation created among one million Cuban Refugees and facing the anguish and sorrow created for the eight million Cubans on the Island of Cuba, due to the reach and significance of the articles contained in the Pact of Bilateral Agreement on Air Piracy, signed last February 15 between the United States Government and the Communist tyranny of Cuba, with the highest respect and also with natural patriotic firmness, wish to make the following public statement:

I. That they respect the United States right to make such Treaties as it may deem convenient for the welfare and security of its People; in such sense, they are not opposed to the Air Piracy Treaty, but only to to those parts which they consider fundamental within its contents, and specially Point II, which unusually and practically forbids all kind of actions against the actual Cuban regime, no matter where it takes effect.

The United States Government, through its spokesmen, has stated that such Agreement does not change the status of its relations with the Cuban regime. However, there is a flagrant contradiction between the above referred statement and the contents of Point II of said Agreement, which leaves the impression of having been worded in Havana and later unexplainably accepted by the Government of the United States, without foreseeing the grave consequences that the application of that section of the Agreement might bring in the future to the ever good relations between the free and democratic People of Cuba and the free and democratic People of the United States.

II. That with the noble intention of avoiding events which may result in differences of opinion between Cuban Exiles and Americans, we have decided to give publicity to this document, hoping to achieve a rapid and healthy rectification on the part of the United States Government, of the serious mistake made, and a decided explanation from President Nixon, who has always had the backing and respect of the Cuban People, "his Cuban friends" as frequently and with human warmth, he has stated.

III. That we are under the protection of the laws of this great Nation, traditional cradle of all world exiles, and that we respect them; but allow us to say that, first of all, we are Cubans who came here and to other shores of America seeking Freedom and aid for our Fatherland, and to procure means and ways for a dignified and patriotic struggle against the tyranny, and for the Freedom, Independence and Sovereignty of Cuba within a democratic frame and of truly Social Justice, where opportunely the People may plainly exercise the right to choose its own destiny through a majority consent of its citizenry cleanly expressed in the ballots.

IV. That the struggle of the Cuban ePople of Cuba for its liberation and afterwards to enjoy living in Democracy, Justice and Freedom, as the American People and Other People on Earth do, is an inalienable right of every Cuban and a patriotic duty imposed upon each son of Cuba, in spite of all adversities, obstacles, conspiracies, and Agreements.

The People Of Cuba cannot consent to anything or anybody to conspire so that Communist slavery reigns forever in our country and to make permanent exiles out of us, or classic immigrants, nor has it granted plenipotentiary powers to foreign person or government, be it large or small, to negotiate its future.

IV. That the struggle of the Cuban People towards its liberation is safeguarded by the Right to Self-Determination of the People and by multiple Interamerican Treaties

and Agreements and also by the United States of America, such as: Monroe Doctrine (1823); American Congress Joint Resolution and Paris Treaty (1898); Cuba-United States Treaty, Suppressing the Platt Amendment and Extending the Guantanamo Naval Base Concession (1934); Declaration of Lima (1938); Rio de Janeiro Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance (1947); Organization of American States-OEA-Chart (1948); Declaration of Caracas (1954); Punta del Este, Uruguay Resolutions (1962); American Congress Joint Resolution, Made Public Act by Sanction of the Executive Power and Therefore, Mandatory (Resolution No. 230, October 3, 1962); IX Meeting of Consultation of Foreign Ministers of America in Washington (July, 1964); Declaration to the Cuban People from the Foreign Ministers of America in Washington (July, 1964).

We must specifically insist that the hereinabove mentioned Point II of the Air Piracy Treaty, of February 15, 1973 arbitrarily violates and consequently is in open conflict with Joint Resolution #230, October 3, 1962, of the United States of America Congress, which was declared a Public Act when it was sanctioned by the President and which, logically, modified the Neutrality Act of that country in regards to Cuba.

Said Joint Resolution establishes that the United States of America shall offer full cooperation to free Cubans in their just struggle against the actual Cuban regime. Now we find that as per the controversial Point II of the Treaty or Agreement on Air Piracy, the United States will punish in accordance with its laws and will not permit any Cuban to prepare, promote or take part in expeditions or other important activities, from its territory or any place in America against the totalitarian regime imposed in Cuba by deceit, force and terror.

We have pointed out the substance of both texts, so that the present contradictions and confusion may be evidenced and to show, from another point of view, how the United States Government has gone so far in concessions and attributions in this Agreement that not only penetrates into the subject of Cuba's sovereignty but also of the rest of the nations of the world, to the point where many might consider it outrageous and humiliating.

VI. That in the same manner that the People of Cuba in exile and in the island of Cuba censored and exposed the Kennedy-Khrushchev Pact, born as a consequence of the October, 1962 Missile Crisis, which in the long run has served only to protect and perpetuate Castro and his regime in power, now equally, free and democratic Cubans censor and expose any coexistence intent tending to maintain the Cuban tyranny in power and unjustly condemning our People to live under a prison-regime which has destroyed the Cuban Nation, established permanent rationing and poverty and violated every principle of the Interamerican System, reiteratedly and ostensibly interfering besides, in the internal affairs of numerous Latin American countries and the United States of America. Frankly speaking, nothing has changed in the Homeland of the great Cuban Patriot Jose Marti that justifies the modifications of OAS sanctions against the tyranny and nothing has changed in Cuba to overlook the crimes, the thousands of political prisoners, hunger, terror and the violation of all Human Rights which characterize the totalitarian regime of the Cuban Judas, Fidel Castro.

VII. That for those free and democratic Cubans who have a clear concept of Dignity and Honor, to walk paths of contemptible coexistence with Castro and his communist tyranny now, is nothing else than treason to the cause of Cuban Freedom, and we consider it is also treason to the forefathers and liberators of the Americas and to the fundamental principles on which destiny and democratic security of the Western Hemisphere and the Free World rest; and also, of course, to the rights, beliefs, and hopes of a better a more just future that all Peoples on Earth deserve.

VIII. That all free and democratic Cubans are eternally gratefully to the People of the United States of America and to the different Administrations of the United States Government since our long and hard exile began, and also to all other Peoples and Governments of America, for the generous aid and job opportunities offered to support our homes with dignity; but with nobility and respect we remind everyone that gratitude does not mean submission; that eternal gratitude does not mean the acceptance of indignities which carry on pain and crucifixion for the Cuban People.

As a distinguished diplomat and intellectual of our Americas stated in a very right sentence: "The solution of the Cuban problem is not to supply the Cubans a diluted and false substitute of Fatherland, but to provide them with an honorable return to their ever-homeland."

Let it be known to the whole world that we left Cuba to return with dignity and to a redeemed Fatherland and that, in such sense we consider that the Organization of American States—OAS—and its Nation Members, deplorably have not lived up to their duty to aid the People of Cuba, and to the Agreements and Treaties which demand from them a firmer and more decorous attitude because, after all, the Battle for Cuba is also the Battle of America.

IX. That the Forefathers and Liberators of the Cuban Homeland, whose struggles and examples are inspiration for our battle of today taught us "that the problems of Cuba concern the Cubans fundamentally"; "that we have nothing while we do not have our Fatherland"; "that the historic truth stands above all"; "that no matters what might happen, Cuba should not and cannot wait for extraneous solutions"; "that Cuba cannot live deprived of the rights enjoyed by other countries, not to consent that it be said it only knows how to suffer"; and "that struggles for Freedom are very costly, but one becomes fond of them, the more time passes and difficulties multiply".

X. That in this occasion we make ours, and take this opportunity to remind them all, the visionary phrases of the great American Patriot, Patrick Henry, when he said:

"Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid, it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!"

President Nixon: You have demonstrated that you are a sensitive and highly intelligent man, a qualified ruler, a person who works for History. Fulfill your promises to the noble People of Cuba, who has deposited their faith in you; but if you cannot fulfill those promises, do not deny our right, nor allow Russia or anybody else to do it!

Regardless and beyond all impediments the Cuban people will not renounce the right to be free!

Given in Miami, Florida, on the 23rd day of March, 1973.

Signed by: In alphabetical order.

Dr. Jose Alverez Diaz, Former Secretary of Treasury Department.

Manuel Artime, Former Civil Chief in the Bay of Pigs Invasion.

Ruben Batista lic. on behalf of his father the former President of Cuba Fulgen cio Batista Zaldivar.

Dr. Jose Borell, President of the Y.M.C.A. International "Jose Marti".

Juanita Castro, Chairman of "Marta Abreu Foundation".

Nicolas Catellanos, Former Mayor of the City of Havana.

Tomaz Cruz, Member of the Executive Staff of Executive Committee for Liberation and Member of the 2506 Brigade.

Angel Cofino, Former General Secretary of the Power Plants Workers.

Dr. Manuel A. de Varon, Former Prime Minister of the Republic of Cuba.

Jorge Esteva, President of the Cuban Lions Club in Exile.

Prescillano Falcon, Former Secretary General of Cuban Sugar Workers.

Dr. Rafael Guas Inclan, Former Vice-President of the Republic of Cuba.

Dr. Cristobal Gonzalez Mayo, Chairman of Cuban Professional Confederation in Exile.

Dr. Enrique Huertas, President of the Cuban Medical Association in Exile.

Dr. Arturo Hernandez Tellaeche, Former Secretary of Labor Department.

Fausto La Villa, Chairman of the Cuban Press Association in Exile.

Pedro A. Lopez, Jr., President of the Cuban-American Sertoma Club.

Jorge Mas Canosa, President of R.E.C.E.

Dr. Carlow Marquez Sterling, Former Chairman of 1940 Assembly to Write Cuban Constitution.

Dr. Humberto Modrane, Sub-director of PRENSA LIBRE newspaper and member of the International Commission for Cuban Political Prisoners Affairs.

Dr. Jose Miro Cardon, Former Prime Minister of the Cuban Revolutionary Government and Former President of the Cuban Revolutionary Council.

Dr. Jose M. Morales Gomez, Former Congressman.

C. P. Luis V. Manrara, Founder and Past President of the Truth About Cuba Committee.

Eusebio Mujal Barniol, General Secretary of Cuban Confederation Workers in Exile.

Andres Nazorle Sergen, General Secretary of the ALPHA 66.

Dr. Raul Menocal, Former Mayor of the City of Havana.

C. P. Rafael Perez Doreste, President of the Truth About Cuba Committee.

Virgilio Perez Lopez, Former Congressman and Former Secretary of Agriculture.

Juan J. Pesuyero, President of the Bay of Pigs Veteran Association, 2506 Brigade.

Dr. Carlos Prio Secarras, Former President of the Republic of Cuba.

Frank Rivero, President of Optimist Club.

Mercedes Rojas, President of the Martyr's Family Association.

Dr. Lincoln Rodon, Former Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Conrado Rodriguez Sanchez, General Secretary of the Independent Labor Action.

Dr. Andres Rivero Aguero, President Elected of the Republic of Cuba.

Vicente Rubiera, General Secretary of the Telephone Workers in Exile.

Lus Sabines, Chairman of the Latin Chamber of Commerce.

Jose San Roman, Military Commander of 2506 Brigade.

Dr. Eduardo Suarez Rivas, Former Speaker of the Cuban Senate.

Dr. Manuel Urutia Lieo, Former President of the Cuban Revolutionary Government.

Luis Varena, Secretary of Cuban National Veterans Association.

Reinaldo Vergara, Former President of the Cuban American Sertoma Club.

Dr. Jose M. Vidafia, Chairman of the Cuban Rotary Club in Exile.

Herberto Valdes Mollinado, President of the Central Executive Committee of the Cuban Municipalities in Exile.

THE LESSON OF WATERGATE

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, with the continuing revelations about the Watergate break-in, the circle of involvement on the part of administration officials widens, but awareness of what is really at stake has yet to be fully realized.

When corruption was exposed in previous administrations, of both parties, the public outcry was immediately felt and the Congress reflected this outraged response. Prosecution always followed.

The inclination of far too many to dismiss the evidence of wrongdoing as a common occurrence among public officials leads me to question whether we Americans have lost our capacity for outrage.

Has the estimation of public servants fallen so low that the events of the past months can be seen as an ordinary part of politics? I would hope not.

What has been happening reflects on every public servant, you and me included, aggravating the cynicism which is eroding democracy today. Unless Congress resolves to investigate these matters fully, Watergate will have afforded no lessons. Confirmation will be delayed, the office of the Director of Management and Budget will not be subjected to confirmation, the effectiveness of campaign reform will be voided and the accountability of the executive branch will be an illusion.

I am pleased to know that a call to conscience has been issued from the heartland of America, from the small community of Douglas, Wyo. Mrs. Betty Rider Bass, in an editorial in the Douglas Budget on March 22, asks questions which Congress cannot ignore.

She rightly appraises the Watergate and related episodes as an opportunity for Congress to compensate for past laxity and indifference and to address a demoralizing trend where wrongdoing is not fully called into account.

I urge my colleagues to read her editorial, "The Good Old Days—When a Scandal Was a Scandal," not because it tells us what is wrong with some administration actions but because it warns us that many Americans wonder what is wrong with government as a whole.

This is not a partisan statement. The citizens of Converse County supported the reelection of the President. For them, these questions are no matter of sour grapes.

Americans of both political parties ought to be alarmed at what has happened and we, in Congress, ought to act positively to reassure them that a scandal is still a scandal and housecleaning is still the rule in matters such as these.

THE GOOD OLD DAYS—WHEN A SCANDAL WAS A SCANDAL!

(By Betty Rider Bass)

Oh, for the good old days when a scandal was a scandal and everyone knew it as such!

Who will forget the vicuna coats or Bobby Baker? In those days, a person close to the President and involved in a shady dealing of any kind, was banished in disgrace.

And everyone knew it—and condemned the weak one—and his "boss".

But now—the magnitude of scandals under investigation by Senate committees is unbelievable . . . the far-reaching effects of the dishonest and totally underhanded Watergate bugging "caper"; the unexplained hundreds of thousands of dollars given to the re-election of the president committee . . . then tens of thousands of that money dispersed for apparently ulterior purposes—the acceptance by the Re-Election Committee of large sums of monies from corporations, a strictly illegal transaction. Even the sale of wheat to Russia was judged a sneaky way of allowing certain wheat dealers large profits from the sale.

Have people's ideas of right and wrong changed so much they are indifferent to such obvious wrongdoing on the part of the Administration? Was the President aware of what was going on in the above instances? If he wan't, he should re-evaluate his aides and advisors to see who actually is governing this land of ours.

Congress is attempting to make up for a number of years of laxity, compromise, possible indifference to its total responsibility to the American people. A little comfort is felt at seeing Republicans as well as Democrats become alarmed at the trend of government of our great country.

Not only lawmakers must be alarmed and vocal. It is everyone's duty to protest dishonesty and corruption in all levels of government—even though it's easier to turn one's head and hope someone else will do the protesting.

ABUSE OF CORPORATE POWER

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the disclosure of the attempt by the International Telegraph and Telephone Corp. to influence U.S. policy toward Chile should come as no surprise. After all, American corporations, for decades, have manipulated and subverted our foreign policy, when it suited them, in order to enhance their own economic interests. The ITT incident is but another chapter in this long history of the abuse of corporate power. In this respect, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the editorial which appeared in the March 22, 1973, New York Times:

I.T.T.'s BRAZEN BEHAVIOR

Sordid, even against the dreary backdrop of earlier revelations, are the latest disclosures about the effort of the International Telephone & Telegraph Corporation to block the democratic election of a President of Chile and to enlist United States Government help for that abortive project. On I.T.T.'s own testimony, if offered the White House and the Central Intelligence Agency a million-dollar contribution to underwrite a plan for preventing the election of Dr. Salvador Allende in 1970.

And who carried that offer to Henry A. Kissinger in the White House and to Richard Helms, then director of the C.I.A.? None other than Mr. Helms' distinguished predecessor as head of the intelligence organization, John A. McCone, still a consultant to the C.I.A. as well as a director of I.T.T. According to Mr. McCone, Mr. Helms had earlier promised "some minimal effort" by the C.I.A. to try to bring about Dr. Allende's defeat.

Mr. McCone says, and there is no reason to doubt him, that I.T.T. did not originate the plan for which the contribution was offered. But a year afer the offer, after Chile had expropriated the I.T.T.-controlled Chilean Telephone Company, the American conglomerate did submit to the White House an eighteen-point plan designed to insure "that Allende does not get through the crucial next six months."

William R. Merriman, an I.T.T. vice president, explained to a Senate subcommittee that Dr. Allende "had stolen our property without compensation," and that the company was simply trying to get help from the Government to force Chile "to pay us off. That's all we wanted." How can that statement be reconciled with the revelation that Mr. McCone's million-dollar offer was made even before Dr. Allende had been elected and a year before his Government moved against I.T.T.?

Here is exactly the kind of brazen behavior on the international scene that has given a bad name to giant American business firms and that prompted Senator Frank Church of Idaho to launch his investigation into their conduct. No Marxist critics, whether at home, in Chile or elsewhere, could inflict half as much damage on the standing of American international corporations or half as much discredit on the free enterprise system as has I.T.T.'s own behavior. Ironically, its antics have helped Dr. Allende enormously rather than hurting him.

While the record is still far from complete, there is no evidence yet that the Nixon Administration ever seriously considered the more extreme shenanigans which the corporation advocated to bring down Dr. Allende. Unfortunately, however, as a working paper of the Securities and Exchange Commission has disclosed, the Administration did come in force to the aid of I.T.T. in its successful effort to retain the Hartford Fire Insurance Company in a controversial 1971 antitrust settlement.

Thus if I.T.T. has furnished ample material for a book on how a giant corporation should not behave in the last half of the twentieth century, the Administration has supplied the stuff for a chapter on the pitfalls of a close relationship between such a firm and the Government.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

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

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

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

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

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

SEX DISCRIMINATION IN CREDIT

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, I had the opportunity to appear before a conference on "Women as Economic Equals" here in Washington to present my views on discrimination in the granting of credit on the basis of sex or marital status.

As you may be aware, my bills, H.R. 246, 247 and, 248—which I also introduced in the 92d Congress—would prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex in the granting of consumer credit, mortgage loans and all loans granted by banks or credit unions whose deposits are federally insured.

I look forward to early hearings on this legislation in the Banking and Currency Committee and fully expect that the 93d Congress will respond to the desires of 53 percent of the population by granting women equal credit opportunity.

I insert in the RECORD at this point the text of my statement before the conference:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSWOMAN BELLA S. ABZUG

If ever a woman is made to feel like a nonperson, it is when she applies for credit. However, capable and reliable she may be, she is treated—solely because of her sex—as though she were totally dependent and unreliable when she applies for a loan, consumer credit or a mortgage. If she is married, she receives credit *only* through her husband. He may be unemployed, unemployable, gone—or even dead; still she is often forced to get credit in his name.

Last May, hearings were held before the National Commission on Consumer Finance. As a result, a great many investigations were started by groups including N.O.W. and the Women's Legal Defense Fund. For example, inquiries were made of BankAmericard, asking that they state the qualifications by which they measure loan requests, such as minimum term of employment and residence, minimum income, co-signers needed and other factors. Three Northern Virginia banks referred these requests to the United Virginia BankAmericard Center, which sets the policy for all. The Center assured the writers that there were "no curent minimum requirements." Nonetheless, complaints from women about these same banks kept coming in. Let me give you a few illustrations:

October 1972: Equitable Trust refused to issue a card to a married women who would not have her husband co-sign. She was told that it couldn't be processed without his signature.

November '72: A married women requesting BankAmericard from a Maryland bank, received a card made out in her husband's name—though he had not asked for it. He was unemployed and the wife's income supported the family (as it true in a rising percentage of families). When the woman protested, she was told that "in Maryland, a woman's income doesn't count for anything"—and that it was a mistake to have issued a card to her at all.

August '72: A woman earning over $8,000 annually, and receiving $15,000 annually in child support from her former husband, was refused a credit card from Suburban Trust because she was "a newly separated person." When she inquired whether her former husband's credit card would be revoked for the same reason, she was told it would not but of course there was no sex discrimination involved; if he were to apply now, he might be refused also. (If so, it would certainly make history.)

March '73: A single woman who applied to United Virginia Bank and was refused, assumed it was because of a relatively short period of employment. A year later she reapplied and was told that she herself had to write her creditors to send references, though she makes $11,000 a year.

March '73: The Equitable Trust bank lends a note of charm by sending a letter of "congratulations on your marriage" to single card holders; but spoils it by adding that "we must now delete your account number, please return your card, enclosed is an application for your husband."

The pattern is clear: there is an actual abuse and misuse of law involved, since banks are regulated by a Federal agency to be operated in accordance with "sound banking policy." To issue credit cards to unemployed men but not women, to make women non-persons unless attached to males, is not sound banking policy nor sound business policy. In the instance we have discussed, National BankAmericard, Inc., should be urged to insist that its franchisee banks adopt non-discrimination policies in the issuance of credit cards to women.

It is hopeful to note that among the sponsors of this conference are the same banks mentioned in the complaints I reported. We can take this as an indication of their willingness to discuss the problem, to open their minds, and to change their policies.

But only legislation can effect real and permanent change. A few states have recently passed legislation prohibiting sex discrimination in mortgage loans. They are: Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, Maryland, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, South Dakota. Washington State has passed legislation covering all forms of credit and financing; other states that have introduced such measures include Connecticut, Georgia, New York and Texas. New York has State and local (New York City) statutes prohibiting discrimination in the financing of housing.

Credit discrimination on the basis of sex is not only irrelevant and unfair but a peculiarly paralyzing form of denial of opportunity: without credit, a woman cannot get loans and therefore cannot go into business.

I have introduced in this session of Congress three bills, H.R. 246, 247, and 248, which go to the heart of the problem, which I'm sure many of you are familiar with.

The first bill, H.R. 248, covers all federally insured banks, savings and loan associations and credit unions. It would prohibit any of these institutions from discriminating against anyone because of sex or marital status.

A study on banking practices done by the St. Paul, Minnesota, Department of Human Rights revealed widespread abuses by banks in that city toward women. The conclusions of the report were that:

Approximately 39% of the banks interviewed revealed discrepancies in the loan policies stated to males and females: Two banks allowed the male interviewed to obtain a loan when under the same set of circumstances they would not make any statement or commitment to the female interviewed. Three banks that had a policy of requiring both signatures on a loan would make an exception for the male interviewer but not the female interviewer. Two banks would allow the male interviewer to receive a loan without his wife's signature, but would not allow the female to receive the same loan without her husband's signature. Two banks would grant a loan to a married man but the same loan is an exception to policy for married women.

This bill would eliminate these abuses by making it illegal for institutions covered by the bill to engage in any of the practices just described.

The second bill, H.R. 246, relates to mortgage transactions. Loans which are federally-related mortgage loans will be subject to the same prohibition against discrimination because of sex or marital status. The coverage is broad. The term, federally-related loans, includes any loan which is secured by residential real property and is made in whole or in part by *any* bank or other financial institution, the deposits or accounts of which are insured by any agency of the Federal government. Other lenders are covered also, but the point I want to make is that this is a critical and necessary area that has long been ignored. The men that control the mortgage market have effectively prohibited women heads of households from exercising their right to use money for shelter, one of our basic rights.

The unique feature of these two bills is their disclosure requirements: the leader must disclose to the appropriate Federal Agency why credit applications were turned down, and keep records that will be available to the public so that banking practices can be documented and possibly used in suits against offending institutions. In order to protect borrowers' rights of privacy, individual borrowers may elect to keep records of their applications secret.

The third bill, H.R. 247, amends the Truth-in-Lending Act to cover discrimination on the basis of sex or marital status in the granting of consumer credit.

George Williams, director of Parents Without Partners, says that his organization represents "85,000 case histories" of women who have suffered from the tendency of financial officers to moralize. The only solution, he says, is the legislative process, which can free women from the effect of male bias.

It is time that women exercise their right to take part in *all* aspects of American economic life. There is no rational reason to have any sort of obstacle to women who want to exercise their economic rights. I hope that all of you will urge the Congress to support this legislation and end the discriminatory practices which have for too long prevailed in the area of finance and credit.

EXTENDING WEST FRONT OF CAPITOL

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I believe that my colleagues would find the thoughts of the American Institute of

Architects helpful in their considerations on the upcoming vote to extend the west front of the Capitol.

The material follows:

RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT THE SEPTEMBER 1971 MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

The final report of the Task Force on the West Front of the Capitol was presented by Milton L. Grigg, FAIA, Chairman and is in the appendix of these minutes.

Resolved, That the AIA accepts the Task Force Report on the West Front of the Capitol, endorses and supports its findings and recommendations, and directs that this report be promulgated as reaffirmation of existing AIA policy; and, be it further

Resolved, That the AIA Board express appreciation to the members of the Task Force and the Architect of the Capitol for their cooperation.

REPORT OF THE 1971 AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS TASK FORCE ON THE WEST FRONT OF THE U.S. CAPITOL, SEPTEMBER 1, 1971

In response to a request from George M. White, FAIA, Architect of the Capitol . . . "to have The American Institute of Architects review the information and circumstances involved in the proposed extension of the West Front of the United States Capitol," the President of The American Institute of Architects, Robert F. Hastings, FAIA, appointed a review Task Force.

The AIA members appointed by President Hastings to this Task Force were: Milton L. Grigg, FAIA, Chairman; William W. Caudill, FAIA; Leon Chatelain, Jr., FAIA; Francis D. Lethbridge, FAIA; Harry M. Weese, FAIA; and Maurice Payne, AIA, Staff.

They were directed by President Hastings, "to examine AIA's position on the West Front of the Capitol now that the engineering report (the Praeger Report) has been submitted."

The full Task Force met at AIA Headquarters in Washington, D.C. on May 26 & 27, 1971, to review background material previously distributed including the Praeger-Kavanaugh-Waterbury report on "Feasibility and Cost Study for Restoration of the West Central Front of the United States Capitol." Architect White, Assistant Architect of the Capitol Mario E. Campioli, AIA, and Philip L. Roof, Executive Assistant to the Capitol Architect, met for a period of time with the Task Force and were the gracious hosts for a general tour of the Capitol building by the Task Force on the afternoon of May 26th.

Subsequent detailed inspections of the Capitol and informal meetings with the Capitol Architect were held.

RESTORE THE WEST CENTRAL FRONT OF THE U.S. CAPITOL

Having studied and analyzed the report by Praeger-Kavanaugh-Waterbury on "Feasibility and Cost Study—Restoration of the West Central Front—United States Capitol—January 1971", the AIA Task Force is unanimous in endorsement of the method of analysis, the general findings and the conclusions of the report. It offers conclusive evidence to sustain the Institute's resolution for, and belief in the practicality of restoration of the West Front in situ.

It is our opinion that the proposed restoration as recommended by the Praeger Report fulfills the five conditions for restoration as set down by Congress in Public Law 91-145:

1. That the restoration can, without undue hazard, be made safe, sound, durable and beautiful for the foreseeable future.

2. That restoration can be accomplished with no more vacation of the west central space than would be required by any extension plan.

3. The Praeger Report provides proper methods of restoration. The Task Force recognizes that the work could be done on a competitive, lump sum, fixed price construction bid or bids but we feel that competitive bidding or a fixed profit and overhead with the work being done on a cost basis should be strongly considered in the same way the White House resoration was accomplished.

4. It would be impossible for anyone at this stage of study to guarantee a total restoration cost. However, the Task Force felt that the Praeger Report methods and budget allowed adequate contingency.

5. The Task Force is certain that the restoration work would not exceed the projected time estimated for accomplishing the extension plan.

This Task Force recommends that the present perimeter facades of the Capitol building be declared inviolable and the surrounding grounds, bounded by First Streets, East and West, and Independence and Constitution Avenues, be declared open space, devoid of significant structures protruding above present grade levels. Extant mature tree groupings in these surrounding grounds also should be declared inviolable and subsurface development be encouraged but confined to areas now either in grass, paving or shrubbery.

PREPARE A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROPERTIES UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL AND THE SURROUNDING AREAS

The Task Force observed, that the present space usage in the Capitol is crowded, misused, or underused; that many functions now located in the Capitol have questionable need of being there; and some functions are duplicated. The Task Force was made aware of the need for additional space by Members of the House of Representatives, especially space adjacent to the House Chamber.

Present preliminary findings of the Architect of the Capitol, following a space need study of the House of Representatives, would seem to indicate that any proposed future extension of the Capitol will not begin to meet present, least of all projected space needs.

The Task Force reaffirms the AIA's historic position that Master Planning of the Capitol must be undertaken if impetuous action by the Congress is to be avoided. This planning should include 1) an inventory space utilization of present buildings; 2) an analysis of floor area ration within the confines of the present Capitol area; 3) a study of possible new land acquisition; 4) a study with particular reference to below surface development capability, categories of use, and environmental factors.

Consideration must be given to the displacing of routine services or lower priority functions now occupying space in the Capitol to new locations.

With the realization of the Metro system, the Visitor's Center at Union Station and the emergence of new people-mover systems, all parking should be removed and the Capitol's surrounding grounds cleared of all but official business cars. New systems of shuttles, horizontal elevators and even a Metro branch should be considered. They could provide fast, automatic, safe and frequent service between all of the buildings in the Capitol complex and would make ready proximity a question of time rather than distance.

It is the recommendation of the Task Force that the Architect of the Capitol could and should request the counsel and guidance of leading architects and other design professionals. Since the future of our Capitol is of deep concern to all Americans, their gratuitous participation in the development of a comprehensive plan can be expected.

TASK FORCE OBSERVATIONS ON THE PRAEGER REPORT

Settlement

(1) Soil pressures are such that there is a 2-to-1 factor of safety.

(2) Further settlement can be expected over the next 150 years, but in order of the ½ inch of the past, which occurred at the outset.

(3) There has been no evidence of differential settlement.

Cracking

(1) Thermal movement and frost action over the years, as between the interior rubble wall and the sandstone face, has caused local failure of cut stone creating a natural pattern of vertical cracks from top to bottom approximately 30 feet apart.

This is a natural phenomenon which designed control joints obviate. The report recommends making control joints of the existing pattern of cracks. There is no reporting of settlement cracking nor out-of-plumb walls.

Erosion and spalling

(1) Sandstone weathers well when laid on bed faces for natural drainage of trapped moisture from within the wall. Improper stone cutting in some cases, but more important, the use of oil paint over the years, has trapped moisture and contributed to surface spalling. The effect is superficial and akin to accelerated weathering. Modern paints which allow the wall to breathe obviate this. The aesthetic effect is that of time making its mark. No attempt should be made to deny these minor inroads of time.

(2) Significant deterioration was noted on marble surfaces on the Olmsted terraces—a condition that should "flash a warning" whenever future consideration is given to wearability of various stone surfaces.

Loose or cracked stones

(1) Certain stones, voussoris, flat arches, quois, and cornice members are in need of affixing to the backup masonry. They are visible and can be treated with modern rock bolting techniques and post tensioning.

Wall Strength

(1) The facing stone is bonded to the rubble wall with alternate courses, making a physical bond uniting the wall in a series of vertical shafts separated by the aforementioned natural control joints. These walls are over 4 feet thick at the foundations. They are not overstressed, taking 236 p.s.i. maximum loading with the stone itself capable of 6000 in the case of sandstone and 14,000 for rubble fieldstone. The lime mortar is the limiting factor, but there is no reporting of vertical displacement or cracking of interior walls. It is proposed that a grout injection to fill voids in the mortar matrix and bond the exterior wall to the interior would add strength.

After paint removal and patching and further measurements, it may prove that grout injection could be limited to the lowest story or localized or could be eliminated altogether. It is not clear that so-called solidification of the wall is called for, but this task force defers to the judgement of the Praeger report.

(2) On page 10, near the conclusion of the portion of the report on the experimental wall grouting, amplification and clarification would seem desirable. The type of epoxy as a final bonding material is questioned and should be clarified to the extent that description is not found with respect to the viscosity of the material proposed. Elsewhere, it is reported that various formulations seem to be identified. Futhermore, experience elsewhere indicates that ferrous metals and certain epoxy compounds are not mutually compatible and that deterioration may occur in both materials through chemical action; hence, use of iron reinforcing rods should be evaluated.

(3) There is discussion of the thermal effect of solidification of the wall resulting from the infilling of the present cavity. This phenomenon is not discussed in great detail other than to conclude that there is to be predicted a 10% net increase in heat gain or heat loss in the solidified wall. The effect of

this change in the internal structure of walls of such comparatively great mass bears closer investigation.

It is probable that it will require an interval of time, perhaps 18 months to 2 years, for the long stabilized thermal and hydro balance within the walls to become re-established, responsive to modifications resulting from the filling of the voids and the possible modification in the reverse permeability or breathing property of the wall.

Moisture

(1) It is difficult to accept the categorical statement that "condensation in the wall will not occur during the summer". The computations on Figure 22 do not appear to indicate a recognition of the lag in change of the ambient humidity and temperature of the internal wall volume and it is possibly questionable whether the conclusions shown thereon are valid without further experimental documentation.

(2) The Praeger Report does not contain a bibliography, therefore the following paper may have been available to the authors. Reference is made to *Consolidation des Monuments D'Architecture par injection dans les Maconneries,* Moscau N. Zvorikine. From this, it is seen that the Russian experiences indicate that the epoxy infilling should not be impermeable to moisture; therefore, the formulation of the material ultimately used should be investigated in light of these reported results it was found that the dilution of the epoxy with a solvent helped to provide better penetration and greater adhesion and, at the asme time, did not produce a mass incapable of "breathing". In the same connection, we were informed by Dr. R. M. Organ, Chief, Conservation—Analytical Laboratory, Smithsonian Institution, that Savestone is an excellent material, particularly if the manufacturers are at this time employing the Lewin Sayre patents. Acrylic plastic compounds have elsewhere been found to be very deleterious in these uses and should be avoided. The Report suggests quite discouraging results from the several experimental methods of removing the old paint from the stone. From other sources, it has been found that the Methylene Chloride paint remover which was used, while not formulated for removal from stone surfaces, actually can be made very effective when combined with a neutral jelly to create an emulsion, keeping the mixture moist for a longer period. (Actually, in the results cited, the coated stone surfaces were covered with aluminum foil to prevent accelerated evaporation.) The latter expedient might increase the effectiveness of the gel remover reported. In this connection, it is somewhat surprising to find that the report does not cover the matter of vapor transmission more positively. It would seem desirable to investigate the advantages of providing a vapor barrier back of the plaster on exterior wall surfaces. It is possible that this will alleviate the tendency for plaster fatigue through thermal and moisture changes as well as more effectively stabilizing the moisture content of the interior of the interior of the wall volume. This vapor barrier, if found to be necessary, could be of the framed-in-place variety, thus avoiding extensive replastering.

(3) Apparently, the authors of the Report have not found conditions to indicate the desirability of horizontal moisture barriers in the base of the walls to offset the capillary action often found in walls of this mass and porous character.

Performance design

(1) The Praeger Report analyzes the structure and loadings of the West Front portion of the Capitol building and proves they are within the parameters of sound practice. The effects of static and dynamic loadings and soil pressures due to dead load, live load, wind and seismic forces, and sonic booms have been given complete attention and analysis.

Painting

(1) The continued use of oil paint in many applications 15 to 105 mils thick has caused accelerated but not severe weathering. Modern breathing paints will obviate this difficulty. The Capitol is made of three materials: yellowish sandstone (original wings), Walter's marble House and Senate extended wings, marble East Front extension and the cast iron dome. White paint on the sandstone and dome is used to unify the ensemble. This has been the style for more than 100 years. The White House is painted stone. London abounds in painted stone. The tradition of painting should continue.

INDEPENDENT LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration has in the works yet another device by which to deny millions a fundamental right guaranteed them by our Constitution.

The millions are the poor, the elderly, the infirm—those who need help most.

The right is representation in the legal process by competent counsel.

It is important at this particular time, when drastic cuts are being made in so many social programs, that the legal services program remain intact and above the political fray.

The Nixon administration is preparing legislation to set up State corporations, destroying the concept of a national independent legal services corporation. Each State corporation, funded through revenue sharing would be under a separate board of directors. One suggestion is that the directors be chosen by the State legislature, another that they be designated by the State bar association. This would clearly be far more likely to subject the program to political control, making it difficult, if not impossible for the poor to pursue the rights and remedies guaranteed to them under the law.

I would like to submit a letter from the directors of MFY Legal Services in New York City. Since the program began, MFY has been providing legal assistance to thousands of people in low income areas of Manhattan. Without these offices, and those around the country like them, literally millions of people would have nowhere to go to seek redress of their legal grievances.

We must create a strong and Independent Legal Services Corporation to guarantee that all citizens will have equal access to all available remedies under the law.

The letter and a relevant article follow:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 12, 1973]

WHITE HOUSE PLANS CHANGES IN LEGAL AID TO POOR THAT CRITICS SAY WILL WEAKEN PROGRAM

(By Warren Weaver, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—The White House is drafting fundamental changes in Federal legal services for the poor aimed at decentralizing them and, in the eyes of its critics, seriously undermining the program.

According to private lawyers who have been consulted, the Nixon Administration is preparing legislation to replace the Office of Legal Services with a national legal services corporation that would serve as a transitional agency while separate corporations were being set up in each of the 50 states.

Each state corporation, funded through revenue sharing, would be under a board of directors. One suggestion is that the directors be chosen by the state legislature; another, that they be designated by the state bar association. Earlier drafts would have given the Governor direct control over the board.

Supporters of the legal services program fear that, one way or another, this would subject the effort to political control, making it difficult, if not impossible, for poor people to bring class action suits against the governmental and economic establishment. Such suits were one of the original purposes of the program.

"These boards are likely to be full of retired lawyers, party contributors or men with political connections, who have damn little sympathy for the idea of welfare recipients going into court to challenge the state government," predicted one lawyer.

Some sort of legislation is essential to keep the legal services program in operation because its parent agency, the Office of Economic Opportunity, is being dismantled by the Nixon Administration and will cease to exist within three to four months.

Leading Congressional Democrats have introduced legislation for a legal services corporation that would continue to operate the program on a national basis. The White House has endorsed the idea of a corporation but has not yet made public any details of its version of the organization or its aims.

Unless bipartisan agreement can be reached, supporters of the activity fear that President Nixon would veto a Democratic plan, ending the program altogether.

Under one draft of the Administration bill, any state that declined to set up its own legal services program would still be subject to a program operated by the national corporation. Such a system, however, could permit a state with little enthusiasm for the program to set up its own version but then keep it as inactive as possible.

White House proposals call for the board of the national corporation to be appointed by the President. Critics would like to make its members subject to Senate confirmation.

One source of concern to backers of legal services is the fact that, under the Administration plan, Congress would play no part in drafting guidelines for the state programs and, thus, in attempting to insure that some sort of effective activity continued.

MFY LEGAL SERVICES, INC.,
New York, N.Y., March 15, 1973.

Congresswoman BELLA ABZUG,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN ABZUG: The issue of the future shape of legal services to the nation's poor will soon be before Congress in an immediate way. We understood that the Administration's legal services bill will be introduced within the next several weeks. It, together with the three bills now pending, will supply the framework within which Congress will consider legal services.

Evidently, as reported by Warren Weaver, Jr. in the New York Times of Monday, March 12, 1973 (a copy of the Times article is enclosed) the Administration is seriously considering a revenue sharing scheme involving the establishment of separate legal services corporations in each state. Presumably, under this approach, each state would establish its own policies and administer its own

legal services program, financed by revenue sharing funds.

We (and we believe, most persons knowledgeable about and concerned with an independent and nonpolitical legal services program) are strongly opposed to the revenue sharing and state control plan attributed to the Administration. We believe that this approach would maximize the possibility of political interference with our programs and would make far more difficult our goal of operating a mature, responsible and stable law practice to the benefit of indigent citizens.

The eight year history of OEO funded legal services is replete with examples of attempts on the part of state and local governments to politicize legal services programs. In states as diverse as California, Connecticut, Missouri and Mississippi, governors have attempted to control or subvert the legitimate, traditional and professionally mandated representation of poverty clients by their attorneys. It is easy to predict that, under the revenue sharing and local control approach, many states would, by the choice of their governors, have no, or only the most hollow of, legal services for the poor. Even in those states which will establish programs (New York would probably be one) we can anticipate that such programs would be far more susceptible of political pressure than would a national program. For example, we fully believe that a powerful and well-financed commercial real estate lobby concerned about the vigor of legal services representation of poor tenants may well find readier listeners to its complaints in Albany than in Washington.

Moreover, we share with the American Bar Association and others the conviction that our programs must be operated in accord with the highest of professional standards. We believe that this will be much more difficult to achieve with 50 individual programs, each of which will relate most directly to different state bar associations with differing standards and likely with differing ideas about the ethical responsibilities of poverty lawyers. We submit that a national standard is preferable.

The President has in the past, repeatedly voiced his support for the concept of a national legal services corporation. So, too, have the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, The New York County Lawyers Association, The New York State Bar, the National Legal Aid and Defender Association and legal services people throughout the country. It is difficult to understand why, in the face of this unanimity of opinion by concerned and knowledgeable persons and organizations, the revenue sharing and local control approach seems to have surfaced. One can only speculate that its advocates do not wish to see a vigorous, independent, responsible national program which can truly deliver on the American promise of equal access by the poor, as well as by the rich, to our system of social justice.

It is our sense that the revenue sharing and local control struggle will be much more difficult if this approach is, in fact, embodied in the Administration bill soon to be introduced in Congress. Since we gather that the Administration bill is not yet fully formulated, we ask that you use your good offices within the White House to urge the President to proceed, as he has suggested in the past that he would, with a national legal services corporation.

We earnestly submit that one national legal services corporation and not 50 state corporations will best serve the interest of our indigent clients. If you agree, we and our client communities will be most grateful for your efforts to that end.

If you feel you need further information or details, we would be happy to meet with you or a member of your staff at your convenience.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE C. STEWART.
NANCY E. LEBLANC.

CONGRESS AS THE CRISIS

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, this year, a great deal of ink has been used discussing the "constitutional crisis" over impoundment of funds. Earlier I expressed the view that Congress was as responsible as the President for the current situation. Secretary Weinberger has written the New York Times expanding on this theme and I submit it for printing in the RECORD. While I may differ on a few points with the Secretary, the basic thesis stands up under scrutiny.

The article follows:

CONGRESS AS THE CRISIS

(By Caspar W. Weinberger)

WASHINGTON.—The avalanche of newspaper articles on the so-called "constitutional crisis" would be more useful to the public if the issues they describe were not so patently false.

The public deserves to understand precisely what is involved in this media-made "crisis"—which basically is nothing more and nothing less than a full-scale battle over whether or not Federal taxes will be raised.

President Nixon, in line with his re-election campaign pledge, has submitted a budget that eliminates now, and for at least three more years, any need to raise taxes—while permitting responsible spending increases for programs that work. Congress wants to boost spending far beyond the $19 billion increase for fiscal year 1974 proposed by President Nixon.

That is the crux of the "crisis," and no amount of high-flown rhetoric, including in The New York Times, about "constitutional questions" or "the precarious relationship between the Executive and Congress" should be allowed to obscure it from the people most involved in its outcome—the taxpayers who foot the bill.

Only Presidential intervention prevented an additional $11-billion increase in this fiscal year's budget. Left to its own devices, Congress had created a spending momentum that would have pushed the budget $19-billion above President Nixon's 1974 request, and $24 billion above the President's proposals for 1975.

The results of such a spending binge were and are predictable: Either taxes would have to be raised, or we would fuel still another round of runaway inflation, or both. President Nixon acted responsibly to forestall these threats to our nation's economy. And he did it in the face of predictions from virtually every outside economist and columnist that a tax increase in 1973 was inevitable.

The President accompanied this by setting a spending ceiling and, when it was clear that ceiling would be exceeded, impounded sums appropriated by Congress. Incidentally, both houses of Congress agreed, separately, that a $250-billion spending ceiling was proper. Yet less than a week later they adjourned, having exceeded that ceiling by $11 billion in spending they believed was required.

Historians have been quoted to the effect that these Presidential impoundments are unprecedented in scope. That is inaccurate. A check of previous budgetary actions by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson shows that both consistently impounded a higher percentage of funds than President Nixon.

Here are the facts: As of Jan. 29 of this year, 3.5 per cent of the total unified budget was being impounded. That compares with 7.8 per cent on June 30, 1961, under President Kennedy, 6.1 per cent in 1962, 4 per cent in 1963; 3.5 per cent in 1964 under President Johnson's first budget, 4.7 per cent in 1965, 6.5 per cent in 1966, 6.7 per cent in 1967, and 5.5 per cent in 1968. So much for the "unprecedented impoundments" myth.

President Nixon's second step was to order the most exhaustive evaluation of Federal programs ever undertaken. Those in the Office of Management and Budget who conducted the evaluation used only one criterion: Does the program work?

Of the more than 1,000 Federal grants programs reviewed, 115 were found to be riddled with waste and inefficiency. There is no money for such programs in President Nixon's 1974 budget.

Included were programs that build ponds and decorative fences for gentlemen farmers; build hospitals where an excess of hospital beds exists; subsidize urban renewal to the principal benefit of land speculators; subsidize public school education in some of the wealthiest communities in the nation at the expense of some of the poorest; and subsidize teacher training when 70,000 teachers already are without jobs.

Every dollar wasted on such programs means a dollar withheld from those who truly need and deserve our help.

Presidential critics have also been quoted as saying that Congress was being denied access to the Administration staff. In fact, President Kennedy invoked "executive privilege"—and thereby kept key staff from appearing before Congress—six times in three years. President Nixon has exercised the same privilege only four times in more than four years.

If the media want to focus on a legitimate governmental crisis, they would do well to summon public attention to the antiquated and illogical manner in which the Congress attempts to enact the budget. Nowhere among its 300-odd committees and subcommittees, each responsible for a small portion of the budget, is there one focal point where a goal or spending ceiling can be set and monitored to assure spending sanity.

Until the Congress gets its budget-making house in order, it is clear that strong Presidential leadership is the only weapon the people have to prevent higher taxes and ruinous inflation. If that is a constitutional crisis, it is clear that it was long overdue.

TESTIMONY OF ROSS PEROT

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, last week, on Wednesday, March 21, Mr. Ross Perot, chairman of the board of Electronic Data System, Inc., appeared at the tax reform hearings now being held by the House Ways and Means Committee and presented his views relating to the tax treatment of capital gains. Without taking a position on the content of his statement, I feel that he

made a most provocative suggestion that is deserving of much closer examination.

Because of the broad interest of the members of the committee in his novel suggestion for stimulating investment, I felt that many of my colleagues might wish to review his prepared testimony and I therefore insert his prepared statement at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

TESTIMONY OF ROSS PEROT

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, my name is Ross Perot, Chairman of the ad hoc Committee on Capital Gains. I am the Chairman of the Board of Electronic Data Systems, Inc., and also the major investor in du Pont Glore Forgan, an investment banking and brokerage firm.

Thank you for allowing me to appear before you today. Although I never had the opportunity to acquire formal training in business, tax law or economics, I have had the unique experience in living and working in almost every strata of our economic system. During most of my life I lived and worked under very modest circumstances, at times not having enough to make ends meet, at other times making just enough, and more recently having been extremely fortunate in building a successful business.

In the past two years I have become a careful student of our capital raising system as a result of our investments in Wall Street. As a result of these various experiences, I have acquired a practical working knowledge of most phases of our economy, our capital system, and the impact of our tax system upon it.

The most valuable resource in the American economic system is the working American. It is the working American who makes our country the world's largest market for goods and service.

It is the working American who is the backbone of our tax system.

It is the working American who, as buyer, creates business growth, business profits and business taxes.

It is the working American who, as investor, helps to create his own job and jobs for others by his investments in common stocks; mutual funds; participation in investment groups; or, more indirectly, by investment in common stocks through his retirement or profit sharing funds.

Collectively, he is the world's largest financial institution. Only he can provide sufficient money to allow our capital needs to be met.

In short, the working American is an economic miracle, supporting his family and bearing the burdens of his city, his state and his nation.

It is of and for this working American that I wish to speak today.

I believe that the working American needs a tax break. America's working families need a government policy which encourages and permits them to accumulate a stake—to accumulate capital—so that they can enjoy, as others enjoy, a meaningful share in the growth and gain of this economy.

Under our system, success assumes one fundamental point—that each willing American worker has a job available to him. Jobs can never be taken for granted.

During our lifetimes, we have seen men looking for jobs that did not exist. We have seen the defeat and despair on good men's faces who could not provide for their families. None of us want to see that again. It is only as a working American that the average American can continue to be our most important resource. Our national planning objective should be to see that the working American continues to have a job—a better job. The better his job, the larger customer he becomes and the United States continues to grow as the collective customer. We must also create many new jobs as our population expands—we must see that his children have jobs.

If these fundamental goals are to be met, we must be mindful of the intricacies of our economic system. Its workings and interrelations are much like those of a complex watch. Adjust one part improperly and you damage the entire mechanism.

All of us are concerned about the deterioration of America's competitive position. We have seen our country lose its leadership role in one industry after another. We are determined to regain that role. We must make the words, "Made in USA" the symbols of excellence, and competitive cost. There is no question that we can do it. There is no question that we must do it. The question is how do we do it.

We can take a number of intermediate steps to protect our economic system by taking full advantage of the fact that we are the world's largest customer. The millions of working Americans are the buyers in this market. At a time when other nations are able to sell goods and services at a lower cost than the United States, the fact that we are the principal country to sell to, and the average American is the principal buyer, may provide the key to our future economic stability. The sooner we do this, the better.

During this period while we operate under this temporary umbrella, we must take the long-term steps necessary to regain our true competitive position. First, if that is to be accomplished, it is imperative that we spend hundreds of billions of dollars to modernize and expand our industrial capacity in order to allow the working American, with his high standards of living, to compete effectively with his counterparts around the world. This is going to take money—lots of money—more money than we have ever raised before in our country. It is that money—that massive new investment—which will protect the jobs we have and create the jobs we must have in the future.

Second, during this same period, we are going to have to launch and complete a very expensive search for new energy sources. We must complete a huge expansion of our public utility systems. Dramatic improvements must be made to our cities. The list of requirements is endless.

What mechanism will we use to raise this money? The United States capital market is without question the finest in the world. Ask any businessman from any other country. There is only one Wall Street. It is a great resource for accomplishing our national goals. Simply stated, it is an alternative to oppressive taxes. What I am saying, though, is that we must strengthen this capital market, because it is going to have unique and urgent demands made on it during the next few years.

For purposes of my discussion, I would like to have us think of the New York Stock Exchange and the other major stock exchanges in our country simply as scoreboards reflecting corporate performance. Under normal conditions, as a company is growing in size and profits, the stock will rise. It is a winning company. It pays more taxes and creates new jobs, with each new worker being a new taxpayer. If every company were a winning company, we wouldn't have to be preoccupied with raising more taxes, trade deficits, and the like. The taxes from these companies and their employees would be more than adequate to meet our growing needs.

There is one unique characteristic about these scoreboards though—the scores can go down as well as up. There are those in this country who assume that no matter what conditions prevail, the scoreboards will always reflect corporate performance. The facts are—this scoreboard also reflects the willingness of people to invest in America's businesses.

In plain talk, I am saying that these scoreboards could conceivably flicker or even go out if the capital markets are badly enough abused. I have seen the scoreboard flicker. I invested sixty-five million dollars to keep the scoreboard lights burning at a time of crisis. The fact that I took a risk of this size is the strongest evidence I can give you of my conviction that we must keep the financial springs flowing in this country without interruption.

Now, if I may, I would like to focus on capital. Perhaps we could think of the flow of capital in the United States as being comparable to the Mississippi River. Looking at this great river, it is inconceivable that the water in it could ever dry up. True, it will have periods of high water and low water, but there is always sufficient water to move the ships and barges down the river.

The flow of capital in the United States, because of its massive size, is comparable to the Mississippi River. However, the Mississippi River has its springs, creeks, small rivers, and other tributaries. Simply by clogging the springs and damming the tributaries, it would be possible to turn the Mississippi River into a ditch. In the same fashion, if we should clog the springs and other tributaries of our capital market, it too, could turn into a dry and empty ditch at a time when it should be at full flow.

Once again, I come back to the average working American. He is the key. The millions of individual investors in our country, the American workers, are like the springs that are the source of the many tributaries that form the Mississippi River. We must make investing in our companies an attractive option to him. Only he has enough money to finance the work that must be done. Collectively, the individual investors make up the world's largest financial institution.

Money moves around the world. Like the ocean tides, money ebbs and flows, forming huge pools in various places at varying times. Right now, too much is flowing away from our country, and even the dollar is threatened, because the world's largest customer, the working American, can best satisfy some of his wants by purchasing goods made in other countries. Our challenge in this decade, in order to protect our jobs and our tax base, is simply to get the money flowing back our way.

At a time when our principal economic competitors, the Germans and the Japanese, are subsidizing business and charging no capital gains taxes—at a time when these governments have shown a total understanding of the importance of industry creating jobs—it is a paradox that some people in our country are proposing programs under the guise of fairness that would dramatically weaken our international competitive position.

What we are discussing here today can impact millions of working people in a positive or very negative way.

As you know, the greatest wisdom in our country comes from the everyday people. Recently, a construction worker came up to me in an airport and handed me an envelope. He said, "I am from the mountains of West Virginia. We have a saying out there that you will like." Scrawled in pencil were these words, "There ain't many hunters, but everybody wants the meat." That says it all. The hunters make this country great. The hunters are the workers—the taxpayers. Our challenge is to develop as many hunters as possible. We have a delicate balance in our Nation between the taxpayer who produces more than he uses, and the tax user who cannot produce as much as he needs. In every possible way, we must move the balance to favor those who can and will build the tax base.

At this time, our financial springs should be flowing at the maximum rate to provide the money to create the plants, the jobs, and the new streets, roads, and the other improvements to our cities. Some are proposing

that we raise capital gains taxes. This will have the effect of clogging the springs. Why?

Simply because the average American has an option about where to invest his money. If there is not an economic advantage to investing in our capital system, with the possibility of gain as well as loss, he will invest his money in other areas. The financial tributaries will begin to dry up, and our capital rivers will begin to drop—just at the time when we need to have these rivers full to the banks.

The proposal I want to make will cause the financial springs to flow to fill the capital river. The markets will become liquid. Our economy will become strong, as we build the new plants and make our industries more competitive. Most importantly, I know through my own experience that the hardest part of the American economic system is getting started. This proposal will allow people who work and strive and save to get started—and get ahead.

My capital gains tax proposal is simple. The millions of ordinary citizens who work, pay taxes, save money, and dream that their children will have a better opportunity, are the financial backbone of this country. Only they have enough money to save and invest for the huge capital expansion necessary to make and keep the United States competitive.

Therefore, I propose—That every American be given the opportunity to accumulate $100,000 in capital gains—tax free, in other words, up to a lifetime total of that amount. This is meant only for the average working American who is trying to accumulate a stake in life which all American families want and need.

Another economic miracle will take place if this materializes. We will be building a whole new base of substantial taxpayers. Once these taxpayers cross the $100,000 threshold, I propose that they be taxed in the same way all other capital gains taxes are handled. In addition to building a new tax base of substantial individuals in this country, we will reap additional benefits from improved corporate earnings and from the many new jobs created by these capital investments.

What does all this mean to the typical middle-aged worker? It means a great deal. Maybe he doesn't want to invest. However, in all probability his retirement income is tied to stock values. Profit sharing funds are also invested in securities. Damage the capital market in this country and prices will drop. The price of a blue-chip stock such as IBM is only worth what someone will pay for it. Keeping industry strong and the market liquid protects the middle-aged worker's job, protects the value of his retirement funds, keeps down the costs of such basic services as electricity, water, and gas. Damage the securities markets and you impose a huge additional tax burden on this middle-aged worker.

I know I speak for this average American also when I say that he considers it very important for his children to have an opportunity to achieve goals and dreams beyond his own grasp.

I am sure you are wondering what sort of capital gains tax I would propose for persons in my category. I will leave that to your judgment. It would be self-serving for me to discuss this, although I will say that I certainly expect to pay my fair share.

It is fundamentally important to give the man who is trying to get started a chance to get ahead. We can best do this by allowing him to invest in our country's future—the businesses that provide the jobs. As these jobs grow, he will grow. As he grows, the tax base grows. As that happens, the United States becomes stronger.

A current catch phrase is, "Money made by money should be taxed like money made by men". While catchy, this statement is invalid. It equates two totally different types of money—income money and investment money—as being the same and operating in the same environment.

Both fish and cattle are sources of meat. It would be illogical to take the position that since both fish and cattle represent meat, that both could be grown in the same environment. Fish require water. Cattle require pasture. Investment money cannot be grown in the same environment as ordinary income for the simple reason that the investor has options about where to invest his money—or whether he will invest it at all.

In addition, this catch phrase incorrectly assumes that a job will exist to allow "Money to be made by men". It incorrectly assumes that the capital money rivers will always flow. These money rivers, like water, will seek alternate sources if the channels are clogged. Seriously, this catch phrase misses a fundamental point, in that it assumes that the market—the scoreboard—will stay constant no matter what happens to the financial springs. The scoreboard will, in fact, drop as the financial springs dry up. Maybe the best answer I can give is that if I were running our Internal Revenue Service, I would rather collect a 35% tax on a $100 stock than a 70% tax on a $40 stock. You logically say, "But will the stocks really go down?" The answer is an unequivocal "Yes".

Fewer people will invest. Stock prices will drop.

Industry will have difficulty raising new money to modernize its plants.

Profits will drop.

Stock prices will drop further.

Men will be laid off.

The tax base will wither.

If we are to raise the capital requirements for our future, the working American must be given opportunity through our tax laws to become a participating capitalist.

I propose that he be given a proper incentive to share in capital gains—and that faith in him will be returned to us manyfold by his faith in his own land, his own system.

Again the words, "Made in USA" will become the hallmark of excellence and economy.

DESALTERS AND WATER RECLAMATION—A CALL FOR NATIONAL PARTICIPATION

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, suppliers of drinking water nationwide have been invited to participate in the National Water Supply Improvement Association, which is dedicating itself to promoting desalination, water reclamation and other water sciences in the interest of raising the quality of substandard water supplies.

As we consider legislation for new drinking water standards it is well to keep in mind that today many hundreds of thousands of Americans in three-quarters of the States do not have available drinking water that meets the old recommended Public Health Service standards.

In several areas of the United States during recent years, desalters of various types researched by the Office of Saline Water of the U.S. Department of the Interior have been incorporated into public water supply systems. American manufacturers have researched the processes and designed the hardware to build the installations. Efficiencies have increased.

A fledgling industry has been brought into being. The formation of NWSIA at this time in 1973 is particularly fortuitous. The Federal Government is reappraising its water resources programs. NWSIA will be ready to assist in assigning proper weights to the new programs and the use of the water sciences.

I am proud that the Orange County Water District in my home county in California has pioneered with water factory 21, a combination of desalination, wastewater reclamation, and conjunctive use of surface and groundwater to protect and improve the quality of community water supplies for most of the people of the county. Langdon W. Owen, secretary manager of the OCWD, conceived water factory 21, and with the help of the Office of Saline Water and the Orange County Sanitation District is bringing it to completion. Mr. Owen also took a leading role with Royal B. Newman, executive director of the Virgin Islands Water and Power Authority, and William E. Warne, of Sacramento, who formerly headed the California Department of Water Resources, in organizing NWSIA. Mr. Newman, the president of NWSIA, is calling on all of those agencies, institutions and individuals who are interested in improving the quality of drinking water supplies to join the new organization.

Mr. Owen describes in his letter to me what their purposes are, and he has attached a summary statement and explanation of the organization meeting, which was held February 1 and 2, in Washington, D.C. Mr. Speaker, through inclusion of Mr. Owen's letter and summary statement at the conclusion of my remarks, may I request members who are interested in this subject to advise their constituents concerning the National Water Supply Improvement Association, and to inform them how they may participate in its work.

ORANGE COUNTY WATER DISTRICT,
Santa Ana, Calif., February 27, 1973.

Hon. RICHARD T. HANNA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DICK: William E. Warne told me on his return from Washington, of your cooperation and interest in our new National Water Supply Improvement Association. I am attaching a summary statement concerning the organization meeting, the Association, its purposes, officers, and plans.

We have about 350 names of individuals in almost every State of the Union, most of them representing government agencies of all levels, colleges and universities manufacturing companies, and suppliers or consulting groups who have participated in great or small ways in the successful effort to organize NWSIA. Our basic purpose is to exchange technical information, and provide the use of desalination and other water sciences in improving the quality of substandard drinking water supplies. Sadly, there are presently many areas which have poor water in which the health and welfare of millions of Americans are being degraded.

Mr. Royal B. Newman, the first President of NWSIA, is inviting the broadest participation of interested groups and individuals in the work of the Association. I am Chairman of the Membership Committee, and would be most interested in receiving the inquiries of all parties who are prepared to

participate in active programs to improve our community water supplies.

The attached statement describes the organization of NWSIA, and its present status. We appreciated the interest you took in our meeting, and that of your colleague, Representative Harold T. (Bizz) Johnson, and many others. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

LANGDON W. OWEN,
Secretary Manager.

NATIONAL WATER SUPPLY IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION ORGANIZED

The organizational meeting of the National Water Supply Improvement Association was held February 1 and 2, at the Dupont Plaza Hotel in Washington, D.C. Temporary Chairman William E. Warne presided over the meeting, which elected Mr. Royal B. Newman, Executive Director of the Virgin Islands Water and Power Authority, St. Thomas, Virgin Islands, as president, to serve until the First Annual Meeting is completed in June, 1973. Thirty-eight persons attended the organizational conference, including Representative Harold T. (Bizz) Johnson, senior member from California of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Warne, of Sacramento, California, a former Director of the California Department of Water Resources, reviewed the objectives proposed for NWSIA, and during the meeting the charter members developed and approved a constitution, elected officers, assigned committee members, and declared their intent to conduct the First Annual Meeting in Florida in June, for the purpose of pursuing the goals adopted. The objectives as established by the Constitution of the new national organization of water suppliers interested in improving the quality of public drinking water through use of desalination and other advanced water sciences are:

A. To promote the use of desalination, waste water reclamation, and other water sciences, and to exchange and spread information concerning the state of the art of desalination, waste water reclamation, and other water sciences to enhance the quality of the environment and of city life by: (1) promoting the conjunctive and efficient use of waters; (2) promoting integration of waters from various sources to supply urban needs; (3) promoting the enhancement of the urban environment and the protection of the public health through raising the quality of substandard community water supplies; (4) advocating operations, methods and procedures conductive to aesthetic, recreational and multiple-uses of community water supplies; (5) minimizing waste and increasing the efficiency of use of urban water supplies; and (6) encouraging regional solutions to water supply, disposal and management problems.

B. To uphold the public interest in adequate, wholesome, clean and sweet community water supplies, and to identify the real costs of poor quality water.

The proposed Constitution had been distributed to most members of the organizational committee previous to the Washington Conference. The Constitution was discussed by the members present, and appropriate additions and corrections made. Having fully analyzed the Constitution and objectives of the organization, the Constitution was adopted on February 2, 1973. The membership for the organization was divided into three categories:

A. *Division One:* Organizations and agencies of Federal, State, or local levels of government and utilities, whether publicly or privately owned, that are engaged in supplying water from whatever sources for community water systems or to users of community water services. (Each member of Division One shall designate in writing its individual representative, who shall serve NWSIA until the member designates his successor.)

B. *Division Two:* Companies and organizations engaging in supplying equipment, material or services used by suppliers of community water services in their projects or operations. (Each member of Division Two shall designate in writing its individual representative, who shall serve NWSIA until the member designates his successor.)

C. *Division Three:* Individuals or organizations interested in the objectives and programs of the Association, whether or not they are engaged in research into or application of water sciences; operation or management of water services; or education or training of practitioners of any phase of the water sciences. (Each organization of Division Three shall designate in writing its individual representative, who shall serve NWSIA until the member designates his successor.)

Officers and a Board of Directors were elected at the final session of the organizational meeting. In addition to President Newman, the Officers are:

First Vice President—Mr. Don Doud, DuPont Company, Wilmington, Delaware.

Secretary—Mr. Langdon W. Owen, Secretary Manager, Orange County Water District, Santa Ana, California.

Treasurer—Mr. Robert E. Bailie, DSS Engineers, Inc., Fort Lauderdale, Florida.

Several standing and special committees were established, and after short meetings, preliminary reports were given. The standing committees are:

FINANCE COMMITTEE

The Finance Committee to be Chaired by Mr. Ivey, adopted the following schedule of annual dues:

Division I—Utilities

Annual Billings in excess of $5,000,000—$150.

Annual Billings from $500,000 to $5,000,000—$100.

Annual Billings less than $500,000—$50.

Public Agencies—$150.

Division II—Suppliers

Each—$500.

Consultants

100 plus employees—$300.

10–99 employees—$150.

1–10 employees—$75.

Division III—Individuals

Each—$10.

The Finance Committee will follow up the actions of the Membership Committee. The Finance Committee will also prepare and suggest for adoption by the Board of Directors plans for financing the activities of the Association and an annual budget to govern the operations of the Association. Modification of dues rates, alterations of financing plans, and budget amendments shall be reviewed by the Finance Committee and recommendations by the Committee made thereon prior to their adoption by the Board of Directors. The Finance Committee will explore sources of financing to further the Association's activities.

BYLAWS AND CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE

The Bylaws and Constitution Committee Chaired by David L. Firor, National Association of Conservation Districts, Athens, Georgia, will review the Constitution and Bylaws prepared by the Board, and present a report at the First Annual Meeting. The Committee will operate on a continuing basis to effect provisions of the Constitution for membership intiative in amending the documents governing the Association.

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

The Legislative Committee, Chaired by Mr. Warne, reported its intent to make the nature and purposes of the organization apparent. The Legislative Committee shall recommend to the Board of Directors and on approval, institute programs (a) to disseminate information concerning legislation proposed for consideration in the Congress, in the State Legislature, or by other governments affecting the interests of the Association; (b) prepare position papers for consideration by the Board and for presentation when appropriate to legislative committees on matters related to the interests and objectives of the Association; and (c) present a legislative summary to the Annual Meeting.

MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE

The Membership Committee, Chaired by Mr. Owen, will canvass the United States for membership in NWSIA. The Membership Committee shall seek and review applications for membership in the three Divisions of the Association, and the committee shall make recommendations to the Board of Directors. The purpose of the Membership Committee shall be to obtain the widest possible participation in the Association among qualified applicants. Charter member rolls are open until the conclusion of the First Annual Meeting. A geographic spread of membership will be sought.

PROGRAM COMMITTEE

The Program Committee, Chaired by Robert Bailie, DSS Engineers, Inc., Fort Lauderdale, Florida, outlined a proposed three-day First Annual Meeting to be held in Fort Lauderdale, Florida. The program will include some technical papers, some papers dealing with the organization and the goals of the organization, and some comments by leaders in the field. Time will be set aside for Executive Committee sessions. Visits will be planned to sites in the Florida and Caribbean areas. The tentative date for the First Annual Conference of the National Water Supply Improvement Association was set as June 18, 1973.

TECHNICAL AND PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE

The Technical and Publications Committee, Chaired by Nabil El-Ramly, Professor, University of Hawaii, will recommend programs to be instituted by the Board of Directors to assess, evaluate and disseminate information concerning the state of the art and advances made in desalination and other water sciences. The Technical and Publications Committee will be primarily responsible to fill the needs of the Active Members of the Association, but public education will be a worthy secondary purpose of its program.

The Board of Directors is made up of eleven members. Six directors from Division One are Messrs. Royal Newman, Virgin Islands, Don Owen, California, W. L. Ivey, Austin, Texas, John Hatch, South Dakota Department of Health, Pierre, South, Dakota; W. E. Steps, Kansas Water Resources Board, Topeka, Kansas; and Dr. Robert O. Vernon, Division of Internal Resources, Tallahassee, Florida. Two directors from Division Two are Messrs. Robert Bailie and Don Doud. Three directors from Division Three are Messrs. William Warne, David Firor, and Professor Nabil El-Ramly.

The luncheon speaker at the NWSIA organization meeting on February 2 was Congressman Harold T. (Bizz) Johnson of California. Congressman Johnson is one of the senior members of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and Chairs the subcommittee which hears matters related to the Bureau of Reclamation and the Office of Saline Water.

Congressman Johnson noted, "the organization you have created sounds very good to me. We have needed this type of organization for years. We need the help of everyone who is thinking about the programs for water resources development and the practical application of the water sciences. We are going to give very serious consideration in all of the committees to these subjects in the months ahead. It takes expertise to perfect a record, and we hope that the organization that you have put together can give that expertise and testimony before the

hearings that are going to be held in both the Senate and the House.

It is time the drinking water suppliers became involved in the intricacies of the employment of desalters, waste water reclamation, and other methods of extending the usefulness of water suppliers."

MINORITY STAFFING: BIPARTISAN HISTORY OF A KEY CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow, Wednesday, March 28, I will have the pleasure of joining with my colleagues Mr. ANDERSON from Illinois, Mr. FRASER from Minnesota, and Mr. GIBBONS, from Florida, in introducing legislation to guarantee one third of committee staffing resources to the minority party.

Equitable provision of minority staffing on congressional committees has long been a nonpartisan objective of reform advocates as a means of improving the legislative process through better scrutiny of legislative proposals, more informed debate on their merits, and consideration of alternatives.

I think it useful, however, to review the evolution of this proposal for the benefit of new Members and others whose recollections may have been influenced by the partisan rhetoric on the issues emanating from the leadership on the other side of the aisle during this session.

None other than our colleague RICHARD BOLLING of Missouri, a ranking member of the Committee on Rules, said in his book, "House Out of Order" back in 1965:

Without the staff to frame alternative proposals, the minority cannot make its position clear on bills sponsored by the majority. Surely the discussion of alternative is an important part of the democratic process, because it informs the public, compels a more careful and penetrating consideration of bills, and in my experience nearly always results in sounder legislation.

Sharing these sentiments, I wrote the following as chairman of the House Republican task force on congressional reform and minority staffing in our 1966 report, "We Propose: A Modern Congress:

The serious threat to an effective Congress, and therefore to representative government itself, which is posed by the lack of adequate staff for the minority has not been fully understood, even by some members of the minority. Interest and concern is growing, however, and the time is not far off when, I believe, the majority of both parties in Congress will realize what adequate minority staffing would really mean for them in terms of increasing *their* effectiveness—and that of representative government.

A statement by a group of political scientists, reprinted in the book, supported these views and added:

The country cannot afford gamesmanship or petty, cheap politics at the Congressional level. Yet, we are witnessing an outstanding example of partisan pettiness in the denial to the minority in Congress that right to exercise its legislative function by refusing to grant it necessary staff support.

On the minority side of the aisle, I want to acknowledge the initiative of our former colleague Fred Schwengel of Iowa and his work as head of the old House Republican Conference Subcommittee on Increased Minority Staffing, and that of JOHN ANDERSON, chairman of the House Republican Conference and now ranking Republican on the Committee on Rules.

Leading Democratic spokesmen for this reform have included Representative FRANK THOMPSON of New Jersey and, of course, Mr. BOLLING.

On July 16, 1970, the House adopted by teller vote of 105–63 an amendment to the then-pending Legislative Reorganization Act what was to become known as the Thompson-Schwengel amendment, governing staffs of standing committees. It stated:

The minority party on any such standing committee is entitled, if they so request, to not less than one-third of the funds provided for the appointment of committee staff personnel pursuant to each primary or additional expense resolution.

This language had the support of Mr. GIBBONS, who again joins us now, and Mr. FRASER, who said:

One of the reasons why I support this amendment is I found in all the years that I served in (the Minnesota) legislature I was a member of the minority group in the State senate. I fought hard to get minority rights. I find it impossible now that I am in the majority suddenly to decide that I was wrong all those 8 years.

And yet, 6 months later, just prior to House adoption of the rules of the 92d Congress, the Democratic caucus adopted a motion offered by Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat of California, deleting the one-third minority staffing provision from the proposed rules and, in its place, substituting the following:

The minority party on any such standing committee is entitled to and shall receive fair consideration in the appointment of committee staff personnel pursuant to each such primary or additional expense resolution.

When the revised rules were brought to the House floor by Rules Committee Chairman William Colmer as House Resolution 5 on January 22, 1971, he made the following observation about the minority staffing change:

Let me say to you in just so many words, let me say to my friends over here on the Republican side, that you cannot win—I know that is pretty blunt on the thing that you are interested in. The caucus, the Democratic caucus, bound the Members, wisely or unwisely, on one issue and one issue alone and that was the Holifield amendment on the money question." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 117, part 1, page 142.

Mr. HOLIFIELD gave his rationale in these terms:

Mr. Speaker and my Democratic colleagues, you are down to the place where the gut cutting occurs. You are going to be practical and take what you can get, or you are going to open up a Pandora's box—and you do not know what you are going to get . . .

Let us vote for the Democratic Party and the control of the Democratic Party and its staff to inaugurate and to enact the legislation we pledged ourselves to in our platform—the Democratic Party platform of the majority party. The people placed on us the responsibilities of leadership. Do not take away the tools.

Vote "yea" on the previous question or you will be like the dog in Aesop's Fables who looked down into the water and saw his own reflection of a big bone in his own mouth. He opened up his jaws to grab for it and he lost the bone in his mouth." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 117, part 1, page 142.

Commented THOMPSON:

With respect to the one-third rule, I must confess my dismay and disappointment. I must reassert my conviction of the principle in support of the principle of a reasonable share of the staff to the minority and I pledge myself at any future opportunity, I will support it." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 117, part 1, page 138.

An attempt to defeat the previous question on the rules and thereby open the rules to an amendment to restore the minority staffing provision of the 1970 act was beaten back by a 213–174 vote. The rules were then adopted on a 226–156 party-line vote with Mr. Thompson voting "present."

At the beginning of the 93d Congress, on January 29, 1973, Mr. ANDERSON and I introduced House Resolution 167 to provide the minority party on each committee, upon request, with "up to one-third" of a committee's investigative staff funds.

On February 5, 1973, John Gardner of Common Cause and Ralph Nader joined us along with Minority Leader GERALD R. FORD and Minority Whip LESLIE C. ARENDS in a press conference to build support for minority staffing reform.

For full texts of following statements, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 6, pages 3229–3232.

Said Gardner:

Common Cause strongly supports House Republicans in their effort to reinstate a provision of the 1970 Legislative Reform Act that allowed minority members of committees to select their own professional staff members . . . *It is an essential part of any congressional reform program.* (Emphasis added.)

Added Nader:

Committee staff is essential to carry out Congressional responsibilities in preparing just legislation and overseeing the Executive branch of government. As long as the Congress is going to be organized along two-party lines, committee staff should be adequate for both the majority and minority parties.

There is inadequate staff for the Democrats and even less adequate staff for the Republicans. Today, the focus is on the latter problem.

At the same joint press conference, I released figures compiled by the House Administration Committee staff demonstrating that the minority party is given only 13 percent of committee employees and 14 percent of staffing funds.

On February 27, 1973, the House Rules Committee defeated the Anderson-Cleveland proposal, and by an 8–4 party-line vote acted to bring resolutions authorizing travel and investigation activities of nine committees to the House floor un-

der a closed rule, thereby to prevent the offering of the Anderson-Cleveland amendment—See press release, House Republican Research Committee, February 27.

Commented Representative MARVIN ESCH, Republican of Michigan, another GOP reform advocate:

In voting against an open rule on this measure, the eight Rules Committee Democrats placed themselves directly counter to the position taken last Thursday by the House Democratic caucus in favor of open rules.

On February 28, an attempt was made to obtain floor consideration of a rephrased Anderson-Cleveland amendment reading as follows:

Up to one-third of the funds authorized pursuant to this resolution shall be made available to the minority of the committee upon the request of a majority of such minority. ("Dear Colleague" letter from me February 27, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 28, p. 5929.)

We sought to defeat the previous question on a committee investigations resolution so as to gain consideration of the amendment. Mr. BOLLING, floor manager of the resolution, opposed our move to defeat the previous question, arguing that it was unnecessary in that a closed rule was technically not in effect:

In other words, I could yield for an amendment, so that the description of the parliamentary situation has not been accurate up to this point.

Mr. BOLLING. I am merely pointing out that there is another way, if I choose to yield.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. No, I would not. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 28, page 5929.

Continued Mr. BOLLING:

I am for the minority having up to one-third of the committee staff. I helped construct the provision of the Reorganization Act which provided that the minority would get one-third of the professional staff.

It had some key language in it which is the crux of the situation. When it gives to the minority an absolute right to select one-third, it reserves to the majority of the committee the right not to retain in its employ people who are of a certain kind. Now, it is understood that people of this particular kind would never be employed by those in the minority, but since the majority is responsible for the orderly management of committees, when it organizes committees it has to retain the responsibility across the board.

There may be some of us who are not aware that in this institution there have been deliberately employed staff who were expected to wreck the operation of a committee, and the majority could not do a thing about it until a sufficient number of the minority became so outraged that they joined in correcting the situation.

Now, I am for—I repeat, I am for the majority [sic] having up to one-third of the staff, but the Reorganization Act said:

"The committee shall appoint any person so selected whose character and qualifications are acceptable to a majority of the committee."

The vote came on a move to defeat the previous question, and was 204–191, blocking action on the minority staffing issue. Fourteen Democrats joined the Republicans on this vote. One voted "present" (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5931.)

On March 7, 1973, the House took up House Resolution 259 which would amend rule XI of the House rules to provide for more open committee meetings. Although the bill came to the floor under an open rule which would make it open to amendment, Mr. ANDERSON was informed in advance by the parliamentarian that a minority staffing amendment might not be in order on grounds of germaneness. Thus another procedural move to defeat the previous question on the rule would be necessary if such an amendment were to be in order for a direct vote. Mr. ANDERSON and I meanwhile had redrafted our amendment to meet the objections raised by Mr. BOLLING, using the language identical to that which now applies to professional minority staff.

Our joint "Dear Colleague" letter announcing our intentions stated:

Mr. Bolling has read this language in draft and has assured us that it meets the objections he previously raised.

In the same statement, however, he made it clear that at the time of that conversation he was not in a position to support the amendment we would offer. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 7, 1973, page 6703.

The amendment:

32(c) The minority party on any such standing committee is entitled, upon request of a majority of such minority, to up to one-third of the funds provided for the appointment of committee staff pursuant to each primary or additional expense resolution. The committee shall appoint any person so selected whose character and qualifications are acceptable to a majority of the committee. If the committee determines that the character and qualifications of any person so selected are unacceptable to the committee, a majority of the minority party members may select other persons for appointment by the committee to the staff until such appointment is made. Each staff member appointed under this subparagraph shall be assigned to such committee business as the minority party members of the committee consider advisable." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 7, 1973, page 6703.

I took the occasion to comment:

So we have walked across the aisle. We have embraced the language of the man who led the fight against the resolution, the Minority Staffing Resolution.

In the name of fairness and congressional reform, what more could we do? What more can you ask? H1431.

can you ask? CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 7, 1973, page 6703.

Neither Mr. BOLLING nor Mr. THOMPSON responded. Nor did they take part in the floor debate. House Majority Leader THOMAS P. O'NEILL did:

Mr. O'NEILL. What does the gentleman (Anderson) want? Does he want to think he runs this Congress?

The Democrats were elected as the majority party. The Republicans do not use the staff they have at the present time. They use it with their eyes on the next election. That is not the way it should be. We are the majority.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman does not yield. We are the majority party over here, and my earnest opinion is that we give the Republican Party far too much as it is at the present time.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I believe I still have some time remaining.

I am surprised; I am deeply shocked and surprised that my friend and former colleague on the Committee on Rules, the distinguished majority leader of this body, would take that kind of partisan view of the situation: "We are in the majority; we have the right to lord it over you with respect to staff; if you were in the majority, you would do the same to us."

I can assure the gentleman that if I were in the majority party of this House, I would be in the well fighting for his rights to have fully one-of staff on every committee. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 7, 1973, page 6704.

The previous question was then adopted 197 to 196 with 17 Democrats voting "nay." Proponents of minority staffing lost the chance for a direct vote on their amendment by only one vote. As he did the previous week, Representative JOHN CULVER, Democrat of Iowa, voted "present."

Analysis of the composition of the votes February 28 and March 7 is worth while, indicating that 23 Democratic Members have been willing to associate themselves with the minority staffing cause under the parlimentary opportunities offered to date this session.

On February 28, the vote was 204 to 191, with 14 Democrats voting with the minority. On March 7, it was 197 to 196 with 17 Democrats voting with the minority. As I indicated earlier, one voted "present" both times.

Significantly, eight Democrats voted with the minority on both occasions, six did on the first vote but went against the minority on the second, while eight who voted against the first time voted for on the second.

Shifts toward the minority position on the second vote could be accounted for by the fact that an open rule was in effect, while shifts against might be interpreted as pressure from the leadership as privately reported to me in one case.

Moreover, one Democrat recorded absent on February 28 was present March 7 and voted with the minority. On the latter occasion, three other Democrats voted with the minority but later changed their votes.

ST. PAUL'S OPEN SCHOOL

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure when I can draw attention to an innovative educational project in Minnesota. Parents and educators looking for new methods of motivating students should be interested in the experience in St. Paul with an open school. Emphasis is placed on self-direction, freedom, and individualized instruction. I submit an article from the October 1972 issue of American Education on the St. Paul Open School for the information of my colleagues:

BUMPY ROAD TO THE OPEN SCHOOL

(By Nancy Pirsig)

How many public schools can you name where teachers have had to devote a large part of two staff meetings to the question of how to get the students to leave the building at night? Where your child calls his teachers by their first name—and so do you? And when did you last hear a 13-year-old boy ask,

"Why do we have to have a Christmas vacation?"

All of the above apply to Minnesota's St. Paul Open School, begun in September 1971 as an alternative form of education within the St. Paul public school system. The months since then have been filled with a mixture of triumph and despair, in about equal parts. Looking back, those involved say also that anyone interested in setting out on a similar venture had better expect a variety of bumps and detours along the way. In this sense, at least, the St. Paul Open School has some lessons to teach, though the ingredients of its day-to-day operations may very well be unique. These include:

Its size—500 students.

Student age range—five through 18, or kindergarten through 12th grade.

A voluntary, citywide enrollment that accurately reflects the city's population mix of whites, Indians, chicanos, and blacks, and all its socioeconomic classes.

A program that not only offers a wide, wild array of classes, minicourses, and individual projects, but allows every child to make his own choices about what he studies.

And last but hardly least, the fact that parents and teachers were responsible for the school's being created at all—one of the rare instances, as a staff member points out, in which educational change came from the bottom up.

The organization responsible for the school's creation, Alternatives, Inc., was organized in October 1970 by a group of parents concerned about what they regarded as the stultifying effects of their children's traditional schooling. Out of their discussions came a basic goal: the establishment, by the fall of 1971, of an ungraded, kindergarten-through-12th grade, public, Open School. That concept quickly attracted other parents of like feeling, plus students, teachers, and just plain interested citizens. In short order the movement became 2,000-strong and, as it turned out, unstoppable. Nevertheless, even some of the most ardent supporters suspected that to get the enterprise under way in less than a year was impossible—and even though the school did in fact open on schedule, it did so with what most members of the staff feel was far too little in the way of money, planning time, equipment, staff training, organization, and materials.

Financing was only partly met with funds provided by the local school district, these being supplemented by two major grants, both for $100,000 and both renewed at a level of $90,000 for the 1972–73 school year. The first came from the U.S. Office of Education through Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The second was from St. Paul's Hill Family Foundation and paved the way for smaller grants from other local foundations and firms. Much of the original equipment and supplies was donated. Despite the interest and generosity lying behind this support, the total fell far short of what almost any experienced educator would have regarded as the absolute minimum necessary to launch such an undertaking.

Says Principal Wayne Jennings, "We had a school that should not have started with so little and, having done so, should have fallen on its face—which it nearly did."

That it did not is attributable in great measure to the extraordinary dedication and energy of its 20 full-time staff members, who were picked specifically for the school; to untold contributions of time by aides and volunteers, and to enormous patience and understanding on the part of parents, even in the face of more difficulties than anyone had anticipated. One parent probably spoke for most when she commented, "I hope increased order will come, but we have to be very tolerant about the first year. The fact that the teachers have even survived—and with some degree of grace—why, you can't ask for more."

The teachers, however, spend little time congratulating themselves for mere survival. They dwell rather on the need for further training and professional growth and for identifying techniques fitted to the particular objectives and character of this daring educational enterprise. They are, in short, finding that the "open school" concept is more easily proposed than achieved.

One of the earliest dilemmas they encountered was how to handle classes in which the ages of the pupils may range from six to 16, a situation that came about at the instigation of the Alternatives, Inc., parents. Among other things, they argued, a diverse age mix promised a more natural setting—more like that of a family, where younger children learn from older students and where the latter begin to take on "adult" responsibilities.

Not all classes, of course, run the gamut of ages. The course in "Junior High School Math" necessarily encompasses a relatively narrow age range, and certain other courses may similarly be restricted either because of the level of work involved or simply because the teacher wants it that way. But by and large, children of various ages group themselves more or less as they see fit.

Within such classrooms the teachers have found it advisable to encourage the students to sort themselves out according to their interests and abilities, with each group then pursuing the subject matter at hand in terms of those factors. In practice, the mixing of ages seems on the whole to work out rather well and to bring about certain benefits. For many of the older students the experience of helping to teach a young classmate gives new zest to school, and many of the younger children are reading books and tackling math problems at levels far above their supposed capacities. On the other side of the coin, many of the older students have just about run out of patience with the exasperating inquisitiveness of the younger boys and girls, and some of the latter sometimes seem to feel overwhelmed by the presence of crowds of teenagers.

Such varied evaluations are par for St. Paul. There seems to be no physical, philosophical, or practical aspect of the operation to which those involved will give unanimous agreement. But the one statement that probably comes closest to getting it is this: The students truly enjoy the school. In many cases they attend more willingly—and more frequently—than they attended previous schools. Overwhelmingly, their parents report, they prefer this school to any other they have attended.

"Our 14-year-old has always gone to school more or less willingly," says one parent, "but now she really loves to go. It's delightful to see her so happy."

Says another parent: "My eight-year-old was miserable in her former school, even though her teachers thought she was doing just fine. This year she goes happily and has enjoyed a really broad range of activities—poetry, improvisational acting, dabbling in French and science, and surprisingly, more phonics than she ever had before."

And still another: "My 16-year-old insists that if he couldn't go to this kind of school, he would simply drop out. After this year, I really can't imagine any other kind of learning environment that would be adequate for our three boys."

The four floors of the school that evokes this fiery endorsement (a converted industrial building along a busy thoroughfare) are divided into 16 "learning centers" or resource areas—an Early Learning Center, for example, and places designated for such subjects or activities as math-science, shop, home economics, or art. Each area contains materials needed for the activities centered there. Also, around the edges of each floor of the building are small rooms variously used as quiet reading areas, as staff offices, as places for holding a class or a conference without interruption, and as small "museums" containing collections of Afro-American and Native American art objects.

When the children arrive at the school in the morning they generally go first to their advisor's area, since they are required to check in there at some point during the day for atttendance purposes. Each student is also supposed to drop off a daily, weekly, or monthly schedule of activities he intends to follow, so that the advisor can have an idea of what the students he is responsible for are doing, and where. However, the advisor makes no attempt to enforce the schedule; the student alone is responsible for following it.

A master agenda of all current and planned activities available to the students in the various resource areas is updated and reissued monthly. It includes specific classes offered at set times and days, together with general or "possible" activities. Many of the entries are specifically aimed at whetting the youngsters' appetites. Thus students noting that a course is being offered in "Math-Creative Logic" presumably find the prospect of taking it less formidable when they learn that it involves such games as Smarty Bingo, Action Fractions, Go, and Five-in-a-Row Tic Tac Toe. But there are also such conventional sounding courses as "The Civil War" and "Beginning Sewing." Even with these however, what might be staid or routine in another setting has a way of turning out differently in the St. Paul Open School. A visitor to the Beginning Sewing class, for instance, is as likely to see boys there as girls, and perhaps a 17-year-old helping a seven-year-old thread her (or his) sewing machine. Or take Joe Nathan's Civil War class. Five students, aged 11 to 17, took the class for the full year. Besides reading books and magazines about the subject, they pored over old newspapers at the Minnesota Historical Society. They built a model of the Gettysburg battlefield, an exercise that incidentally called upon them to display basic skills in math, shop, and art. And as a wind-up, they took a two-week trip to Gettysburg, earning expense money by holding bake sales and giving talks along the way.

Last fall a group of 28 students went camping in the South Dakota Badlands as part of their work in a class in prehistoric life and one in Native American Studies. The youngsters in the group ranged in age from seven to 17 and included five black students, six Ojibway, and 17 whites. Fourteen students in a class in Spanish spent a month at a Mexican school, living in Mexican homes, and then subsequently hosted nine exchange students from Mexico.

A cross-disciplinary project whose central motif was the nose rather than cultural heritages was carried out by an ecology class led by teacher Joe Nathan. It was touched off when some of the students got to talking about the smells that pervaded the school's neighborhood. Then came a walk during which three "odor polluters" were pinpointed. When officials of these firms declined to meet with members of the class to discuss the problem, the students successively 1) got advice from a consumer-action group about what to do next, 2) did research into anti-pollution laws, 3) consulted with a lawyer, 4) filed complaints with the St. Paul Pollution Control Agency, 5) circulated petitions, and 6) took their case to the news media. The end result, after considerable additional agitation, was that the three firms were found in violation of St. Paul's anti-pollution laws and ordered to submit implementation plans for controlling the odors caused by their operations. Nathan figures that in the course of their various activities, which included testifying at State hearings on air-pollution

guidelines, members of the class immersed themselves in such traditional subject-matter disciplines as political science and government, speech, sociology, science, law, and math (the comparative measurement of smell)—and learned these subjects in a way none of them is likely to forget.

Members of the staff see such projects as illustrating important and basic advantages of the Open School arrangement—its flexibility to launch undertakings the students find genuinely exciting and rewarding, its ability to accommodate youngsters of varying ages, and its capacity to overcome the arbitrary and unrealistic compartmentalization of subject fields. Which is not to say that eveything is peaches and cream. Far from it. The project is still as much experimental as resolved, and problems remain plentiful.

During the first year some youngsters—relatively few, but enough to cause concern—steadfastly decline to display even minimal interest in any of the various subject areas. Some abandoned any pretense at filling out a schedule of activities. A few went for weeks at a time without seeing their advisors, spending inordinate amounts of time "horsing around in the lobby," as one parent mentioned, or "rapping" with friends or playing ball or leaving school or "wandering," never settling down. Some, especially the high-school-aged, claimed they were bored—that "nothing's happening."

Such indifference and apathy have been a source of widespread agony among the staff and continue to be so now that the new term is under way. And the teachers fret also about whether most students can really handle the wideopen freedom of choice offered to them, about the effectiveness of the advisor-student relationship, even about whether authentic, certifiable learning truly occurs in this open, noncoercive situation.

"We've been surprised by some things that happened to us," says teacher Dave Evertz, "such as the difficulty of getting students involved. We expected it to be easier."

Adds another teacher, Joan Sorenson: "We have to get away from the 'rising curtain' syndrome, where the students come in and sit down, watch the curtain rise, watch the actors-teachers perform and, if they don't like it, act bored or leave. We have to get the kids away from wanting us to put on a show but not wanting to participate themselves. And it's hard. *We* feel guilty if we don't 'perform' well enough. We ask ourselves, 'Where did I fail today?' "

The problem seems to boil down to trying to figure out how to motivate students who don't *have* to show up.

"The school's greatest need in my view is in the area of teacher development," says Nathan. "Most teachers, here and everywhere else, have been trained primarily to transmit knowledge, to package and deliver a body of information. But at this school we are putting increased emphasis on helping kids to explore, and we tend to continue trying to accomplish that objective by imposing our own viewpoints and values on them."

As the Open School teachers search for ways of breaking out of the mold of functioning primarily as "transmitters of knowledge," they see themselves as carrying out three broad responsibilities, each requiring different skills: First, to develop resource areas that are demonstrably effective and stimulating. Second, to act as "learning facilitators." And third, to serve as genuinely useful and maybe even inspiring advisors or counselors.

"As counselors," says Nathan, "we inevitably find ourselves called upon to try to help students with their emotional problems. And that's important, because a kid's hang-ups obviously have a significant effect on his progress in school. But we haven't had much training in this field, and we really don't know as much as we should about how to deal with these situations."

Evertz agrees that the advisor-student relationships needs straightening out. "We're all struggling with it, trying to figure out how you create relationships that really amount to something. Some of the staff are more successful than others, but even the successful ones aren't sure why. I see a technique that seems to be working for someone else, so I try it and it fizzles. I guess that the 'magic' element is honesty. Some of my relationships with students are honest and some are not, and the latter tend to become directive and manipulative. Of course, with some of the students your need to be directive, especially the younger ones, but it should be honest, deliberate directiveness, aimed at helping the youngster and not just stringing him along."

The concern so obviously felt by Evertz and Nathan and the other members of the staff stems not simply from their personal sense of success or failure but from the fact that the advisor-student relationship is at the crux of the St. Paul Open School's operational theory. This theory holds that as a student exercises his freedom to choose among various activities, he will be guided by interests and needs he has identified as a consequence of a close relationship with his advisor; and, furthermore, that together they will agree upon the student's educational goals.

Those propositions sound so reasonable that no one anticipated any difficulty with them, but in practice they have generated much puzzlement and even opposition. A high-schooler refused to discuss "goals" because "I don't know what I want to be yet." An eight-year-old had difficulty in developing a practical and feasible way of accomplishing the goal of "improve spelling" and had to be coaxed into picking a workable number of specific words to master each week.

"At first," says Miss Sorensen, "the students tended to write down what they thought they should do, or what we wanted them to do. They didn't really examine their own personal, private desires and interests or what direction they wanted to head in or how their interests fitted into the reality of their lives rather than into something called 'school' And, of course, no one had ever asked them to think about these things before. They had quite literally been taught to be passive. Just do what teacher tells you."

Prior to the end of the school term last spring the staff had come up with a six-page guide to student program planning, illustrating a variety of goals and how one might achieve them, together with a formal Progress-Evaluation Work-sheet for keeping track of work or projects completed. "And this year," says Miss Sorenson, "we are trying to get parents in on the goal-setting so that they understand what their children are trying to accomplish and can help them stay on the track."

With the new term now under way, members of the staff feel they have made considerable progress with the pesky business of trying to strengthen the advisor-student arrangement and with the other puzzles that beset the school during its first year of operation. They do not suppose that their lives will suddenly become placid, but they do feel that they have a good handle on the situation and that the school's performance so far augurs well for the future. And a comfortingly large proportion of the parents agree.

"Our 11-year-old girl had been completely turned off by school," says the mother with five children in the Open School. "Now she's our great success story. She's completely switched around She's doing good things, and she's beginning to be pleased with herself. Not having to compete has been just marvelous for her."

Says a father of three boys: "The main positive thing we've observed is the social climate—the freedom of the youngsters to move about and encounter other youngsters they might not meet otherwise, and the encouragement to reach out and to develop the ability to find one's own way. Our boys have a much greater awareness of the world around them."

"My 12-year-old son," says another parent, "is much more outgoing and self-reliant, thanks in part to the fine relationship he has developed with his advisor. He is rid of the feeling that 'I have to be perfect' and he doesn't fear failure any more. He is more free, one might say, to be confident."

To which Evertz adds: "One thing I particularly notice is the beautiful way many of the younger kids became independent. At the start of the year they would hang on you, not let you alone; now they can just say 'Hi, Dave' and go off about their busineess. It's been great to see that happen."

The staff sees such reactions as these as not just being nice compliments but as evidence that they seem to be making progress toward achieving a full measure of what they think school is all about—that is, of helping a youngster develop as a whole being. They do not play down the importance of cognitive knowledge, but neither do they consider it more important than affective knowledge. Rather the two are seen as inseparable: *What* you learn about the Civil War is inextricably bound up with *how* you learn about it. Thus the ability to memorize an accumulation of facts—the kind of thing measured by most standard tests—is considered interesting but not crucial. There are no "grades" or report cards. Basic values, less easy to articulate and evaluate, are what the staff hopes the youngsters will absorb.

"Some parents have complained that their kid isn't 'doing something,' " says Nathan. "We are trying to make it clear, both to ourselves and to the parents, that we need a new definition of what 'doing something' means. We place value on an older student's helping a younger one, a shy youngster's development of the ability to hold his own in an argument." Nathan's notion of an "A" student is exemplified by a boy who had dropped out of a conventional school and then found his way to the Open School but spent most of his time away from the building. It later turned out that he was busy organizing a center aimed at helping dropouts find jobs or encouraging them to return to school.

"At first," says Nathan, "his mother was extremely upset, both with her son—they used to have lots of fights—and with us. She thought we were a bad influence. But she wound up feeling it had been a terrific experience. I guess she came to see the value of giving her son a chance to be purposefully free—to come to a school that let him express his own viewpoints and feelings and gave moral support to his projects and encouraged him to do things *he* felt were important. He not only could talk about philosophical ways to improve society, he had a very direct community experience in doing something concrete. And he was able to explore ideas and interests which, because they weren't standard of 'normal,' had in effect been closed to him. He is now headed for college, he knows exactly what he wants to take, he is highly motivated—and his mother realizes how good it's been."

Adds Jennings: "What we want is for kids to learn those skills and subjects they will need for competence in life—to be humane, effective people and responsible, competent citizens of the world."

Summing up the "school that should have fallen on its face," Jennings says, "I know of no other school that's testing so many of the traditional assumptions about what schools are and should be, and testing them all at once. Not some little experiment in modular scheduling, but the whole concept of student-designed education. Not whether

it's worthwhile to teach 15 minutes more of math a day, but how you motivate kids to take math without ever forcing them to. And doing all these things with all-aged kids at once."

To which Miss Sorenson adds: "Perhaps the most important think that's happened is that we've established an atmosphere in which kids feel accepted—every kind and variety of kid, with all their difierent personalities and problems and peculiarities, but all accepted on a human basis, as people in their own right. Maybe that's why the students feel good about the school, and maybe that's a big accomplishment."

SENATE—*Wednesday, March 28, 1973*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Divine Creator of all that is beautiful and good and true, we thank Thee for the beauty of this season. For buds and blossoms, for lush lawns and soothing sun, for calm winds and bounding waters, for scampering wildlife and the lyric notes of the birds we give thanks to Thee. As we thank Thee for the new life in nature we thank Thee for the promise of new life in man. May the beauty of sight and sound without be matched by the beauty of life within each of us. Help us to walk with Thee in the holiness of beauty and to worship Thee in the beauty of holiness. We pray Thee so to assist us and all men that at last all nations may come under Thy rulership and men dwell in the peace of Thy kingdom.

We pray through Him whose life was above all life. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

FEDERAL DRUG LAW ENFORCEMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations. The message is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Drug abuse is one of the most vicious and corrosive forces attacking the foundations of American society today. It is a major cause of crime and a merciless destroyer of human lives. We must fight it with all of the resources at our command.

This Administration has declared all-out, global war on the drug menace. As I reported to the Congress earlier this month in my State of the Union message, there is evidence of significant progress on a number of fronts in that war.

Both the rate of new addiction to heroin and the number of narcotic-related deaths showed an encouraging downturn last year. More drug addicts and abusers are in treatment and rehabilitation programs than ever before.

Progress in pinching off the supply of illicit drugs was evident in last year's stepped-up volume of drug seizures worldwide—which more than doubled in 1972 over the 1971 level.

Arrests of traffickers have risen by more than one-third since 1971. Prompt congressional action on my proposal for mandatory minimum sentences for pushers of hard drugs will help ensure that convictions stemming from such arrests lead to actual imprisonment of the guilty.

Notwithstanding these gains, much more must be done. The resilience of the international drug trade remains grimly impressive—current estimates suggest that we still intercept only a small fraction of all the heroin and cocaine entering this country. Local police still find that more than one of every three suspects arrested for street crimes is a narcotic abuser or addict. And the total number of Americans addicted to narcotics, suffering terribly themselves and inflicting their suffering on countless others, still stands in the hundreds of thousands.

A UNIFIED COMMAND FOR DRUG ENFORCEMENT

Seeking ways to intensify our counter-offensive against this menace, I am asking the Congress today to join with this Administration in strengthening and streamlining the Federal drug law enforcement effort.

Funding for this effort has increased sevenfold during the past five years, from $36 million in fiscal year 1969 to $257 million in fiscal year 1974—more money is not the most pressing enforcement need at present. Nor is there a primary need for more manpower working on the problem—over 2,100 new agents having already been added to the Federal drug enforcement agencies under this Administration, an increase of more than 250 percent over the 1969 level.

The enforcement work could benefit significantly, however, from consolidation of our anti-drug forces under a single unified command. Right now the Federal Government is fighting the war on drug abuse under a distinct handicap, for its efforts are those of a loosely confederated alliance facing a resourceful, elusive, worldwide enemy. Admiral Mahan, the master naval strategist, described this handicap precisely when he wrote that "Granting the same aggregate of force, it is never as great in two hands as in one, because it is not perfectly concentrated."

More specifically, the drug law enforcement activities of the United States now are not merely in two hands but in half a dozen. Within the Department of Justice, with no overall direction below the level of the Attorney General, these fragmented forces include the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, the Office for Drug Abuse Law Enforcement, the Office of National Narcotics Intelligence, and certain activities of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The Treasury Department is also heavily engaged in enforcement work through the Bureau of Customs.

This aggregation of Federal activities has grown up rapidly over the past few years in response to the urgent need for stronger anti-drug measures. It has enabled us to make a very encouraging beginning in the accelerated drug enforcement drive of this Administration.

But it also has serious operational and organizational shortcomings. Certainly the cold-blooded underworld networks that funnel narcotics from suppliers all over the world into the veins of American drug victims are no respecters of the bureaucratic dividing lines that now complicate our anti-drug efforts. On the contrary, these modern-day slave traders can derive only advantage from the limitations of the existing organizational patchwork. Experience has now given us a good basis for correcting those limitations, and it is time to do so.

I therefore propose creation of a single, comprehensive Federal agency within the Department of Justice to lead the war against illicit drug traffic.

Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1973, which I am transmitting to the Congress with this message, would establish such an agency, to be called the Drug Enforcement Administration. It would be headed by an Administrator reporting directly to the Attorney General.

The Drug Enforcement Administration would carry out the following anti-drug functions, and would absorb the associated manpower and budgets:

—All functions of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs (which would be abolished as a separate entity by the reorganization plan);

—Those functions of the Bureau of Customs pertaining to drug investigations and intelligence (to be transferred from the Treasury Department to the Attorney General by the reorganization plan);

—All functions of the Office for Drug Abuse Law Enforcement; and

—All functions of the Office of National Narcotics Intelligence.

Merger of the latter two organizations into the new agency would be effected by an executive order dissolving them and transferring their functions, to take effect upon approval of Reorganization Plan No. 2 by the Congress. Drug law enforcement research currently funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and other agencies would also be transferred to the new agency by executive action.

The major responsibilities of the Drug Enforcement Administration would thus include: