

cialist in torture. The prisoners called him Fidel because he seemed to be Latin, but no one really had any idea where he came from. He obviously was a high official of some Communist country, because he lorded it over the Vietnamese.

Fidel grabbed Kasler by the shirt and demanded, "Who knows you are resisting?" Kasler answered: "Nobody." "Then why?" asked Fidel. "For myself." Fidel promised treatment for Kasler's leg, better food and conditions if he would go before the July 4 delegation. "I refused. He ordered me back on my knees. My broken leg was still killing me. My arms were in irons behind my back. He worked on them with the rope for a while. Then he got a thin wire and wired my thumbs and hands together. He tortured me, working on the rope and wire and irons. After about 45 minutes I was punchy. But I found I had discovered a way to endure."

SHREDS

"As long as I could concentrate on something else, it seemed as though I could stand the pain. I would start saying the Lord's Prayer, and when I forgot a line I would go back over it and over it. Finally Fidel knocked me over on the floor and asked if I surrendered. I said no."

The torture continued for days. Fidel would beat Kasler across the buttocks with a large white truck fan belt until "he tore my rear end to shreds." At one point Fidel said, "You are going to see a delegation if we have to carry you on a stretcher." For one three-day period, Kasler was beaten with the fan belt every hour from 6 a.m. to 10 p.m., and kept awake at night.

"By noon the third day I couldn't keep control of my mind. I said I surrendered. They kept beating me on the hour until 6 p.m. By this time I had a gash over the eye where my head had hit the edge of the bed during one beating, my leg was throbbing and bleeding, my back was bloody. I signed a statement agreeing to do everything the camp commandant ordered."

Kasler was allowed to sleep that night. His mosquito net, which had been taken away, was given back, thus sparing him at least the torment of insect bites. For the next two days the guards kept asking him if he surrendered and each time he said that he did. But on the third day his strength was partly back and he answered no.

"I think I made a tactical error. It was around 7 a.m. on a Sunday. Four guards came in and put me on my knees. They began slapping me around. Soon they were using their fists, and one of them pulled out a fan belt and began beating me with it. One blow by a fist on the ear ruptured my eardrum. Blood was pouring down my head. A kick popped one of my ribs. They turned into mad dogs. They began smashing my head against the concrete floor, kicking my bad leg. It went on for three hours. I think some other guards finally had to stop them.

"I lay in a stupor for three days. I was in terrible pain. They had dislodged the iron pin in my leg during the beating, and it was shoved three-quarters of an inch up into my hip. My mouth was so bruised that I could not open my teeth for five days."

A week later Fidel asked Kasler if he surrendered. "I decided I'd say yes, and then resist when they asked me to do something." He was put in a room with fresh air, and given cigarettes and chewing gum. Though under threat of death, he communicated once again with his fellow captives. "The guys didn't recognize my old call signal, so I just kept sending my own name. Finally old Norm Wells [Lieut. Colonel Norman Wells had been one of Kasler's wingmen] came up in the next room. Boy, it was good to hear him."

But Kasler's leg continued to get worse, and his morale ebbed. "I started to go downhill rapidly. I lay on my bed all day, dreading when the food came around because I had to get up to get it at the door of my cell." Finally, in the winter of 1968, he was taken back to the hospital. X-rays showed that an operation was necessary. One of the guards told him that his leg had to be amputated. The wound was cleaned out, however, the iron clamp removed and the leg was finally on its way to healing—nearly 2½ years after it had been broken. In early February 1969, Kasler was returned to the Zoo, and to a roommate, Navy Commander Peter Schoeffel, who had been shot down in 1967. He had spent a total of 18 months in solitary confinement since his capture.

KILLED

The torture continued through the spring and summer of 1969. But that July, under threat of more beatings, Kasler wrote one last statement "about the struggle of the great Vietnamese people." He was never tortured again, though others were.

By October 1969, conditions noticeably improved for the prisoners—but were still not good. Kasler and others were moved in December 1969 to the Hanoi Hilton, where there was a room called Heart Break. In it, new captives and men who had cracked mentally under torture were placed in stocks in their beds, unable to move. Three unbalanced Americans were held there. "We could hear them in our room. We pleaded with the guards to let them come to our cell, but were turned down. Two of them just eventually disappeared. We saw the other's name on a list of dead. All told, at least 15 men were either killed during torture or were not accounted for."

Sitting in his comfortable Indianapolis apartment last week with his wife Martha, Kasler, now 47, looked amazingly fit. He wears glasses and his hair is grayer. But he walks without a limp, and he still has a quick smile and a soft chuckle. He had already caught up with the latest fashions and was sporting bright blue bell bottoms. Touching

his short hair, he chuckled and said that he planned to let it grow a bit. Despite all his pain, Kasler displayed remarkably little bitterness—except when he mentioned Fidel. "I'd like to meet him some day," he said softly. But for now, Kasler was looking forward to some rest and then spending a year at the Air Force War College. His goal: command of a wing (two squadrons) of fighter aircraft. At heart, he is still very much a fighter pilot.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the program for tomorrow is as follows:

The Senate will convene at 10:30 a.m., following a recess. After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, the Senate will resume its consideration of S. 929, the bill to amend the Par Value Modification Act.

The question at that time will be on the adoption of the amendment No. 76 sponsored by the able senior Senator from Virginia (Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.).

There is no time limitation on that amendment.

There will be yea-and-nay votes tomorrow. It is hoped that the Senate will complete its action on S. 929 tomorrow, in which event, in view of the sparsity of measures on the calendar, the Senate will then go over until Monday.

RECESS TO 10:30 A.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and, at 7:08 p.m., the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 5, 1973, at 10:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATOR MOSS ISSUES CHALLENGE TO OUR COUNTRY'S ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CAPABILITY IN ADDRESS TO THE NATIONAL ENERGY FORUM

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in the history of this country, in times of crisis, we have marshalled our strengths to solve complex challenges. The most recent example of our national capability

in this respect is, of course, the rallying of our scientific and technological expertise to launch a successful space program, after 15 years of Federal leadership.

Too often, however, we fail to sustain such efforts beyond the immediate objective to be responsive to the long-term problems. We also often dissipate our strengths in budget cuts and reductions, after an initial flurry of activity.

Economy in Government is a necessary pursuit, and I commend such efforts, where they reflect efficient management practices and recognized national policies. The United States, how-

ever, must maintain its international leadership in science and engineering if adequate energy supplies are to be assured and environmental policies successfully implemented. It is vision and courage that will be required to understand and achieve solutions to our country's problems. The energy crisis is no exception, in fact it is a prime example of such a challenge.

This was articulated very clearly by my able colleague, Senator FRANK MOSS, of Utah, in his recent luncheon address before National Energy Forum 2, on March 20, 1973, under the sponsorship of the U.S. National Committee for the

World Energy Conference. I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the *RECORD* at this point for the benefit of the Members of the Senate.

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

CREATIVE OPTIONS—CHALLENGE TO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

I begin on the premise that there is an energy crisis. After this winter of our frozen discontent, to say otherwise would belie the facts. How we meet the challenge of the energy crisis is the challenge to me in the course of the next few months.

The United States has long been the world's top energy consumer. With but one-seventeenth of the world's population, we consume one-third of the world's energy. Each American uses seven times the amount of energy consumed by the average citizen in the rest of the world.

This nation's economic growth has been booming along for almost a century, with faster and faster escalation in the last 50 years. You have only to look around you to see what is supported by energy in America; 120 million motor vehicles on the road, 14,000 aircraft flights daily, 12 million factories and office buildings to be heated, cooled, lighted and elevated, 60 million homes, and thousands of schools, hospitals, shopping centers and shelters of every kind.

Last year we used almost 5 and a half billion barrels of oil, 500 million tons of coal, 22 trillion cubic feet of natural gas and some 1,600 tons of fissionable uranium to fuel this country. Our growth has been so rapid that we are doubling our energy demands every 10 years. Where is it all going to come from? Today 40 percent of all oil used along the Atlantic seaboard is imported. Even more significant, 90 percent of all the residual fuel oil used on our East Coast is shipped in from abroad.

Right there you have the nub of the problem.

Oil import quotas, powerplant siting, and leasing and regulatory policies which affect our production of fossil fuels are very important. At the same time, we must think of the future. And when we do the facts which we find are sobering. Our supplies of fossil fuels are limited. Estimates by experts indicate that mankind can consume them in their entirety within the foreseeable future.

In other words, our traditional sources of energy will be very scarce in the years to come.

These few statistics point to a desperate need for government, industry and the universities to come together in a combined effort of research and development. Knowledge and technology are the hope for a solution to the long term energy crisis.

What is technology, how do we use it and what is the relationship between technology and the Congress?

The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration in a November 1972 publication states that "Technology is the systematic, purposeful application of knowledge, skill and expertise toward a function or service useful to man." Such a definition of "technology" reads like a law maker's creed.

Increasingly, the law making function has been taking on a scientific content. By the very nature of things, the necessity has arisen in our complex society for members of Congress to participate in many decisions relating to science and technology.

The interaction of science and politics has often proved rewarding to mankind. Great periods of science have had direct bearings on political innovation and advance. For example, the scientific achievements of Isaac Newton, early in the 18th century, were the primary motivating force in the "age of reason," a period in which, perhaps for the

first time, man perceived the possibility of scientifically designing his government to fit his needs on a practical basis. This rational, analytical approach to the political order was one of the main intellectual ingredients of the Constitutional Convention that met in Philadelphia in 1787.

A hasty survey of American science policy from 1945 to about 1968 shows that it could be summed up roughly in the phrase, "more money for research and development". From 1945 until the last year or so, the Congress lavished progressively larger support on science in each annual budget.

About 1968 for a multitude of reasons, the Congress put the brakes on. The pressure for economy, reservations about the secondary effects of many technologies, revolt on the campuses over military research by universities, congressional resistance to the continuation of arrangements by which the Department of Defense provided the principal support for basic research all contributed to our re-examination of the scientific imperative.

Technology has been blamed for many of the ills of our country—what we forget is that public demand for the products has created this if it is a problem.

Everyone wants freeways to make driving easier, everyone wants appliances to make life comfortable; but they forget that land must be cleared for roads and that whenever a light is turned on, an electric generator is running to provide the power, which in turn requires fuel to be burned.

The consumer must share the burden of our technological society.

Problems affecting the quality of life challenge the leadership skills of mankind and require the application of the kind of scientific and technological effort urged upon the nation by President Kennedy and President Johnson, which resulted in the success of Apollo.

It is surely better to put technology to work solving our problems of making a more livable humane world than to go back to our Stone Age past.

But now, in 1973 in a period of doubt about science and technology, we not only face an energy crisis, we face a constitutional and domestic crisis. I refer to the unilateral re-ordering of our national goals and priorities by the Administration and the impounding of funds.

This is a matter of vital concern to every American, to our global neighbors with whom we share this earth, and certainly to those in the scientific and professional communities who exercise leadership with respect to the utilization of our resources, the advancement of our technology and the economic, cultural, society and military applications of our research and technology.

While I am concerned today primarily with the challenge to the United States in meeting its energy crisis, I believe it important to point out that technological developments have demonstrated the physical irrelevance of national boundaries. Technological developments have led to a requirement for greater international cooperation in order to utilize the technologies, and it is not unlikely that in the relatively near future there will be important new demands upon the international system within which we operate to solve other emergency global problems. The negative side effects of intensive application of technology throughout the world are evident in the pollution which is a global problem. Witness the Stockholm world wide conference on the environment last June. Nuclear energy technology is another obvious example, as is technology for weather modification. On the positive side is the international planning for a global communication satellite system.

Intelsat and the U.S. corporation Comsat represent examples of the cooperation necessary in establishing the commercial criteria under which the system would operate, but

also insuring that the developing countries would benefit from the new technology. Using technology to solve shared world-wide problems and establishing the international machinery by which we share such responsibilities await us in the not too distant future.

The energy picture for the United States divides into rather distinct parts. Given time to develop the sophisticated technology required, we can solve our problems; but at the very time when we need science and technology and the vision for creating new options, there are a few ramblings of dissent on the Hill, and the Administration is engaged in a program of hit and miss slashing of on-going programs and abolishing the White House Office of Science and Technology and the 20 member Science Advisory Committee.

If we exercise our options with some vision, we can look forward to new sources of energy such as:

Nuclear power plants. Although they deliver less than one percent of our electricity today, we may expect to get as much as 30 percent of our electrical requirements from nuclear plants by the beginning of the 21st century.

Oil Shale and Tar Sands. Our western states, including my own State of Utah, have immense reserves of this petroleum-bearing materials, but it's an expensive process and needs the application of new technology to solve development and environmental problems and to reduce production costs.

Gasification of coal. The carbon from coal combines with hydrogen from steam to form methane, which can be converted into energy.

Refining of Naphtha into natural gas.

Nuclear stimulation of tight formations such as the Mesa Verde.

Solar and geothermal energy. Geothermal energy is particularly important in the western states. Solar energy is unlimited once we are able to capture and transmit it.

Home heating bills can be reduced drastically or eliminated altogether by harnessing the energy of the sun—air conditioning would work even better than heating. Eventually, mankind will be forced to resort to the sun for energy—These sources of energy will require innovations and creative options and success in our efforts could mean whole new industries.

Who will conduct the research and with whose money? The most important ventures will require very large investments and the very best we have to offer in trained scientists and researchers.

Two years ago in his first energy message, Mr. Nixon committed his administration to a successful demonstration of the fast breeder reactor by 1980 and to stepped up efforts in coal gasification and economically feasible oil shale development. The target dates are now being stretched out, and while Mr. Nixon increases Federal outlays for energy research (\$750 million has been proposed) it is too little, and it soon will be too late.

Mr. Nixon is treating symptoms instead of causes and his solutions will result in patchwork engineering.

This is a time when we should be encouraging science and technology with consistent support for research and development not down grading such efforts.

Let me give you some specific examples.

The program of the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1973 reflects a cutback of \$62.4 million from the amount appropriated for NSF programs. NSF science and education improvement activities in fiscal 1973 are being funded at a level of 47 million versus the planned \$77.8 million. Funds for graduate student support and institutional science programs totalling \$15 million are deferred altogether from the planned fiscal year 1973 programs; and another \$11 million has been deferred from some computing and

science information activities as well as a number of research equipment and facility items. And so it goes.

My own Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences has jurisdiction over NASA, one of the greatest assemblages of talent and scientific expertise in many a moon (if you'll forgive a play on words), but NASA finds itself forced to reduce its programs and to force RIF's on its talented personnel.

NASA is a prime example of the benefits of science and technology. The great accomplishment of land 12 men on the moon will be exceeded in my view by the spinoff benefits to mankind from that effort. For instance:

The foam solution developed for space flight for fire proofing and insulation—a boon to conservation of energy and a direct result of the science and technology from the space program.

Representing one of the largest responses over to a NASA R&D solicitation, over one hundred organizations in the United States have asked to be issued RFP's by Lewis Research Center for a program to develop and demonstrate a solar energy system designed to heat and cool a home or building.

The solar energy system, which is to utilize proven technology and off-the-shelf equipment to the maximum extent possible, is expected to consist of three units: (1) a solar collection subsystem; (2) a power conversion subsystem; and (3) an output unit.

Ideas are coming in for relaying solar power from satellites and, of course, the fuel cell technique is a product of the space age.

One of the greatest benefits in my view comes from the earth resources technology satellite.

The satellite has taken more than 160,000 pictures of earth, photographed 90 percent of the United States, 75 percent of the world's land mass and accumulated the picture equivalent of eight times the earth's acreage. The pictures include 20 percent of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China.

The satellite has found what appears to be the color and contour of nickel deposits in western Canada. Its pictures of Alaska's North Slope show a peculiar alignment of the lakes there that geologists say is a direct link to the huge petroleum deposits along the entire slope.

ERTS has made similar discoveries when it's peered down on other countries. It appears to have spotted huge nickel deposits in South Africa and has seen what mining engineers are 90 percent certain are two large copper ranges in the remote reaches of Pakistan.

In the western part of the United States the pictures from the satellite show us unknown faults in earthquake country, trona beds in Wyoming.

One of the most exciting bits of feed back from satellite observations of Alaska is the occurrence of large lineaments or structural breaks which show little or no correlation with surface geology which cross cut formations and structural features. This provides geologic inference for further oil and gas development.

Here is a tremendous potential which is cut back by Nixon budget constraints. The second ERTS satellite is now delayed three years, to 1976.

If the United States is to maintain its leadership in education, scientific programs and technology, new directions must be sought to coalesce the drive and dreams of the young. Such a program takes vision and courage.

Technology has contributed mightily to the advancement of this country. Technology must be used to solve the energy crisis.

The Congress must seek better ways to stimulate and support private risk capital investment for innovative research and development activities by industry, the universities and independent research centers.

We cannot abandon the search for creative options.

On Friday last, I joined Senator Jackson in co-sponsoring a bill which will over the next 12 years provide \$20 billion for research and development to solve the energy crisis.

The economy and well being of America and our global neighbors requires the best we have to give. This is the way to solve the long haul energy crisis.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, recently the *Muskegon, Mich., Chronicle* published a six-part series of articles exploring in depth the current controversy over freedom of the press.

In an additional editorial, which appeared in its March 18 edition, the *Chronicle* summed up the series and expressed some interesting conclusions.

Mr. President, I ask that the editorial be printed in the *RECORD*.

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

GOVERNMENT VERSUS THE FIRST AMENDMENT:
PRESS SHIELD LAW? WE WILL STAND WITH
CONSTITUTION

This newspaper Friday published the final article in a six-part series by *Chronicle* reporter Mike Skinner on the growing conflict between the federal government and the press over the issues of press freedom and First Amendment rights—a struggle with implications which drive straight to the heart of the democratic system.

The articles covered all aspects of the historic confrontation, and we are confident that many of our readers will join with us in our judgment that the series documents a deliberate and growing erosion of press freedom and of the ability of the press to inform the public.

There is no question that the nation's press has been increasingly faced with government interference and harassment—even including actual imprisonment—in recent years, and the resultant threat to this free society should be a matter of the gravest concern to every citizen.

The public's right to know is under powerful attack, and the burden of defending press freedoms guaranteed in the First Amendment weighs more heavily on the press now than at any time since the adoption of the Bill of Rights.

It is a battle with many fronts, but the toughest fighting at this stage is the struggle by newsmen to protect their confidential news sources from the government. The Nixon Administration has moved far beyond the news management efforts and press feuds of previous administrations to mount a continuing and well-orchestrated drive to intimidate, discredit and legally curb the press.

It has tried to impose prior legal restraint on the publication of the news, as in the *Pentagon Press* case. It has harassed and threatened the television networks and has encouraged and expanded the use of subpoena power to obtain reporters' notes and tapes, a practice which could not only chill but kill investigative reporting.

And in June of 1972, as the Administration had asked, the Supreme Court ruled, 5-4, that newsmen did not have the con-

stitutional privilege to refuse to provide a court or a grand jury with the name of an unidentified source or withhold confidential information.

However, the high court also held that state legislatures could—with an implication that they should—enact laws to shield reporters from disclosing confidential data. Such bills, ranging from heavily qualified to absolute protection for newsmen, are under consideration in Michigan and a score of other states (many already have them), and since January no fewer than 34 bills have been introduced in Congress to undo the effect of the decision by enacting a statutory privilege for newsmen.

Should newsmen have the right to refuse to provide courts and grand juries with information gathered in the course of their work? Our answer is an emphatic "yes"—and it is important that the public understand why.

The First Amendment guarantee of a free press embraces a right to gather, as well as to publish, news. The continuing threat of a subpoena—or other government harassment—requiring a newsmen to divulge to a court or to a grand jury confidential information he has gathered in the course of his journalistic investigations will shivel the sources of his information.

Without these sources, the value of his investigations and his reporting to the general public will be substantially diminished. As Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas forecast in his dissent, "The reporter's main function will be to pass on to the public the press releases which the various departments of government issue."

The fundamental value of a free press is the service it performs in providing the public with a free flow of information. The information is essential to the effective functioning of a democratic government.

Earl Caldwell, a respected black reporter for *The New York Times* whose knowledge of the Black Panthers Party the government pursued all the way to the Supreme Court (he was jailed for refusing to reveal his sources), put it this way: "Only when we can operate in an atmosphere free of the intimidation of government can we assure the public that we are vigorously investigating all phases of corruption and political chicanery . . . It isn't so that New York Times reporters can move freely . . . it is so that ideas can move freely among a free people, so that we can all make the judgments that we must be able to make if democracy is to remain a living ideal . . . This large and complex society needs the best available information to make sound judgments about public policy."

A reporter is not a prosecutor or an investigator for a prosecutor or a court, although he could be expected, and rightly so, to report a murder or to testify in the case of a robbery or some similar crime. We would not change this, and no such change is being suggested.

The reporter's ultimate responsibility is to the people; he is, in effect, a public servant and therefore responsible to the governed and not to those who govern.

This relationship was recognized by the authors of the First Amendment, in fact, recognition of this relationship was one of the major reasons why the guarantee of a free press was added to the Constitution. All laws are made, or should be made, with the greater good of society as the goal. When the freedom of the press is impinged on, then society is the loser.

That said, be it noted there appears little overt opposition to the idea of a shield law for newsmen. Indeed, recent national polls indicate a clear public majority favors such a shield. The major debate centers on whether the protection should be absolute or qualified.

A number of legislators—and virtually all of the newsmen who have testified before Congress—favor blanket or absolute immunity. But the informed guessing is that what will evolve is a qualified or limited immunity to protect reporters from official "fishing expeditions" or the kind of legal harassment that sent Earl Caldwell and many others to jail.

This sounds fair enough, but we're not alone in worrying over the ultimate effect of such a law. Mindful of the proverbial camel which first stuck his nose in the tent, then took over the tent, we ask whether there can really be such a thing as a "little bit of government regulation" in the area of freedom of the press.

While he might be considered a devil's advocate, inasmuch as he is a government official, we're inclined to agree with Roger C. Cramton, assistant attorney general in the Justice Department, who told a House subcommittee "The more the newsmen are subject to legislative control, the more that will become regulatory control . . . Step by step, once you start down that road, what starts out as a privilege or a favor to the news media ends up with some species of regulation."

Much the same warning has been voiced by a respected member of the news fraternity, Vermont C. Royster, former editor of the Wall Street Journal. The very word "immunity" leaves a bad taste in the mouths of many people, even though the law has always accorded such immunity to doctors, lawyers and clergymen.

But to compare reporters with these professions is to get onto shaky ground, says Mr. Royster. Physicians, attorneys and priests don't write newspaper stories on the basis of what their clients tell them.

Even the idea of a limited immunity may be a dubious one. To have any useful application, such a law would have to differentiate between those who are bona fide journalists and those who are not. This would not be easy—although the total shield bill offered by Sen. Alan Cranston, of California, makes what we consider a workable stab at it.

The problem is that once we let the law decide who may write, we will have taken a very long step toward letting the law decide what they may write.

We submit that at least this much is clear: that the present wave of pressure against newsmen constitutes a clear and present danger to freedom of the press in America, and to the people's "right to know."

If a shield law is passed, and it appears this is likely, we think that nothing short of the total * * *. Anything less would not only not do the job, but could be extremely dangerous. There can be no such thing as "a little bit" of government legislation in the sphere of press freedoms.

We think the wisest course is to rely on tradition rather than new statutes; on increasing public understanding of the role and the needs of a free press rather than on a law or laws which would attempt to cover every conceivable circumstance.

We'll take our stand with the First Amendment. It says simply, "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech or of the press." We think there can be little question about the spirit or the intent of that statement.

Both freedom of the press and the profession of journalism, have, after all, flourished for nearly 200 years under that amendment. And while this "shield" may have been pierced a few times lately, and while it is battered and dented in places, it still serves.

We'll be better off in the long run if we fight each case on its merits, as it comes along. We have no real confidence in a statute, no matter how absolute or well-intended. The Constitution should be shield enough.

YATRON SETS LEGISLATIVE GOALS FOR THE ELDERLY

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, amidst all the current discussions of inflation, soaring food costs, and meat boycotts, it is my hope that we will not dismiss from our minds a segment of the population which has been boycotting meats and other foods for some time, albeit unwillingly—27 million elderly Americans.

I have discussed with a number of local food merchants and supermarket checkout personnel the types of foods they might have noticed being purchased by the senior citizens who shop in their establishments. The answers are dismaying. Cans of weak soup, macaroni and cheese, and foods that may be filling but are not at all nutritious are among the vast majority of products being bought. That such a situation exists and has continued and been fostered by economic conditions is unconscionable. I am certain that we have all received letters from older persons pleading for help and questioning whether they will, in fact, be able to survive. Americans are told not to buy expensive food; this is nothing new to the retired and elderly living on fixed incomes.

As part of my efforts to develop a legislative program and set goals in this important area of concern, I have sponsored several specific proposals which, if approved, would contribute immeasurably to the well-being of senior citizens. They would: Include certain qualified drugs under medicare, which could mean the difference between illness or improved health and survival; provide that the first \$5,000 of any and all retirement income be tax exempt; allow a credit against income taxes or Treasury payment for persons 65 and over, to offset the cost of State and local property taxes; provide reduced or free transportation for persons 65 and over; protect private pension plans; increase retirement benefits; and strengthen and improve the Older Americans Act.

I have again introduced legislation designed to assure elderly persons full payment of all Federal benefits under such programs as veterans' pensions, social security, medicare, and old-age assistance. It makes no sense to raise social security benefits only to withdraw an equal amount from recipients of other Federal payments. In my district alone, nearly 78,000 older persons receive some \$106 million each year from social security in Berks, Schuylkill, and part of Northumberland Counties. The last increase was not received by many due to unfair income ceilings.

Certain measures I sponsored in the last Congress were approved such as the social security increase, the inclusion of chiropractic services under medicare, the increase in the earnings limitation, a railroad retirement increase, and others. My bill to provide hot, nutritious meals was, unfortunately, vetoed by the President but I continue to support and advo-

cate such a program. I cannot, however, condone any increase in medicare which would place an additional strain on recipients and I strongly favor full coverage. It is necessary, of course, to continually explore legislative avenues in behalf of the elderly and this I am doing.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in indicating our genuine concern for and awareness of the problems of older Americans by taking decisive action on these and other proposals of benefit to them. An administration which takes the position that we cannot afford to help the elderly strains confidence in its ability to understand and deal with human and social problems. No price can be placed on the fulfillment of human need nor on the acquisition of human dignity.

THE NATION SUPPORTS REMOVAL OF TAX DEDUCTIBILITY FOR CIGARETTE ADVERTISING

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, since cigarette smoking is one of the major contributors to premature death and disease, I introduced, earlier this year, H.R. 4640 which amends the Internal Revenue Code by removing cigarette advertising as a deductible business expense. I do not believe the Government should promote, through advertising tax exemptions, products which sell ill health and early death to the American people.

In this respect, I am pleased to note that the highly respected journal, *The Nation*, in its April 2, 1973, issue, had editorialized favorably on my effort to disallow tax deductions for cigarette advertising.

CONTINUING CIGARETTE PROBLEM

The Surgeon General keeps warning us that cigarette smoking is a major health hazard, and cigarette sales keep increasing. Per capita consumption appears to have stabilized for some groups, but population increase accounts for the higher sales. Most ominous of all is a sharp rise in cigarette smoking among youths of high school age, both girls and boys. It makes them feel grown up, they see it as a sexual attribute in magazine and newspaper ads, and they are not deterred by the Surgeon General's warnings. Kids as young as 7 and 8 are smoking cigarettes.

Banning cigarette advertising from radio and television has had little effect. "American ingenuity and salesmanship have the reputation of being able to sell anything," remarks Rep. Robert W. Kastenmeier (D., Wis.). The cigarette industry has rechanneled some 75 per cent of the \$25 million a year it expended on TV advertising into newspapers, magazines, billboards, etc. The corner caption, "The Surgeon General Has Determined That Cigarette Smoking Is Dangerous To Your Health," is lightly passed over, if it is read at all. As for the young, who should be the principal concern of the antismoking forces, a prominent Canadian physician who has been active in this field sums it up: "Frightening medical statistics bounce right off them. Cancer is something only old people get and, for them, old age is an eternity away." Of course cancer is not the only hazard, and coronary heart disease, emphysema, etc., afflict and kill not only the old

but the middle-aged and even the young. However, experience shows that the medical approach has only limited efficacy.

Should we just give up, blaming it all on "human nature"? In that case, why all the uproar about "hard" drugs, and even marijuana? Or should more radical measures be undertaken? Representative Kastenmeier favors the latter course. "While the advertising dollar tax exemption is extended to all businesses in the country," he says in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5066 "I feel the harmful and deadly effects of the product which cigarette manufacturers market should prevent these industrialists from enjoying this otherwise universal privilege." Let them advertise if they wish, but at their own expense. Either the advertising will diminish, or the industry's profits will drop, or the cost of cigarettes will rise to still higher levels.

Mr. Kastenmeier has introduced legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code by removing cigarette advertising as a deductible business expense. Of course there will be an uproar if this legislation seems likely to pass. Alcohol is harmful too, and lobbyists for the liquor interests as well as those of the cigarette industry will rave and roar about do-gooders and health nuts. But isn't it better to brave such onslaughts than to make ourselves ridiculous by issuing official reports on the perils of cigarette smoking, while subsidizing cunningly contrived messages in its favor?

MISS JANE FONDA

HON. PETE V. DOMENICI

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the activities of a young movie actress would not normally merit the attentions of this body. But when the lady in question happens to be a widely publicized and self-appointed commenorator on international affairs, morals and ethics, her observations may merit some brief consideration here.

I refer in this instance to Miss Jane Fonda, who is presently solemnly assuring Americans that our returned prisoners of war are liars—that they did not, in fact, experience what they say they experienced. She further suggests that their testimony would be unworthy of our attention no matter what they told us because they are some species of paid killers—murderers, in short.

I am confident the majority of Americans are by now more than capable of evaluating Miss Fonda's judgment. I doubt if anyone considers her a dispassionate observer.

What strikes me, however, is the paradox of the situation—that it is largely the existence and dedication of the men she vilifies that preserved Miss Fonda's freedom, the freedom she then misuses for her torrential abuse.

If there is any benefit to the Nation in Miss Fonda's offstage performances, it may be this: That she serves as a dramatic reminder to all the world that freedom, which is difficult to achieve and maintain, allows for both responsible and irresponsible use of its privileges.

Now would not it be edifying to us all if the Jane Fondas, who have flourished

and grown wealthy under the advantages of freedom, would resolve to show us all how responsibly they can use those freedoms.

NEW FARM PROGRAM REPUDIATED BY ADMINISTRATION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, less than 2 weeks after it was presented, the President has rejected his own proposed agriculture policy. And in the process, he has betrayed the American farmer and consumer alike.

The new farm program outlined by the Secretary of Agriculture proposed to phase out farm income support payments, and to let the farmer receive the market value for his products in the marketplace. This would take the food subsidy off the taxpayer, with the full food costs being borne by the consumer.

In testimony before the House Agriculture Committee on March 20, Secretary Butz said:

Farmers and the private trade should keep the supply in their hands. They should retain the marketing decision and market at the best prices for them. They should earn the profits for carrying the crop from periods of lower prices to periods of higher prices. Farmers are benefitting from this right now.

In any discussion of legislation and the future of agriculture, we should turn to the question of who should control farming in America. I think we can agree—it should not be government. It should not be non-farm corporations. Farming should be controlled by the men and women and families who farm our land and provide our food.

We have taken a giant step away from domination of agriculture by government. The Agricultural Act of 1970 provided that step. It reversed a trend. The Federal Government is now serving agriculture rather than dominating it. The legislation we finally develop together can and should continue this trend to the undying gratitude of the Nation's farmers and in the best long-time interest of all citizens.

Last week Mr. Butz was quoted in the newspaper as referring to those who pressed for price controls on food as "damn fools." Surely his comment was not directed at the President. He added that those who favor ceilings on food prices "have not fully assessed" the effect of such ceilings.

Last Thursday in the face of a meat boycott, however, the President slapped a price ceiling on the cost of beef, in rejection of his own proposed farm program. The same ceiling also limits the prices a farmer can get for food exports to foreign countries. This in practice increases the cost to the American consumer by decreasing the price the farmer can get for his products abroad.

The nationwide boycott should be seen as a repudiation of the administration's proposed market concept of nonsubsidized agriculture.

I include a related newsclipping:

[From the Washington Star-News, Mar. 29, 1973]

BUTZ EASES CONTROLS STAND

(By John Holusha)

Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz today appeared to soften significantly his opposition to food-price controls.

This came amid recurring reports that President Nixon would announce some new form of controls in his televised address to-night.

Butz has been the administration's most outspoken opponent of controls on prices that farmers charge for their produce. Last week, Butz referred to those who are pressing for such controls as "damn fools."

But at a news conference today, Butz tempered the tone of his comments on food price controls even as he held steadfastly to his position that controls on raw agricultural products would tend to dry up supplies in conventional channels and develop black market outlets.

He said he continued to feel that those who favor ceilings on food prices "haven't fully assessed" the effect of such ceilings.

But, asked if he would resign in protest if President Nixon did impose controls, Butz waved off the question with a laugh. "I've lost many battles at the White House," he said. "Even on the Cost of Living Council I've been overruled several times—sometimes I win and sometimes I lose."

Asked if he could support controls if imposed, Butz parried by stating flatly that he supports the President. He went on to say, though, that controls on food prices—if extended for any length of time—would require a system of rationing similar to that used during World War II.

Butz sought to play down threats by farm organizations to withhold their meat animals from market in retaliation to consumer boycotts. He said farmers economically cannot afford to keep hogs and steers for more than two or three weeks past their prime marketing time.

"The price per pound of the animal starts to decline then—they just can't keep them much past the 'bloom,'" he said.

He said the boycott "may have a major impact in the short run" on food prices. Lessening of demand via the boycott, he indicated, would simply be an exercise of the classic economic system.

Overall though, he said the only way to hold down food prices was to control inflation.

Plans to withhold hogs, cattle and lambs from the market starting today because of a record drop in hog prices and a decline in cattle prices have been announced by the National Farmers Organization.

The influential farm group took the action last night, claiming, "The price drop on hogs has been so drastic that it requires immediate action." The NFO also called for farmers' meetings in 15 cities tomorrow to determine future action.

The falling prices paid to ranchers came as plans for a nationwide meat boycott next week gained support. In San Francisco yesterday, about 200 persons paraded at the Federal Building plaza and shouted pledges not to eat meat all next week and on Tuesdays and Thursdays thereafter.

The decline in hog prices was blamed on "panic selling and a lack of confidence in what the market will be tomorrow or next week" by a spokesman for the hog market in Des Moines.

"This has to be the impact of what they call consumer resistance," said Ron Jarvis, president of Oppenheimer Industries of Kansas City which operates one of the biggest cattle herds in the nation.

Jarvis and other cattlemen expressed doubt that they could withhold herds even from a declining market. "The cost of hold-

ing them gets too prohibitive, and I don't know anybody that isn't trying to raise as much beef as they can," said cattle producer Phil Arnold of Ashland, Kan.

But NFO President Oren Lee Stanley said, "Farmers must stand together now if a serious economic disaster in agriculture is to be avoided." The last time the NFO asked members to withhold their supplies was in 1968.

Meanwhile, Japan, the biggest single customer of the American farmer, has temporarily quit buying U.S. pork. Government experts think sales will resume shortly as present supplies in that country dwindle.

There have been some reports in the meat trade that the curtailment of Japanese pork buying—now in its second week—is a big factor in dramatic declines in Midwest hog prices in recent days.

According to Agriculture Department officials, however, the volume of pork sold to Japan has not been large enough in itself to be an important market factor.

Last year, when U.S. pork sales to Japan soared, shipments amounted to 46 millions pounds or only about 0.3 percent of total U.S. pork output.

HUD ATTACKS DISCRIMINATION IN PLUMBING CODES

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, discrimination, in any form, is bad. It is immoral, unhealthy, and unlawful. Yet, it persists and its mere presence stifles the rights and expectations of many millions of our citizens who justifiably have come to feel neglected.

Perhaps the most damaging form of discrimination is that which threatens or denies to workers their right to economic security; for if an able and willing worker is stifled at the threshold of employment, his disappointments and frustrations multiply and ultimately threaten the basic fabric of our system of ordered liberty.

It is because of these concerns that I was most pleased with the recent policy position expressed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development—HUD—in directly and frontally assaulting the discriminatory provisions and practices perpetuated by plumbing codes.

The particular vice I am referring to concerns a practice—common to virtually every State, city, and hamlet which has a plumbing code—whereby only "licensed" plumbers are permitted to perform pipework outside of buildings or structures. This outside work—often referred to as "utilities" installation—involves such semiskilled tasks as the digging of ditches and trenches, the unloading and lowering of pipe into the trench, the pushing together of separate lengths of pipe, the making of the joint by screwing or cementing the lengths together, and the filling and tamping of the trench.

These work tasks are typically the kinds which utility contractors and their laborers have historically performed throughout the United States, and hardly require the skills normally associated with the plumber's craft. Yet, by virtue of plumbing code provisions

which mandate that pipe work to be installed within property lines be performed only by licensed plumbers, local plumbing officials and plumbing inspectors have precluded utility contractors and their employees from performing such work—and have even gone so far as to invoke the codes' criminal provisions, subjecting them to arrest, fines, and imprisonment.

Mr. Speaker, this invidious practice is nothing less than a monopoly which, under the aegis of local governmental fiat, permits only the special class of licensed contractors and plumbers to do outside utilities work. And while a monopoly of any kind is contrary to national and public interest, it is particularly damaging when its radiations contaminate the jobseeker and taxpayer alike. Thus, these monopolistic practices perpetuate higher contract prices and higher labor costs which are passed on to the consumer, notwithstanding the wealth of evidence that as a matter of national practice, this work can be done by nonlicensed contractors and workmen with even greater efficiency, economy, and competency, and while conforming to the highest performance standards.

While I am deeply concerned with limiting the high costs and spiraling wages involved in construction, I am even more troubled by the crises in the cities and the attendant evils which such crises create. While a depressed economic market knows no partisanship and is felt by all workers alike, its impact is nevertheless more acute for those minority citizens who are further disadvantaged in attempting to gain initial access to employment or training opportunities. If no rational basis exists for precluding minorities from obtaining work experience in utilities construction outside of property lines, why then is there any basis for requiring a license inside such imaginary line?

The U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Indiana, in the case of *White v. City of Evansville*, 310 F. Supp. 569 (1970), answered this question by holding that a plumbing code which required a license for work performed within property lines was arbitrary and unreasonable, and in violation of the 14th amendment to the United States Constitution; and further, that where members of minority groups could not gain access to the licensed class, such codes also violated constitutional principles by perpetuating a condition of de facto racial discrimination.

In addition, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has noted that because of the drastically low percentage of minority workers who have been able to gain admission to the Plumbers' Union, the EEOC "would look favorably upon any code activity which sought to remove such restrictions and provide wider channels of employment access." It is apparent to me that to the extent a code prevents anyone other than a privileged licensed workman the means of gainful employment, to that extent does the code interfere with every man's right to be judged by his ability to perform.

It is because of the foregoing discriminatory aspects of plumbing code administration that I was encouraged by

the recent action and declaration of policy made by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. For a number of years, various trade associations, labor organizations, and public interest groups have brought these grievances to the attention of HUD—with little visible result. At long last, HUD has finally taken the long-awaited and necessary step declaring that communities will no longer be entitled to receive HUD certification and financial assistance if they continue to administer discriminatory plumbing codes. Mr. Speaker, because of its significance as a major breakthrough in a long-neglected area of public concern, I submit in its entirety the March 16, 1973, letter of policy from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the National Utility Contractors Association:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., March 16, 1973.

Mr. JOSEPH M. STONE,
General Counsel, National Utility Contractors Association, Inc., Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STONE: We are pleased, in response to your letter of February 2, 1973, to give you a summary of actions we have taken to overcome problems of provisions in plumbing codes which tend to limit work and contract opportunities regarding plumbing outside of structures and specifically involving outside utilities.

First, we recently prepared a notice to all communities concerned with the Workable Program for Community Improvement that HUD will not accept for certification purposes any plumbing code provisions which establish the property line or other arbitrary point outside of structures as a basis for defining work subject to licensing. The notice points out a court decision which held that use of the property line, when licensing is not required for work beyond that line denies work opportunity and equal protection of the law and so is unconstitutional. The court noted also in the particular case that licensing provisions were so administered as to deny licenses to minority individuals. We will be pleased to send you a copy of the notice as soon as we receive it from the printers. It will take immediate effect upon distribution to communities which will occur shortly.

Second, we have been apprised of several cases of pending litigation which challenge the legality of such arbitrary provisions.

Third, we have received reports, at our request, from the International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials and the Southern Building Code Congress as to specific revision steps these organizations are taking with their Uniform Plumbing Code and Southern Standard Plumbing Code respectively to remove or amend provisions which have used arbitrary points for establishing licensing requirements on plumbing outside of structures.

Fourth, we are instructing our field offices, which have responsibility for certifying Workable Programs, as to our policy and the unacceptability of locally enforced codes, irrespective of source (Model Code, State code or locally developed code), which employ the property line or other arbitrary point in establishing requirements for licensing. As you may know, a HUD-certified Workable Program is a requisite for local participation in renewal, neighborhood development, code enforcement and related renewal-type grant programs.

Upon close reexamination of the issues and technical problems involved, and upon fuller realization of the impact that code provisions can have with respect to work and business rights and opportunities, the Department became convinced of the necessity of these steps.

We are confident that these steps will be effective in reaching our objectives and in meeting concerns you have expressed. We shall be pleased to provide any additional information you may wish. Also we would like you to know that we appreciate your continuing interest in this matter and that this has been helpful in identifying the issues involved and in framing corrective action.

Sincerely,

RICHARD H. BROWN,
Acting Director, Office of Community and
Environmental Standards.

TELEVISION'S POW COVERAGE

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, all of us, at one time or another, have sought fit to speak out when the broadcast media overstepped its responsibilities. This day however, I want to commend the media particularly NBC for the outstanding coverage they provided of the returning POW's on the "Today" program last Friday morning.

On that particular program NBC devoted its entire 2 hours to the most extensive coverage of the repatriation of prisoners of war given by any network.

During the first hour the returnees were interviewed by "Today" Washington editor Bill Monroe and John Cochran, NBC correspondent at the Pentagon. During the second hour, the final satellite feed from Clark Air Force Base in the Philippines carried films of the last POW's released in Hanoi.

By the time the last serviceman came down the ramp at Clark everyone of the 589 POWs had passed the NBC cameras. And, I might add, each and every one were seen on the "Today" program.

Like myself, I feel that anyone who had the opportunity to view this program, must have been touched deeply.

This poignant portrayal elevated television journalism to new heights. I commend them, and look forward to more of the same. It was indeed, one of television's finest hours.

The letter follows:

NATIONAL BROADCASTING
COMPANY, INC.,

Washington, D. C., March 30, 1973.

HON. JOHN E. HUNT,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I know that you have been interested in the coverage that the television networks have given to the return of our POWs; because of your interest I am sending you a release from our News Department indicating the kind of continuing coverage that NBC has undertaken since the first POWs were released in late January.

I certainly enjoyed visiting with you Tuesday night at the NAB cocktail party; the worst part of this job Congressman, is that I'm so busy fighting the forest fires in my own balliwick that I don't have as much chance as I would like to visit with my friends. One of these days I hope that situation will change but I'm not counting on it. Best wishes.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. HYNES, JR.,
Director, Government Relations.

MARCH 29, 1973.

MOST EXTENSIVE TV COVERAGE OF REPATRIATION OF PRISONERS OF WAR TO REACH CLIMAX ON NBC AS "TODAY" DEVOTES 2 HOURS TO SUBJECT

As a climax to the most extensive coverage of the repatriation of prisoners of war given by any network, NBC-TV's "Today" program will devote its entire two hours to the subject Friday, March 30 (7-9 a. m. NYT).

During the first hour, recently returned POWs will be interviewed in Washington by "Today" Washington editor Bill Monroe and John Cochran, NBC correspondent at the Pentagon. During the second hour, the final satellite feed from Clark Air Force Base in the Philippines will carry films of the last POWs released in Hanoi.

After the last serviceman comes down the ramp at Clark Air Force Base, every one of the 589 POWs who passed the NBC cameras will have been seen on the "Today" program. Additional coverage has included the subsequent arrivals of POWs at air bases close to their homes.

VA HOSPITAL AT PRESCOTT, ARIZ.

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on March 9, 1973, there appeared in the Prescott Courier an excellent account concerning the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Prescott, Ariz. In view of the unfavorable publicity that has been given to VA Hospitals by some groups, I am sure it will be of interest to my colleagues to see this report of activities at our Prescott VA Hospital.

The article follows:

WHIPPLE BETTER OFF—MCINTYRE REFUTES VA HOSPITAL FIND

(By Tom Coat)

Results of a congressional investigation which harshly criticized conditions in the nation's veterans hospitals do not describe the situation at Whipple Veterans Administration Hospital according to center Director Virgil McIntyre.

"Every hospital has a different situation," McIntyre said commenting on the investigation, "but in our situation here we are not finding that the problems exist which are described in the AP story."

The story, which was released yesterday, alleges the congressional investigators found a pattern of neglect in the nation's VA hospitals that endangers the well-being of hundreds of thousands of patients.

The story went on to report that veterans face long waiting periods of from a few weeks to months for admission to one of the 168 VA hospitals.

Once there, the investigators claim, a veteran is likely to receive little attention from undermanned nursing staffs and is also likely to be put in cramped quarters due to shortages of space.

In conclusion, the investigators state, conditions at some hospitals are so bad that a patient may leave in worse shape than when he was admitted.

The investigation was based on interviews with VA officials at 14 VA hospitals throughout the nation and examinations of VA records.

In commenting on the local VA hospital, McIntyre stressed that there is adequate staffing to handle the needs of its approximately 190 patients.

Presently there are 57 registered nurses at the hospital and 15 staff physicians, nine of

whom are certified by the American Board in their special area of study.

"Overall," said McIntyre, "our staff to patient ratio is above the national average for VA hospitals."

Part of the reason for the high ratio as well as the advanced study by the majority of the staff physicians is that Whipple Hospital is reportedly in a very favorable recruiting area.

While McIntyre recognized that there are some areas in which veterans cannot get treatment in the Prescott area because of staff limitations, he was quick to point out that the other two state VA hospitals in Phoenix and Tucson work closely with Whipple Hospital.

"If a veteran comes to us for care in a specialty we don't have, such as neurosurgery, we can have him to Phoenix or Tucson in a matter of hours..."

BUSING, TRUE OR FALSE—A DIFFERING VIEWPOINT

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, on March 22, I introduced into the RECORD a column by editorialist William Raspberry in the Washington Post. Subsequent to that editorial, and to my introduction of it into the RECORD, Mr. John Buggs, Staff Director of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, wrote a letter to the Washington Post criticizing the editorial. In the interest of fair play and equal time, Mr. Buggs' letter follows:

LETTER FROM JOHN BUGGS, STAFF DIRECTOR, U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS TO THE WASHINGTON POST

MARCH 26, 1973.

It would have been serious enough if in his March 16th column, "Busing, True or False," Post columnist William Raspberry had only seriously distorted the conclusions of a recent Civil Rights Commission report of a national poll. However, he also attempted to confuse the issue with an essentially meaningless analogy between housing and school policies. To these two major errors, which any uninitiated person might commit, he added a third—and for an outstanding columnist, unforgivable blunder—Mr. Raspberry suggests that the Commission used two words that are calculated to raise the hackles of most people, "bigotry" and "insincerity" in describing its findings. Nowhere in the entire 26-page report and appendices are those two words found or implied.

Mr. Raspberry believes that the Commission's report distorted the evidence to claim that busing opponents were "bigoted and insincere" rather than motivated by honest opposition to the "economic, social and educational costs" of implementing Court orders requiring busing.

The Commission, however, specifically criticized those who analyze the difference between poll findings of support for integration and opposition to busing as expressions of public hypocrisy. The survey was designed to probe, in unprecedented detail, the reasons for this gap. The Commission did not conclude, as Raspberry implies, that the only thing standing in the way of public enthusiasm for busing was the lack of adequate information. Raspberry has ignored the following passage early in the Commission's report:

"Misinformation is not, of course, a total

explanation of the intense public opposition to busing. Even with effective national and local leadership accurately communicating the facts of the situation, there would doubtless be substantial opposition...

"The fact remains, nonetheless, that many millions of Americans are very seriously misinformed about vital issues affecting their children. The only reasonable hypothesis is that if they did know and understand the facts then their attitudes would become somewhat more favorable."

Mr. Raspberry finds it "hard to see how informing the ignorant... would make the slightest difference in their attitudes toward busing." Surely, Mr. Raspberry cannot think that resistance to busing is not intensified on the part of many millions of Americans who erroneously believe their children are damaged educationally by desegregation and that the Courts have ignored such damage. Can he seriously dispute the implication that public attitudes are affected when most Americans think it costs up to twenty-five times more than it actually does to implement a typical busing plan? Can he ignore the conclusion that part of the opposition to busing grows out of the belief, held by most people, that the courts have already ordered the consolidation of suburban and central city school districts for desegregation purposes? Should we overlook the very real probability that there is a mistaken belief that the courts are ordering unnecessary busing when there are millions of Americans who say they oppose busing but yet are willing—if asked another question—to support busing when there is no other way to desegregate? Is it not important when the survey shows that people who were reasonably well informed were three and a half times more likely than those seriously misinformed to support busing?

Unfortunately, Mr. Raspberry's writing reflects the very kind of misinformation the Commission discussed in its report. He writes of the heavy financial and educational costs of busing and insists that integration not be "the overriding goal, to be achieved no matter what the cost." Had he carefully read the Commission report, he would have noted that the cost of busing orders is only about 1 or 2 percent of school district's budget, far less than any significant compensatory program. While the available evidence indicated no massive educational gain for black students, the gains are far more significant than for any existing compensatory programs. In addition, there is no evidence of harm to white children. Mr. Raspberry is among the major figures of the mass media who bear the responsibility for giving widespread public credence to the myths of massive economic and educational costs.

Mr. Raspberry claims that support for court-ordered urban school desegregation plans is the same as "requiring that families residing in neighborhoods that are too white or too black be forcibly relocated to other neighborhoods in order to achieve neighborhood integration."

Mr. Raspberry's analogy does not hold in most housing situations. For most Americans, housing has always been a private market commodity purchased through a private market in which buyers and sellers are free to make their own choices so long as they do not violate the rights of others. Schools, on the other hand, are a basic public responsibility, providing what is probably the most important public service for most citizens. Public programs whether they be schools or housing must comply with the constitutional requirement of "equal protection of the laws" and this Commission supports a requirement against discrimination in any housing subsidized by tax funds. The courts have rightly concluded that equal opportunity cannot be provided within segregated schools in an intentionally segregated school system.

We may have made an error in not providing Mr. Raspberry with the raw data from which our interpretations were drawn—it was sent to his paper and he was advised to call the expert on our staff for any questions he might have. Had he done this it is doubtful that he would have given so much weight to the fact that only 49 percent of the black respondents said they would be willing to send their children into white schools to obtain a better quality education.

On the question of basic support for busing, blacks divided 49 percent favorable, 40 percent opposed and 11 percent undecided. That means that of the blacks expressing an opinion 56 percent favored busing. When follow-up questions were asked, an additional 12 percent of blacks favored rerouting existing school bus service to increase desegregation and another 10 percent favored busing if it were the only available way to overcome unlawful segregation. Thus, black opinion on the question of limited busing, when busing is the only way to desegregate breaks down as follows: 71 percent in favor, 16 percent opposed, and 13 percent with no opinion.

In conclusion, it is, I believe, important to answer another question raised by Mr. Raspberry. He inquires as to whether or not the Commission's staff favors, as a national objective, neighborhood integration. While I cannot speak for all our staff without actually polling them, I believe they would agree with my answer, which is "yes."

NATIONAL NUCLEAR MERCHANT SHIP PROGRAM

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee on Merchant Marine I have had a continual interest in the development of a strong and competitive national nuclear merchant ship program. That is why I was happy to read the recent speech by Mr. Howard F. Casey, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Maritime Affairs before the 12th annual meeting of the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board in Williamsburg, Va., on March 27, 1973.

I believe the most important statement Mr. Casey made during his speech, and an area I support, is that the Maritime Administration is actively developing a realistic and workable approach on some form of "incentive financing" to assist operators in meeting the initial outlays required to install nuclear propulsion on the first several ships.

I commend this outstanding and informative statement to my colleagues.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS BY HOWARD F. CASEY

It is a great pleasure for me to participate in this 12th Annual Meeting of the Southern Interstate Nuclear Board. As you know, Bob Blackwell, the Assistant Secretary for Maritime Affairs, had originally intended to be with you. Unfortunately, the development of a serious scheduling conflict prevented him from doing so.

In preparing to fill in for him, I undertook some research into the history of the nuclear power industry in the United States. I found that since its beginning in the mid-1950's, it has compiled a distinguished record.

The first land-based electrical generator and the first marine propulsion system are only a part of the many historical break-

throughs that have been made in this revolutionary technology.

One characteristic of the industry that particularly impressed me is the excellent cooperation between industry and government that has been maintained throughout its development. In these days when an adversary relationship between the two is so commonplace, it is interesting and encouraging to see that this type of cooperation can be established and how effective it is in operation.

As most of you are aware, this element is particularly important in the maritime industry. Government, business and labor share responsibility for the well-being of the U.S. merchant fleet. Unfortunately, the track record in the maritime industry has not been nearly as impressive as the one that the nuclear industry has compiled.

For most of the post-war period, shipping management, labor and government could not agree on a viable program to assure the future growth of the industry. The government was unwilling to assume its share of responsibility for the industry's health by providing the necessary priorities for a workable program. Industry and labor too frequently put their own parochial interests ahead of those of the fleet as a whole.

Needless to say, the American Merchant Marine suffered greatly as a result of this lack of unity. The once-proud U.S.-flag fleet dwindled steadily over the years, until it was only a shadow of its former greatness.

By 1969, it was apparent that drastic action had to be taken to reverse this downward trend, or the U.S. would soon find itself with no commercial fleet worth speaking of. Recognizing this, President Nixon advanced the most sweeping overhaul of our national maritime policy in over 30 years. He held out to the industry government assurance of a long-term ship construction program to replace the obsolete ships in the present fleet with new and highly productive vessels.

In return, he asked the shipping and shipbuilding industries—management and labor alike—to concentrate their efforts on improving efficiency, thus enhancing their competitiveness in the world market.

This program—which received nearly unanimous support from labor, management, and the Congress—requires management and labor to pull a strong oar and not rely so heavily on the government to shape its destiny. It requires the industry to raise several billion dollars in new capital in this decade. It requires labor and management to become more productive and reduce costs. And it encourages them to construct a new and more cooperative relationship that will enable them to resolve their differences without resorting to the strikes and work stoppages which characterized the industry in the past. I am pleased to report that since the program's enactment in late 1970, substantial progress has been made in achieving its goal of a revitalized American Merchant Marine.

The shipping industry has responded to President Nixon's shipbuilding initiative with orders for 37 new ships to date, along with 16 conversions. These ships have an aggregate value in excess of \$1.7 billion.

These new orders represent a major breakthrough for the American Merchant Marine, since they include 24 bulk carriers—the first to be built for U.S. registry and operation in the foreign trades in many years. In the post-war era, an influx of new and economical foreign-flag tankers and dry-bulk carriers virtually ended American participation in these vital trades. Recognizing the growing importance of imported energy supplies and raw materials for the United States, President Nixon's maritime program extended to such ships the operating and construction aids formerly limited only to general-cargo carriers.

Largely as a result of these orders, American shipyards today are enjoying the greatest backlog of merchant-ship construction in

their peacetime history. The shipyards, too, are responding to the challenges of the new maritime program which called for them to make major improvements in their productivity by incorporating new equipment and mass-production techniques in their operations. These gains are to be reflected in a steadily declining subsidy rate which will fall from 53 percent in 1969 to 35 percent in 1976. To date, the yards have successfully met this challenge. All shipbuilding contracts to date have been within the subsidy guideline rates. In view of the fact that American shipyards today are spending approximately \$100 million a year for improved facilities and equipment, we have every confidence that they will continue to meet the reduced subsidy goal.

The final highlight of the progress made in implementing President Nixon's maritime program that I would like to relate this afternoon concerns research and development. In announcing the program in 1969, President Nixon singled out R and D as an area in which enlargement and redirection were required. Too often in the past the Maritime Administration's research efforts bore little if any relationship to the needs of the maritime industry; yet, effective research and development on a near-term basis is an absolute prerequisite in increasing productivity to compete successfully with lower cost foreign shipbuilders and ship operators.

You will be pleased to know, I'm sure, that nuclear propulsion is high on the list of priorities in our research and development program.

All of you are familiar with the Maritime Administration's initial efforts in this field—the design, construction, and operation of the world's first nuclear-powered merchant ship, the *NS Savannah*. In the ship's 10-year history, the *Savannah* traveled over half a million miles on nuclear power with no casualties, and opened 44 ports around the world to nuclear-propelled ships. The *Savannah* completely fulfilled the mission set out for her—demonstrating the technical feasibility and safety of nuclear propulsion for merchant ships.

This innovative ship, however, did not and could not demonstrate the economic soundness of nuclear power. First, it was not designed as a competitive commercial ship. Second, and more important, fossil fuel in the fifties and sixties, when the *Savannah* was being built and operated, was comparatively cheap, putting nuclear power at a severe disadvantage.

This situation has changed radically. The ships being built today are far larger and faster than their counterparts of even 10 years ago. They consequently require far more power than their predecessors.

At the same time, the cost of fossil fuel has risen dramatically—more than doubling between 1969 and 1971. While future increases in fuel prices will probably not be nearly as spectacular, the upward trend will undoubtedly persist through the end of this century.

In view of these developments, the Maritime Administration two years ago re-evaluated the future of nuclear propulsion for merchant ships. The question to be answered was: Would nuclear power remain a scientific curiosity as far as merchant shipping is concerned, or would it offer an attractive alternative to conventional powering systems?

After intensive analysis, we concluded that atomic power will indeed provide shipowners with an attractive method of propelling their vessels in the near future.

In fact, the recent advent of ships with conventional power plants of more than 100,000 horsepower indicates clearly that the day of nuclear power is near. Together with Babcock & Wilcox's Lynchburg, Virginia, Division, which had developed a consolidated nuclear steam generator system, we initiated a series of research projects aimed at providing shipowners with the powering capability they will need.

This development effort was not geared to-

ward achieving major scientific breakthroughs. Instead, it was focused on extending the technical know-how generated from the *NS Savannah*, and the more recent developments in land-based reactor technology, to produce a technically sound, economically feasible marine propulsion system.

In the last three years, we have committed over \$6 million to this effort. Just recently, we reached a major milestone in this progress when the preliminary safety analysis report was presented to the concerted federal agencies for their review and comment. We expect to have their reactions in the next few months.

Together with our continuing effort to test and evaluate the critical components in the proposed reactor system, the completion of the safety analysis in the near future will mean that American shipowners will be able to place orders for nuclear propulsion systems within the next year, orders which we fully expect to be received by the U.S. nuclear power industry.

Our analysis to date indicates three areas of shipping where nuclear power appears to be nearing competitiveness. As I mentioned, we have entered the era of high-speed container ships—highly productive vessels that can carry over 1,000 containers at speeds of more than 30 knots. These vessels require power plants producing 100,000 or more shaft horsepower. We estimate that each of these ships will consume \$50 to \$100 million worth of fuel in its 25-year life. Under these circumstances, nuclear power, despite its higher initial capital cost, appears to be quite competitive with conventional fossil-fueled plants.

Until recently, the speed of the container ship itself was not viewed as a major consideration in the establishment of an intermodal shipping system. However, as other phases of intermodalism have reached an advanced stage of development, particularly on the heavily trafficked trade routes, ship speed is more and more being looked upon as an area offering competitive advantage. In my view, we can expect this factor to assume increasing importance in the future.

While increased speed is one of the vessel characteristics that can make nuclear power attractive, growth in size is another. Possibly one of the most dramatic changes in bulk shipping in the last ten years has been the phenomenal growth in vessel capacity. Ten years ago, the 115,000 dwt. *Manhattan* was one of the two or three largest ships in the world; today it is dwarfed by tankers of nearly 500,000 deadweight tons and vessels of up to twice that size are being planned. These mammoth ships require far larger power plants to attain the same speeds as their smaller predecessors. It is likely that nuclear propulsion will offer owners of these vessels the same economies it offers to the high-speed container ship operators.

A third potential application for nuclear power in ship propulsion is one that we are just beginning to investigate. This is the growing area of special vessels—drilling ships, ice breakers, and the like.

We have just recently initiated a jointly funded project with one of the leading American drilling ship operators, Global Marine Corporation, for a study of the feasibility of equipping Arctic drilling ships with nuclear power plants. The present offshore drilling season in the Arctic is limited by weather and the high cost of flying in fuel in 50-gallon drums to about 60 days per year. The cost of fuel oil can rise to as much as \$10 a gallon under these conditions. Nuclear power has the potential to eliminate this inefficient means of supply and at the same time significantly lengthen the Arctic drilling season.

The increased attention being given to the Arctic as one of the world's greatest storehouses of energy supplies may result in a requirement for high-powered ice-breakers and ice transiting tankers or submarines in the next ten years. Such ships would require

up to 250,000 horsepower to operate successfully in Arctic ice. Here again the potential for nuclear power is real and may well be imminent.

In view of these potential uses, the future of nuclear propulsion appears to be extremely bright. But much remains to be done in converting this potential into reality.

The shipping industry, I can tell you from long years of experience, is a hard-headed one with more than its share of skeptics and cynics. Because of the fiercely competitive nature of the world shipping business and the large capital investments required to enter it, shipowners are generally not the type of businessmen to make decisions on faith or promises.

This means that the United States' nuclear power industry must exert the maximum efforts possible to sell nuclear propulsion to the marine industry.

We recognize that some of the questions for which shipowners will demand answers are areas in which the government must take the lead. Such matters as ship licensing, port entry, indemnification against third party liability, and similar issues must be resolved at the international level, and these are subjects that we in the government are pursuing at this time.

Additionally, some form of "incentive financing" to assist operators in meeting the high initial outlays required to install nuclear propulsion may be needed. This also is an area where the Maritime Administration is actively developing a realistic and workable approach.

But in the end, the shipowners' decision to install nuclear propulsion must result from the sales efforts of the nuclear suppliers. Matters such as system performance guarantees and delivery dates can only be resolved by suppliers working with shipowners on a one-to-one basis.

Based on the nuclear power industry's past success in opening new fields of application, I am sure that commercial maritime uses for nuclear reactors will soon be added to the industry's long list of accomplishments.

Thank you.

THE NATIONAL HEALTH RESEARCH FELLOWSHIP AND TRAINEESHIP ACT OF 1973

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining Congressman PAUL ROGERS in sponsoring the National Health Research Fellowship and Traineeship Act of 1973.

The purpose of this legislation is to allow for the continuation of graduate training grants and research fellowship programs in the field of biomedical research, through the National Institutes of Health and the National Institute of Mental Health.

Since their inception, these training grants and fellowships have been highly successful. They have provided the bulk of the manpower involved in scientific research and in academic medicine in this country. They have provided substantial faculty funds for medical schools. Most important, many of the breakthroughs in medicine practice during the past 20 years, have occurred as a result of the research carried on under NIH grants.

But this work is not finished. Research into the basic biological processes and

mechanisms involved in the physical and mental diseases and impairments must continue. The administration has proposed terminating support for training new biomedical scientists. But the stakes are too great to permit an interruption of biomedical research just when so much progress has been made. Elimination of these programs is truly a false economy.

If we are to maintain continued progress in our fight to improve the health of Americans now and in the years to come, we must continue these valuable programs. I urge all my colleagues to join Congressman ROGERS in support of this legislation.

MR. AND MRS. ROBERT J. HASWELL
EXPRESS THE VIEWS OF MANY

HON. GENE TAYLOR

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting for the information of my colleagues, a letter I recently received from Mr. and Mrs. Robert J. Haswell of Springfield, Mo. I believe their views are consistent with the feelings of many Americans, and should be given careful consideration by this body.

The letter follows:

SPRINGFIELD, Mo.,
March 12, 1973.

DEAR MR. TAYLOR: It has been our observation that for the past several years, many of the laws and methods of carrying out the laws have totally ignored a basic fact. This important fact being overlooked is the human nature of people. It has been well proven that a law cannot change the way people think and in most cases act. To wit: The present welfare law damages the persons image by taking away a desire to improve ones present position. It tends to force a person who must accept welfare to give up their feeling of freedom, responsibility, self respect and the hope of ever improving their position. A point in case: A mother receiving ADC. If she desires to try and get a job to augment her income, she is penalized for doing so by a taking away a part of her welfare check. In addition to this severe penalty, she must also make arrangements for someone to care for the children and to pay for someone to care for the children. She has transportation problems and expense, additional clothing expense, etc., incurred by having an outside job. With these mothers not being able to keep a majority of their extra income, it is no small wonder many of them do not seek outside employment, therefore resulting in larger welfare roles with no end in sight to ever getting this mother off welfare until she can produce no more children.

With the mother having no self respect, no sense of accomplishment, it is no small wonder that many of her children produce citizens that are rebellious to the society who so graciously raise them.

A welfare law that will ever reduce the welfare roles must be responsive to the following human emotions. People do not work or show initiative without reward commensurate with that work. A sense of having earned it yourself brings about a feeling accomplished and a feeling of responsibility. Without these items no law will work successfully. We realize that not everyone receiving welfare would take advantage of this

extra income offer. Some provision would need to be made to deal with these people.

I heard the President's message on TV in 1968 dealing with his proposed welfare reform law. I felt that he had sensed what I have been talking about and feel a welfare reform law based on this outline would be good for all the people of the United States because it would provide an end in sight to the people on welfare, thereby reducing the tax load on people presently employed.

I have been hearing much comment as of late, about closing tax loopholes that supposedly are making the rich richer and the poor poorer. I think supposedly what the Representatives in Congress who are proposing these laws are saying, is that a person, or company made up of persons, who are willing to make the extra effort that is necessary and required, who are willing to show responsibility necessary in putting people to work, who are willing to lay in bed at night looking at the ceiling solving the problems necessary in the successful operation of any business endeavor should not be rewarded for this effort. That they should keep proportionately far less than they make after taxes than does the individual who is not willing to make this sacrifice.

It just does not work that way. If laws that accomplish this end are enacted, it will be a detriment to the country as a whole because human nature says, you don't work unless you get paid for it. You don't take a chance without thought of personal reward and the men in Congress must be aware that if these leaders located throughout this great nation of ours cease to take a chance, the people for whom the tax reform laws were supposedly enacted, will be the injured party since there will not be as many jobs, enough oil, enough homes to serve those people you in the Congress are responsible for serving. You must therefore consider the human element when making any law. This has been particularly true with any method our country has followed in the dispensing with the millions of dollars in foreign aid. We have not made extra effort to get these dollars into the hands of common men who need it, who could use them. Instead they have been given to the political leaders whose Bureaucracy has sopped up a large percentage of them.

It is no small wonder that the communists who have put people in the field living and working with the people whom these dollars were intended to help, are able to make these people despise us. Case in point: Egypt.

If our political leaders in Congress are not aware that the doing away with of these human emotions were in a major part responsible for the fall of Rome and do not believe that history repeats itself, then our nation in its present form is not long for this world.

Please consider these thoughts in your future attempts at making laws. I am confident that you will find more uni-lateral support from the people they affect.

Respectfully yours,

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT J. HASWELL.

IN MEMORIAM: MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

HON. BARBARA JORDAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Miss JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, today is the anniversary of the death of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Cut down by an assassin's bullet, his life ended before he had achieved the goals and fulfilled the dreams that carried him

across this country and won him worldwide recognition. He was a golden-voiced giant among men. He spoke and lived a philosophy of compassion, understanding, and righteousness that both soothed and inspired men and women of all colors and creeds. The force of his reason and the strength of his example helped guide this Nation toward a more just society. His work underlaid the civil rights accomplishments of the 1960's.

His premature death deprived us of one of the foremost leaders of this century. His words and the example of his Christianity are as relevant today as they were 10 years ago. In that sense he is still with us, never to be forgotten. His memory and his beliefs form a permanent part of the spirit of this Nation's people.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE JOHN B. ANDERSON CONCERNING THE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague, the Honorable JOHN B. ANDERSON, recently delivered an address at the national symposium on the future status of earth resources in society.

I found his subject one of vital importance to our national economy and to the energy crisis that we face today, and I would like to share his thoughts with my colleagues.

Mr. ANDERSON concludes that, for economic reasons as well as the more publicized environmental concerns, the Congress and the Nation should consider a trans-Alaska-Canada route to deliver the rich reserves of oil and natural gas from Alaska's North Slope to the continental United States. I wholeheartedly concur with his conclusions.

As a Representative of an area of the Midwest that has already acutely felt the effects of petroleum shortages, I believe that Mr. ANDERSON makes a strong and rational case for an all-land oil pipeline which would deliver Alaska's oil reserves to the oil-starved Midwest.

I think all of us who recognize the seriousness of the energy crisis and who can foresee continued shortages of petroleum products, especially in the midwestern and eastern portions of the United States, should review Mr. ANDERSON's remarks carefully.

The address follows:

THE ENERGY CRISIS

Gloomy prophecies of an impending energy shortage in this country abound with such frequency these days that one hesitates to add still another voice to an already clamorous chorus. Nevertheless, as many Illinois and other midwestern communities discovered this winter, we are no longer just speculating about what might happen but are now confronted with a crisis that has already arrived. Within the short span of two years, mere statistical projections of fuel shortages have been transformed into actual facts of life, and formerly hypothetical alternatives for alleviating such conditions have leaped forth as hard, baf-

fling policy choices which must be dealt with—now.

My topic this morning—The Midwest Stake in Alaskan Oil—goes right to the heart of one of this nation's most difficult energy problems: the growing shortfall of domestic petroleum production relative to consumption, and the vexing policy alternatives we will be forced to grapple with as we seek to meet this deficit.

NATIONAL ENERGY OUTLOOK TO 1985

Just as few now question the fact of such shortages or the likelihood that they will become much more severe, there is equally little disagreement about the need to develop the vast reserves discovered on the North Slope in 1968. Some estimates place ultimately recoverable petroleum reserves in this area at more than 40 billion barrels—enough oil to supply the needs of the entire nation for nearly a decade at current rates of consumption.

Of course, there are some environmental purists who are more concerned about potential interferences with the migratory patterns and sex habits of the 340,000 caribou alleged to inhabit the barren plains surrounding the North Slope than with supplying the energy needs of a nation of 200 million people; but for the most part they are confined to the fringes of the current public debate.

And well they should be. A recent authoritative study of the energy outlook for the next 15 years published by the Chase Manhattan Bank showed that energy consumption in the U.S. will increase at a rate of 4.5 percent each year until 1985. That means that the current national energy consumption rate of 32.9 million oil barrel equivalents daily will rise to 64 million barrels daily by 1985—a 92 percent increase. Expressed another way, whereas the average American consumed 60 oil barrel equivalents of energy in 1970, he will consume more than 100 barrels each year by 1985.

If increased domestic energy supplies were expected to be readily forthcoming such projections would not be too troublesome. But the fact is, exclusive of the new Alaskan reserves, domestic supplies of natural gas and petroleum are expected to increase hardly at all during the next fifteen years.

According to the Chase study, fully one-half of the total energy consumption increase I have referred to will have to be met by petroleum. Concretely, this means that U.S. oil consumption will rise from about 15 million barrels daily at present to more than 30 million barrels in 1985. Yet the same Chase projections show that production in the lower 48 states will only increase about 12 percent during the next fifteen years—from about 11.6 million barrels daily in 1970 to 13 million barrels daily in 1985. As a result, where we were dependent on imports for about 20 percent of our petroleum supplies in 1970, we will be dependent upon such sources for almost 60 percent 1985—if the Alaskan fields are not developed.

Now I will not pretend for a moment that Alaskan oil could drastically reduce this growing dependence on foreign supplies, almost 75 percent of which will be derived from politically unstable Middle Eastern sources. At most, output from the Alaskan fields when fully developed will total two million barrels per day. Whether we will like it or not, then, almost fifty percent of our petroleum supplies will be imported for the foreseeable future even under optimal conditions.

Yet the potential two million barrels daily from the North Slope is enormously important despite this fact. For one thing, it would be infinitely more attractive from a national security viewpoint than would be an equivalent amount from the Persian Gulf. Moreover, it would not be subject to the

potential price manipulation, not to say extortion, that the increasingly strong Middle East producers' cartel has shown both an interest and ability to engage in.

More importantly, though, development of the Alaskan field would provide a substantial balance of payments savings on an energy account outflow which will otherwise turn into a massive monetary hemorrhage. If we conservatively assume that imported oil prices will rise to about \$3.00 per barrel in the 1980's, a decade of Alaskan production at projected rates would save the U.S. almost \$22 billion. In light of the current dilemmas we are facing from too many dollars awash in the world already, better that that \$22 billion stay here, it would seem, than end up in the private coffers of assorted Arab sheikdoms.

A decision to move ahead with production on the North Slope, however, would open far more new questions and dilemmas than it would solve. Specifically, it raises the overriding question as to the manner in which such new supplies are to be delivered to consumer markets in the lower forty-eight states.

As many of you know, the petroleum companies which did the original exploration around Prudhoe Bay were nearly set to begin construction of a combination trans-Alaska pipeline/West Coast tanker system in 1969 when Congressional passage of the National Environmental Policy Act intervened. The courts shortly thereafter ruled that no construction permit could be issued until the Interior Department had completed the "environmental impact statement" required by that new statute and, as a result, development has been placed in limbo since that time.

In the view of many, especially of the petroleum companies involved, this long delay has been a costly mistake; a futile exercise forced on the nation by a motley band of lichen-lovers that will delay by up to three or four years delivery of desperately needed petroleum supplies to hungry U.S. markets.

I must admit that originally I too was somewhat unsympathetic to delaying tactics of the environmentalists, but from the perspective of hindsight I must confess that their efforts have served an important public purpose. The delay has allowed a far more thorough and detailed public consideration of the alternative routes over which this new oil can be transported, the different markets it can potentially serve, and the varying social benefits that it can provide than would have otherwise been the case.

From the national debate that has thus ensued, I think one very distinct conclusion can be drawn. Namely, that the original decision to build a combination Alaskan-North Pacific transport system may not have been quite so wise after all, and that the environmental, economic, and national security interests of the nation would be far better served if an overland pipeline transport system is constructed through Canada in its stead. Fortunately, the stay on the construction of the trans-Alaska pipeline makes this still a feasible option.

OIL DEMAND AND SUPPLY PROJECTIONS FOR WEST COAST AND MID-WEST MARKETS

If supply and demand conditions were roughly similar in regional U.S. markets and oil could easily be transported from one area to another, the question of where the new Alaskan supplies should be delivered would probably not be too important. But the fact is, there are tremendous imbalances in supply and demand among regional markets and movement of petroleum long distances from one area to another is in many cases so costly as to be prohibitive.

Currently, the West Coast consumes about two million barrels of oil daily, with about 70 percent of this supplied by domestic producers located within the region (PAD V) and the remainder by imports. Moreover, only about one-third of these imports, or 10 per-

cent of total supply, is derived from Persian Gulf sources.

Over the past three or four years domestic production within District V has increased at about 1.3 percent annually. Even if it were conservatively assumed that this rate of domestic production growth would decline to 1 percent annually over the next eight years, by 1980 1.53 million, out of a total demand estimated by the Office of Emergency Preparedness to be 3.1 million barrels daily, would be supplied by domestic producers. If non-Persian Gulf imports maintained their current ratio of 20 percent of total West Coast consumption (and the prospects for this are good) an additional 620,000 barrels daily would be available from these sources. This would leave only about 950,000 barrels to be supplied by Middle Eastern sources, or about 29 percent of the total West Coast market.

But consider now what would happen if the full two million barrels per day from the North Slope were delivered to West Coast markets in 1980 as currently planned. While these things are difficult to predict, the most likely result would be that all foreign oil would be "backed out" of the market. Yet even if that occurred there would still be a surplus of more than 400,000 barrels daily in District V.

Obviously, a surplus of this magnitude would encourage a variety of efforts to re-establish a balance between demand and supply. One possibility, of course, would be a drop in oil prices designed to stimulate additional consumption. But in light of the tremendous shortages which would prevail in other parts of the nation and the drastic steps that will have to be taken to reduce gasoline consumption on the West Coast itself in order to comply with air pollution standards, that does not seem like a very rational solution, to say the least.

Moreover, crude oil prices in the midwest, for example, are already 20 percent higher than those on the West Coast; a price drop in District V sufficient to clear the market of this projected surplus, assuming a price elasticity of demand equal to unity, would widen this differential to 38 percent. As a midwesterner, I find it difficult to detect much equity in that kind of solution.

Another alternative way of dealing with this surplus would be to export a portion of the two million barrel daily Alaskan production. Some oil executives have already gone on public record as indicating that up to 500,000 barrels a day could be shipped by tanker to Japan. But in light of the fact that we will be dependent on foreign imports for at least 50 percent of total national petroleum supply in 1980, much of it from uncertain Middle Eastern sources, it seems more than a bit ludicrous to propose that we export even one barrel of domestic production.

Finally, it might be possible to ship some of either the new Alaskan oil landed on the West Coast or District V production to Midwest and Eastern markets. But since additional pipeline and other transportation costs would range from 25¢ to 50¢ a barrel to move surpluses in this roundabout manner, this would not appear to be a very viable solution either, unless the cost of transporting Alaskan oil directly to these markets via a Canadian pipeline would be even greater. As I will attempt to show momentarily, this just is not the case. In short, the surpluses which would be created on the West Coast by the infusion of vast new supplies of Alaskan oil simply could not be disposed of in a manner which would be economically rational or in keeping with broad national interests.

By contrast, consider the 1980 outlook for the Midwest market, referred to as District II in bureaucratic parlance. According to OEP, demand in District II will reach six million barrels per day in 1980, but only 2.25 million barrels of this will be supplied by

domestic production. Fully 62 percent will have to be obtained from foreign sources.

Moreover, because of likely continued Canadian curbs on exports to the U.S. and limited supplies elsewhere in the world, 2.3 million barrels, out of total imports of 3.7 million barrels daily, will be from Middle East sources. That means that without Alaskan oil, the Midwest will be dependent on the whims of Middle Eastern oil producers for exactly 39 percent of its total petroleum supply.

The direct transmission of the expected two million barrels of daily Alaskan production could obviously improve this untenable situation tremendously. Even assuming that one-third of North Slope oil transported directly to the Midwest via an overland pipeline would eventually find its way to East Coast markets, the need for Middle Eastern oil would still be cut in half. Put another way, with Alaskan oil the Midwest would be dependent for only about 17 percent of its total supply on the Arab states, roughly within the range of proportion I mentioned earlier for the West Coast (assuming it would receive no Alaskan oil).

It seems to me that in terms of simple fairness, it would be far more desirable to distribute the potential risks of Middle Eastern oil dependence evenly among the regions of the country than to create a situation in which the West Coast would be floating in a substantial surplus of secure domestic oil, while the economy of the Midwest would be literally hanging in the balance of developments in the politically volatile Middle East. In addition, while the infusion of Alaskan oil into Midwest markets would not appreciably lower prices there, it would at least prevent the further substantial widening of an already significant differential in prices between the two regions.

In terms of the basic U.S. regional supply and demand situations, then, the Canadian alternative makes a lot more sense. Rather than deliver the new Alaskan oil to a market where it is not needed, further increase a price advantage which is already inequitable, or create a situation where precious domestic supplies would be actually exported, it could deliver vast new supplies to a market where it is desperately required and, in the process, remove the threat of political blackmail against the vast industrial heartland of the nation.

CONSTRUCTION COSTS OF THE TWO ROUTES

These supply and demand, price, and national security considerations, of course, do not alone establish an air-tight case for the Canadian pipeline alternative. Conceivably the capital costs of such a route could be so much greater than the Alaskan system as to override all of the foregoing analysis. Indeed, some opponents of the Canadian alternative have attempted to create just this impression by suggesting that it would cost more than \$6 billion to construct, an amount roughly twice the projected costs of the Alaskan pipeline and tanker transport system combined.

A closer examination of the economics of the two systems, however, reveals that they would be roughly comparable in cost. Current estimates for the 800-mile Alaskan route suggest a cost of about \$1 billion for the construction and acquisition cost of the pipeline itself, or about \$1.2 million per mile; another \$500 to \$750 million expense for interest during construction and the development of access roads in the Alaskan wilderness, and perhaps an equal amount for the storage and transmission facilities at Valdez. Finally, an additional \$1 billion plus would be required for the construction of the tanker fleet to ship petroleum from Valdez to various West Coast ports. This brings the total capital cost of the Alaskan system to a range of \$3.0 to \$3.5 billion in

1971 prices, a figure generally accepted by the petroleum industry.

The Canadian pipeline system would obviously be substantially longer—about 2900 miles—and it is perhaps this fact which has given rise to wild estimates about the capital cost of developing such an alternative route. But before these estimates are accepted at face value, a number of off-setting factors should be given careful consideration.

First, there would obviously be no tanker or port storage and transmission facilities involved in the trans-Canadian route, a fact which provides an initial advantage of at least \$2 billion. Secondly, a new pipeline would have to be constructed for only slightly more than one-half of the route—the 1700 miles from Prudhoe Bay through the Mackenzie River Valley to Edmonton. At Edmonton, the current Interprovincial Pipeline which extends down into the U.S. as far as Chicago could be "looped" at a cost equal to only a fraction of that required for new pipeline construction and right-of-way clearance and preparation.

Finally, even the new segment between Prudhoe Bay and Edmonton would be less expensive on a per mile basis than the trans-Alaskan route. This is due to the fact that it could follow the flat Mackenzie River Valley as opposed to the rugged plateaus and mountain ranges of Alaska, and that, over a considerable share of the distance, existing highway systems would preclude the heavy access road construction costs required by the Alaskan route.

Specifically, even if \$1.2 million is allowed for the construction of each pipeline mile from Prudhoe Bay to Edmonton (a figure equal to that allowed for the Alaskan route, although the terrain would be considerably less difficult), and an additional \$800 million is allowed for interest during the construction period and other costs, such as access roads which would have to be developed along some parts of the route, the total cost of this segment would be \$2.9 billion.

As I have already indicated, the remaining 1100 miles of the route to Chicago would be considerably less expensive, because the existing Interprovincial Pipeline could be "looped"—to use industry jargon. Currently, the Interprovincial Pipeline Company is looping its existing line with a new 48 inch pipe over a substantial portion of the Edmonton to Chicago route. It estimates a total capital cost of roughly \$450,000 per mile for the project. This, of course, is less than one-third of the total cost of laying an entirely new line.

Thus, even a conservative estimate of the lower portion of the trans-Canadian route would entail total capital costs of about \$600 million. In combination with the cost of the Prudhoe Bay to Edmonton segment, overall capital costs would be in the neighborhood of \$3.5 billion, a figure at the high estimate range for the Alaskan system.

Using these capital cost assumptions, Professor Charles Cicchetti, in a study prepared for Resources for the Future, estimated that the discounted capital and operating costs over the lifetime of the systems would amount to \$1.10 per barrel in the case of the Alaskan pipeline/West Coast tanker system and about \$1.15 per barrel for the trans-Canadian line. Given the preceding considerations about markets, prices, and national security, that differential seems pretty slight indeed.

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPARISON OF THE TWO ROUTES

The environmental hazards posed by the development of the Alaskan system are well known after more than two years of national debate. While some critics have perhaps exaggerated the importance of alleged threats to the caribou, lichen, and tundra, there are at least three very serious environmental threats that cannot easily be brushed aside.

Perhaps the most notable of these is that the route of the lower 70 percent of the proposed Alaskan pipeline would pass through literally a thicket of known earthquake epicenters, and within close range of three major transcurrent faults. The potential for pipeline breakage and vast oil spills is underscored by the fact that this area has experienced 23 major earthquakes with a Richter rating of 6 or more during the last 70 years.

A second, equally serious, environmental threat is posed by the danger of earthquakes or tidal waves in Prince William Sound, the site of storage and transmission facilities scheduled to be constructed in the port city of Valdez. As some of you may know, in 1964 the worst recorded earthquake in North American history, and the tidal waves which followed it, literally destroyed the original town on this site. Yet the Alaskan pipeline system would result in the continuous storage of more than 20 million barrels of oil in Valdez, posing a clear and serious threat to the rich fishing resources of the Sound—to say nothing of other aquatic life and literally thousands of miles of Alaskan and Canadian coastline.

Finally, the hazard presented by two million barrels of daily tanker traffic on the route between Valdez, Puget Sound and southern California needs little elaboration. Even the environmental impact statement filed by the Interior Department noted that "the whole coast between Port Valdez and southern California is seismically active—some of the largest historic earthquakes occurred in these areas and the magnitude and frequency of future seismic events are predicted to be high."

The statement also noted that "Prince William Sound is poor climatologically" with frequent presence of highly restricted visibility and violent winds. In all, the Department concluded that up to 140,000 barrels of oil would be unintentionally discharged into the north Pacific each year as a result of these conditions.

By contrast, the Canadian route receives far superior environmental ratings. Less than five percent of the route between Prudhoe Bay and Edmonton would pass through seismically active areas, and, as indicated previously, it would pass through relatively flat terrain as opposed to the rugged Alaskan mountain chains. Obviously, there would also be no threat of marine spills and contamination similar to those associated with the Alaskan route.

Moreover, a gas pipeline must be built through the Mackenzie Valley in any case because of the impracticality of gas liquification at Valdez and Alaskan state laws banning flaring at the well site. Thus, if admittedly some risks to the terrain, wildlife, and ecology of the Canadian Northwest must be run anyway, why not bring both pipelines down the same right-of-way? To do otherwise would simply double or triple the environmental hazards unnecessarily, given the superiority of the Canadian route on other grounds.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Let me say in conclusion, then, that from whatever perspective viewed the Canadian pipeline alternative seems to be far superior to the route currently planned. There has been some concern, I must admit, that the Canadians are not eager to cooperate in the development of a new line through the Mackenzie Valley, and that this may be a substantial deterrent to the alternative I am advocating.

I think, however, there is ample evidence on the record to dispel this concern very handily. If anything, the Canadians are highly concerned not about the Mackenzie Valley route but about the Alaskan system because of the hazards it would pose to their North Pacific Coast. In a recent letter to Secretary Morton, for example, Donald S.

MacDonald, the Canadian Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources said:

"In reciting some of the advantages to the United States and Canada of a cooperative relationship between us in the construction of an oil pipeline across Canada, I am mindful, too, that such a measure would avoid the considerable increase in tanker movements of oil on the Pacific Coast and particularly in the inland waters of Alaska, British Columbia, and Washington State, and the resultant significant risk of serious environmental and economic damage. This is an area which, if not solved with reason and wisdom by us today, could produce difficult influences in Canada-United States relations."

Earlier, this key member of the Canadian government had also pledged during a debate on the floor of the House of Commons that "there will be no unnecessary roadblocks (to the Mackenzie Valley pipeline) at the Canadian end and Canadian governmental side." As recently as March, 1972, this same official traveled to Washington at the time the Interior Department's environmental impact statement was released to urge U.S. authorities to reconsider the potential advantages of the Canadian alternative.

But the real key to Canadian attitude on this question is the fact that vast reserves of petroleum are known to be available in the Canadian Arctic; supplies which at some future date would have to be pumped down a pipeline through the Mackenzie Valley if they were to be successfully exploited. Given the known economies of looping a previously existing line, it would hardly be likely that the Canadians would hold up the development of a pipeline that could result in significant savings to them at some date in the not too distant future.

Finally, some concern has been expressed that with the desperate need for new petroleum supplies in this country, the two-year delay acknowledged to be implicit in developing the trans-Canadian pipeline is unacceptable. I would submit that this particular caveat might well have some significance if it were not for one enormously important fact: The surplus situation in West Coast markets means that a full through-put of two million barrels per day could not be attained until 1980 even if the Alaskan system were completed as early as 1976, according to testimony submitted by the petroleum companies themselves. By contrast, sufficient markets already exist in the Midwest so that, as soon as technically feasible after completion, a full two million barrels per day could be pumped down the Canadian line. As a result, cumulative total barrels delivered by both systems would be roughly equal by 1980, despite the fact of a two-year construction lag associated with the Canadian line.

As many of you know, the Alaskan line is once again stalled, this time by a court order on the basis of a technicality in the 1920 Mining Act concerning right-of-way width. Very likely, legislation will soon be offered to amend that law so that construction of the Alaskan system may at last begin.

In light of the obvious environmental, economic and national security advantages of the Canadian alternative, I would hope that such legislation would be written to specify that the Mining Act will be amended only insofar as it would allow for the development of a line across the northeastern portion of Alaska to feed into a Mackenzie Valley pipeline. In that way we would assure that the vast reserves available on the North Slope will ultimately be delivered to Midwestern and Eastern markets in the U.S. where these new supplies are desperately needed. In the meantime it will be up to both the consumers and businessmen of the vast Eastern and Midwestern areas of the country, who stand to benefit substantially from the construction of the Canadian alternative, to mobilize support for a policy which would not only be in their own interest but in the long run interest of the entire nation as well.

EASTERN RAILROAD CRISIS

HON. M. CALDWELL BUTLER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said recently about the worsening situation of many of our eastern railroads. On February 8, this House passed a resolution to provide for a temporary halt to a strike against the Penn Central Railroad. As was clear to everyone at that time, this action was but a part of what needed to be done to clear up the overall problems facing the railroad companies of the East, and the resolution accordingly directed the Secretary of Transportation to draw up and submit to the Congress a comprehensive plan to preserve rail transportation service in this part of the Nation.

Since it is clear that this matter will be before the Congress again, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to a perceptive analysis of the situation contained in a speech by John P. Fishwick, president of the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. As the head of one of the few eastern railroads that are not in financial trouble, Mr. Fishwick can speak with some authority. I am inserting the text of his remarks at this point in the RECORD:

THE EASTERN RAILROAD CRISIS—GUIDELINES FOR ACTION

(An Address by John P. Fishwick)

I want to talk to you today about the Eastern railroad situation. It is not an appealing subject. Since Penn Central went into bankruptcy in 1970, millions of words have been written about that fiasco. Many of you are tired of hearing about it. In fact, most of us have hoped that the problem of the bankrupt Eastern railroads would solve itself or simply go away.

The problem has not gone away, and in the next few months, perhaps within the next few weeks, decisions will have to be made which will have a tremendous impact upon our transportation system. It is time, therefore, that I, as President of a railroad which has substantial trackage in the Northeast, and you, as citizens of the largest railroad terminal in the world and the keystone of our rail transportation system, faced up to this problem.

What is the situation in the Northeast? There are six major Eastern railroads in bankruptcy: Penn Central, Central of New Jersey, Lehigh Valley, Reading, Erie Lackawanna and Boston & Maine. It is impossible to travel or ship by rail between Chicago and New York without passing over a bankrupt railroad. Over 50% of the railroad mileage in the Northeast is in bankruptcy. The bankrupt lines account for 60,000 miles of track (17% of the U.S. total) and 120,000 employees (22% of the U.S. total). Most of these railroads have a negative cash flow and cannot be reorganized under traditional reorganization procedures.

SOLUTION REQUIRED

In fact, the Penn Central Trustees on February 1 announced that, even if they could achieve their goals of massive reductions in mileage, substantial reductions in numbers of employees and increased compensation for providing passenger service, the railroad still cannot be reorganized unless it receives between \$600 million and \$800 million of government funds over the next four or five years. Penn Central had a one-day strike on February 8 over its proposal to reduce the

size of its train crews. To stop this strike, Congress enacted a law which postponed the strike for 90 days and required the Administration to develop a proposed solution to the Northeastern railroad problem within 45 days, or by March 26.

This legislation has formalized the crisis and precipitated action on a number of fronts. The White House and Department of Transportation are reportedly working on plans as directed by Congress. A subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee is holding hearings. The ICC has instituted an investigation. The railroad industry has been exploring alternatives. Last Tuesday the federal judge handling the Penn Central reorganization gave the Trustees until July 2 to produce a practicable plan of reorganization or, alternatively, a plan of liquidation. On that same day, the Lehigh Valley petitioned the court to discontinue all operations on October 1 because a feasible reorganization plan could not be formulated.

So far, no one, to my knowledge, has come up with a generally acceptable, politically feasible solution to the Northeastern railroad problem. I want to report to you on some of the approaches which have been advanced and to suggest some guidelines which I feel should be followed in trying to solve the problem. But, first, I want to remind you why the railroads in the Northeast have come upon such hard times. The truth is that for more than a decade the Northeastern lines as a whole, excluding the two Pocahontas lines, C&O and NW, with which I happily am associated, have not made money. They have limped along by making minimal capital expenditures, deferring maintenance, liquidating assets and being supported by nonrail earnings. In this period, industry moved out of the Northeast into the South and West, and highways expanded. I do not say that inadequate management had nothing to do with the financial showing of some of the railroads, but I do not believe the poor management was a major cause of the difficulties of Northeastern rail systems.

INTERSTATE SYSTEM'S IMPACT

There was a sharp decline in the fortunes of the Northeastern railroads beginning about 1966. This decline was caused, I think, by inflation and completion of most of the Interstate Highway System. When we embarked upon building the Interstate Highway System, I doubt that anyone realized the impact it would have upon our nation, especially upon the railroads. It has doubled the competitive range of the trucks already, substantially reduced their costs and dramatically increased the utilization of their equipment. Truck competition has been particularly severe in the East where, unlike in the West, rail hauls are relatively short. It costs truckers about five cents of each revenue dollar to use the highways; it costs the railroads about 25 cents of each revenue dollar to own, maintain and pay taxes on their trackage.

I do not believe the maximum impact of the Interstate Highway System on the railroads has yet been felt. We are rapidly shifting more and more of our freight to the highways. This poses a threat not only to the railroads but also to the common-carrier trucks for private-truck carriage is probably the fastest growing segment of the transportation industry.

The year 1972 set all-time records for the production of trucking units of the sizes which are competitive with railroads. Domestic sales of medium-heavy trucks were up 40%, and heavy-truck sales were up about 27%. The medium and heavy-duty trucks sold in 1972 alone have a capacity under conditions of intensive use for hauling 500 billion ton miles of freight traffic a year. For comparison, total actual ton mile traffic of the railroad industry annually is less than

800 billion ton miles. Thus, one year's truck production has created a potential carrying capacity of about two thirds of the total annual business of the American railroads.

The basic problem for the Northeastern railroads is, therefore, that there is simply not enough present or prospective business to support anywhere near the trackage the railroads now own and operate. We must either permit the railroads to contract their plants to the level of viability or in some way provide government funds to enable the railroads to continue operations. This is the hard choice that we face.

POSITIONS DISCUSSED

There are those in responsible positions in government, I am told, who would treat this in the Adam Smith manner. They say that what rail service is essential for the public interest is what is viable. The test of what is viable is what private enterprise will pay for and operate. The rest should be liquidated. The chief opponents of this view, of course, will be the labor organizations and the states and localities which do not wish to lose their rail service and taxes. It will also be opposed by those who do not accept the Adam Smith view of the public interest.

Even if we accept this view as a basis for determining policy, however, there remains a serious problem as to how it could be implemented. We might consider reorganizing the viable parts of the Penn Central and other bankrupt railroads within a new corporation or corporations formed under reorganization procedures. We might also consider selling off the viable parts of these railroads to connecting lines or interested parties. But no one could determine whether he would be willing to undertake an operation of any part of these bankrupt lines unless he knew in advance what the final price would be, what obligations he would be undertaking with respect to payments to employees whose services would not be necessary and what would be demanded by the affected labor organizations as a condition of their members' operating the acquired property. No satisfactory resolution of these crucial points may be possible without government intervention and probably without a major contribution by the federal government toward the social costs involved in abolishing thousands of railroad jobs.

On the other hand, those who insist upon the continued operation of nonviable rail lines must accept the fact of government participation in some form with whatever threat such participation implies. Nearly all of those who have accepted that premise have tried to find some solution for government intervention short of outright ownership and operation by the federal government. The Trustees of Penn Central, for instance, have suggested a contribution by the federal government as their first choice. Senator Hartke, on the basis of a Senate staff study, has introduced a bill providing for a federal corporation to acquire the rights of way of all of the Eastern bankrupt railroads and permit the owners to operate them at a user charge of 60 cents per 1,000 gross ton miles. Such a plan would provide devastating competition for solvent competitive railroads, which would have to own and maintain their own rights of way at a cost about triple that charged to the bankrupt railroads.

LIMIT GOVERNMENT PARTICIPATION

My own view is that the best possible outcome would be to have the Eastern railroads, or as much of the Eastern trackage as possible, owned and operated by private enterprise and that any intervention by government should be limited. Moreover, any such intervention should have as one of its principal guidelines the preservation of the remaining rail systems in the East as well as

those in the South and West as viable transportation companies.

Since we must find a solution which encompasses all the Northeastern railroads, I suggest we look at areas rather than individual bankrupt railroads. One important area includes the corridor tracks between Washington and Boston. These tracks are used largely for passenger operations, and the Metroliner service operated by Amtrak in this corridor has proven popular. I think that the federal government, through some organization such as Amtrak, should own the right of way and operate passenger lines through this corridor. The freight traffic moving through this corridor could easily be moved over other trackage of the Penn Central or other railroads.

For several years the Department of Transportation has been supporting research on air-cushion vehicles. West Germany and Japan are exploring magnetic levitation. We will soon see trains somewhere in the world operating at speeds of 200 to 300 miles per hour over new kinds of "tracks," and the American public will expect such trains to be operated in this country.

The capital costs of providing such trains between, say, New York and Washington or New York and Boston, will run into billions of dollars and will be far beyond the capacity of any existing private transportation company or companies. On the other hand, the cost-benefit ratio may be highly favorable and fully justify government support. If frequent surface transportation could be provided between downtown Washington and downtown New York at speeds of around 300 miles per hour, there would be very little need for air transportation between those cities.

APPROPRIATE PURCHASE TIME

There will never be a better time than now for the federal government to acquire a right of way between Washington, New York and Boston. And the price, based upon net liquidation value, will never be lower. It could be accomplished without troublesome federal budgetary problems either through Amtrak or a new corporation which could issue bonds in payment for the property acquired. Such an undertaking probably could be fully justified quite apart from any collateral effects it would have on the Eastern railroad situation, although undoubtedly the infusion of substantial liquid assets into Penn Central would be helpful.

If the remaining trackage operated by Penn Central and the other Eastern bankrupt lines cannot be combined or broken up so as to form a viable operating unit or units, then, of course, the only alternatives would be further abandonments of line or some form of government support or operation. I would hope that, recognizing the magnitude of the problem and the seriousness of any long-range involvement by the federal government, we could agree upon the first alternative. If that cannot be accomplished, however, and government participation is necessary, the government should think not of support or acquisition of all of the lines of the bankrupt railroads but of only those parts which cannot be made viable and which can be operated or supported by the government with a minimum threat to the viability of the remaining rail system.

TERMINALS IN SUBURBS

For instance, the area extending north of Philadelphia into New York has much railroad trackage, all of which cannot be operated profitably. Much of it could be abandoned without substantial controversy. This area might be cordoned off for government support or operation without serious impact on the privately operated connecting lines. In fact, it might be in the public interest to develop a rail transportation system which does not thread its way through the countless streets of our major metropolitan areas,

blocking traffic and blighting the landscape. Rather, it would make sense to have railroads end most of their freight service at major terminals on the outskirts of major metropolitan areas with door-to-door delivery by truck.

Not all rail deliveries could be made by trucks, of course, especially deliveries of bulk materials. And in the New York area, the railroads would have to have port connections, especially at the container ports, to provide for the transfer of goods directly to and from ships. But much of the railway trackage in such areas as northern New Jersey could be cleared away without any noticeable inconvenience to shippers and much land made available for more advantageous usage. The government might make this a model project which could be followed in other highly congested areas.

TIME OF CRISIS

Let me summarize. This is a time of crisis for the Eastern railroads. Unless some action is taken, one or more of them may cease operations before the year's end. They have reached this distressing condition because for a number of years there has been too little rail freight to support all of the Eastern railroad facilities and operations. Because of a continuing shift of freight from rail to truck, there is no real prospect that all of the railroad trackage in the East can be made profitable.

The hard-nosed, economic view is that unprofitable lines should be abandoned and the remainder operated by private enterprise without government support. The opposing view, sometimes based on sentiment or nostalgia, is that most of the present mileage should be operated even though some form of government support is required. The political—and probably the wisest—solution will probably fall somewhere between the two.

In that event, government intervention and support should be so limited and so focused that it will preserve to the maximum extent possible the operation of most of our railroad system under private enterprise. The Eastern railroad problem has festered for generations, and we should attempt to provide a solution not for a few years, but for generations to come.

TRIBUTE TO RICHFIELD HIGH SCHOOL BASKETBALL CHAMPIONS

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, Richfield High School has recently won the 1973 Minnesota high school basketball tournament. The city of Richfield, in my congressional district, has never been satisfied with less than excellence, and that spirit is manifested in its school system as well as in its community activities. The basketball championship was complemented by an earlier State high school debate championship won earlier this year.

State titles in any activities are the most dramatic indications of the community's continuing quest for excellence. Richfield's debate and basketball teams deserve special congratulations not only for their specific individual achievements, but also for calling the attention of the State and the Nation to the community spirit in the city of Richfield.

GORDON BROWNING OF TENNESSEE: A GREAT STATESMAN HONORED

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Carroll County Historical Society and other organizations, leaders, officials, and citizens of this great county and Tennessee recently honored Tennessee's highly respected and esteemed Governor-emeritus, Gordon Browning, and his memorable record of public service.

Gordon Browning served three terms as Governor, six terms as U.S. Representative, 7 years as judge of chancery court, and with great distinction in the U.S. Army in World War I and World War II.

He was captain in World War I and colonel in World War II—a Congressman, judge, and Governor in Tennessee—and a military governor in Europe.

The occasion of the recent tribute to Governor Browning was the dedication of the Gordon Browning Room in the McKenzie Memorial Library in McKenzie, Tenn. This room contains—in the words of columnist Joe Hatcher of the Tennessean in Nashville—the "words, deeds, record, and memorabilia" of Governor Browning.

Certainly this is a richly deserved tribute to this courageous statesman who insisted on standing for 2 hours to greet many of his countless friends, although he is 83 years old and suffering from Parkinson's disease. Governor Browning has not permitted the ravages of this disease to affect his great sense of humor and his indomitable courage is a shining example of will power and determination to overcome any handicap.

Governor Browning is a great Tennessean, a great American, and a great Democrat, and the illustrious record of his administrations as Governor will stand as a perpetual monument to growth and progress under his enlightened leadership.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in the great men of our times, I place in the RECORD the article by Mr. Hatcher in the Tennessean concerning the recent dedication in McKenzie:

MEMORIAL PROUD DAY FOR GORDON BROWNING

(By Joe Hatcher)

MCKENZIE, TENN.—The words, deeds and records, and memorabilia of Gordon Browning, three times governor of Tennessee and much decorated hero of two world wars, were dedicated to the public here yesterday with Gov. Browning himself the center of the ceremonies.

The "Gordon Browning Room" in the McKenzie Memorial Library was dedicated as a permanent memorial to Browning, but plans were made known that the Carroll County Historical Society has aims for a memorial building and memorial to the county's most distinguished citizen later.

Gov. Browning stood proudly in the spacious room in the McKenzie library to welcome hundreds and hundreds of friends, associates and fellow countians who came to pay him tribute.

Dr. J. A. Barksdale, professor of educa-

tion at Bethel College here, and state commissioner of education under Browning, dedicated the memorial, paying tribute to Browning as a citizen, as governor and his role in two world wars.

Despite his 83 years and the inroads of Parkinson's Disease, Browning arrived early for the ceremonies, stood behind a desk at the end of the big room, greeted the hundreds personally and called most of the visitors by name.

"I am happy on this occasion. I am most humble," he commented.

"I am so pleased with the room and the arrangements, and I am told they plan to build a permanent exhibit hall and memorial for me. I am most proud," the governor told us as we passed through the line.

"Mr. Legislator" Jim Cummings of Woodbury, who managed one of Browning's campaigns for governor and served as his secretary of state, and McAllen Foutch of Smithville, who was a Browning speaker of the House, were among the first to be received by the governor.

There were old buddies from World War I, all too few of whom are left, he observed. Bascom Jones of Nashville was one of those to recall a few incidents that led to Browning's familiar nickname "Cap" to those who served with him in Battery D, 114th Field Artillery.

Secretary of State Joe C. Carr, former Sen. Gerald Stratton, who served during the first Browning administration, Judge Robert L. (Bob) Taylor of Memphis, who was the Browning commissioner of insurance for a time, and many others were in the lines to pay their respects.

Former Rep. Ray Blanton, who occupied the seat in Congress that had been Browning's for 12 years was there. Also former House Speaker Jim McKinney of Nashville, John J. Hooker Jr., Floyd Kephart, Judge James L. England of Decaturville, and others.

The room itself is a tribute to the women of the Carroll County Historical Society who have worked long with volunteers at getting the room ready and arranging the displays of the Browning war decorations, his uniforms from two wars, the records of his administration, his war keepsakes and artifacts, including the last two French 75 shells fired by the 114th Battery before the Nov. 11, 1918, Armistice on the German front.

There's a beloved picture of old "Kaiser," the big German Shepherd dog that Capt. Browning rescued on the German front and brought home with him. "Kaiser" lived until 1939.

There's much of the history of the 114th Field Artillery, pictures of Col. Luke Lea and his captains, Browning, Enoch (Nuck) Brown, Tom Henderson, Larry McPhail, Reece Amis of Franklin, but with the entire battery.

Lacking is a history of the 114th, written by Capt. Reece Amis of Franklin, but which the society hopes to obtain to add to the collection.

To demonstrate the amazing vigor of the man, friends kept insisting that he be seated at the big desk to welcome his visitors. "I would not want to welcome all these beautiful and lovely women sitting down," the governor remarked—and stand he did for most of the two-hour reception.

The large portrait of the governor in the reception hall outside the big room was unveiled for the ceremonies. A souvenir program was given to all carrying a Browning quote that typifies the man:

"Had I my life to live over I would marry the same girl, seek the same office, and be as much service to my fellow man as my strength and ability allowed. As a young man watching my mother raise a family and work in the cotton field all day to help educate the family, I took a vow then that if I came to manhood I would fight for the things that would make it a better world for the people. I have tried to do that."

Browning was governor in 1937-39, and 1949-53. He served in combat in World War I, participating in the St. Mihiel, Argonne Forest, and Louvre sector, with decorations for those battles and from the British, and French governments, and other allies.

In World War II, he served with the military government, aiding in planning for D-Day and was the first U.S. officer to reach Brussels, Belgium, to help restore civilian government. He was later to serve as director of all civilian government in occupied country, and later as governor of Bavaria. Again he was decorated by the British, French, Belgian, Luxembourg, and other allied governments.

All these medals and citations and memorabilia are part of the display in the "Gordon Browning Memorial Room."

TOURIST PARKING

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress is thoroughly familiar with the frustrations experienced by tourists in the Nation's Capital each year, especially as they drive in the vicinity of Capitol Hill in what must seem like a never-ending search for a place to park.

I believe this intolerable situation should not be permitted to continue any longer, and I am therefore introducing in the House today a bill to require the Administrator of the General Services Administration to establish a system of fringe parking facilities in the District of Columbia. These facilities are to be sufficient in number to accommodate the number of tourists who visit the Capital each year, and the Administrator is authorized to charge a reasonable fee for the use of these parking facilities.

Under this legislation, the GSA Administrator is also required to provide an express bus service from these fringe parking facilities to Capitol Hill, and he would have authority to charge reasonable fees for the use of this bus service.

Based upon information received from the Sergeant at Arms, more than 1 million persons a year take the tour of the rotunda in the Capitol Building. While it might be interesting to speculate on the number of persons who were unable to take that tour because of an inability to park their car, the fact remains that most visitors to Capitol Hill must bear the frustrations of either parking a mile or two from the Capitol Grounds, or accept an inevitable parking citation for parking in an unauthorized area.

The bill I am introducing today will correct what I feel is one of the most glaring deficiencies in the effort to accommodate tourists to the Nation's Capital. To the many families and groups which travel to Washington each year, we owe them the simple privilege of being able to park at a reasonable distance from the Capitol Grounds, and the access to some means of transportation to these grounds from the parking area.

Simple courtesy demands a solution to this problem, and I urge my colleagues to vote favorably on this legislation when it comes before the full House.

EXPORTS AND DOMESTIC PRICES

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, recently a study issued under the auspices of the Brookings Institution undertook to put a price tag on the cost of tariffs and quotas to the American consumer.

Frankly, I do not know how much measurements can be made in dollars and cents. At best the effort must be very imprecise because many other factors than the tariff or import quotas have an effect on the trend of consumer prices. How one would go about measuring these different effects can best be answered by the academics who try such things.

If the Price Commission could be that sure they could probably be more effective. Perhaps they should hire the Brookings Institution to make a study for them.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, if tariffs and quotas cost the American consumer some \$6 billion a year, what do exports cost them? No one knows, but a good case can be made for the claim that exports do have a price-boosting effect. Recently some light was shed on this subject by O. R. Strackbein, who has done much work in the field of tariffs and trade. He points to the price-raising effects of wheat exports to Russia, for example. This is quite definite because of the sudden spurt in prices that took place almost the minute the sales were announced. Various estimates have been placed on the cost of this transaction to the public. In this instance, because of the absence of other price-boosting factors, a fairly definite estimate can be made. If, for example, we consume a billion bushels of wheat in this country, and the price rose by a dollar per bushel, then the cost to the public was in the neighborhood of \$1 billion. These are not exact figures, but they can at least be substantiated.

Much the same effect is produced by the heavy export of soybeans. Here the price has doubled in recent months. Exports in 1972 were at a high level. Shall we credit exports with the increased cost to the American consumer? We produce lots of soybeans, or well over a billion bushels in 1971. Prices have risen from \$3.13 per bushel in 1971—average for the crop—to \$6.50 per bushel this year. This is an increase of over \$3 per bushel. Exports, to repeat, rose to a high level in 1972 and may be considered as a heavy contributing factor to the price rise. Shall we say then that soybean exports will cost the American consumer \$3 billion in 1973? Or \$2 billion or \$1 billion? Maybe the Brookings expert could tell us.

Mr. Speaker, as of interest to all who give attention to this subject I include Mr. Strackbein's paper at this point in the RECORD. He gives attention to a few other products that we export to other markets, and thus cause upward pressure on prices. His article speaks for itself:

EXPORTS AND DOMESTIC PRICES

(By O. R. Strackbein)

We are constantly told that import quotas result in higher prices to the consumers.

That this claim is not borne out by the facts does not in the least temper the unsubstantiated statements.

On the other side of the ledger, there is clear evidence of the effect of heavy exports on domestic prices. We have only to look at our exports of wheat to Russia as a striking example.

Coal exports produced upward pressure on the price of coal. In 1960 exports of bituminous coal were 36 million tons. The wholesale price index stood at 95.6, where 1967 equals 100. In 1970 exports had lifted to a high point of 71 million tons, or almost double the 1960 exports. The price index had risen to 150.0 compared with the all-commodity index of 110.4. There is no import quota on coal, and we import very little. Although exports subsided to approximately 55 million tons in 1971 and 1972, the price continued to rise, reaching 205.5 in December 1972. (Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1972, Tables 1088 and 562; Survey of Current Business, January 1973, p. S-8.) The 205.5 level of the coal price index for December 1972 compares with 122.5 for the all-commodity index. Higher energy costs contribute to the rise in the general price level.

The price of wheat, No. 2, hard and dark, winter (Kansas City), in June 1972 was \$1.53 per bu. After the huge sale to Russia the price escalated above \$2 per bu. by September and reached \$2.60 in December, 1972.

Such a rise was naturally reflected in the price of bread and other bakery products.

Corn exports also rose sharply in 1972. They went from 511 million bu. in 1971 to approximately 876 million bu. in 1972. The price, No. 3 yellow (Chicago) was \$1.21 in December 1971. By the end of 1972 it had risen to \$1.53.

Corn is the principal feed on which cattle is fattened for slaughter. The price increase of beef to the housewife is therefore attributable in part to the increase in corn prices. The rising prices of poultry and eggs also reflected to some extent the higher prices of corn and other grains. (See Survey of Current Business, Jan. 1973.)

Soybeans and soybean oil and meal, have come to the fore to the point where they now represent our principal single agricultural export.

In 1971 soybean exports reached \$1.325 billion, compared with \$1.090 billion wheat exports and \$746 million in corn exports, which were the other two leading farm exports, both of them well surpassing exports of tobacco and cotton.

The price of soybeans has soared in recent months. The price has indeed doubled in 1973 over 1972. Exports rose from 294 million bu. in 1969 to 433 million bu. in 1971. (Stat. Abs., 1969, Table 929, p. 612; Ibid: 1972, Table 1004, p. 605.) We exported 93.5% of total world exports of soybeans in 1971. In that year we exported 37% of our production. We produced 73% of the world's production. (Ibid: 1972, Table 1004, p. 605.)

A rise in price of soybeans and soybean oil creates an upward pressure on the price of many other consumer products and animal feeds.

The price of footwear has risen sharply in recent years, although there is no import quota on footwear imports. The price had risen to an index of 135.0 in July 1969, where 1957-59 equals 100, compared with an index of 115.1 for all commodities at the same date. Since 1970 the wholesale price of footwear rose to 128.7, where 1967 equals 100. The all-commodity index had risen to 122.9 or over 5 points less.

Hides and skins are the principal raw products used in the manufacture of footwear. In 1963 and 1964 we exported only a small number of cattle hides, distinctly less than a million hides each year. In 1965 we exported over 13 million hides. By 1971 the number had reached nearly 16 million hides and in 1972 reached approximately 18 million. (Sur. of Current Bus., January 1973, p. S-30.)

The price index on hides outpaced that on footwear, reaching 142 in December 1972, where 1967 equals 100, compared with 128.7 for footwear and 122.9 for the all-commodity index. Actually the price of hides and skins is very volatile, depending on the demand-supply equation. Style changes in the end-product may also greatly affect the equation. In 1966, for example, the wholesale price index of hides and skins, where 1967 equals 100, was 149.5. In 1968 it was 106.1. In 1969 it went up to 124.1 and dropped to 104.4 in 1970. (Stat. Abs., 1972, Table 562, p. 345.) By the end of 1972, as we have just noted, the index was up to 142.

These examples of the price-raising effects of exports do not, of course, exhaust the list. They do support the expectation that rising foreign demand for domestic products produces a distinctly inflationary effect. The run-away prices, i.e., those that exceed the all-commodity index, can in many instances be traced to a lively export demand.

IMPORT QUOTAS

Import quotas, on the other hand, have not, by comparison, been inflationary. One of the leading import quotas is the one on oil.

Yet the wholesale price index on refined petroleum products had risen to only 112.4 in December 1972, where 1967 equals 100, compared with 122.9 for all commodities. The index for coal, which is a competing fuel, stood at 205.5 at the end of 1972, by contrast. Yet there is no import quota on coal, but we do enjoy a lively export trade in that product.

The wholesale price of wheat, which is protected by a stringent import quota, far more restrictive than the one on petroleum, lagged well below the level prevailing at the time the import quota was first imposed, and also well behind the general wholesale price level. The price per bushel was \$1.53 (Kansas City) before the export sale to Russia was made. The price then skyrocketed to \$2.60 by the end of 1972. The import quota could hardly be saddled with the cause of this price spurt.

Again, while sugar is protected by an import quota, the price from 1970-73 rose only 1 cent per lb., moving (wholesale) from \$1.12 in 1970 to \$1.22 in December 1972. There was no export demand to boost the price. The import quota on its part did not produce an inflationary effect. A strong export demand would be expected to have the same effect on the price of sugar as it did on wheat, hides and skins, coal, etc.

Those who seek to measure the cost to consumers attributable to import quotas, to be fair, should also seek to measure the inflationary effects of exports. No such effort has surfaced to date. All the emphasis, misplaced as it is, has been spent in seeking a consumer indictment of import quotas. Exports, by contrast, are absolved, without investigating, of all liability.

A TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM P. COCHRANE

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to join my colleagues in paying tribute to William P. Cochrane, our retiring Assistant Parliamentarian.

Like many other Members of the House of Representatives, I have had the good fortune of becoming personally acquainted during my service here with

Bil Cochrane and I have found him to be unfailingly courteous and conscientious in his dealings with Members of the House.

Knowledgeable and fair, possessed with a warmth of personality and a winning wit, Bil Cochrane will be much missed by us all.

I hope that he will find much happiness in whatever way he chooses to spend his retirement years.

NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN RECYCLING

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, on February 15, the Minneapolis Star carried a news article which, I believe, will be of considerable interest to Members who are interested in the subject of recycling. The article discusses the activities of the Recyclomatic Co. in developing and operating a recycling process for nylon. Nylon is a nonbiodegradable product. Such materials pose special handling disposal problems, and recycling techniques which apply to them are especially interesting to environmentalists.

The article follows:

PANTY HOSE, NYLONS RUN INTO FIELD OF RECYCLING

(By Beverly Kees)

Don't throw away your old nylons and panty hose. Like bottles and beer cans, panty hose can be recycled.

The world's first panty hose project is starting right here, it was announced today by W. S. Egekvist, president of Sorencos, Inc., a Minneapolis-based consulting firm.

The firm has formed a new division, the Recyclomatic Company, to deal with recycling nylon and related plastics, Egekvist said. The executive director is David H. Carlson, who is resigning as director of the Metropolitan Recycling Center, St. Paul, one of the sheltered work programs operated by the Occupational Training Center, Inc. (OTC), St. Paul.

Sorencos is putting up the money for the equipment to process the nylon and handicapped workers will do the processing. Proceeds from the sale of recycled products will go to support OTC programs.

Women are asked to drop off laundered panty hose and nylons at any of several collection stations around the metropolitan area.

John DuRand, OTC executive director, said several retailers and manufacturers cooperating in the program plan to give coupons worth money or trading stamps as added incentives.

Handicapped workers will snip off the elastic and separate the hose according to type (6 or 66—most American hose is type 66) which is determined by a heat test.

The nylon is shredded, the color is removed and it is melted, then re-extruded into elastic nylon thread. The thread can later be used to make a variety of nylon products, Egekvist explained. He said the company plans to get into other nylon recycling programs later, perhaps using lingerie.

Egekvist said he spent a year in research to start the program because he believes industry must do its part "to conserve our natural resources within industries in which we operate."

If the project is successful here, Egekvist

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

11101

hopes similar projects will be launched around the country.

The project not only reuses otherwise abandoned material but also provides jobs for the physically and mentally handicapped, he said.

Certainly the raw material for the project is available, he said. Hosiery Association data from 1971 shows 2 1/4 billion pairs of hose are produced annually, a significant share of which is panty hose and nylons.

Laundered hose can be dropped off starting today at Metro-Recycling Center, 666 Pelham Blvd., St. Paul, and its St. Louis Park outlet at 7200 Walker Av.

Carlson Companies are setting up the collection stations at Gold Bond Gift Centers: 1082 University Av., St. Paul; 1102 Nicollet Av.; 12715 B. Hwy, 55; and in Mankato, Minn., at 611 S. Front St.

Also National Brand Distributors catalog showrooms at 6215 Brooklyn Blvd., Brooklyn Center; 1815 N. St. Paul Rd., St. Paul; and in Sheboygan, Wis.

WELFARE SCANDAL—VIII

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, our efforts to provide basic services to our needy people through our welfare system have failed. The high cost of administration has not assured efficient or even competent management in the distribution of billions of welfare dollars.

Miss Gene Cunningham and Mr. Stuart Wilk, investigative reporters for the Milwaukee Sentinel, have completed a 3-month investigation of the Milwaukee County Welfare Department and concluded that one dollar in five is being wasted through fraud or administrative error.

Today I am inserting the eighth segment of this series dealing with provision of housing for welfare recipients. The same story is now being uncovered in Washington and doubtless exists in other parts of the country. Welfare families being forced to live in condemned housing because the buildings were never inspected or "inspected" by telephone. Tax dollars that should have helped needy people obtain a decent place to live were funneled into the pockets of slumlords, a waste of both our human and our financial resources.

The eighth segment follows:

CONDEMNED HOUSES OK'D FOR WELFARE RECIPIENTS

(By Gene Cunningham and Stuart Wilk)

Condemned houses have been approved by the Milwaukee County Welfare Department as fit for habitation by welfare recipients.

And the department has paid the security deposit required and included the monthly rent in the recipient's welfare grant.

The welfare department's housing division has approved as acceptable for recipients:

Houses that have been condemned and scheduled for demolition.

Houses that have been placarded by the city's Building Inspection Department as "unfit for human habitation" because of health and safety hazards.

Houses that have been ordered vacated pending repairs.

The welfare department has a policy that, before any security deposit is paid, an aide from the department's housing division must check the house or apartment and determine that it is acceptable, said John Casey, supervisor of staff resources for the department and the administrator in charge of its housing division.

The aides, Casey said, check to see that all city codes are being met, that the toilet flushes, there is running water, the windows aren't broken—"It's a visual inspection."

"If they (houses and apartments) are not acceptable, then we don't allow the security deposits," Casey said.

Casey also said that the department's housing division commonly checked with the building inspector's office to determine the condition of the property before issuing a security deposit.

Not so, the building inspection office said.

Never, to his knowledge, has anyone from the welfare department ever checked or inquired as to the condition of any property, said George Heider, who handles complaints and inquiries in building inspection.

"They move people into real bad places... Then later we get complaints," Heider said.

The department recently issued its approval and a \$125 security deposit for a house that had been damaged by fire and condemned by the building inspection department.

Asked about the house and his department's approval of it, Casey at first said he knew nothing of the situation. Later, he said that he understood the fire had taken place after the welfare family had moved in.

The welfare department was contacted by the building inspection department last December and told to get the welfare family out of the condemned house.

There was "some dispute over when the fire took place," Casey said.

Any dispute could have been resolved in the time it took to make a telephone call to the Milwaukee Fire Department.

The fire took place Oct. 16, 1971, the fire department told a Sentinel reporter, an answer that matched what city building inspectors had said.

The house—at 1831 N. 16th St.—was ordered vacated when its owner failed to repair it following the fire. It was vacated as ordered, building inspectors said, but then last September, the welfare department approved it for occupancy and paid a \$125 deposit to the owner so a welfare family could move in.

The plumbing and wiring were in bad repair, electrical switches were exposed, the toilet had to be flushed with a bucket of water, the baseboards were burned out so you could see through to the basement, the closets were charred and burned out and the house was rat infested, said Robert Kuells, assistant supervisor of the Enforcement Division of the building inspection department.

Kuells erupted when his inspectors notified him that the welfare department had authorized a family to move into the house and had paid a security deposit on it.

The building inspection department immediately ordered the family out and took steps to speed up the demolition of the building.

"The building was condemned before they (the family) were moved in," Kuells declared.

A housing aide from the Welfare department supposedly inspected the house and declared it habitable, Kuells said.

Not all buildings are inspected, even though some aides report they have inspected them.

A local real estate broker told of accompanying one of the department's housing aides when he inspected several of the brokers' buildings to be rented to welfare recipients.

The aide asked if the broker's other buildings were in the same condition as the ones

he had just inspected. The broker said he told him that they were and the housing aide approved them sight unseen.

Later, the broker said, the same housing aide telephoned him and "inspected" some of his buildings by telephone.

The broker said the aide told him to ask for him the next time any of his buildings were to be inspected by the department.

A partial check by Sentinel reporters of city building inspection files in December turned up a list of 16 condemned and substandard houses in which welfare recipients were living.

One welfare family, with the approval of the welfare department and with its \$150 security deposit, had moved into an apartment building at 1135 N. 20th St.

The building had been placarded months before as unfit for human habitation, building inspectors said.

During much of 1972, the building was on inspection records as having 37 housing code violations plus plumbing, electrical and structural violations. An inspection late last year turned up even more violations, an inspector said.

The same inspector told of another case in which the welfare department approved moving a family into a substandard house and then, within one month, filed a complaint with the building inspection department suggesting that the house was not up to standards and asking that it be inspected.

"The (correction) orders already had been issued on the house when the family moved in, but the welfare department didn't bother to check with building inspection to find out what shape it was in," the inspector said. "Instead, they move them in and complain later," he said.

This way, he said, the welfare department gets rid of the housing problem and it gets dumped on the city. The Department of City Development's relocation office ends up having to find new housing for the family.

Fifty-eight of the 99 families living in condemned housing for which the city relocation office had to find new housing from May of 1971 through November of 1972 were families on welfare, said Gerald L. Anderson, relocation director for the Department of City Development. That count was as of early December.

A workload count taken at the same time by the relocation office showed that 12 of 19 families in condemned housing were on welfare, Anderson said.

His division, Anderson said, had documented six cases in which the welfare department had approved substandard or condemned housing for welfare recipients.

That, he said, is only the count in the federally subsidized Model Cities area, not citywide. And that also is just the number called to the attention of the relocation division.

Anderson recalled one case in which the welfare department referred a family of 10 persons to a substandard two bedroom home. His division took action to prevent the family from moving into the home, he said.

Another time, Anderson said, the welfare department referred a family to a house in which the toilet didn't work.

As a result of the burned out house case and the welfare department's approval of that house as suitable for a welfare family, an agreement was worked out between the city building inspector and the welfare department, Kuells said.

The department has agreed to furnish the building inspector's office with a list of addresses of dwellings into which it is considering moving welfare recipients, Kuells said.

With the list, the department is asking that the inspector's office notify the department of any outstanding orders pending against those addresses.

This agreement was worked out in December, and it is too early to tell whether it will have any effect, building inspection officials said.

PORTRAIT OF A FAIR MAN

HON. DAN DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the judiciary has sustained much criticism for their decisions, conduct of office and overall lack of rapport with the public.

For this reason it is refreshing to see from time to time articles calling attention to outstanding judges who continue to perform their duties in a fair and equitable manner, while still retaining a great deal of public respect.

Such a judge is the Hon. John Dillard Hooker of the Seventh Judicial Circuit of Virginia which is included in the Fifth Congressional District which I have the honor to represent. The Martinsville Bulletin of April 1, contained a splendid article entitled, "Portrait of a Fair Man," which not only pays well-deserved respect to the performance of Judge Hooker but also lays out in considerable detail the general requirements which a judge is customarily expected to fulfill.

Judge Hooker is an outstanding Virginian who has contributed in a magnificent way to the traditions which the Commonwealth has tried to uphold throughout our history. He approaches each case on its own merits, in a fair-minded and practical way, always exemplifying judicial temperament and embodying humanity in dealing with those who come before the court.

We live in a day in which the overall public concept of the judiciary has unfortunately deteriorated but so long as we have jurists of the type which Judge Hooker represents, I feel confident in the fairness and workability of our judicial system. It is an honor for me to count him among my friends and constituents and I am privileged to include the text of the above-mentioned article herein with my remarks. I commend this reading to the Members of the House.

The article follows:

[From the Martinsville (Va.) Bulletin, Apr. 1, 1973]

PORTRAIT OF A FAIR MAN

(By John D. Willson)

Compassionate without being soft. Dignified without being stuffy. Fair.

Many expressions could be used to describe John Dillard Hooker of Stuart, but these are the ones that keep cropping up when his colleagues are asked to comment on him.

Judge Hooker is judge of the Seventh Judicial Circuit of Virginia, which includes Henry and Patrick counties. He has one of the heaviest, if not the heaviest, caseloads of any circuit judge in Virginia, yet lawyers who practice in his court marvel that he still takes his deliberate time before rendering a judgment in any case.

The judge himself reinforces observation. When asked for a rundown on problems of the world, Judge Hooker said one of the worst is the tendency of people to judge others too quickly.

"It's a human weakness," he said, "and we are all afflicted with it to some degree, but I do think there is a tendency to judge people a little hastily . . . It would be so much

better if people would make an honest effort to understand each other better . . ."

Judge Hooker, an astute student of human nature, says that, following all his years on the bench, he believes one of the most indispensable ingredients to his profession is understanding and appreciating human nature. "That's basic," he says, "and utterly indispensable to do a job reasonably well and be an effective judge."

These are not empty words, as evidenced by his concern for young people, and especially young men. He agrees that a spirit of rebellion and resistance to authority flourished during the 1960s, but feels that attention was focused on a boisterous minority. After years of dealing with these and others, however, he's convinced "there are still a lot of fine young people . . ."

One of the things that troubles him most is the frequency with which young people, especially young men between age 16 and 25, repeatedly get involved in serious violations of the law. They are sent away to correctional institutions with the hope that they can be helped in some way. Unfortunately, not all such institutions are properly geared and equipped for rehabilitation.

"We need about 10 Southamptons," he said, referring to the correctional unit there, which tries to train inmates for useful roles in the society they return to.

He admits that more Southamptons would cost the state a lot of money. " . . . but what better investment than in the young men of today? We can't just sweep these youngsters under the rug, or let them go down the drain . . ."

He cited the example of a young man from Patrick County who was sentenced (he's even forgotten for what) to Southampton. Returning on furlough, he visited the judge "all bright-eyed and bushy-tailed," eager to tell of his training.

Officials were in the process of getting the youth a job with a paving firm, following training in heavy equipment operation. "He's just one of many . . . probably a little above average. He was from a shaky background, raised under adverse circumstances. His father died when he was young and his mother worked in a factory. She had a large family and couldn't possibly cope with raising them . . ."

The judge admits that breakdown of traditional family ties is probably one of the major causes of crime, but warns that "It's easy to point the finger at the home . . . there are many contributing factors . . ."

In some cases family breakups happen almost without anyone involved realizing it. The father works on the third shift, the mother on the first. The children are in school, but there are times when they are not properly supervised. The family seems fragmented, there is no unity. Such situations can lead to disintegration of family ties—and trouble.

The only solution the judge can think of lies in education. Young people not equipped to cope with real-life situations, with no training to earn a livelihood, are ripe for trouble. If they are unfortunate enough to get involved in crime and get sentenced to prison, few institutions are equipped to train them properly.

Thus the judge comes full circle to the thing that bothers him most—young people who get into trouble, again and again.

Judge Hooker has grappled with this and other legal and judicial problems for years, but they haven't dampened his love for the law and the role it plays in maintaining an orderly society.

Love of the law comes naturally to Judge Hooker, who was born into the profession, figuratively speaking. His father, James Murray Hooker, was born and reared in Patrick County and practiced law in Stuart. His uncle, Lester Hooker, was a judge, and his mother, a member of the prominent Dillard

family of Patrick County, had two brothers who were lawyers.

Thus there wasn't much hesitation after Judge Hooker graduated from Stuart Elementary School, Hargrave Military Academy and enrolled in the University of Richmond. Four years later he received his BS degree in business administration and in 1933 his law degree from the University of Virginia. His stint at Hargrave came when his father was a U.S. Representative from the Fifth Congressional District (two terms) and the family lived in Washington.

After law school the judge returned to Stuart and practiced with his father in the firm of Hooker and Hooker until his father's death in 1940. In 1934 he was appointed Trial Justice for Patrick County, a position comparable to the present Judge of the County Court.

In 1935 he married Elizabeth Bailey of Portsmouth, a pharmacist's daughter he met while he was a student in Richmond and she was at Westhampton College.

When World War II came along he enlisted in the Navy, was commissioned Lt. (j.g.) and stationed in the 11th Naval District in California with the Office of Naval Intelligence. He was discharged in mid-December 1945.

Meanwhile, his first son, James Murray Hooker, was born in 1944 in California.

The family returned to Stuart in January 1946 where Judge Hooker picked up where he left off—Trial Justice of Patrick County, and private law practice.

A second son, John D. Hooker Jr., was born in 1946. Both sons followed in their father's and grandfather's footsteps. James Murray went to Hampden-Sydney College and T. C. Williams Law School, University of Richmond. Following military service he began practicing law in Richmond. He is married to Lane Martin, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Charlie Martin of Patrick County.

The youngest son, John Dillard Jr., graduated from Hampden-Sydney and is now a third year law student at Marshall Wythe School of Law, College of William and Mary. He is due to graduate in June and plans to join some colleagues in a law firm in the Virginia Beach area.

As if that weren't enough, Judge Hooker's sister, Mrs. Ann H. Jones of Spencer, also is connected with the judicial system. She's a probation officer with the Regional Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court.

Judge Hooker says he would have liked very much to have had his sons practice in this area, but admits this might have posed an awkward situation. "We felt the wise thing to do was to let them begin practice in some area other than the Seventh Judicial Circuit . . ."

In 1948 Judge Hooker gave up the position of Trial Justice and became Commonwealth Attorney for Patrick County. He served until April 1951, when Gov. John S. Battle appointed him judge of the Seventh Circuit, succeeding Judge Kennon C. Whittle, who was named to the Virginia Supreme Court.

Judge Hooker has served in that capacity since, a total of almost 22 years. Originally, the circuit was composed of Martinsville and the counties of Pittsylvania, Patrick and Henry. In 1956, because of the heavy caseload and rapid growth of the area, Pittsylvania was joined with Franklin County to form the 30th Judicial Circuit. Five or six years ago Martinsville got its own Corporation Court, so this left the judge with only Henry and Patrick counties in his circuit.

The caseload is still heavy, but help will come soon because of a court revision system that will go into effect July 1. Martinsville and the counties of Patrick and Henry then will become the 21st Judicial Circuit, presided over by Judge Hooker and Judge Frank I. Richardson Jr., who is present judge of the Martinsville Corporation Court.

The whole idea of the court revision system, explains Judge Hooker, was to spread the work so caseloads would be more evenly

divided, and to introduce more uniform procedures for all courts. "All this," he noted, "is for more efficient administration of justice . . ."

Aside from his professional duties, there are several major facets of his life which provide him cause for satisfaction.

He's very proud of his family. And he's active in the affairs of Stuart Baptist Church. He was the first president of the Stuart Rotary Club and has been a member since 1938, when it was formed. He and his wife also have been active in Boy and Girl Scout work and Mrs. Hooker has done her bit toward civic betterment. She is chairman of the Patrick County Library Board, chairman of the Patrick County Bicentennial Commission, and is a member of the Patrick Historical Society, which is in the process of remodeling a house to house a Patrick County Historical Museum.

Judge Hooker also is proud of his connection with the R. J. Reynolds-Patrick County Memorial Hospital and has been on the board since its foundation. He was instrumental in the drive which obtained money to build the hospital, which was dedicated in 1962.

Ten years ago there was another project in which he was instrumental—that of the establishment of Patrick Henry College as a branch of the University of Virginia. Judge Hooker looked after Patrick interests for the college, which was set up originally to serve basically the two-county area of Patrick and Henry.

Judge Hooker's sincerity is obvious when he speaks of civic endeavors involving the hospital, the college, Scouts, and the like. "I think I would be a pretty dull individual if I hadn't engaged in some of these civic endeavors. I think it has helped me in getting to know and understand people," he says.

Because of his love of the law, there's another facet of his life that has given him much satisfaction: close association with lawyers and others connected with the administration of justice. "I have a high regard for the legal profession and I think highly of the people . . ." connected with it, he says.

Some of the younger lawyers here, especially, concur. One comparative newcomer says he arrived here five or six years ago wondering what kind of reception he would get from the profession and the courts.

"Judge Hooker," he said, "seems to take a real interest in lawyers, and especially the younger ones . . ." adding, "He's always anxious to be helpful."

Another chuckled when he described the judge's demeanor. He runs a dignified court, all right "but you can sometimes tell how he's reacting to a situation by watching those bushy eyebrows . . . When they get to moving up and down real fast, you'd better be on your toes. . ."

Another describes the judge as "a gentleman of the old school," emphasizing that there's no slur intended by the old school remark. "He's easy-going, but you can't push him too far. He can be wrathful when the situation calls for it."

TRIBUTE TO BIL COCHRANE

HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the opportunity to join my colleagues in expressing our appreciation to Bil Cochrane on the occasion of his retirement as our Assistant Parliamentarian.

A native North Carolinian, he has been

a credit to his home State and to those of us who have had the privilege of serving with him over the years.

On many occasions, I have said that the office of Parliamentarian of the House has been one of the most efficiently run anywhere in Government and certainly one of the best here on Capitol Hill.

And along with our longtime Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler, Bil Cochrane has been one of the reasons it has been such a success. I join with other Members in wishing him all the best in his future undertakings.

TWO BROOKLYN HOSPITALS THRIVE UNDER HUSBAND-WIFE MANAGEMENT

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, during its annual convention in San Francisco in February, the Federation of American Hospitals elected as its president, Dr. Samuel Berson, who is a distinguished authority in the field of health care.

I would like to congratulate Dr. Berson on his new post and also commend the following article to my colleagues which appeared in the February issue of the FAH Review magazine:

TWO BROOKLYN HOSPITALS THRIVE UNDER HUSBAND-WIFE MANAGEMENT

This is the story of two investor-owned hospitals in Brooklyn with distinct personalities of their own.

Kings Highway Hospital was conceived at sea—and born in the heart of Brooklyn, New York in 1953.

Flatbush General Hospital came along in 1959.

Both are owned and operated by Dr. and Mrs. Samuel L. Berson. He is the executive medical director, and she is the director of purchasing and executive supervisor of the Housekeeping and Dietary Departments. They form a unique management team in the investor-owned hospital field.

Both facilities were developed at the request of physicians to serve community needs. They are located five miles apart in neighborhoods with slightly different ethnic backgrounds.

The two have a total of—323 beds—212 at Kings Highway and 111 at Flatbush.

665 employees—450 at Kings Highway and 215 at Flatbush.

255 on the medical staffs—175 at Kings Highway and 80 at Flatbush.

The conception of Kings Highway Hospital is a story in itself. A case of seasickness is part of the plot.

In 1950, Dr. and Mrs. Berson took a voyage to Europe and while in Norway, they visited a combined hospital and nursing home. They talked about the possibility of establishing a similar facility in their home area.

ON THE WAY BACK

During the return voyage to the United States aboard the ship, Queen Elizabeth. Mrs. Berson became ill in the dining room. When she left to go topside, she unconsciously took a menu with her.

She settled into a lounge chair on deck—and to pass the time of day, she sketched on the back of the menu what was to become the design for the Kings Highway Hospital.

The preparation of such sketches was second nature for her since her father was a noted New York architect and builder. As the oldest child in the family, she was closely associated with him during her "growing up" years.

The dream wasn't fulfilled until 1953 because of difficulty in acquiring the property for the hospital site.

"We had to buy several buildings and houses," Mrs. Berson recalled recently. "Purchasing lots in Brooklyn isn't like buying land out West. We had to demolish the buildings to prepare the land. It took us from 1948 to 1953 to get the project done. But we did it together."

The hospital site is in a residential district in the geographical center of Brooklyn. The facility was opened as a hospital with a large physiotherapy department for rehabilitation which was a new concept in this area.

Dr. Berson said in an interview with the FAH Review Magazine:

"We probably were before our time because this facility was opened before Medicare—and before the general public realized the serious need for beds for rehabilitation. So, Mrs. Berson and I constructed the first proprietary rehabilitation facility of this kind in New York."

FACILITY CONVERTED

"It was a combination rehabilitation center and hospital. After operating this way successfully for about a year, we were approached by a group of physicians who were practicing in the area. They felt there was a more serious need for an acute general hospital. So, we took their advice and converted from the treatment of the chronically ill patients to the more acutely ill patients in 1955."

The Kings Highway Hospital was expanded from 135 beds to 174 beds in 1964—and to 212 beds in 1970. Several special treatment facilities were added over the years, including one of the first formal Intensive Care Coronary Units in Brooklyn.

Kings Highway Hospital serves an area with about 300,000 population. Jewish and Italian residents are predominant.

"Our mix of patients includes about 50 percent Medicare, about 30 percent Blue Cross subscribers, about 3 percent Workmen's Compensation, a small percentage of Medicaid cases, and the remainder are covered by other types of insurance," Dr. Berson explained. "The average age of the patients ranges between 50 and 55."

"At Kings Highway, our services include general surgery and internal medicine. We have a fairly large number of cardiac patients. We are very proud of our treatment of these patients. We also treat many vascular surgical cases. We do not do heart surgery. We do a large number of urological cases. I would say this probably is due to the fact that we are in an older-age area, and these types of patients suffer from ailments of that kind."

Dr. Berson said that Kings Highway Hospital did not handle maternity cases.

"This decision was made voluntarily by us when we started the hospital," he explained. "We are in an older-age area, and we felt that if we introduced this service, it would be only a very minimum service. It is my impression that if there is a minimum service, you could not render high quality care."

"We have not introduced other kinds of procedures which are esoteric or unusual. It always has been our opinion that these procedures should not be done in every hospital because they could not be performed as well as they could be in institutions specializing in this type of care."

EMERGENCY SERVICE

"Kings Highway has an emergency service

which is now rendering care to about 10,000 patients annually. We receive many letters commending this service. Patients are admitted regardless of ability to pay."

"Proprietary hospitals often have been criticized for picking and choosing the cream of the cases—or skimming off the top. Personally I am vehemently opposed to this type of criticism. Our hospital takes every case for which we feel we can provide adequate care."

The operations of Kings Highway Hospital and Flatbush General Hospital are similar—but both function as separate entities.

Dr. Berson explained:

"Business and financial records of both institutions are completely independent. However, for purposes of economy, one warehouse is used. There is a centralized purchasing agent. We do not have shared services because we feel this is not feasible. We have separate administrators, nurses and other personnel. The employees are not interchangeable between hospitals. The physicians have courtesy privileges at both hospitals."

Flatbush General is in East Flatbush where the ethnic mix includes Jewish, black and Puerto Rican residents. Coverage of patients includes about 45 percent Medicare; 10 percent Medicaid and the remainder, Blue Cross and other types of insurance, Dr. Berson said.

"The emergency rate at Flatbush General generally does not run high because King's County Hospital, a municipal facility, is about a mile away," he said.

Dr. Berson indicated that the next expansion at both hospitals might be the construction of professional buildings for physicians.

COMMUNITY ORIENTED

He explained that the hospitals conducted numerous activities to help the community.

"We have a community-oriented program and a community advisory board composed of representatives of various endeavors, including the churches, schools and neighborhood organizations. We participate in community programs outside the hospital such as, screening, pap smears for malignancies and community-wide injection programs during times of concern over diseases such as flu."

"We recently had a symposium on coronary diseases which are so prevalent in our neighborhood. We have excellent relationship with the police department."

Dr. Berson noted that he and his wife "have divided our responsibilities so that she is responsible for housekeeping services, and I am responsible for the areas that are related to the professional part. We have two daughters who are involved in the operation of the hospitals."

SETTING AN EXAMPLE

Dr. Berson believes that "the only way the institutions can maintain a high quality of care, high standards and the dedication of employees is by the owners setting an example."

"We feel that it is extremely important to make rounds at the hospitals, not only inspecting the physical plant and the degree of efficiency in the housekeeping, maintenance and dietary departments, but also in personal interviews with patients so that problem areas can be corrected as they arise. "It is our impression that the only way you can run a successful hospital is by somebody taking a serious personal interest in what goes on."

Dr. Berson is a member of the Comprehensive Health Planning Commission of New York City, and he also served on Mayor John Lindsay's Health Task Force a few years ago. He is a member of the board of directors of the Federation of American Hospitals. He is president emeritus of the Association of Private Hospitals of New York, Inc.

Mrs. Berson said she wanted to be "in a

business where my husband and I could communicate with each other." The two have been married more than 32 years.

Mrs. Berson, the former Iola Bee Doorman of New York City, handles the interior decorating of both hospitals.

"We do all the wallpaper to match the draperies and the window shades. Every wallpaper is distinctly different, and everything in the room matches. So, when drapery or chairs are taken out, it is not hard to find which room to return them."

Dr. and Mrs. Berson built a third hospital in 1959 for an osteopathic group in Brooklyn and sold it to them in 1962.

TRIBUTE TO DR. SIDNEY FARBER

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I bring to the attention of this body and the American people the knowledge that a great benefactor of mankind has died. A truly great man, a healer, a world-renowned cancer researcher—Dr. Sidney Farber of Boston has died—and his passing leaves us all the poorer.

Dr. Farber was best known for his work on behalf of children. He was the guiding force behind the Jimmy Fund and Charles A. Dana Cancer Center. His dream of a hospital devoted exclusively to cancer in children was fulfilled when the Jimmy Fund Center of Roxbury, Mass., was built in 1948. Money for the Jimmy Fund Center was raised through individual and company gifts and the nickels and dimes of millions, to relieve parents of afflicted children of the additional hardship of expensive treatment.

Dr. Farber's major work at the Children's Cancer Center was advancing research into childhood leukemia and other diseases of children. When he first began his work, children afflicted with leukemia could look forward to at best weeks or months of life. When his research ended, children were kept alive for years through chemotherapy and radiotherapy developed at his Jimmy Fund Center. As well as being a world authority on cancer, Dr. Farber was the founder of modern pediatric pathology.

Among his major contributions were: his discovery in 1947 that the drug aminopterin and the related chemical methotrexate could bring about temporary but complete remission of symptoms in acute leukemia; and his work with the antibiotic actinomycin-D which reduced the size of the Wilms' tumor of the kidney and killed spreading cancer cells. He was the first to describe cystic fibrosis as a generalized disorder, and with his colleagues discovered Eastern Equine Encephalitis.

In addition to nine honorary degrees, he received innumerable honors and awards. In 1953 he was honored with the Judd Award for Cancer Research, and in 1958 with the United Cerebral Palsy-Max Weinstein Award for his stimulus to broad areas of neurological research. In 1959 he won the Gold Medal of the

American Cancer Society, and in the following 2 years was awarded the Great Medal of the University of Ghent and the Modern Medicine Award.

Dr. Farber was president of a number of medical societies: the American Association for Pathologists and Bacteriologists; the Society for Pediatric Research; the New England Pathology Society; the Worcester Foundation for Experimental Biology; and the Boston Pathology Society.

Dr. Farber's service to the Government included membership on the President's Conference on Heart Disease and Cancer, and appointment to the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke in 1964. He was Medical Advisor to the Board of the Federal Food and Drug Administrations, and was a consultant both to the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology, and on the Committee on Consultants on Medical Research of the U.S. Senate.

He appeared before numerous congressional committees to speak on behalf of cancer research. He was active in the work of the National Cancer Institute, and in 1968 served as president of the American Cancer Society.

It was my privilege to know him personally when I worked with him on important social programs as a Massachusetts State legislator. I can only try to share my personal sense of acute loss with this brief tribute; but it was his work on behalf of the children of the world that will serve as his best memorial.

Sidney Farber died on March 30, and we shall not soon see his like again.

ARKANSAS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION CELEBRATES 18TH YEAR OF SUCCESS

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, next month members of the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission will fly to Japan for meetings which they hope will culminate in Japanese industries establishing plant sites in Arkansas. This trip abroad represents the culmination of 18 years of successful work by the AIDC in establishing jobs and industries all over the State of Arkansas.

The AIDC was created in 1955—a time when Arkansas was faced with a post-war job shortage, unemployment and migration of native Arkansans. Because of the work of this commission, Arkansas has seen the appearance of 3,389 new or expanded plants representing 192,430 jobs on plant investments in excess of \$1.8 billion. It was this growth that led former Gov. Winthrop Rockefeller, first chairman of the commission to boast in 1970 that—

Today, Arkansas is currently growing at a rate far exceeding that of the nation as a whole.

In the week of its 18th birthday, I would like to share with my colleagues the story of the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission and what it has meant to Arkansas:

AIDC CELEBRATES 18TH BIRTHDAY WITH AN EYE TOWARD INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

LITTLE ROCK, April 1.—The Arkansas Industrial Development Commission celebrates its eighteenth birthday today.

And, like many other 18-year-olds, it will soon be drafted to an overseas country to serve in the best interests of the folks back home.

On May 23, AIDC director Joe Dildy and other staff members will fly to Tokyo and Osaka, Japan, for extensive meetings that, they hope, will culminate in some Japanese industries establishing plant sites in Arkansas.

The Japanese trip is a new effort on the part of the AIDC to compete in international markets for new plant locations. Dildy will emphasize Arkansas' industrial benefits as including a highly diversified labor network highlighted by the redeveloped Arkansas River; diversified labor skills with high production rates; natural resources; central location with rapid access to American and international markets, and financing programs to help establish new industry.

For the AIDC, the Japanese trip is a must. It reflects a new but common knowledge, recently expressed by former AIDC director Adrian Williamson, Jr.:

"We see multinational corporations building plants in our country. This is a developing market to which we must sell the State of Arkansas. Arkansas must compete in the market place, and the market place is increasingly becoming worldwide."

The new emphasis on international development also reflects many past successes by the AIDC, which is literally an April Fool's baby, born prematurely as a result of an emergency clause.

Faced with a post-war job shortage, unemployment and migration of native Arkansans, the 1955 Arkansas General Assembly responded with Act 404 to create the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission, charged with bringing in new industry, expanding existing industry, and blending labor, industry and other resources to further Arkansas' standard of living.

Act 404 called for the AIDC to begin operation on July 1, 1955. But a relatively new Arkansan named Winthrop Rockefeller, elected in March, 1955, to serve as the first AIDC chairman, was chomping at the bit to get started. Thus, the legislature passed an emergency clause which allowed the AIDC to begin work three months early—on April Fool's Day, 1955.

Later, Rockefeller was to reminisce that he felt like a man trying to swim upstream when he accepted the AIDC job. He had noticed, while building his farm atop Petit Jean Mountain, that thousands of Arkansans were leaving their farms to find work in cities outside of the state.

"I was convinced of the need to scatter industries in our smaller towns, rather than let them pile up in a handful of urban areas," Rockefeller remarked.

It was a unique concept. And it worked. Rockefeller was able to boast later that, "Today, Arkansas is currently growing at a rate far exceeding that of the nation as a whole. Working under the 'scatter' approach, we have generated some 3,000 new and expanded industries, representing more than 145,000 new jobs."

And that was in 1970. On April 1, 1973, the AIDC has boosted the total to 3,389 new or

expanded plants, representing 192,430 new jobs on plant investments in excess of \$1.8 billion.

That was a giant step for an agency that began with a budget of only \$75,000 per year.

Rockefeller was appointed—largely because of the magic in his name—by a personal friend and future political foe, Governor Orval Faubus. Faubus gave Rockefeller the responsibility to run the AIDC any way he wished to.

First, seven commissioners were appointed—one from each of the six Congressional districts, to provide the representation for the smaller, rural areas, and the seventh was to be the president of the Arkansas Bankers Association, who would serve as an ex-officio member. (The commissioners now number 15.)

The original commissioners were W. W. Campbell of Forrest City, Earl A. Harris of Rogers, Leon Kuhn of Texarkana, William R. Smith of Lake Village, Elmer O. Yancey of Searcy, Winthrop Rockefeller, and the ABA president, Louis E. Turley of El Dorado.

Yancey is still a commissioner, and Hurley is currently chairman.

Bill Rock became the first director of the AIDC, starting on July 1, 1955.

Rockefeller knew that the original budget of \$75,000 simply was not enough. He enlisted the help of businessmen throughout the state through the "Committee of 100." Its goal was to raise \$200,000 to supplement AIDC operating funds. Hence, the creation of the Arkansas Industrial Development Foundation, which is still used to meet special needs.

In 1957, the legislature boosted the AIDC budget to \$575,000, and, like spring, things began busting wide open as the flow of new industries into the state began to take on significance. However, the first year had been a success, resulting in 127 new or expanded plants and 5,000 new jobs.

Rockefeller's idea of bringing new industry into smaller towns was helped along by several community financing methods, some of which were passed into law at his suggestion.

Act 404 of 1955, the same act which created the AIDC and which has since been amended, provides for the issuance by communities of first and second lien bonds to finance up to 80 per cent of the total cost of lands, improvements, buildings and equipment. Act 9 of 1960 authorizes towns or counties to issue special obligation revenue bonds to be used for securing and developing industry. Act 173 of 1967 authorizes guaranty of Act 9 revenue bonds, whereby the AIDC can issue revenue bonds to help marginal industries get set up. And, constitutional amendment 49 of 1958 allows first and second class cities, incorporated towns and counties to issue, with voter approval, ad valorem bonds for the purpose of securing and developing industry.

These financing methods obviously assist smaller towns as well as large cities in bringing in new industries.

A recently developed program is the Industry Training Program, a plan which is nearly unique and which provides for classroom and on-the-job training. Thus, industries entering the state and requiring new skills can be assured that Arkansas labor will have those skills when the new plant is erected. The training program also helps existing industries which require new skills as a result of diversification or new manufacturing techniques.

A major part of the AIDC's budget goes into national advertising, so that industrial

prospects will be made aware of Arkansas' industrial benefits. The AIDC prides itself on never having used a "hillbilly" approach in its advertising. Instead, it has chosen to project a quality image for the state, and the advertisements have frequently featured full color photographs and new printing techniques that lend an air of sophistication.

Partly as a result of such an approach, 125 of the Fortune Top 500 companies now have plants in Arkansas.

The work of the AIDC consultants is probably the biggest factor in the agency's success. The consultants used the latest data and computer technology available in providing interested companies with up-to-date, statistically detailed information regarding labor availability, job skills, transportation facilities, wage rates, plant sites and other data.

The consultants are always "on call," making contact by telephone, mail and personal visits. Today, AIDC consultants call on more than 4,000 prospects each year, and travel to national and even international industrial centers. They also maintain close contact with companies after location, assisting in such projects as plant expansion.

The agency consists of seven separate divisions—administration and finance; information services; communications center; transportation; advertising and public information; training; and international.

The "return on investment" from the AIDC's efforts is approximated as follows: \$1.4 billion in increased personal income per year for Arkansas residents; 718,000 more residents in the state and \$662 million in increased retail sales; the creation of an additional 130,000 non-industrial jobs as a result of the new industries; and \$27.6 billion additional taxes furnished to local governments for use in maintaining streets, providing police and fire protection and contributing other community services enjoyed by each community resident.

Other AIDC chairmen since Rockefeller were the late C. Hamilton Moses of Little Rock, who served from 1964 to 1966; L. L. Baxter of Fayetteville, 1966-1967; Herbert H. McAdams of Jonesboro, 1967-1972 and Hurley, 1972 to the present.

AIDC directors who succeeded Rock were Colonel Carl Hinkle, Robert M. Millwee, Jr., Adrian Williamson, Jr., J. Dan Reebuck, and, now, Joe Dildy, the only staff member who has been with the AIDC since its founding.

THE CASE FOR A VOLUNTARY MILITARY

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished and capable colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) makes an excellent case for a volunteer military force in the Washington Post of Saturday, March 31, 1973.

Mr. STEIGER's article was prepared in response to a Post reprint of Joseph Califano's defense of national conscription.

Congressman STEIGER correctly points out that a good deal of the cost which is popularly associated with "the Volunteer Military" has actually been previously built into our system. He also correctly points out that the pay raises which came about particularly as a result of the thrust for a volunteer military force might have occurred anyway and surely were strongly supported by those proponents of national conscription.

I commend our colleague's, Mr. STEIGER's, article to all Members. The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 31, 1973]

THE CASE FOR A VOLUNTARY MILITARY

(By WILLIAM A. STEIGER)

When I opened The Washington Post on Thursday, March 22, I fully expected to find a story on the victory of Congress in its long battle with the Executive to regain control of the draft authority. To my dismay, I found instead a reprint of Joseph Califano's superficial and out-dated defense of conscription.

Mr. Califano's several miscalculations begin with an error in elementary mathematics. He subtracts the fiscal 68 personnel budget of \$32.6 billion from the fiscal 74 budget of \$43.9 billion—and comes up with \$12.3 billion. This billion dollar error might be excused as a "typo" had it not appeared twice in his original article in The New Republic. More importantly, these figures are irrelevant to an evaluation of the volunteer military, because they include the budget for all civilians employed by the Defense Department, not just the volunteers.

This distortion is compounded by the fallacious assumption that military pay hikes since 1969 can be charged to the volunteer force. In fact, only 23% of the increase in pay is attributable to ending the draft. Fully 77% of the increase results from miscellaneous payments initiated long ago, and from legislation pushed through Congress by one of the most ardent advocates of conscription—the late Rep. L. Mendel Rivers (D-S.C.).

The "Rivers Amendment"—enacted in 1967, before any plans were made for ending the draft—simply gives military personnel cost-of-living increases equivalent to those received by their civil service counterparts. While it has been of value in enabling the military to keep pace with inflation, it has had virtually no role in ending the draft. Witness the effect on entry level compensation: the monthly basic pay of a recruit in 1967 was \$95.70, which rose over the next four years to a mere \$134.40. It was only in 1971 that competitive pay scales were enacted.

Despite his years in the Defense Department, Mr. Califano displays a serious misunderstanding of the compensation system: he contends that a volunteer force is expensive "since raising pay at the bottom requires increases in higher ranks and retired pay as well." But one becomes eligible for retirement pay (which is geared to basic pay) only after completing 20 years of service. When Congress revised the pay schedule in 1971, no increases in basic pay were given to men with more than two years service above the enlisted grade of Corporal (E-4) or officer grade of 2nd Lieutenant (O-1). Since virtually no one retires at these low ranks, the effect of the volunteer force on retired pay is negligible. Moreover, had he inquired, Mr. Califano would have learned that a major reform has been proposed in conjunction with the volunteer force: it would save billions of dollars in retirement costs while improving the quality of middle management.

After erroneously using end strength rather than average strength to compute the yearly costs of military manpower, and including reserve forces in his active duty calculations, he places the annual cost of the volunteer force at \$6 billion. This number is simply pulled out of the air without any reference to specific programs initiated to end the draft.

The total cost for fiscal '74, including the current impact of the 1971 pay increase, the Special Pay Act, and Project Volunteer initiatives is \$3.1 billion—or one half of Mr. Califano's estimate. The incremental cost over fiscal 73 is only \$400 million, as compared

to a \$4 billion increase in the Defense budget as a whole.

The bulk of the cost—the \$2.3 billion pay increase enacted in 1971—represents an investment backed by opponents as well as supporters of the volunteer force. The broad support for this expenditure stemmed from the fact that much of the increase was used to eliminate the disgrace of compelling young men to serve their country for wages below the poverty line. Mr. Califano has forgotten that prior to 1971, thousands of service families were forced to depend on welfare, food stamps, and moonlighting on second and third jobs for survival.

Finally, the author errs in his criticism of the Gates Commission. Their estimate of costs during the transition to a volunteer force of 2.5 million men was \$3.24 billion, not the \$2.1 billion figure Mr. Califano selected. The latter amount represents the annual estimate for the force on a "stable continuing basis," six to eight years after inductions have ceased. The Gates Commission's projection for the transitional year is remarkably close to the \$2.7 billion spent for a 2.3 million man force during this last year of the draft. This investment will rise slightly to about \$3.3 billion in fiscal 76. But as savings are derived from reduced training loads and revised capital-labor ratios, the costs will decline sharply to the "stable" levels as predicted by the Gates Commission.

It is not my purpose to defend the high cost of military manpower. Significant savings can be achieved by taking a series of bold steps: change the retirement system, hold down "grade creep," revise the pay schedule, create a visible salary system, use Special Pay Act incentives, and replace personnel with machinery. Comprehensive planning can save the taxpayers billions of dollars. But these issues will never receive serious consideration so long as critics persist in misrepresenting the relatively small portion of the manpower budget which is devoted to ending the draft.

SGT. CARROLL FLORA, JR.,
RETURNS HOME

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, last week Sgt. Carroll E. Flora, Jr., recently returned from captivity in North Vietnam, returned home to Brunswick, Md. Sergeant Flora, joined by his wife, Joanne, was welcomed to his hometown in a moving ceremony, and I would like to join with his many friends and relatives in saying, "Welcome Home" to this young man who endured the ordeal of captivity.

I would like to share with my colleagues the account of the home-coming activities from the Frederick Post:

BRUNSWICK WELCOMES HOME SERGEANT FLORA
(By Nancy Crist)

Sgt. Carroll E. Flora, Jr., was greeted by a standing ovation Tuesday night at the Steadman-Kennan Post, American Legion in Brunswick as approximately 250 persons gathered to welcome him home.

The informal program gave the citizens of Brunswick an opportunity to pay him and his courageous family a tribute. "Eddie's return symbolized the hope for a better understanding with our adversaries and a stepping stone to a lasting peace throughout the world," Richard Bowers said.

"President Nixon stated it well when he described the arrival of our POWs at Clark Field in the Philippines, 'that when they stepped from the door of the plane and saluted the

flag, we all recognized the tremendous pride we felt at that moment for those men, their families and the devotion to their country," Bowers added.

Sgt. Flora was presented with a number of gifts including a key to the City of Brunswick presented by Mayor Jess Orndorff who, said, "Eddie we hope that you will use this key to the city to open the door and come back here with us." A Brunswick native, Flora's home is now at Discovery near Walkersville.

Post Commander Silas Phillips presented Sgt. Flora with a life membership to the American Legion and Mrs. Lorraine Ferrell presented him with a family Bible on behalf of the Ladies Auxiliary of the Brunswick Volunteer Ambulance Company.

Grover Frye presented him a gift from the neighbors and friends of Sgt. Flora who resided on North Virginia Ave., and he also was given the title of "Honorary Coach of the Slow-Pitch Softball team" which included a hat and green jacket and a description of his duties which brought chuckles from Flora and the crowd. Frye said "We play the game for an hour and a half and then meet back here and replay the same game for another three hours."

Ernest Wineholt representing the Fraternal Order of Eagles presented Sgt. Flora with a \$100 savings bond; Mrs. Margaret Moss, a gift certificate at J. C. Penney's from the Pythian Sisters, Century Temple No. 4. The ladies auxiliary, Steadman-Keenan Unit No. 96 president, Mrs. Norma Jean Frye, also presented him with a gift.

Dan Burkhardt, American Legion Department Adjutant gave a few brief comments commending Mrs. Joanne Flora for her courage throughout this ordeal and her help in getting the prisoners released. He cited her trips throughout the country and the many trips she made to Washington, D. C. He ended his remarks with "It's Christmas time again."

Burkhardt then introduced Dolly Eshbaugh who let Sgt. Flora remove his POW bracelet from her arm.

Sgt. Flora said "I was proud to be an American before I went to Vietnam but I am even prouder now."

Mrs. Flora asked that people continue to pray for those whom we do not know of their whereabouts—the ones still missing in action.

The president of the class of 1959, Brunswick High School Joe Baine, welcomed Flora back and said that he would stick by his guns when he said "I am going to do all I can to fight Communism in the future." He added that the people are with him on this commitment. "We always knew that you would make a top rate trooper someday," Baine said.

Other guests included his mother Mrs. Frances Flora, his sisters, Carol Ann Zimmerman and Dixie Longerbeam, his brother, Frank Flora, his grandmother, Mrs. Lucille Anders and the Brunswick City Council which co-sponsored the reception.

CONGRESS JEOPARDIZES VALUABLE PROGRAM

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, today I supported the final passage of H.R. 5683, the

Rural Electrification Act introduced by Mr. DENHOLM. However, I would like to express my personal reservations about this legislation.

Already this session we have seen the rural environmental assistance program and the Vocational Rehabilitation Act shot down in the crossfire between the President and the Congress. Once again I believe that the Congress has unwisely jeopardized a valuable program in our rural communities in order to challenge the President on purely political grounds.

The message from the White House should be perfectly clear by now. The President is firmly committed to holding the line on taxes and preventing a new round of inflation. He is not about to back away from this commitment by allowing the Congress to enact legislation which would stimulate increased Federal spending. The bill we passed today is viewed by the White House as another example of the Congress' fiscal irresponsibility. In trying to force the President's hand again, Congress has not only risked another defeat, but it has flirted with a veto at the expense of the rural communities which depend upon the rural electrification program.

Today we had the opportunity to support Mr. NELSEN's substitute bill—legislation which apparently was an acceptable compromise with the administration. These amendments would not have totally satisfied the rural electric cooperatives around the Nation, but they would have been more palatable than no bill at all.

Mr. Speaker, I supported the final legislation before us today because I wanted to express my strong support for the continuation of a separate REA loan fund. At the same time, I think we have made a serious mistake by refusing to compromise with the White House. I only hope that before this legislation reaches the President's desk, the reasonable proposals which Mr. NELSON offered unsuccessfully will be substituted for the final language we considered today.

PARKING PRIVILEGES FOR CIVILIAN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to require that civilian employees of the Federal Government pay for the privilege of parking, a privilege which up until now has been subsidized by the American taxpayer.

There are many reasons why it would be fair, reasonable, and equitable for civilian employees of the Federal Govern-

ment to pay for their parking privileges.

First, Congress has recognized over the past few years that it is necessary to reduce the number of automobiles in urban areas by encouraging the use of carpools and other means of transportation. A reduction in the number of such automobiles reduces pollution and reduces traffic congestion as well.

Second, there is no justification for requiring an already overburdened American taxpayer to pay for the parking privileges of civilian Federal employees. Recent pay raises have brought about comparability between compensation for public and private employment, and parking fringe benefits for civilian Federal employees are therefore unnecessary and undesirable.

Third, charging civilian Federal employees for the privilege of parking is reasonable in light of similar charges levied on employees in private industry. A substantial majority of privately employed persons in urban areas of this country pay for their own parking, and these charges usually amount to at least \$20 to \$30 per month. These persons have no one to subsidize their parking facilities.

Finally, it is therefore equitable and reasonable to charge civilian employees of the Federal Government for the privilege of parking, including Senators, Representatives, and Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court.

To accomplish these objectives, the legislation I am introducing today implements the principal recommendations of a 1971 study conducted by the Public Buildings Service of the General Services Administration. The specific provisions of the bill are as follows:

First, that the Administrator of the General Services Administration shall have exclusive authority to regulate, operate, and maintain all parking facilities and parking arrangements established by the Federal Government for the private cars of civilian employees of the executive branch;

Second, that the GSA Administrator shall have the authority to provide for the imposition of a reasonable fee for the use of these parking facilities, taking into account the cost of operating and maintaining the parking facilities as well as the fees charged for commercial private parking spaces in the area where the space is provided;

Third, the GSA Administrator shall, in providing for the assignment of such parking spaces, give priority first to high officials for whom flexibility of working hours is essential to the efficient performance of the Federal Government—although no more than 15 percent of the spaces available to any one agency or department shall be assigned to such high officials—and then to employees in carpools, with highest priority assigned to those carpools with the greatest number of passengers;

Fourth, that the GSA Administrator shall, in cooperation with local authorities, establish a system of free fringe parking in the District of Columbia in order to further encourage the use of transportation other than automobiles in moving between places of work;

Fifth, that the GSA Administrator shall, upon a finding that the system of free fringe parking in the District of Columbia has sustained the objectives of this act, consider and establish where appropriate free fringe parking facilities in other metropolitan areas of the United States;

Sixth, that the authorities responsible for parking arrangements and facilities for officers and employees of the legislative branch, including Senators and Representatives, shall establish reasonable fees of not less than \$1 per day for each day of use of one parking space;

Seventh, that the authorities responsible for parking arrangements and facilities for officers and employees of the legislative branch shall, in providing for the assignment of parking spaces, first give priority to high officials for whom flexibility of working hours is essential to the efficient performance of Government business, and then to carpools of other employees of the legislative branch, with highest priority assigned to carpools with the greatest number of passengers;

Eighth, that the authority responsible for parking arrangements and facilities for officers and employees of the U.S. Supreme Court shall establish reasonable fees of not less than \$1 per day for each day of use of one parking space, with priority first given to Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court, and then to carpools of other employees of the Supreme Court, with highest priority going to carpools with the greatest number of passengers.

Mr. Speaker, the American taxpayer

expects and deserves that his Government operate efficiently, with a minimum of unnecessary frills and fringe benefits. In fact, there is nothing which irritates the taxpayer more than unnecessary fringe benefits and subsidized extras which the Federal Government picks up at taxpayers' expense.

During the past several years, there have been many changes affecting economical operations on Capitol Hill, due in large part to the efforts of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on House Administration (Mr. HAYES). These changes have been implemented with a view toward charging for the payment of services on the basis of what it costs to provide those services.

I agree that it makes no sense to require the taxpayers to subsidize the cost of haircuts and lunches for Federal employees, and I also believe that it makes no sense to require the taxpayers to subsidize the parking privileges extended to Federal employees.

I sincerely hope that this legislation is also viewed favorably by the House Select Committee on Parking, as few men in the Congress have been as careful and judicious with the taxpayer's dollar as the distinguished banking minority member of that committee (Mr. GROSS).

I believe that enactment of this legislation will also improve significantly the morale of civilian Federal employees, as many of them now suffer from the unavailability of parking facilities.

Mr. Speaker, the General Services Administration currently exercises jurisdiction over more than 117,000 parking spaces. Combined with the more than 7,000 parking spaces on Capitol Hill, and the added spaces available to employees of the U.S. Supreme Court, enactment of this bill should result in a substantial savings to the American taxpayers.

The Department of Transportation has estimated that at least \$10 million will be generated annually by civilian Federal employees paying for their parking in the District of Columbia area alone.

Enactment of this legislation would represent a very positive step forward in the effort to conduct the operations of the Federal Government as efficiently and as equitably as possible, and I urge its enactment by the Congress at the earliest practicable date.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, FEBRUARY 1973

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I include a release highlighting the February 1973 civilian personnel report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures:

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, FEBRUARY 1973

Total civilian employment in the Executive, Legislative and Judicial Branches of the Federal Government in the month of February was 2,798,080 as compared with 2,807,389 in the preceding month of January. This was a net decrease of 9,309. Total pay in the month of January, the latest month for which actual expenditures are available, was \$2,922,599,000. These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Civilian employment in the Executive Branch in the month of February is compared with the preceding month of January and with February a year ago, as follows:

	Full time in permanent positions	Change	Temporary, part time, etc.	Change	Total employment	Change
Current change:						
January 1973	2,446,048		319,900		2,765,948	
February 1973	2,437,649	-8,399	318,192	-1,708	2,755,841	-10,107
12-month change:						
February 1972	2,550,984		277,284		2,828,268	
February 1973	2,437,649	-113,335	318,192	+40,908	2,755,841	-72,428

Full-time permanent employment in the month of February was reduced by 8,399, reflecting a decrease of 5,852 in Defense agencies and 2,547 in all other agencies. Over the 12 month period full-time permanent employment was reduced by a net of 113,335, reflecting decreases totaling 132,635, primarily in Defense agencies with 74,641 and Postal Service with 51,268. These decreases were partially offset by increases totaling 19,300, primarily in Veterans with 6,429, Justice with 2,574, HEW with 2,646 and Treasury with 2,307.

TOTAL EMPLOYMENT

Total civilian employment in the Executive Branch in February, as compared with January, is shown for civilian and military agencies, as follows:

	February	January	Change
Civilian agencies	1,690,916	1,685,166	+5,750
Military agencies	1,064,925	1,080,782	-15,857
Total, civilian employment	2,755,841	2,765,948	-10,107

The civilian agencies of the Executive Branch reporting the largest increases in February were Treasury with 6,354 and postal Service with 5,924. The largest decrease was in Agriculture with 3,107. In the Department of Defense the largest decreases were reported by Army with 12,299, Navy with 2,235 and Air Force with 1,326.

Total Executive Branch employment inside the United States in February was 2,607,752, an increase of 233 as compared with January. Total employment outside the United States in February was 148,089, a decrease of 10,340 as compared with January.

FISCAL YEAR 1974 BUDGET PROJECTIONS

Comparison of current full-time permanent employment (February 1973) with the budgeted projections for June 1973 and 1974 follows in next column.

LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL BRANCHES

Employment in the Legislative Branch in February totaled 33,512, an increase of 725 as compared with the preceding month of January. Employment in the Judicial Branch

in February totaled 8,727, an increase of 73 as compared with January.

	Civilian agencies	Military agencies	Total
February 1973, actual	1,422,120	1,015,529	2,437,649
June 1973, estimate	1,472,300	1,012,400	2,484,700
(Compared to February 1973)	(+50,180)	(-3,129)	(+47,051)
June 1974, estimate	1,451,800	986,800	2,438,600
(Compared to February 1973)	(+29,680)	(-28,729)	(+951)
(Compared to June 1973, estimate)	(-20,500)	(-25,600)	(-46,100)

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a tabulation, excerpted from the joint committee report, on personnel employed full time in permanent positions by executive branch agencies during February 1973, showing comparisons with June 1971, June 1972, and the budget estimates for June 1973.

FULL-TIME PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT¹

Major agencies	June 1971	June 1972	February 1973	Estimated June 30, 1973 ²	Major agencies	June 1971	June 1972	February 1973	Estimated June 30, 1973 ²
Agriculture.....	84,252	82,511	82,729	83,400	Environmental Protection Agency.....	5,959	7,835	8,011	8,900
Commerce.....	28,435	28,412	28,598	28,200	General Services Administration.....	38,076	36,002	35,890	38,100
Defense:					National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	29,478	27,428	27,137	26,800
Civil functions.....	30,063	30,585	30,067	32,400	Panama Canal.....	13,967	13,777	13,696	14,000
Military functions.....	1,062,741	1,009,548	985,462	* 980,000	Selective Service System.....	5,569	5,791	5,570	5,700
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	104,283	105,764	108,911	* 110,200	Small Business Administration.....	4,004	3,916	4,021	4,200
Housing and Urban Development.....	16,030	15,200	16,378	15,800	Tennessee Valley Authority.....	13,612	14,001	14,151	14,000
Interior.....	57,570	56,892	56,534	57,000	U.S. Information Agency.....	9,773	9,255	9,206	9,400
Justice.....	42,662	45,446	45,667	47,200	Veterans' Administration.....	158,635	163,179	167,707	171,600
Labor.....	11,352	12,339	12,391	12,800	All other agencies.....	31,333	33,499	33,966	35,800
State.....	23,398	22,699	22,401	23,200	Contingencies.....				2,000
Agency for International Development.....	13,477	11,719	10,833	10,800	Subtotal.....	1,955,530	1,910,854	1,895,428	1,915,200
Transportation.....	68,482	67,232	66,079	67,700	U.S. Postal Service.....	564,782	594,834	542,221	569,500
Treasury.....	90,135	95,728	97,256	103,000	Total ³	2,520,312	2,505,688	2,437,649	2,484,700
Atomic Energy Commission.....	6,920	6,836	7,032	7,000					
Civil Service Commission.....	5,324	5,260	5,735	6,000					

¹ Included in total employment shown on table 1, beginning on p. 2.² Source: As projected in 1974 budget document; figures rounded to nearest hundred.³ Excludes increase of 5,000 for civilianization program.⁴ Excludes increase of approximately 9,000 in adult welfare categories to be transferred to the Federal Government under Public Law 92-603.⁵ February figure excludes 2,448 disadvantaged persons in public service careers programs as compared with 2,610 in January.

FOLK CENTER LEADER SEEKS TO CONSERVE

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, on May 5 of this year, the Ozark Folk Culture Center will open in Mountain View, Ark. The center represents the fruition of years of work to preserve our cultural and folklore heritage. Its young director, David Newbern of Fayetteville, Ark., is a man of many talents. A lover and composer of folk music he has taught at American University, worked at the Pentagon, and was acting dean at the University of Arkansas Law School. Newbern sums up the purpose of the center in this way:

The whole idea of the Center is to preserve the culture of North-Central Arkansas. The problem is—how do you preserve it by taking it out of its natural setting and putting it into a new modern complex.

At this point I would like to share with my colleagues a recent article which explains a bit more about Newbern and how he may accomplish this.

The article follows:

FOLK CENTER LEADER SEEKS TO CONSERVE
(By Sheila Daniel)

MOUNTAIN VIEW.—W. David Newbern, 35, the first administrator of the Ozark Folk Culture Center here will bring to the job an unusual sense of understanding and caring for the mountain way of life.

This life style is the main attraction now playing to the nation every year here.

Newbern is a multitasking man, raised in the traditions of the Ozark Mountains' song and dance and simple philosophy. Currently a professor at the University of Arkansas Law School at Fayetteville, Newbern plays the banjo and guitar and writes folk songs.

He wants to manage the \$3 million Center, play his instruments, write his songs and conserve the quality of Arkansas's mountain style. Another musician and his friend, Charlie Sandage, has been appointed program director at the Center.

"Charlie and I started a group last year that we call the Illinois River Valley String Quartet," he said. "Most people don't think about it, but the Illinois River Valley is just west of Fayetteville, so that's how we got our name."

The group's other members include David Treadway of Little Rock and Ed Ryland of Arkadelphia.

"Charlie, David and Ed had a rock group at Henderson State College a few years ago," he said. "When Charlie and I got into folk music, we introduced it to the others. They took to country (music) just like ducks to water."

Finally, last April Newbern saw Mountain View for the first time when he attended the 10th annual Arkansas Folk Festival and Arts and Crafts Show. Since that time, he has frequently been a guest of the town's Rackensack Folk Society at the group's Friday night musicales.

But the professor doesn't regard himself as a folksinger.

"A folk person is not an entertainer," Newbern said. "He's someone who tells a story just because he wants to. An entertainer, on the other hand, concentrates on the impact of his performance."

Newbern sees the members of his group as entertainers also, not as folk musicians. "For this reason, anything we might do at the Folk Center will be only as guest performers," he said.

Newbern admits that his decision to leave the law profession is a bit unusual.

"This development of a very intense interest in folkways has come late in my life—I'm already 35," he said. "I guess I'm doing this because I feel that there isn't anything more worthwhile for me. Americans live a frustrated sort of life; everybody is looking for roots. Right now, this is the best thing I can do to help."

He plans to finish his teaching at the law school in May, when he will assume his new job on a full-time basis.

The new Center is to be open May 5, although it will be partially opened for the annual festival, which begins April 19. It includes a complex of 59 buildings, constructed with 80 per cent federal funds and 20 per cent locally bonded funds. The state plans to hire 78 employees at the Center, most of them from Stone County.

Newbern is enthusiastic about his new job, but he realizes that he will face problems.

"The whole idea of the Center is to preserve the culture of North-Central Arkansas," he said. "The problem is—how do you preserve it by taking it out of its natural setting and putting it into a new modern complex?"

In the past, activity has been centered at the Mountain View High School gymnasium.

"The atmosphere may be changed by moving it out of the gym," he admitted, "but that's a whole lot better than letting the tradition die. The oldtimers at Mountain View are the last of the oral folk tradition. And if you don't give them a place where

they can teach others, then it will certainly die. * * * I also believe that we can preserve a lot of what is there in Stone County without destroying it.

WIFE INTERESTED IN MOUNTAIN CRAFTS

Newbern's wife, the former Carolyn Lewis of Fayetteville, is also looking forward to the move to Mountain View. Her knowledge of folkways complements her husband's, since her interests focus on the crafts tradition. Carolyn holds a master's degree in American Studies from the University of Delaware, and she now works in a Fayetteville arts and crafts shop.

Newbern has been on the faculty of the University of Arkansas Law School since 1970. He served as acting dean of the school from September 1972 until February 1.

Newbern developed an interest in music early in life. When he was 11, he spent a summer singing and touring with a boy's choir at Dallas. Later he was active in the U of A opera workshop as an undergraduate.

Oddly enough, Newbern became enamored of folk music when he was in school at Boston just five years ago.

"I went to hear Lester Flatt and Earl Scruggs at a Boston concert," he says, "and I suddenly realized what I had missed. It's hard to believe, since I grew up right in the middle of the Ozark folk culture."

Soon afterward Newbern bought a new banjo and began to pick it. He had crushed his first one in the back seat of his Volkswagen.

"My grandmother gave me that first banjo when I was only five," he recalled. "It had an 1892 patent on it. My great-grandfather found it in Kansas City where he was selling apples, and he brought it to Fayetteville around the turn of the century."

The loss of his first instrument still saddens Newbern.

The lawyer turned to composing when he was stationed in Korea with the Army in the late 1940s. Although he had been singing all of his life, he had never considered writing songs.

Why did he take up writing songs with a folk flavor when he was so far from the Ozarks?

Newbern isn't exactly sure.

"When I went to the Far East, I was just beginning to take folk music seriously," he said. "I had a lot of time on my hands, and I guess this is why I started writing."

So when he returned to Arkansas after nine years, Newbern was prepared to rediscover the music and arts of the Ozarks. The law professor found a culture that his own great-grandparents had brought into the area from Tennessee and Kentucky, along with many, many other early pioneers.

In fact, Newbern's family goes a long way

back in Arkansas history. His maternal grandfather, Dr. A. M. Harding, served on the U of A faculty from 1905 until his death in 1947. As president of the University during World War II, Dr. Harding spent much of his time promoting the U of A and its heritage, emphasizing the college's unique cultural and intellectual offerings.

After Newbern began teaching at the U of A Law School, he began to pursue his musical interests in earnest. He took banjo lessons from a student, and he also bought a guitar. During the last two years music has come to claim more and more of his time.

"I go home every afternoon and sit with my banjo the rest of the day," he said. "And I still have an awfully long way to go toward becoming a really good musician."

He usually plays traditional folk songs, ballads and tunes that he writes himself. He also enjoys bluegrass music.

"Most of my own songs are about Arkansas," he explained. "The lyrics often mention rivers such as the White, the Mulberry, the Ouachita and the Illinois. I like to write about the mountains and the rural life of the state."

In fact, Newbern has written an "Arkansas Trilogy," which he performed recently in concert with the Uarketes, a U of A singing group. The third song in the trilogy is one of the composer's favorites. It's called "Come The Fall," a gentle, smooth-flowing melody about the seasons of the state.

"Some of my other pieces are just mood-type songs, and some make a comment about modern society," he added. Over-all, Newbern's music reflects the styles of his favorite musicians. They include John Denver, The Dillards, The Nitty Gritty Dirt Band and Joan Baez.

He went through the Fayetteville school system, and then earned his bachelor of arts and a law degree from the U of A at Fayetteville. When Newbern finished law school in 1961, he entered the Army Judge Advocate General's Corps. While in the Army, he took advanced degrees from George Washington University of Washington and from the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University near Boston.

The young lawyer, also taught at American University and worked in the Pentagon at Washington. He spent time in Germany and Korea before he was discharged with the rank of major in 1970.

STEEL INDUSTRY SHOWS EMPLOYMENT DECLINE FROM 1971 DESPITE BOOMING LEVEL OF OUTPUT

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the American steel industry and the United Steel Workers on their recent adoption of a negotiating process which eliminates a strike threat next year. This is a new policy of conciliation, rather than confrontation over the bargaining table and across picket lines. Both industry and labor have proved conclusively that they have in mind not only the best interests of industry and labor, but also those of the national economy and the American people.

A recent Wall Street Journal article explores the continuing decline in employment in the steel industry despite the strong boom in production. This paradox of shrinking employment—while

there is such a heavy demand for steel—calls for bold new action. Now responsible leaders in labor and industry have taken that action.

I hope this is just the beginning of a new and mature relationship between industry and labor. This cooperation in strengthening the steel industry will make this Nation more competitive in world markets, and produce more jobs for American workers.

I include the Wall Street Journal article in the RECORD, as follows:

STEEL INDUSTRY SHOWS EMPLOYMENT DECLINE FROM 1971 DESPITE BOOMING LEVEL OF OUTPUT

(By Michael K. Drapkin)

PITTSBURGH.—The nation's steelmakers are in the process of compiling record first half production of an estimated 76 million tons of crude steel. That's some four million tons more than the first half of 1971, when users were stockpiling heavily against the prospect of an industry strike.

But the industry is pouring the steel with about 40,000 fewer production and maintenance employees, and this is a fact of life the United Steelworkers union and the country's 10 largest steelmakers are trying to alter under the historic agreement signed last week.

The accord to eliminate a strike threat next year and arbitrate unresolved issues is designed to do away with the contract-time hedge buying that has distorted domestic production and spurred import buying over the years and forced domestic production to shrivel after a settlement when users started to use their accumulated supplies.

As import figures suggest, buying from foreign suppliers doesn't decline to prebuildup levels after contract settlements. And U.S. workers called back during normalcy never quite equal the number laid off during slack post-settlement times.

LAST BUILDUP PERIOD

During the first half of 1971, the last buildup period, employment climbed to about 530,000. But the total slumped to a 32-year low of 429,000 in November 1971 as users worked off their bulging inventories and took in huge new tonnages ordered from overseas. And, even with today's record pace, employment has rebounded only part way, to 490,000.

The current productive strength is beyond doubt. Mills say volume continues well in excess of shipping capability, lead times are extending and backlogs are continuing to rise. The strength, moreover, doesn't show signs of abating.

As has been the case for some months, tremendous tonnages of flat-rolled products lead the demand, and mills say plates and structural steels are beginning to move upward. These are signs of renewed strength in the capital goods markets, too. Tin plate shipments also are rising, one mill says, "and everything points toward the industry producing and shipping at capacity over the next few months."

Among specific markets, mill analysts say, machinery production will set records this year, and demand for bar products is said to be "unprecedented." Another positive factor, in part psychological, is domestic inventory building, analysts say. Some customers, whose inventories have proved inadequate in light of record consumption figures in recent months and lengthening lead times, are ordering in excess of their current needs, where possible, to avoid a possible crunch of supplies.

TORRID DEMAND

A top sales official of one of the big mills says overall steel demand remains "torrid." He says the mill has been allocating orders for some time, its backlog has reached a record 80 days and it's turning down orders.

"It's especially enjoyable to turn down some heavy users of imported steel," he said.

One big producer says a few of its operations have recalled all available employees from the 1971 layoff and have started to hire new workers, but that overall it hasn't any pressing need for more manpower at most of its plants.

A plant in the Midwest, where the labor supply traditionally is tight because of a fairly high turnover rate, says it "isn't really having trouble finding enough workers." Another mill in that area says it's getting enough "walk-ins" to take care of its normal replacement needs. As a result, this producer says, it has curtailed for the time being recruiting trips for laborers and other less-skilled jobs that it traditionally makes to other states.

The high level of output and shipment of finished products is running afoul of one long-time problem, however—an inadequate supply of rail cars, especially the open-top cars preferred for carrying steel coils. One big mill says that "aside from a continuous shortage of special rail cars for loading sheet steel coils, transportation of one mode or another is generally available, but with virtually no margin, and with spot or temporary gaps as to particular types of rail cars."

Others echo that and point to "the constant battle" for rail cars, which in some locations has spread to include pressure on available trucks beyond the mills' own fleets.

AN "IRRITANT"

Another mill executive says the rail problem "is more of an irritant than a basic problem" and that it isn't expected to curtail any production or shipments.

Mill spokesmen generally agree very little in the way of steelmaking equipment could be brought into production—at least that's worthwhile in economic terms—and even if there was, it's doubtful finishing mills could handle much more of the popular grades and types of steel products. First half shipments appear headed for a record 55 million tons.

A Midwestern steel official said industry shipments "will give people a good head on what the industry's productive capacity is." He said it's becoming "increasingly clear that 1973 shipments will break 100 million tons by a good margin." His company is lowering hot metal (iron) charges in the open hearths to 25% from 50% in order to keep enough hot metal going to the much faster, more efficient basic oxygen furnaces.

TINY POST OFFICE GOING?

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, a number of residents of Northfield, which is a community in the town of Litchfield in my district, have contacted me concerning their fears that postal services at the Northfield Post Office are about to be terminated.

The Northfield Post Office, which has served this community for the past 100 years, is an integral part of life in the village. Users of the facility would be adversely affected if services were to be terminated. I fully support the citizens of Northfield who want to preserve their post office as a convenience and as a landmark of their community's history. The U.S. Postal Service has been contacted for a full status report on Postal

Service plans regarding the local facility.

The following editorial in the Express of Thomaston, a weekly newspaper, gives some idea of the importance of the post office to the residents of Northfield:

JUST ONE LITTLE POST OFFICE

Rumor has it that Northfield's tiny post office will not be around much longer. Just when it will close and just what will be available in the way of postal service are unsettled questions.

Several residents, concerned over the identity that the post office gives to the village and concerned about the inconvenience a change will mean for the elderly residents of the area, have written to Congresswoman Ella Grasso, asking that she investigate what might be done to keep the post office.

A post office is a little thing. But so is one little school, a road name here and there, a vote here and there. When our identity has been swallowed up by bigger towns, more important issues and somebody else's priorities, we may wish we hadn't given up those little things.

"CAN DO"—A LOST ATTITUDE

HON. PETE V. DOMENICI

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise to commend the fine citizenship that is being displayed by the residents of a community in my State of New Mexico. The citizens of Melrose, a small city in the eastern part of our State, have taken on the task of developing a community center entirely on their own with no outside financial help.

This is self-help at its finest. The citizens realized they needed the community center, and they realized it would cost money. Yet they also knew that the Government is attempting to cut back on Federal spending and is encouraging local governments to do more for themselves.

And that is exactly what Melrose is doing. The citizens are remodeling an old building using a great deal of donated materials and labor.

But they needed \$1,800 to pay necessary bills and they are paying this off by hosting a fundraising dinner and a benefit basketball game. Together with donations of residents they have already accumulated \$1,000.

Mr. President, I am proud of the residents of Melrose and of the community spirit they have displayed. They should serve as an example to citizens across the country.

They did not say, "We have the right to have a community center and we expect you to build one for us."

They said, instead, "We want a community center and, therefore, we will set about building one for ourselves."

I hope in the future I will be able to report to you that many, many more such fine endeavors are taking place in my good State of New Mexico.

ONCE ROMANIAN, ALWAYS ROMANIAN

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, the Romanian citizenship laws are cause for concern. The Library of Congress issued a paper explaining the dangers former Romanians have if they return to Romania for a visit. Dumitru Danielopol has used this paper as a basis for a column which appeared in the Aurora, Ill., Beacon-News on March 7, 1973. Mr. Danielopol cogently explains the situation. The column follows:

**ONCE ROMANIAN, ALWAYS ROMANIAN
(By Dumitru Danielopol)**

WASHINGTON.—A year ago I pointed out in a column that Communist Romania had adopted a bizarre nationality law under which Bucharest claimed the right to designate anyone a Romanian citizen regardless of what legal steps he might have taken to proclaim allegiance to another state.

According to the law, no one—or his descendants—loses Romanian nationality unless Bucharest courts so decide. It makes no difference how long ago a person or his ancestors left Romania.

The law specifically rejects any nationality that a former Romanian or his descendants may have adopted or inherited. Once a Romanian, always a Romanian, unless the Romanian government decides to let him go. And before that can happen he must pledge allegiance to the Communist regime in Romania!

No limit is set on the law's retroactive clauses, so Romanian authorities could implement them as they wish.

When I called attention to this peculiar law, I pointed out the danger it posed for any former Romanians who might venture to visit his homeland in these supposed safe days of détente. Any such visitor can be denied exit. The law says he's still a Romanian subject. He can be tried for alleged past sins. He might even be drafted into the Romanian Army.

A few months ago a Romanian diplomat in Washington challenged my interpretation of the law. He said my article had created fears among former Romanians who might otherwise travel to that country.

The Romanian embassy gave assurances that travelers would suffer no consequences from the new law. My "Danielopol interpretation," they said, was wrong.

I asked the embassy to give me these assurances in an official memorandum. Nothing happened, for good reason.

The Romanian embassy is in no position to contradict my interpretation because it is also the interpretation of the European law division of the Library of Congress. I had checked my facts with them before writing my March 1972 column. I've checked again. The law, we both believe, exposes former Romanians to great potential danger if they enter that country.

At the request of Congress, the Romanian section of the Library of Congress issued a paper explaining these dangers.

"Any foreigner of Romanian descent is considered a Romanian citizen and subject only to Romanian law upon his return to Romania and he may need an exit visa (and a Romanian passport) from the Romanian government in order to leave the country again. He may be tried by Romanian courts

for his activities abroad or for violation of the law, i.e. for having been an enemy of the state or anti-Communist. Therefore, foreigners of Romanian descent may enter Romania but there is no assurance that they will be free to return to the United States."

What is more, the lawyers at the Library of Congress warn that "assurances" given by Romanian embassies to would-be travelers to that country are worthless. What is required is nothing less than an "authoritative interpretation or a directive ruling of the Supreme Court (in Romania) in regard to the respective provisions of the 1971 law so that those who desire to return to their country of origin should be able to rely on some legal basis of non-persecution," the library lawyers say.

Until this happens, anyone of Romanian ancestry travels to Romania at his own risk. The Bucharest government, by law, denies that his adopted country has any right to protect him.

I'll be happy to write another column on the "Danielopol Interpretation" whenever the Romanian Supreme Court decides to recognize international rights of citizenship.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE WARSAW GHETTO UPRISING

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, throughout history the Jewish people have struggled to escape the chains of bondage and oppression. The Warsaw ghetto uprising, which began on April 29, 1943, was one more bitter example of the terror and travail that has had too many sad counterparts.

The uprising was an inspirational display of raw courage and perseverance. Not until the conclusion of World War II did the world fully comprehend and realize the terror of that time and the determination displayed by the beleaguered and outnumbered Warsaw Jews. For 3 weeks these gallant people withstood hunger and fear in an effort to survive the destruction that was wrought by Nazi men and machines. Despite daily radio broadcasts pleading for help, the Warsaw Jews received no outside assistance. Their valiant effort was doomed and the ghetto was razed by Nazi troops.

The destruction of the Warsaw ghetto was only one episode in a long history of the oppression of the Jewish people. From Moses' search for freedom and a homeland, to discrimination against Jews in the Soviet Union today, the Jewish people have learned that the struggle for freedom is an integral part of their cherished traditions.

It is with profound respect that we honor the memory of the people of the Warsaw ghetto who died to defend their religion, culture, indeed, their very existence.

In commemoration, I am introducing a resolution asking the President to proclaim April 29, 1973, as a day to observe the 30th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising.

FOOD PRICES AND SECRETARY BUTZ

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's food marketing system is incredibly complex. Accordingly, there is no easy solution to the food price emergency now facing millions of our consumers and no single individual or industry group responsible for the crisis.

I do believe though, that the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Butz, and his predecessor in office, Mr. Hardin, must assume a major portion of the blame for high food prices. Under Mr. Butz, it has been USDA policy to pay farmers billions of dollars in subsidies not to plant crops; to oppose increased imports of lean beef from foreign nations; to encourage the sale abroad of farm commodities that are scarce here; to cheerlead for higher and higher food prices; to discourage the imposition of price controls on agricultural products; to underestimate, deliberately or by neglect, the growing demand for beef and other food commodities by U.S. consumers; and to permit USDA officials to accept agri-business employment, in apparent violation of the Federal conflict-of-interest laws.

Mr. Speaker, I must reluctantly conclude that Secretary of Agriculture Butz is not only an enemy of the American consumer but is responsible, in a material way, for their inflationary spiral that continues to plague our country. For this, he should have been fired long ago. Instead, Mr. Nixon elevated him to one of his super Cabinet positions.

The March 31, 1973, Business Week has an excellent editorial on Mr. Butz, urging that he be replaced. I include the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

AGRICULTURE NEEDS A CHANGE

There is a sort of rough justice in the fact that the Agriculture Dept. this week drew the painful task of telling the American public that the cost of food to the average family went up 2.4% between January and February. The Administration has blamed bad luck and bad weather for the climb in food prices. But the main reason is bad management. And the Secretary of Agriculture, Earl Butz, has been primarily responsible for the management mistakes.

Under Butz, the Agriculture Dept. has acted as though inflation and wage-price controls were the problems of some other country. It has plugged away single-mindedly with policies designed to limit crops and raise farm incomes by raising farm prices.

It slept quietly through the negotiations with the Russians for huge grain purchases last year. And though it is supposed to employ some of the most expert agricultural forecasters in the world, it did not anticipate the impact of the purchase program on world markets. When the prices of wheat and feed grains skyrocketed, no one was more surprised than Agriculture, which found itself obligated to pay \$100-million in export subsidies on the Russian purchases.

Nor has the department shown any capacity to learn from its mistakes. When it set up crop targets last fall, it still was thinking of limiting output. And more recently, it programmed a cutback in turkey production to keep prices up.

Butz's scornful opposition to farm price controls has made it all but impossible for the Administration to give this crucial question serious consideration. And since he ranks as a super-Cabinet official, his public comments have undermined confidence overseas in the willingness of the Administration to do anything effective about inflation.

When the most productive agricultural country in the world finds itself facing runaway prices and food shortages, it needs a new policy and new people to administer the policy. The only way President Nixon can now do what must be done with prices is to overhaul the Agriculture Dept., beginning with the replacement of Secretary Butz.

CONNECTICUTS "DA VINCI OF FINANCE"

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, for more than 25 years, Carey Cronan has reported the news of Washington to the readers of the Stamford, Conn., Advocate and the Bridgeport, Conn., Post. Because of his long experience, I often look to Mr. Cronan for insight and background, especially as it relates to the emerging history of Connecticut politics.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, last month, a man of significant stature on the Connecticut political scene, former Senator William Benton, passed away. In a recent Post column, Mr. Cronan recalled Senator Benton in life and I would like to share his incisive comments with my colleagues today, as follows.

SELF-MADE MAN

(By Carey Cronan)

WASHINGTON.—The late Senator William Benton was a self-made man, who according to his Washington record, was not as successful in politics as he was in business.

He was, of course, more or less a casualty of the Eisenhower sweep in 1952, but it appeared that he had some difficulty in politics primarily because he was accustomed to doing his own thinking and making his own decisions. In party politics this is not always popular or successful.

FLOOR SPEECH

On one occasion he was discussing a Senate floor speech with a top aide, who suggested they might contact State Chairman John M. Bailey and others in the state for their opinions on whether this particular move should be made.

While the aide was talking on the phone, the Senator arose on the floor and made the speech. It was therefore his decision.

He was an innovator in politics, one of the first to use the helicopter for campaigning for instance, and he did give a lively and imaginative spirit to what had become a musty craft.

One man on his staff described him as a "pollinator who launches ideas and then expects others to carry them out." But in this he was what most public figures are not, an originator.

He carried his love for taking calculated chances because he believed in his own judgment, and his own judgment had been proven correct time and time again.

LISTENED TO ADVICE

On the other hand he was not a man to spurn advice, and he listened patiently to countless advisors with courtesy although he seldom acted on their evaluations.

He had recording machines with him constantly at home, in his car, on planes, and even while playing tennis, his favorite sport. One writer said he brought a recorder to the tennis court but the Senator corrected the report by saying: "It was not on the court but just outside."

He would often dictate verbal notes, letters, etc., on these records or tapes, which some of his less informed employees thought he would perhaps forget.

GOOD MEMORY

Invariably he would ask about a notation for research or a copy of a letter he had recorded days or even weeks before. Bill Benton had a memory anyone would be proud of having.

He was a good friend to many and a good host although he was often preoccupied with other concerns than mere social graces.

Bill Benton took a deep and abiding interest in his party and his vision in this financial field went far beyond that of the average man. While others quibbled, he acted, while some hesitated, he went forward trusting always in his own diagnosis on a situation.

He seldom carried much cash, depending on charge accounts for proper records of his activities.

MANY FRIENDS

He knew and liked people in all walks of life. One friend said he had so many contrasting friends he was like the star of the play of "The Man Who Came to Dinner." The Senator asked what that meant and the commentator replied with an explanation of Sheridan Whiteside.

The Senator retorted: "Never saw it, I have no time for the theater."

The business and the political world as well as the art world and the educational world will miss Bill Benton and his talents.

He was, one might say respectfully, a Leonardo da Vinci of finance.

SOME 350 GUN DEATHS IN 1 WEEK

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, with legislation to control guns—particularly handguns—which I and other Members have proposed still languishing in the Congress, the Associated Press has come up with new evidence of the increasing cost in human lives of this Nation's gun mania. Following is an Associated Press report which appeared in the March 30 issue of the New York Times entitled "Gun Deaths Rise 70 Percent in U.S. Study," and an editorial commentary on that report from the March 31 issue of the New York Post:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 30, 1973]

GUN DEATHS RISE 70 PERCENT IN U.S. STUDY—350 KILLED IN A 1973 WEEK, UP FROM 206 IN 1969

In one week this month, 350 men, women and children in the United States were shot to death. Some were the victims of armed robbers, some were policemen killed in the line of duty and some were shot during family quarrels.

Other gun deaths were more bizarre. A bartender was machine-gunned as he sat in his car at a Boston intersection, for example, and two teen-agers were executed as they knelt by a sleeping bag in the Arizona desert.

The 350 deaths, counted in an Associated Press survey the week of March 4 to 11, represented a 70 per cent increase over those counted in the last similar survey four years ago.

In each of three previous AP surveys, gunshot deaths totaled about 200. There were 199 from June 16 to 23, 1968; 192 from July 7 to 14, 1968, and 206 from June 15 to 22, 1969.

The dates for the surveys were chosen at random. The first two were taken in the wake of the assassination of Senator Robert F. Kennedy. The third came a year later after passage of a Federal gun control law.

HOMICIDES UP 44.5 PERCENT

In the latest survey, 239 deaths were classified as homicides, 91 as suicides and 20 as accidents. While the total number of gunshot deaths rose 40 per cent since the 1969 survey, homicides climbed 44.5 per cent, suicides 33.7 per cent and accidental deaths 20 per cent.

The weapons included the small, cheap handguns called "Saturday night specials" and often used in holdups, a father's revolver in the hands of a curious infant, and the family shotgun grabbed during a quarrel.

In most states, there are no attempts to compile comprehensive, statewide records of gun deaths until weeks or months after they occur. And, in many cases, the type of weapon is not always listed immediately.

But in the 350 gun deaths counted March 4 to 11, at least 128—or 37.1 per cent—of the weapons used were handguns. Handguns were responsible for at least 41.4 per cent of the homicides, 25.8 per cent of the suicides and 20.5 per cent of the accidental deaths.

Ten persons were killed during holdups, and five robbery suspects were killed by policemen.

SALES DESPITE CURBS

The 1968 Federal gun control law banned interstate mail order sales of rifles, shotguns and all types of ammunition. It also banned most over-the-counter sales to out-of-state residents.

The 1968 law also banned imports of cheap, small-caliber pistols, but a number of United States concerns sell "Saturday night specials" assembled locally from parts shipped in from overseas.

Attempts to get tighter controls have failed in Congress.

Last year, the Senate passed a bill to prohibit the sale of easily concealed handguns, ranging from the cheap specials to expensive, snub-nosed handguns. But the House took no action on the bill, and its chief sponsor, Senator Birch Bayh, Democrat of Indiana, says he sees no point in reintroducing it this year unless there are signs the House will pass it.

One bill re-introduced this year would require registration of all firearms and licensing of owners. The bill, proposed by Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Democrat of Massachusetts, failed 78 to 11 last year.

Another bill re-introduced this year would outlaw private ownership of all handguns. The bill, proposed by Senator Philip A. Hart, Democrat of Michigan, was rejected 87 to 7 last year.

[From the New York Post, Mar. 31, 1973]

HOME-FRONT TRAGEDY: UNCONTROLLED GUNS

There was a disaster early this month in which 345 Americans were suddenly and violently killed. But almost nobody noticed at the time, the probability is that only a few will remember and, to judge from the reactions of the people who might have prevented the tragedy, hardly anybody cares—yet.

A grisly fantasy of some sort? Not at all. There were stories in the newspapers and television news reports at the time, but none of them seem to have made any difference. It was not a series of airline crashes, or a train wreck or a devastating explosion. It was something much more common.

The 345 persons who died, of both sexes and all ages, were gunshot victims during the week of March 4 to 11. There were, of course, individual reports on the deaths—236 of which are listed as homicides. The full

dimensions of this national tragedy could not have been measured locally; it remained for the Associated Press to compile the complete figures for the week. It has made three such surveys before—yet really strict gun control is still lacking in America. Perhaps the latest data will stir action, if anything can.

For the new survey shows a 40 per cent increase in gunshot deaths over the results of the last study in June, 1969.

The figures also show that the homicides rose 44.5 per cent and that in 41.4 per cent of the murders handguns were used. New York State ranked fourth among the first five states with the most gun deaths—25 during the week. That information should help to spur the pending legislation in Albany more stringent handgun controls. The full survey demands careful examination in Washington, where essential control legislation is now languishing. There was nothing particularly unusual about the week of March 4-11. The coming week could be just as bad—or worse.

Surely tough gun-control laws are an elementary, minimal weapon for any serious war on crime.

HOME LOAN AMENDMENT BILL

HON. ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which is designed to free badly needed funds from federally chartered savings and loan associations so that more families in Guam, Hawaii, and Alaska will be able to purchase homes in these areas.

Under present law, an entirely inadequate supply of capital is available to finance new mortgages over \$45,000 in the three areas mentioned. This is due to the fact that federally chartered savings and loan associations are required by law to charge any mortgage exceeding \$45,000 against its allowable surplus loan fund, which may not exceed 20 percent of its assets. Although savings and loan associations are understandably reluctant to commit large amounts of their surplus funds to long-term mortgages, the net result in Guam, Hawaii and Alaska, where high land and construction costs quite often force house prices well over the \$45,000 limitation, has been to limit available housing loans in an already tight money market.

Savings and loan associations have an important place in financing new home construction in the off-shore American areas and in Alaska. To restrict the maximum amount of a loan which they make to \$45,000 in areas well-known for high building costs is unreasonable and places a harmful constraint on both the financial institutions and the individuals who want to purchase a home of their own.

The measure which I introduce today would remedy this inequity by amending the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933 to provide for a 50-percent escalator clause beyond the present \$45,000 limit for Guam, Hawaii, and Alaska. My good friend Senator DANIEL INOUE, Democrat of Hawaii, has introduced a similar measure in the Senate regarding this matter.

There exists within the Federal housing policies ample precedent for what I ask. The prime example is in title 12, section 1715(d), which allows the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to increase the maximum mortgage limits up to 50-percent with respect to Guam, Hawaii, and Alaska. This provision has been applied to increase the FHA insurable limits on single-family housing from \$33,000 to \$49,000. And, within the Federal savings and loan association charter, special provisions permit larger loans on multifamily dwellings in high-cost areas. Thus, the measure I introduce today would simply extend existing national housing policy with respect to mortgages made by savings and loan associations on single-family homes.

Legislation to increase the amount of money available for home loans would be a welcome stimulus to the local economy and certainly would provide a large number of families with the opportunity to buy the home of their dreams.

I respectfully urge that this measure be given a prompt and favorable consideration by my colleagues in Congress.

Thank you.

CONVINCING POSITIONS ON STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the past few months I have met with both educators and students to discuss the alarm produced by budget proposals to eliminate some sources of student financial aid.

While the administration has included for fiscal 1974 requests for the basic opportunity grants, authorized by the Congress last year, and for the college work-study program, it has ignored two other existing student-aid programs, the supplemental opportunity grants and the national defense student loan program.

By rejecting the SOG and NDSL assistance, the President has again flouted congressional mandates as well as the needs of the people. The Education Amendments of 1972 required specified amounts to be spent for the SOG, NDSL, and CWS programs as a prerequisite to funding the basic opportunity grants. The budget omissions are a clear violation of both congressional intent and law, and a grave disservice to higher education.

Students at State University College at Buffalo, N.Y., have prepared position papers in support of funding for these four financial aid programs. A group of students assisted Glenn Nellis, assistant to the president of State University College at Buffalo, in the preparation.

The research is scholarly and their case for continuation a convincing one. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the following position papers on an urgent issue:

NATIONAL DIRECT (DEFENSE) STUDENT LOANS

For the past fourteen years the National Direct Student Loan program has made loans available to undergraduates and graduate

students for the purpose of financing their education. Since it is one of the nations' oldest investments in student financial aid it has become a mainstay in the aid picture.

The proposed budget for financial year 1974 would cease federal contributions to the institutionally held funds which operate in a revolving loan fund basis with the previous years repayments and federal capital contributions financing the next years loans.

Although it was the sense of Congress to make NDSL self-perpetuating, continued federal contributions, at least of the present, are necessary because of the extensive forgiveness clauses in the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and the Education Amendments of 1965. These forgiveness clauses reduced the number and amounts of repayments. In 1971-1972 State University College at Buffalo loaned out close to 1 million dollars in NDSL loans. Repayment for the same period was 100,000 dollars only one tenth of the money loaned out. Federal contributions must make up the difference for the survival of the program.

The Educational Amendments of 1972 changed the forgiveness clause and reduced the amounts of forgiveness however it will take three to four years for the old clause to work its way out of the system. All loans prior to September 1972 are under the old forgiveness clause. The last of these loans will not come due until September of 1976 and must be forgiven according to the old clauses.

There are weaknesses in the argument that the guaranteed student loan programs can absorb the borrowing needs of the students. One is the actual availability of the loans. Many commercial lenders place certain qualifications on the loans, such as, a specific grade point average or an account relationship. Independent students are especially hurt here with no established roots in any community and lack of residents they must rely on school loan programs.

Another fact that will supposedly help the guaranteed student loan program absorb the NDSL cut off is the Student Loan Marketing Association (Sallie Mae) authorized in the 1972 amendments. The problem with this is that "Sallie Mae's" marketing operation can not be made functional in time to have any impact on the 1972-1973 season. It has taken six months to get the temporary Directors selected and it is improbable that the technical functions of "Sallie Mae" can be implemented in the next few months.

Another important question is the willingness of the lenders to sell the loans to "Sallie Mae". Although this type of system seems to work well in the area of housing it remains to be seen if the banks will be willing to expand their volume by selling to the association.

Nobody can doubt the commitment that Congress made to Education in the passage of the Education Amendments of 1972. A commitment that does not stop after the bill is passed but one that persists through the budget and on to appropriations. We sincerely hope that you agree with us and push for the necessary funds to continue to give an education to those whom would not be able to afford.

COLLEGE WORK-STUDY PROGRAM

We support the full-funding of the College Work-Study Program for the next academic year. Our reasons for doing so follow:

1. The federal portion of CW-SP currently provides 80% of the wages for more than 500,000 needy students. Most earnings (up to \$650/year) must be utilized for educational expenses.

2. The work done during the academic year, vacation periods, or summer, not only aids students financially, but provides work experience frequently related to the student's academic program.

3. The CW-SP assists the employer, as many of the institutions and agencies using work-study students would find it difficult to support the needed manpower to provide essential services without these funds.

4. Many institutions have been receiving only a fraction of the CW-SP funding they could effectively use, resulting in many unmet needs on both the part of the student and the potential employer.

However, the proposal to provide \$250 million for the CW-SP in 1973-74 is not quite adequate, even if supplemented with the Basic Opportunity Grant. We would support an increase in the CW-SP funding for the following reasons:

1. Some 500 post-secondary institutions are seeking federal student aid funds for the first time this year. Many of these institutions are requesting CW-SP funds.

2. Even though official tallies are not yet compiled, projected requests for CW-SP funds are 25% above last year's requests.

3. The 1972 Amendments have extended eligibility for CW-SP to half-time students for the first time. This possible increase on student demands may be even more than anticipated by participating institutions when applying for funds.

4. In the event that Congress acts favorably during this session on a new minimum wage bill, overall impact of the proposed appropriation would be further diluted.

5. If the Basic Opportunity Grant is only funded 50%, many more students will be in need of additional financial aid to complete their college education. The CW-SP would be the "home ground" for those people whose need is greater first; and those less needy, but still lacking funds may not receive aid through CW-SP, if the funds provided are not sufficient.

Students are willing to work (rather than borrow such a large portion of their expenses), the employers are eager to participate, and the benefits are mutual. All that is lacking is adequate funding.

SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANT

We students believe that the Supplementary Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG) should be funded as authorized by the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1972 because:

1. The SEOG program has proven to be an effective and adequate source for higher education costs for the needy.

The wise decision of Congress to help in the financial aid of the needy has been justified. Since its origin in 1965, the then known Educational Opportunity Grant (EOG) has benefited three quarters of a million students, seventy per-cent of whom have come from families with annual incomes under \$6000.

2. In the Amendments to the Higher Education Act, Congress has stipulated that the SEOG, National Direct Student Loan (NDSL) and Work Study programs be funded before the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant (BEOG) program.

We believe Congress recognized some of the dangers of the immediate implementation of the BEOG in substitution for SEOG and NDSL and its impact on the higher education of the needy. We support the follow-up of the intent of Congress in the Higher Education Amendments.

We also believe that the BEOG would not serve the best interests of students at the present time in its substitution for NDSL and SEOG as the basis for financial aid because:

1. Funding of the SEOG is necessary if the BEOG program is to accurately and adequately reflect Congressional intent in the Higher Education Amendments.

The awarding of the SEOG was to make the attendance of the needy at an institution of higher learning of their choice more accessible. The SEOG was intended to be the supple-

mental resource over the BEOG for higher educational costs not adequately financed by the BEOG. For example, private education costs are such that even a \$1,400 BEOG as the sole source of gift aid, which is the maximum amount if fully funded, does not make the private institution as accessible as the public one. Also, the Administration's proposed budget requests no funding of SEOG. This lack of resources will restrict the disadvantaged student's choice of institution, which appears contrary to Congressional intent as stipulated by the Higher Education Amendments.

2. The Administration's proposed federal budgetary allocations for SEOG and BEOG are contrary to the Higher Education Amendments.

The budget does not allow for full federal funding of BEOG. Instead of the maximum \$1,400 per student, incomplete federal funding would place the individual's award from \$75 to \$800 per academic year. In this situation, it is crucial that adequate SEOG funding exist to supplement the individual BEOG allocation.

BASIC EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANTS

We support the concept of the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program, but are opposed to the immediate implementation of B.E.O.G. as the primary source of student financial aid, at the expense of the other authorized aid programs.

According to the President's proposal, B.E.O.G. would take effect immediately. However, there are no guidelines available yet and they probably won't be available until July. Also, there have been estimates that the money proposed (\$662,000,000) would only be enough for 21% of the college students in the United States.

We feel that the President is acting prematurely in enacting this program. If the National Direct Student Loan Program (NDSL) and the Educational Opportunity Grants (EOG) are eliminated, many students who receive these funds will be forced out of school. In New York State many students on the SEEK Program depend on federal funds to subsidize their education. With the elimination of NDSL and EOG these people would be forced to go to banks to obtain the money. However, by their very status, as SEEK students, they will be considered "high risk" and denied the loan. This shortage of several hundred dollars in funds would be enough to force them to withdraw from college.

In addition to this, under the proposal, Social Security and one half of Veteran's Benefits would now be used in determining family contributions. Many students depend upon this money for part of their support while in college. Very often due to the death of the bread winner, the family is living off these benefits because the student cannot support the family while attending school full-time. Therefore, if students are penalized for receiving Social Security and Veteran's Benefits they would be ineligible for B.E.O.G.

Still another problem is in the calculation of assets. Family contribution will be determined partially by capital property, such as tractors, land, and plows. Students that come from agricultural areas would then be excluded from B.E.O.G. due to the capital property owned by the family even though much of it is owned through mortgage and time payments.

We recommend that NDSL and EOG be maintained at present levels for the 1973-74 fiscal year. During this period adequate guidelines could be established, and a timetable for the gradual phasing out of NDSL and EOG could be established, if so desired. In this manner, those presently receiving aid through NDSL and EOG could not be cut off in midstream and B.E.O.G. could come in fully funded without hurting the other programs.

JOHN J. RICCARDO, THE PERSONIFICATION OF THE AMERICAN DREAM

HON. DONALD J. MITCHELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. MITCHELL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues an especially incisive editorial that appeared in the March 26 Evening Times of Little Falls, N.Y. It provides testimony to document that the so-called American dream really can and does come true. John J. Riccardo has come a long way from an eager young student in Little Falls to the presidency of one of the Nation's mightiest corporations. The journey was not completed overnight or with little effort; it took time, great ability, keen intelligence, perseverance, courage, and hard work.

It is my privilege to be personally acquainted with Mr. Riccardo. He is a true success story in every way; the personification of the American dream. His story, as mentioned in the following editorial, is a source of real inspiration to all Americans:

HONOR FOR JOHN RICCARDO WELL-DESERVED

John J. Riccardo, president of Chrysler Corporation and native of Little Falls, has been chosen by the Comity Club of Utica to be the recipient of its first annual award to present or former area residents of Italian descent for outstanding achievement. As stated in a news article in The Times, Mr. Riccardo will receive the award at a dinner on May 18th at Twin Ponds Golf and Country Club, New York Mills.

Selection of Mr. Riccardo for this honor is well-merited. His native Little Falls and the entire Mohawk Valley have reason to take pride in his rise to a position as one of the chief captains of American industry. By a most remarkable coincidence, he is one of two top motor car executives in the country born here in Little Falls, the other being Richard Gerstenberg, chairman of the Board of General Motors Corporation. Both of these men bear personal testimony to the validity of the American pledge of opportunity under our system of free enterprise. In days gone by it was the sons and heirs of the business and factory owners who succeeded them in the positions of wealth and leadership. This system has not completely disappeared but today there is much greater opportunity for men of brains and energy to forge to the top strictly on their merits. Riccardo and Gerstenberg made it on their own.

John Riccardo's father, still living, operated a shoe store here for a number of years and, with his wife's help, raised a fine family and through industrious efforts provided his children with opportunities for education that were lacking for most of the older generation. What the elder Riccardo did not lack, however, was faith in the American dream of a better life. It was this that led him and great numbers of his fellow Italians and people from other countries to seek opportunities on this side of the Atlantic.

Why did they come from the Mediterranean basin, from all parts of Europe, from Ireland, England and Scotland, even from remote Czarist Russia? There was no promise of social security payments, welfare allotments, unemployment insurance or medicare assured them. None of these existed, even in most modest form. They came for a simple reason, to breathe the air of freedom, to have a chance—just a chance—at a better way of life.

The immigrants are among the authentic

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

11115

heroes and real builders of America. They often encountered hostility, prejudice and oppression as new arrivals on these shores. Working long hours at tedious tasks for low pay, they nevertheless accumulated enough modest capital to buy their own homes and sometimes launch their own businesses. They had come to stay.

The immigrants had a rough time of it but they maintained faith in God, belief in freedom and courage in the face of adversity. Their descendants and the country as a whole are the beneficiaries of their devoted adherence to these convictions.

THE ATLANTIC ALLIANCE

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently sent a letter to all Members of this body outlining my reasons for opposing House Joint Resolution 205, the Atlantic Union Resolution. In my opinion, a U.S.-sponsored initiative of this kind, and at this time, might well damage efforts already underway to promote closer cooperation and understanding between this country and our Atlantic allies.

In an article which appeared in last Sunday's New York Times, Flora Lewis accurately depicted the malaise currently afflicting the Atlantic alliance. Entitled "U.S./Europe—Old Friends Drifting Apart," the article focused upon the 3-day "Europe-America" conference held last week in Amsterdam and attended by some 300 participants from 10 countries. As the only Member from the House or Senate in attendance at that conference, I can confirm the atmosphere of frustration at times even "dispar" pervading what Miss Lewis calls the "loose but recognizable Atlantic establishment." In particular, I should like to call Members' attention to the following brief quotes from her article:

But it became all too quickly evident that the Atlantic concept has aged, it was not renewing itself and the dangerous affliction of nostalgia was setting in. "Where is the succession?" complained a devoted European Atlanticist.

The new generation of leadership had not appeared in Amsterdam to continue the relay. There was no single reason. Partly, not enough new names had been on the list. Why? Partly, because the younger people who have come to prominence and influence are interested in quite different matters.

In short, while the old generation of Atlantic Unionists keeps on talking, it is apparent that the new generation is not listening. These new leaders do not seek union with the United States. Many, in fact, have trouble enough at times agreeing with one another.

The search for renewal and reinvigoration of our relationship with Europe will be difficult enough without raising the "bogeyman" of Atlantic Union. To many Europeans this concept will represent—rightly or wrongly—a U.S. attempt to regain "hegemony" on the Continent. Any doubts about European apprehensions on this score were,

in fact, dispelled by Chalmers Roberts, another member of the U.S. delegation to the Amsterdam conference. In a Washington Post story, dated April 1, Mr. Roberts noted that the Americans were "shook up" by a statement by the editor of the West German paper Die Zeit, who warned the Europeans present of the dangers of "Canadianization." "Canadianization," the editor, Theo Sommer, defined as:

Being pressed into economic subservience to the United States, their (i.e. the Europeans') autonomy and their freedom of choice threatened by ruthless dollar diplomacy...

However far-fetched such rhetoric may sound to us, the fact remains that the European fear is a real one—and must be recognized as such.

These are the realities, Mr. Speaker, which we must face—and understand before we vote on House Joint Resolution 205.

Mr. Speaker, I include the full texts of the articles by Miss Lewis and Mr. Roberts in the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 1, 1973]

OLD FRIENDS DRIFTING APART

(By Flora Lewis)

AMSTERDAM.—The signs of slip-page along the European-American seam had become uncomfortably visible a year ago. It was no longer the old theme, echoed as often as the mischievous shepherd boy's "wolf," that the alliance was in "disarray."

The growing concern was that the Atlantic partnership was wearing out, that even as the United States was growing less hostile to its Russian and Chinese antagonists, it was growing less friendly toward its friends. Some of the people who had spent much of their adult lives constructing the institutions of a postwar world based on America's newfound strength and Europe's traditional civilization felt that something should be done about the erosion.

So last week they convened the Europe-American Conference here. The purpose was to discuss the problems of a changed international landscape, not to negotiate; so there was little effort to attract officials possessed of the power of decision. But there was hope of developing the kind of high-level intellectual momentum which can influence policy. That meant a reunion of what has come to be the loose but recognizable Atlantic "Establishment."

By and large, the establishmentarians were there—among the Americans, George Ball, Nelson Rockefeller, John McCloy, John Tut-till, Eugene Rostow; among the Europeans, Joseph Luns, Dirk Stikker, Walter Hallstein, Kurt Birrenbach, Eric Blumenthal, Roy Jenkins.

But it became all too quickly evident that the Atlantic concept has aged, it was not renewing itself and the dangerous affliction of nostalgia was setting in. "Where is the succession?" complained a devoted European Atlanticist.

The new generation of leadership had not appeared in Amsterdam to continue the relay. There was no single reason. Partly, not enough new names had been on the list. Why? Partly, because the younger people who have come to prominence and influence are interested in quite different matters.

"I don't see why we should bribe them by offering more windy talk about pollution, and minorities, and women, and the Third World," said the European veteran, "The key issues for us are still security, economic and political cooperation, making the Western world work."

There was some despair, some sober fear,

and a good deal of frustration among men and women who had knotted the Atlantic ties. The ties were fraying just because they had served so well that they were being taken for granted, it seemed.

"There can be no prosperity without security," NATO's Secretary-General Luns warned, and he appealed to "my fellow Europeans" to remember how much depends on continued close partnership with and military support from the United States. Europe's safety is the American nuclear shield, Mr. Luns reminded, and the presence of American forces in Europe is both a guarantee and a prop for that shield.

Former Under Secretary of State George Ball issued a sharp reminder that isolationism can affect both sides of the Atlantic, that if cooperation is to bring mutual advantage, it must also bring mutual concessions.

But also, there was some recrimination and some edgy argument in the corridors. National positions have shifted and the establishments unwittingly reflected it.

Many Americans complained privately that the Europeans no longer knew what they wanted, that they couldn't expect the United States to indulge them any more. But how could the United States deal with Europe as an equal when Europeans couldn't agree among themselves? For example, the Common Market countries have different positions on the currency issue, reflecting different trends in their domestic economies and political situations.

Many Europeans complained privately that the United States no longer cared so much about Western Europe's fate, that it had come to see Europe more as a rival than a partner and was trying to use its strength now to shift the burden of its mistakes across the Atlantic. The United States insists that a new economic balance should be found through trade, with other countries accepting many more American goods. Europeans feel that the American deficit comes more from capital exports and Vietnam spending, and claim that the United States is essentially trying to meet its domestic inflationary problem by exporting its trouble.

The point wasn't whether some were right and some were wrong. It was the subtle change of assumptions—no longer so much that Europe and America urgently needed each other's support, and more that each must take care to prevent the other from undermining vital interests. The drift was not toward collision, not at this stage and among these people anyway. It was apart, toward new and increasingly separate definitions and these vital interests.

While the speakers groped for something energizing to say, the industrial world's Finance Ministers were meeting in Washington to confront the most immediate issue—the crisis of confidence in the dollar and the need for reform of the world's system of exchanging money. They agreed there to study American proposals; for more automatic exchange rate changes when currencies get too strong as well as too weak; to see why money is so loose it floods the market's dikes in always quicker tides and what can be done about it; to see how the mass of unrooted dollars can be gathered and bundled securely for long enough to replace their role as international reserves.

It was adequately good news, but there was still no tonic in it, just a sense that things hadn't gotten worse.

The one topic that perked ears was petroleum, a warning from oil expert Walter Levy that unless Europe, America and Japan add another major element to their web of common action, their soaring needs for energy will put them at the economic and political mercy of the Arab Middle East. That, Mr. Levy pointed out, could draw the Soviets, who are self-sufficient in fuel, into a new and possibly more dangerous conflict than the cold war. Here was a real and worthy

reason for shifting back from competition to cooperation, he said.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 1, 1973]

THE MANY TRANSATLANTIC DISAGREEMENTS (By Chalmers M. Roberts)

AMSTERDAM.—Jean Monnet, the father of the dream of a United States of Europe, sent a telegram to the Europe-American Conference which met here recently for three days saying that the group's first task was to "change the climate of confrontation" between the two sides of the Atlantic. The conference certainly failed to do that. What it did do was to demonstrate the depth of the confrontation, not only between the United States and Western Europe, but among the Western Europeans themselves.

The conference raked over the familiar problems of the Atlantic Alliance in the areas of politics, military affairs and economics and trade relationships. Hardly any group could agree about anything except that there are vast disagreements. In the realm of politics there were divisions over the desire for detente and the old cold war suspicions of Russian trickery. In military affairs former Deputy Defense Secretary David Packard disparaged tactical nuclear weaponry in Europe but the Europeans derided the idea of beefing up their conventional forces as a substitute.

In economics, everybody quarreled about how to bring the Japanese into the conversation and they disagreed about floating currencies. Walter Hallstein, who chaired the conference, complained about "nasty surprises" by the Americans. One session was devoted to the energy crisis facing the Western world but oddly no one even mentioned the word "Israel" in discussing the relationship between Arab oil and European and American needs.

Theo Sommer editor of the German paper *Die Zeit*, shook up the Americans with a paper saying that not only must the European community seek to prevent Finlandization—"being swallowed up, politically, if not militarily, by the Soviet Union with only a semblance of autonomy left to them"—but must also "ward off what might be called 'Canadianization'—being pressed into economic subservience to the United States, their autonomy and their freedom of choice threatened by ruthless dollar diplomacy." The term "Canadianization" seemed to apply in many minds to the problem of the transnational corporations which a lot of people derided but few had any idea of how to control.

Governor Nelson Rockefeller of New York boosted the idea of an Anglo-French nuclear deterrent. His aides said this had been cleared with Henry Kissinger but the governor himself denied that. Such a joint deterrent is an old Kissinger idea from the Kennedy period and it was something of a surprise to hear it raised here, given the current negative French attitude. Packard, who with Rockefeller was the closest thing to a Nixon administration voice at the conference, suggested that the United States could provide its European allies with some of the "smart bombs" used in Vietnam as a substitute for manpower. Most everybody seems to believe that the United States before long will trim the size of its forces stationed in Europe despite President Nixon's assurances to the contrary. There even was talk of "suppressed radiation" from new tactical nuclear weapons, a variant of the "clean bomb." Albert Wohlstetter pointed out, however, that the smallest so-called tactical nuclear weapons are around 100 tons of explosive force whereas the largest conventional bombs used in World War II were ten tons in force.

A good many of the continentals at the conference took the position that the whole thing had been arranged by the Anglo-Americans and one Frenchman stomped out charging just such a "directorship." George Ball was at his most pessimistic, complaining of

European isolationism and Mr. Nixon's "new American Gaullism."

The conference ended up in something of a shambles on the final day during a plenary sessions where emotions showed. Young Winston Churchill, a Tory member of Parliament, complained that the proposed communiqué was a collection of platitudes. But John McCloy, who has been at a host of conferences during the past quarter century, cut him down. Said McCloy: I've seen a lot of platitudes in my day but the biggest collection I remember was put together by two fellows named Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill.

Whether there will be a successor conference, as Eugene Rostow, the leader of the American delegation, clearly wanted, is open to question. Certainly if there is and if it is to have any meaning the various delegations will have to be far more representative of their countries. The German delegation, for example, did not include a single member of Willy Brandt's ruling Social Democratic Party and only a handful of French were on hand.

Probably the most significant thing about this Europe-American conference was the fact that it occurred. All the many transatlantic differences came out in bold relief with a minimal number of ideas on how to do anything about them. Still, some of the conversation at least was useful in clarifying the differing points of view. But if 1973 is to be, as the Nixon administration has proclaimed it, "The Year of Europe," then President Nixon and Henry Kissinger had better get cracking. Events are running very fast and in a very negative fashion for the Atlantic Alliance.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HOSPITAL CENTER AT ORANGE, N.J.

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the hospital center at Orange, N.J., upon the 100th anniversary of its founding.

On April 4, 1873, the hospital center at Orange was formally incorporated as the Memorial Hospital and Dispensary by a special act of the New Jersey Legislature.

I am proud of the hospital center at Orange—proud of the conscientious and thorough way it provides health care for my constituents. Under the expert leadership of Mr. Benjamin W. Wright, its president and administrator, it has become a leading voluntary, nonprofit health care center, with 400 beds in two major units—Orange Memorial Hospital, a general community hospital, and the New Jersey Orthopedic Hospital, a specialty hospital. It provides a broad range of services in 42 clinics, maintains a superior cardiac unit, an advanced radiotherapy institute, and New Jersey's oldest diploma nursing school. It annually admits more than 10,000 patients, treats nearly 25,000 emergency cases, and handles a like number of clinic outpatients. To do all this, it employs nearly 1,000 people—both professional and nonprofessional.

The hospital center at Orange has come a long, fruitful way since it opened its doors as a dispensary in an Orange,

N.J., firehouse in 1873. It has followed a course of steady, solid, thoughtful growth to reach its present position of excellence—exhibiting always a strong consciousness of its obligations to those it serves.

A community institution that has faithfully cared for its community for a full century reflects a stability that is the very base of this country. As the representative of the area in which the hospital center at Orange is located, I salute it on this most auspicious milestone.

**DEFENSE SECRETARY RICHARDSON
DELIVERS TIMELY ADDRESS CON-
CERNING SECURITY ASSISTANCE**

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an excellent address delivered by Secretary of Defense Elliot L. Richardson, given at a luncheon in San Antonio on March 30.

The address follows:

**THE CASE FOR SECURITY ASSISTANCE TO OTHER
NATIONS**

(Address by the Honorable Elliot L. Richardson)

I am delighted to have this opportunity to visit San Antonio, a community with a long record of understanding and support for our country's men and women in uniform and for our national security needs.

It is particularly pleasing to know that even as I speak with you here 18 Homecoming returnees are about to arrive at Kelly Field. I know that in the last days and weeks you have marveled as I have at the great courage and patriotic determination of these returnees. I know San Antonio and all their home communities will continue to give these men a hearty welcome.

Today I'd like to talk to you about an important, little understood, much criticized, yet increasingly necessary and productive component of our international security posture. This is our Security Assistance Program by which we provide other countries the means of military self-sufficiency.

This program is a linchpin of the Nixon Doctrine and of President Nixon's foreign policy for the '70s. Tragically it is undergoing direct and continuing attack by some within the Congress, and is poorly understood by the American public. It is my purpose today to shed some light on this difficult but crucial subject, by outlining what security assistance is, showing how it meets important foreign policy and security needs of this country. In so doing, I hope to dispel certain of the misconceptions commonly held about the program. My goal is to gain your understanding and support, as a first step toward broader public and Congressional awareness of the need for security assistance.

THE CONTEXT

Let me begin by describing the foreign policy context for security assistance. Security assistance is not new. It has been with us since the days of lend-lease at the beginning of World War II. The three decades that have passed since then have seen many changes in the program, and in the levels of resources devoted to it. But our purpose has remained constant—to provide those who are willing to help themselves with the wherewithal to do so.

Our efforts to help other nations arm them-

selves and train their forces were perhaps easier to understand in an age of confrontation and containment. For then we were faced on the one hand by the unremitting hostility of adversaries who had demonstrated their readiness to use force, and on the other by the vulnerability of nations weakened by war and over-burdened by the task of development. In this context the massive military aid we extended was fitting, and but one part of the heavy responsibility and burden that the American people were willing to bear in the cause of peace.

The world is different today—and the better for it. The rigid bipolarity of the past no longer dominates our policies as it once did. We have begun to build a more stable relationship with the Soviet Union and China. Western Europe and Japan are once again able to play roles consistent with their great human and material resources.

Given these changed circumstances, the spur of a long and tragic war, and the growing awareness of our own domestic needs, the American people have come to believe that we must place realistic limits on our world role. And it is proper that they ask how our security assistance programs relate to these changing circumstances. But some have challenged the very need for these programs, arguing that they continue an involvement in the affairs of others that is contrary to our interests or responsibilities. This, I submit, is dangerous counsel, and would turn our nation toward a course that this Administration and the American people have rejected.

We have sought instead a new, realistic yet responsible role for the United States in the international affairs of the 1970's—one consistent with the new conditions and circumstances I have described.

The Nixon Doctrine is in essence a statement of that new role. It is rooted in the conviction that the U.S. must continue to play a major part in world affairs. Our own security and well-being demand it; our sheer weight in the international scheme of things make it unavoidable; and our hopes for a generation of peace and a more stable world order depend upon it.

With this said, the central element of the Nixon Doctrine is a new and more balanced partnership—a more realistic disposition of roles and responsibilities—between ourselves and our friends and allies. The U.S. today cannot, and should not, attempt to do all that it did in the past. This would be inconsistent with our changed circumstances and the strengthened resources of other nations. It would also—and more basically—be inconsistent with the very nature of the international order we are trying to build. For if we assume primary responsibility for the security of others, then they will fail to marshal their own resources and political energy. And they will neither in spirit nor action participate in building a stable international order which can only endure if all have had a hand in its creation and a stake in its maintenance.

Security assistance helps us in our search for stability and peace based on a new, more balanced partnership between us and other nations.

It encourages self-reliance and independence among other nations by providing them the capability to maintain their political independence in the face of military blackmail or threats.

We and those allied with us, have three important and immediate common objectives which are promoted by security assistance.

First, to discourage any effort to impose political control over those nations whose human and economic resources, or geographic location are important to the U.S. or could be used as important levers against us.

Second, to give nations important to us the sense of security and political confidence

which they must have if they are to maintain their independence and to marshal their own resources for their own defense.

Third, to maintain political confidence and cooperation between ourselves and our allies and friends.

SECURITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Now, what sort of programs make up security assistance to other nations? Let me answer this by delineating the different components of security assistance, and citing some specific examples of how they work.

Under the rubric of security assistance, the Department of Defense carries out two distinct programs: The Military Assistance Program, or MAP, provides foreign governments with equipment and services as grant aid—that is, no reimbursement to the U.S. by the recipient. Through Foreign Military Sales, or FMS, the foreign government pays in U.S. dollars for the equipment and services it purchases. A third program, under which we transfer ships to foreign navies, is a combination of no-cost loans and sales at low prices.

Under our grant aid program, we make maximum use of excess defense articles to meet the foreign country's requirements. This equipment was, in most cases, purchased by our Military Departments many years ago. It has served the purposes for which procured, is no longer needed by our own forces and, if not used to meet foreign requirements, would for the most part be disposed of as scrap. This equipment may be obsolescent, and perhaps would cost too much, by U.S. standards, to repair. But to the foreign country, where labor is relatively inexpensive but material relatively scarce, these are valuable defense articles indeed. A good example is the transfer now in progress of several hundred M48 medium tanks to one of our NATO partners. After refurbishing in the foreign country—at its own expense—these tanks will be its principal armor. In terms of original cost, our program for use of excess equipment runs several hundred million dollars annually and, thus, we are able to carry out a major part of our grant aid program without any need for new funding from the Congress.

We cannot, of course, obtain from our excess inventories all of the items that must be provided as grant aid, and for these items we must seek funding annually from the Congress. For example, modern jet fighter aircraft are urgently needed by several of our foreign friends. Thus, of necessity, we are purchasing a number of the new F-5E fighters for them.

During the decade of the 1950's, United States security assistance to our friends and allies took the form of large doses of military grant aid. Today grant aid is down to 10% of its peak. In our efforts to make other nations self-sufficient in their defense efforts, we have encouraged the trend away from grant aid to sales. This trend has seen dramatic results. From a high of forty-five countries receiving grant equipment and training in 1964, we have reduced the number consistently each year and in 1974 we are proposing grant equipment and training in less than half that number.

In 1965, Foreign Military Sales—that is the outright purchase by others of U.S. defense equipment—exceeded military grant aid for the first time since the inception of the program in 1950. Today sales run at about eight times the level of grant aid. With the economic recovery of the free world, notably our European allies, many nations now have the capability to pay either cash on the barrelhead for their purchases from us, or buy with the help of credits annually authorized and appropriated by the Congress. These credits are repaid in dollars by the borrower in full with interest.

During fiscal year 1972 alone, nearly \$3.5 billion of U.S. defense equipment and articles were sold to our friends and allies around

the world. A little over \$500 million of these sales were facilitated by the use of Foreign Military Sales credits, while nearly \$3 billion sold for cash.

Because of the growing cost and complexity of defense equipment, it is increasingly difficult and uneconomical for any country, particularly a developing country, to fill all of its legitimate defense requirements from its own design and production base. Thus, when Germany, one of our allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, decided to modernize its tactical aircraft committed and earmarked to the common defense of the Alliance, that country procured nearly 200 of the McDonnell F-4 aircraft for nearly \$1 billion in cash. Quite apart from buying a fighter aircraft that is already designed, proven in combat and in a long production run, the benefits to Germany, the U.S. and indeed the entire free world of two major allies having a common first line fighter aircraft and a common logistics system are enormous.

Our ship transfer program enables us to improve the strength of friendly navies. By doing so we help others maintain a naval presence in troubled areas, thus reducing the demands on our own ships and men. For the most part, these are ships no longer needed by our active and reserve naval forces, and which, if not transferred to friendly foreign governments, would be mothballed or perhaps even sold as scrap. In some cases ships, although not needed now by our Navy, cannot be sold because they are required for our mobilization reserves. Under these conditions, we may loan the ship to the foreign government for a fixed price over time, and with the understanding that we may recall it if needed. Wherever practical, however, ships are sold to the foreign government at fair market value—usually a small fraction of their original cost.

We are now, for example, in the process of selling two submarines to one of our NATO allies. These ships will carry out a critically important mission in the NATO area. During this fiscal year we expect to transfer, either through sale or loan, over 50 ships to foreign governments.

SECURITY ASSISTANCE AND U.S. FORCE PLANNING

These diverse components of security assistance are related to our own force capabilities and commitments today in a way that they were not in the past.

For most of the post World War II period the U.S. designed and deployed its forces abroad to meet collective defense needs without full consideration of what others might do. We were inclined, in fact, to treat allied capabilities as little more than supplements to our own. This may have been appropriate when others had little they could contribute to the common defense. But as time passed our allies grew stronger; yet the burden of maintaining an effective deterrent continued to rest largely on our shoulders.

This Administration has moved to change that situation. Today when we design and deploy our forces, we are guided by the Total Force Concept—total because we take into consideration the capabilities and potential not only of the U.S. but also of our allies and friends. In keeping with this Total Concept, military security assistance programs have been integrated into the Defense planning cycle for U.S. forces, as has specific consideration of present and potential allied capabilities. This helps insure continuing focus on the allocation of responsibilities between us and our allies; and it gives practical expression to the Congressional injunction that a dollar spent on military assistance to foreign countries must be as necessary as a dollar spent for the U.S. military establishment.

Today when we plan our forces, and design our security assistance programs, we follow a series of guidelines aimed at assuring the correct balance between what we do and what we expect others to do.

First, in cases where our capabilities are integrated with those of other nations' under common defense arrangements, we seek to help our partners do their share through assistance, rather than take up the slack on our own. Thus, our security assistance to Greece and Turkey is designed to provide their forces with the equipment and training necessary to make it possible for them to assume a proper role and responsibility in the defense of NATO's southern flank.

Second, by developing other nations' capabilities, our assistance programs make a contribution to deterrence that U.S. forces alone could not make. An important tenet of the Nixon Doctrine is that the nation directly concerned should have the primary responsibility for providing the manpower for its own defense. This is based not only on the principle of partnership and self-reliance, but also reflects our conviction that aggression is best deterred when the nation directly threatened is doing all that it can to assure its own first-line defense.

Strong national capabilities thus reduce the chance of local conflicts which could threaten U.S. interests and potentially require our military involvement. Our assistance to Israel, for example, has played a vital role in maintaining the military balance required to avoid war and to make an eventual settlement possible.

A third principle which guides our planning is that enhanced local ability to cope with aggression, should it occur, makes it less likely that U.S. military involvement might be required in defense of our own interests. Further, in some cases as we build up the ability of others to defend themselves, we may be able to reduce our own deployments. This, of course, depends very much on the particular threat involved, and the political circumstances surrounding our commitment.

Korea is an important case in point. In 1971 we began a five-year modernization plan for Korea aimed at enhancing the deterrent of its own forces against aggression or pressures from the North. This plan, coupled with our earlier security assistance efforts, has permitted increasing reliance on South Korea's capabilities. Thus, we have been able to withdraw some 20,000 U.S. troops, while South Korean soldiers have assumed responsibility for front-line defense along the entire demilitarized zone. At the same time, South Korea has made great economic progress and shown increasing energy and confidence in dealing with its security problems.

But the job is not yet done. While Korea is far more capable of defending itself today than it was when the decade began, we have not yet reached the day when no U.S. forces are needed. Until that day comes we must be prepared to continue to maintain a presence, both as an earnest signal of our intent to defend a staunch ally, and as a guarantee that the mutual security program that we have, together, so well begun, will be completed.

Our allies and friends are ready to assume primary responsibility for their own defense, and to commit to it a heavy share of their manpower and economic resources. But, for some of them, financial and technical resources are limited, and they cannot make full use of their defense potential without the aid our programs are designed to provide.

Over time the development of their resources will permit them to devote an increasing share to their own defenses. We expect this to lower the requirements for security assistance—and particularly grant aid—in the years ahead. Indeed, the 25 year

history of our security assistance program demonstrates precisely this trend. As I described above, some countries have made the transition from grant aid to financial assistance through loans. Several are no longer recipients of security assistance in any form.

SOME MISUNDERSTANDINGS

I have described for you the basic purposes and benefits to this nation of our security assistance to others. Seen in this light, there can be no question that the American people and Congress will support these programs. Yet there are persistent misunderstandings that obscure the contribution they make to this nation's interests and security.

Thus, for example, there seems to be a belief that the Security Assistance Program has a negative effect on the international balance of payments. The truth is exactly the opposite. Over 99% of the funds involved in the security assistance program, both grant and sale, are spent in the United States buying U.S. products from U.S. firms. Orders for defense equipment are expected to total about \$4.0 billion this year. In addition \$500-600 million worth of direct military sales through commercial channels are consummated each year. The benefits to the United States from these transactions is enormous in assisting to offset the adverse balance of payments and in sustaining U.S. employment.

It has also been falsely claimed that projects in which the foreign country participates in production or assembly of U.S. designed equipment result in the loss of jobs in the U.S. The issue in most cases is not production in the United States or coproduction in the foreign country—the issue is whether or not a United States or foreign firm shall obtain any part of the contract. We have learned through sad experience that where we are not prepared to sell overseas, other countries are.

Finally some believe that our assistance programs force sophisticated and expensive weapons on our friends and allies. We force nothing on other nations. The content of our programs is designed in response to customer requirements, carefully geared to his needs, to his ability to procure, operate and support the weapons and to his decisions on type of equipment and size of purchase.

CONCLUSION

We must set such misunderstandings aside. The issue of whether we should provide security assistance—and, if so, how much—deserves to be debated by the American people and the Congress. But that debate needs to be carried on in the context of an understanding of the purposes and benefits of the program.

I, for one, am convinced that when the debate is ended we will have won support for a realistic security assistance program, for our purpose is to provide others with the tools necessary to defend themselves, and our goal is a partnership in which all our friends and allies bear with us the responsibilities of maintaining the peace.

In sum, what is at stake is whether security assistance will play the role it must as an instrument of transition from an age of confrontation and containment to a new, more stable structure of international relations. As President Nixon said to the Nation last night, "Because of our strength, America has the magnificent opportunity to play the leading role of bringing down the walls of hostility which divide the people of the world; in reducing the burden of armaments in the world; of building a structure of lasting peace in the world." We have that magnificent opportunity of which our President speaks because of our strength. And security assistance is vital to the overall strength of the free world.

April 4, 1973

TRIBUTE TO COMPOSER AND
TEACHER ERIC OSTERLING, JR.

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to a fine American and one of Connecticut's great citizens—Eric Osterling, Jr.—for his outstanding contributions to the world of music and musical education.

Eric Osterling, Jr. might best be known for his internationally famous music. He has arranged at least four popular movie themes, including "The River Kwai March," "Picnic," "On a Clear Day," and the theme from "The Summer of '42." All told, he has written or arranged more than 150 pieces of music. These include pop songs, the "Kiss Me Kate" overture, marches, new arrangements of works by Handel, Reineck, Wagner, and Mozart, and his own classical music compositions. In a 1971 poll that listed the 100 most popular marches ever written, four of them were composed by Eric Osterling, making him second only to John Philip Sousa.

Eric Osterling's talent for conducting has led to invitations for guest conducting appearances with orchestras and bands in many sections of the country. He has received four awards from the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, of which he is a member, for his outstanding contributions in concert and stage music. In 1961, he was named man of the year by the junior chamber of commerce and received that organization's distinctive service award. He has also been honored with the presentation of "An Evening with Osterling," a program of his works performed by the University of Connecticut's concert band.

But Eric Osterling's contribution to the musical education of the young also deserves wider recognition. His studies at the Julius Hartt College of Music, Ithaca College, and the University of Connecticut provided him with a sound musical background. At the age of 22 in 1948, when he was fresh out of college, Eric Osterling created the first musical instrumental education program at Portland High School in Portland, Conn., in the Second Congressional District. Within a year, Portland High had a 60-piece band. Because of Eric Osterling's talent and dedication, Portland High and Junior High bands have grown and distinguished themselves over the past 25 years.

During the New England Music Festivals, Portland received six first-place ratings. Its young musicians have played before the National Music Educators' convention in Atlantic City, and the band was invited to play at the Orange Bowl. On Saturday, April 7, the Portland High School Band will celebrate its achievements of the past 25 years under Eric Osterling's direction with a musical concert.

More important than awards, however, is the fact that Eric Osterling's many students, as well as the community, down

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

through these years have been made richer because of his devotion to teaching music to the young.

This is Eric Osterling's greatest honor.

HOLLIS M. DOLE HONORED BY
INTERIOR

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my warm congratulations to Hollis M. Dole on his willingness to undertake the job of building the Nation's first commercial oil shale plant in Colorado. Typical of his do-it-yourself philosophy, the plant will be built with private funds by private enterprise, on privately owned lands.

Oregon has been fortunate to enjoy Hollis Dole's splendid services for 23 years, 14 of which were spent as Director of its Department of Geology.

The Nation was fortunate to enjoy them from 1969 through 1972 when he was Assistant Secretary of Interior for Mineral Resources. For a testament of his dedication and effectiveness during the 4 years just past, I can summon no better witness than the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Rogers C. B. Morton, who recently bestowed on Mr. Dole the highest award the Department of Interior can give for performance of duty: the Interior Honor Award for Outstanding Service.

Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD a copy of the letter accompanying the Honor Award given to Hollis M. Dole at a dinner given by the National Petroleum Council in Washington, on December 10, 1972:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington.

HON. HOLLIS M. DOLE,
Assistant Secretary, Mineral Resources, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR HOLLIS: There are times as the Secretary of the Interior when I have pleasurable tasks to perform—and this letter is one of those tasks.

We, in Interior, have few opportunities to publicly recognize outstanding contributions by an Assistant Secretary. So, it is an honor and a pleasure to recognize you, Hollis, before this distinguished National Petroleum Council for your able leadership in the Mineral Resources area.

Besides serving with me as Government Co-Chairman of NPC, you serve as Interior's representative on over thirty other committees and councils concerned with industry, state, national, and international aspects of energy and minerals. For example, in oil activities, you represent Interior on the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, the National Commission on Materials Policy, OECD and, most important, the President's Oil Policy Committee. And, you do an exemplary job on each committee, whether as chairman or as a member.

Under your able leadership since President Nixon nominated you Assistant Secretary for Mineral Resources in 1969, Interior has made giant steps forward. You are a professional—not only in energy and minerals but also in administration of government—

11119

in every sense of the word. You were among the first Nixon Administration officials to call attention to the Nation's deteriorating energy situation. Your lecture at Stanford University in January, 1971 certainly will continue to be hailed as one of the most thoughtful, progressive, and concise statements on energy, in its full international context and ramifications, made by a Federal official.

Your basic philosophy is the strength of your actions. You have made available public resources for development under our private enterprise system. And, while increasing availability, you have imposed stringent environmental and health and safety safeguards on mineral producers, which is a proper course of government action. The Mining and Minerals Policy Act and the Geothermal Steam Act were passed by the Congress with your support. The Nixon Administration's expanded efforts on coal research, OCS oil and gas leasing, oil shale and geothermal leasing programs, all represent what you do best—sound administration coupled with responsible incentives.

Perhaps the greatest contribution you have given our Nation—and which also strongly supports this high award by Interior—has been your own words to others. Recently in New Orleans before the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners you stated that the only viable long-term solution to United States energy problems lies in intensive development of domestic resources. Citing the perils of excessive dependence on foreign fuel sources with problems in diplomatic options, military capabilities and foreign exchange pressures, you said, "Both logic and experience caution us that the hard and costly choice of developing our own resources will be the cheapest in the end."

As my effective and hard-driving administrator of minerals and energy, Hollis, you represent what the Nation requires in a dedicated public servant. And so, it is with great honor that I present to you the Department of the Interior Honor Award for Outstanding Service.

Sincerely yours,
ROGERS C. B. MORTON,
Secretary of the Interior.

CALIFORNIA COLLEGES AID
MANAGUA

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, recently a Managua, Nicaragua, relief fund co-ordination was organized by the California State University and Colleges Student Presidents Association, which represents 19 campuses and approximately 269,000 students.

I highly commend these students for this most worthy attempt to supply relief to their fellow man. Oftentimes, good individualistic endeavors by students, go unmentioned. I find it very refreshing today, to be able to thank them for their constructive contributions on behalf of us all.

Aid from the United States, to these victims, was noteworthy, but somehow expected. It must be consoling, to the citizens of Managua, to feel that not only the Government, but the individual citizens, of the United States, are concerned about their well-being and future.

The idea originated at Cal Poly College at San Luis Obispo in our congressional district, so I am especially proud of this splendid student project.

I especially commend Mr. Robin Baggett, president of the Associated Students and his outstanding committee headed by Jim Barlow, Ernie Eaves, and Hedy Smith.

CEILING ON MEAT PRICES

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, quite properly, the President's imposition of the ceiling on certain meat items has drawn commentary since so many, many questions were raised as a result of the action. An editorial in the Chicago Sun-Times of March 31, 1973, is, in my judgment, an objective and responsible commentary on the question.

The editorial follows:

CEILING ON MEAT PRICES

President Nixon's ceiling on meat prices may give housewives a boost in spirit because it shows that someone in Washington is responding to their complaints. But all Mr. Nixon's edict can do is prevent prices from going even higher. It pegs them at or near their current all-time highs. If prices are to come down there must be an easing of consumer demand or an increase in meat supplies, or both. The ceiling doesn't change that fact.

Mr. Nixon was driven to do something about meat prices because they were soaring far beyond other foods and threatening the President's antinflation plans. With big-industry negotiations coming up, meat prices could escalate union demands.

It is likely, however, that meat prices already had reached their zenith. As we have said before, they are not due to unconscionable attempts to profiteer. Meat processors were and are under Phase III profit controls. Meat prices went up because the cost of animals went up and because consumers are eating record-breaking amounts of meat. The cost of animals went up because farmers' costs, particularly grain, went up.

This year's anticipated consumption is 102 pounds of beef, lamb and pork per capita. Last year it was 188. If consumer demand would ease off, even to last year's level, so would prices. Selective buying is better than an all-out boycott. A boycott, with its abrupt reduction in demand, disrupts supply lines and could influence farmers to plan less production for 1974 and 1975. And boycotts often are followed by a splurge in buying.

Prices can come down sharply if there is an abundant increase in supplies. Actions taken by the government to encourage production and lift import restrictions should pay off later in the year. The ceiling is a mere holding action and could create more problems than it is worth.

The exigencies of the situation have forced Mr. Nixon to change his view expressed two weeks ago that controls might stop prices "momentarily, but as a result of discouraging increased production, we would reap the consequences of greater upward pressure on prices later."

Although no ceiling was put on live animals in keeping with the view that this would cut incentive and production by farm-

ers, their prices obviously must be affected. By putting a ceiling on the meat that processors, wholesalers and retailers handle. Mr. Nixon controls what they can pay for live animals and stay in business.

There would be pressure on the ceilings if farmers did, indeed, hold animals off the market. There would be ceilings but no meat on the butchers' shelves. On the other hand, farmers can't hold animals off the market interminably; there is an optimum time and weight when animals must be marketed. Animals held back must be fed and feed is, as noted, expensive.

The most optimistic view we can take, therefore, is that the current high prices were due to come down later anyway and Mr. Nixon has merely engaged in a psychological holding action which will keep them no higher than current high levels pending the operation of the law of supply and demand, which alone can bring real relief.

THIEU AND HIS CRITICS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Wall Street Journal contains a very insightful editorial on the political situation within the Republic of Vietnam, and particularly on the role that its President, Nguyen Van Thieu, has played in preparing that nation for today's world.

The editorial correctly criticizes those who would carp about certain alleged political excesses in South Vietnam, while these same critics apparently ignore the fact that that nation has been torn asunder by war for many years.

Because of the timeliness of this editorial, I include the editorial at this point in the RECORD.

THIEU AND HIS CRITICS

For the first time since he came to power six years ago, South Vietnam President Nguyen Van Thieu is in the United States this week "to express our thanks to the American people." Of course, he is also talking to Mr. Nixon about the next phase in his nation's relationship to the United States.

The two Presidents issued a joint communique yesterday in which Mr. Nixon promised South Vietnam continued "substantial" economic aid. And perhaps Mr. Thieu will try, as R. W. Apple Jr., of The New York Times phrases it, "to change the minds of at least some of those American critics who view the former general as a petty dictator."

On this last score, we doubt Mr. Thieu would have much success if that is indeed his aim. His American critics have for so many years characterized him as a petty dictator, or in Sen. McGovern's words, "a tinhorn dictator," that Mr. Thieu could conceivably visit with us for a year and talk himself blue without changing their minds. Has he not clapped political opponents in jail? Has he not censored Saigon's newspapers with a heavy hand? Has he not suspended various elections and run the country by martial law from time to time? Is this not petty dictatorship?

These are valid debating points, to which Mr. Thieu could only answer defensively if he were of a mind to answer them at all. He could say that Vietnam is not Massachusetts, that war is not peace and that a free press may not be a nation's highest priority at a time when its survival is threatened by

subversion from within and attack from without. He could say these things and, in our mind at least, take the edge off the charges raised against his rule. But his most strident critics here have already made allowance for these extenuating circumstances by labeling him no more than a "petty" dictator.

On the other side of the ledger, though, are some valid points that cut against the Thieu critics, which is why they are never mentioned by those politicians and opinion leaders who prefer to keep the Thieu image neat and black. Yet they go a long way toward explaining Mr. Thieu's resilience and political strength, which it would be unwise to underestimate in either the political struggle already underway or in a military clash, should it come.

For one thing, it was the Thieu government that armed the South Vietnamese peasantry. His critics here have used this fact in the past to justify a hasty U.S. withdrawal, yet they sidestep a fascinating contradiction. For Mr. Thieu to hand out modern weapons to one million villagers, who could use them against him as easily as against the Vietcong, is an act unheard of in the annals of dictatorship, petty or otherwise.

And he gave the villagers something to defend. Land. In June 1969, when Mr. Nixon and Mr. Thieu met on Midway Island, there was more to their compact than the inauguration of the Vietnamization program. Mr. Thieu committed himself to a land reform program more ambitious than any the U.S. State Department had advised. Indeed, Mr. Thieu's "Land to the Tiller" program outstripped the land-reform promises being made by the Vietcong—the rough equivalent in U.S. politics of Mr. Nixon leapfrogging his opposition by proposing a guaranteed income.

It took Mr. Thieu almost a year to push the program through the National Assembly, amid predictions here and there of fakery. But in the past three years, 2.3 million acres of land have been purchased by the government with cash and credit and distributed to the 750,000 families—more than 50% of the rural population—who had been farming the land as tenants. Another half million acres are being processed for another 150,000 families.

Those of his American critics who now try to explain Mr. Thieu's durability, his success in holding together his nation even as a half million American troops departed South Vietnam, maintain that his secret was the iron fist, martial law, tyrannical abridgement of civil liberties. It follows that under these conditions he does not deserve any continued U.S. support, and if there is to be any of this at all, he should be required to embrace a social and political agenda that is consistent with American ideals.

Yet even while admitting we don't always understand what Mr. Thieu is up to as he thrusts and parries with the National Liberation Front, we're reluctant to make value judgments on a point-by-point basis. Now is certainly not the time, if there ever was one, for Washington to be counseling Mr. Thieu on how best to win the minds and hearts of his people. Nor do we see much profit in U.S. politicians pressing lists of suggested concessions that he should make to the Communists as the best means of solidifying his government's position.

On the contrary, Mr. Thieu's durability speaks for itself; while his regime is not a model of Western democracy, tyranny is not his secret weapon. If it had been, he would not have lasted six months, let alone six years. He has turned out to be a deceptively shrewd political leader, somehow always staying a jump or two ahead of his enemies at home and his critics abroad. Unless Washington impulsively cuts the ground from under him, as it did with President Diem a decade ago, he could continue to confound his U.S. critics.

DR. SIDNEY FARBER

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the medical profession and the worldwide effort to find a cure for cancer has suffered a great loss in the passing of Dr. Sidney Farber, a native of my home city of Buffalo, N.Y.

For 41 years, until his retirement in 1970, Dr. Farber had been on the faculty of the Harvard School of Medicine and since had been serving as emeritus professor of pathology at the university.

He was recognized as a worldwide authority on cancer in children and as the founder of the discipline of modern pediatric pathology.

Dr. Farber was president and scientific director of the Children's Cancer Research Foundation, popularly known as the "Jimmy Fund."

He was a frequent witness before congressional committees considering legislation and appropriations for cancer research. He was a pioneer in the chemotherapy technique and his contributions to medical knowledge and research over the years are endless.

Although he had made his headquarters in Cambridge for years, he often came back to Buffalo to visit and participate in the outstanding cancer research work being done at one of the world's oldest and largest cancer research centers, Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

Foremost was Dr. Farber's enthusiasm, his inspiration, and his dogged determination in the multifaceted effort to find an answer to the scourge of cancer.

He will be greatly missed, but he has left behind a great legacy and an example for all of us—researchers, public servants, and laymen alike.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I include an obituary from the Buffalo Evening News:

DR. SIDNEY FARBER IS DEAD; EXPERT ON CHILDREN'S CANCER

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., March 31.—Dr. Sidney Farber, 69, Buffalo-born world authority on cancer in children, died here Friday night after a short illness.

A former president of the American Cancer Society, he was recognized as the founder of the discipline of modern pediatric pathology.

Dr. Farber, who along with four of his brothers achieved a spot in "Who's Who in America," received his undergraduate degree in biology and psychology from the University of Buffalo in 1923, then studied medicine in Germany and at the Harvard University Medical School.

He served for more than 41 years as a member of the staff and faculty of medicine at Harvard University and was president and scientific director of the Children's Cancer Research Foundation, popularly known as the Jimmy Fund.

Upon his retirement from Harvard in 1970, he was named S. Burt Wolbach emeritus professor of pathology at the university.

His definition more than 30 years ago of the total care of children with cancer and his discoveries in the chemotherapy of can-

cer are regarded as two of the great milestones in cancer research and care.

Among his brothers, Harold Farber is a Buffalo insurance company executive, Dr. Marvin Farber is philosophy professor at the State University at Buffalo, Dr. Seymour Farber is a chest disease specialist on the faculty of the University of California Medical School in San Francisco and Dr. Eugene Farber is a dermatologist and professor at the Stanford (Calif.) University School of Medicine.

Survivors, in addition to the brothers, include his wife, Norma, whom he married in 1928; two sons, Stephen, assistant to the president of Harvard University, and Thomas; two daughters, Ellen and Miriam, both in the Boston area, and two grandchildren.

Private funeral services will be held in Cambridge.

LAW TO PROTECT POLICE OFFICERS AND FIREMEN**HON. WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, as a former public safety official, I am proud to be a cosponsor of legislation (H.R. 4001) making it a Federal crime to kill or assault a fireman or law enforcement officer in the line of duty when the perpetrator travels in interstate commerce or employs any facility thereof in furtherance of such reprehensible conduct. During my 2-year tenure as a member of the Indianapolis Board of Public Safety, and later as its interim director, we were confronted all too often by incidents of assault or homicide on such public servants. The board's jurisdiction includes the metropolitan police and fire departments, and extends to all civil disorders, disasters, and day-to-day public emergencies in the city.

Also, in my association with volunteer firemen in Marion County and with the Marion County sheriff and his officers and deputies, I have come to know firsthand the similar threats to personal safety that they face, too.

The intentional injury or killing of peace officers during the commission of a crime or apprehension of the criminal, is as old as it is heinous. This is the pre-eminent danger the police officer faces when he joins the force. To the extent possible, we train police recruits to protect themselves from the worst when answering runs, investigating crimes, and apprehending suspects.

Occupational safety is a paramount concern of firefighters, also. They also assume special risks when they join the department, and are hopefully taught how to minimize these threats to their personal safety.

What peace officers and firefighters consider workaday tasks, most of the citizenry deem heroic conduct.

These protectors of the public safety can be exposed at any given moment to threats upon their life and limb. Police-men dispatched to answer calls for help, or merely writing traffic tickets, and firemen called to save lives and property

while fighting fires in the face of injury from burns, suffocation, and dangerous heights are now subject to summary execution in carefully planned ambushes. Ironically, their assassins rely upon the unselfish response of policemen and firemen in the face of danger to serve as the bait for a despicable trap.

My experience with the Indianapolis Board of Safety has led me to believe that the remedy for this wrong must include a strong Federal mechanism in order to eliminate these archcriminals whether they be ideological extremists, agents of organized crime, or products of a mob psychology. There are certain barriers imposed on State and local action, including jurisdictional limitations, manpower shortages, and the lack of sufficient investigative resources. The legislation which I have sponsored, if enacted, would assist in the apprehension and conviction of these offenders and hopefully would serve as a deterrent.

I urge the passage of this bill, so that the Federal Government can do its part to help stem attacks upon America's policemen and firemen in the performance of their duties.

S. 7 VERSUS FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY**HON. J. HERBERT BURKE**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the following remarks were prepared in case the House of Representatives was asked to vote on President Nixon's veto of S. 7. Since it was unnecessary to vote, as the matter was resolved in the Senate, I nevertheless would like to share my views with my colleagues. The following is my position with regard to S. 7:

REMARKS IN SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF S. 7

I have always advocated the need for job training for those who have the dexterity and inclination for such training. In addition, I favor and have advocated job training for mentally and physically handicapped people so that they can prepare for jobs and be productive in our society. Despite my strong feeling in this regard I, nevertheless, wish to add my support to the President on his veto of S. 7, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

The President rightly stated when he vetoed S. 7, that the sponsors of this bill would have the American people believe this furthers an important social cause which is true, but as the President also stated, the cumulative effect of this and other big spending bills constitute a massive assault on the pocketbooks of the millions of women and men in our country. Certainly the President is right when he stated, that: "simply throwing money at problems does not solve anything; it only creates poor legislation which frequently misses the target."

I feel that the President has taken a courageous course in the public interest by vetoing fiscally irresponsible spending bills passed by the Congress. The American people must begin to look at the problems honestly and fairly. The free wheeling, free spending attitude of the Congress of the United States certainly has been one of the primary causes in the inflationary spiral that has caused so

many complaints from the American people. S. 7, for instance, calls for an outlay of over \$1 billion above the President's proposed recommendation for fiscal years 1973 thru 1975. This bill when taken into consideration with other bills already before the Congress collectively, can lead to nothing but further inflation. The federal budget, for instance, in the last six years, since I have been in the Congress, has risen from \$184.5 billion in FY 69 to \$268.7 billion in FY 74. How long can our economy remain safe for all Americans if the Congress continues its present deficit spending spree? The President indicated that the serious reservations which he had respecting substantive defects in S. 7 were:

(1) S. 7 would further divert the Vocational Rehabilitation program from its original purposes by requiring that it provide new medical services. For instance, it would set up a new program for end-stage kidney disease—a worthy concern in itself, but one that can be approached more effectively within the Medicare program, as existing legislation already provides.

(2) Vocational Rehabilitation has worked well for over half a century by focusing on a single objective: training people for meaningful jobs. We should not dilute the resources of that program or distort its objective by turning it toward welfare or medical goals.

(3) S. 7 would create a hodge-podge of seven new categorical grant programs, many of which would overlap and duplicate existing services. Coordination of services would become considerably more difficult and would place the Federal Government back on the path to wasteful, overlapping program disasters.

(4) By rigidly cementing into law the organizational structures of the Rehabilitation Services Administration and by confusing the lines of management responsibility, S. 7 would also prevent the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare from carrying forward his efforts to manage vocational rehabilitation services more effectively.

(5) Finally, by promising increased Federal spending for this program in such a large amount, S. 7 would cruelly raise the hopes of the handicapped in a way that we could never responsibly hope to fulfill.

Certainly we who are in the Congress owe a responsibility to help, not only our constituents, but all American people. How then can we help if we take the very path that will lead us to even higher spiraling costs, uncontrolled inflation and ultimate economic disaster by such irresponsible Federal spending.

Let me make it clear that I, like all of my colleagues, want to help handicapped people, but we cannot help any Americans if we make promises or attempt to fund programs no matter how good the intentions, which might well, in the future, lead to fiscal disaster.

We Americans have, in the past, enjoyed a high standard of living, but we have done so in the past because our currency was strong, not only at home, but in the markets of all the nations of the world. We should know that in any country where inflation gets out of hand, and the country's currency becomes worthless because of irresponsible overspending, and burdensome government programs that economic chaos is the result and substantial suffering follows. It is my intention to vote to support President Nixon's veto of S. 7, not only for the foregoing reasons which I have set forth, but also because I am sure that the Congress has the ability to come up with a fair and meaningful bill for the Vocational Rehabilitation of those which S. 7 purports to help.

My colleagues, forget the politics of the times. Fiscal responsibility is not a problem for most of us in handling our own budgets—why then should we not practice it when handling the American people's money?

MEATLESS MENU FIGHTS FOOD PRICES

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support this week's meat boycott and hope that it produces a meaningful effect on the cost of food. I, my wife and five children will not merely refrain from buying meat, but will not eat it this week, regardless of what we might find in the freezer. In this way we can help reduce overall total demand for meat.

For those families that may not remember the "meatless Tuesdays" of World War II and those who would like to join in the boycott but do not know what to substitute for meat in their diet, I am pleased to share with my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD the meatless menu I am following this week.

The menu and the recipes which follow were prepared for me by a resident of my district, Mr. Tex Eldermire of Glen Cove.

MENU

Monday—Eggplant Parmigiana.
Tuesday—Fishballs.
Wednesday—Tuna Noodle Casserole.
Thursday—Herring Salad.
Friday—Spanish Omelet.
Saturday—Sea Chowder.
Sunday—Spaghetti with Clam Sauce.

RECIPES

Eggplant parmigiana

2 eggplants
½ cup flour
1 or 2 eggs (as needed) slightly beaten
½ teaspoon salt
1 cup olive oil
2 ozs. grated parmesan or romano cheese
¾ lb. mozzarella, sliced thin
1 jar meatless tomato sauce
Pare eggplant, cut into very thin slices. Sprinkle each slice with salt; pile slices on a plate and cover with a weight to draw out juice; let stand for 1 hour. Flour eggplant slices and dip into egg to which salt and pepper have been added and beaten slightly. Fry in olive oil until slices are golden brown on both sides. Sprinkle with grated cheese and cover with a layer of mozzarella. Bake in 400 degree F. oven for 15 minutes and serve hot. Serves 4 to 6.

Fish balls

2 cups codfish cooked and shredded
4 medium sized potatoes
3 eggs
Deep fat for frying
Rinse fish with hot water, then press water out. Boil potatoes and put them through a ricer. Combine freshly boiled potatoes with fish and mix the two, adding eggs; stir as little as possible. Drop mixture from a spoon and fry in deep fat at 350 degrees F. until brown. Serve with vegetables and salad. Serves 4.

Tuna noodle casserole

1 small onion, sliced thin
butter
1 can fried noodles
1 can tuna (13 oz.)
pepper
¼ lb. potato chips, crushed
1 can mushroom soup
Saute onion in butter until it is golden brown. Place half the noodles in greased casserole dish, spread with layer of onion, tuna fish and mushroom soup. Top with remaining noodles and sprinkle top with

pepper and potato chips. Bake in 325 degree F. oven for about ½ hour or until thick and brown. Serves 4.

Herring salad

3 cups pickled herring, diced
1½ cups boiled potatoes, diced
1½ cups pickled beets, diced
½ cup apples, diced
¼ cup onion, chopped
¼ cup pickled gherkins, diced
2 tbs. sugar
2 tbs. water
4 tbs. vinegar
white pepper, to taste
1 pt. sour cream, beaten stiff
Thoroughly mix herring, potatoes, beets, apples, onion, and gherkins. Blend vinegar, water, sugar and pepper before adding to herring mixture, toss gently. When ready to serve, pour sour cream over top and garnish with hard boiled egg and parsley.

Spanish omelet

3 tbs. butter
1 tomato, diced
1 chopped onion
1 chopped green pepper
5 chopped mushrooms
6 eggs
3 tbs. milk
½ tbs. salt
dash of red pepper
another tbs. butter
Place 3 tbs. butter in pan and add next four ingredients. Cook slowly for 15 minutes, stirring occasionally. Beat eggs and milk, salt, red pepper. Melt butter in another pan (1 tbs.) and pour in eggs. Fry slowly until eggs are set. Pour part of sauce from first pan over eggs. Fold omelet and turn onto hot-plate, cover with remaining sauce. Serves 6.

Sea chowder

1 can clam chowder
1 can flaked tuna
1 can crabmeat
1 can tomato soup
1½ cups milk
2 tbs. minced onion
1 can peas and carrots
pepper, to taste
chopped parsley
Combine ingredients in large sauce pan. Heat, but do not boil. Serves 4-6.

Spaghetti with clam sauce

¼ cup olive oil
pepper, or red pepper according to taste
4 cloves garlic
1 pint clam juice
1 lb. spaghetti or linguini (cook as directed on package)
Pour oil and garlic in 1-quart sauce pan, cook until garlic is light brown. Add salt, pepper and clam juice. Let simmer, while spaghetti is cooking. Strain spaghetti, add mixture from sauce pan, serve directly from pot.

MR. ANDREW B. BARBER

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Andrew B. Barber of Joliet, Ill., is completing his 25th year of service as Chairman of the U.S. savings bond program in Will County. During that period he has been truly an outstanding county chairman, in the words of Acting National Director Jesse Adams of the U.S. Savings Bond Division, Department of the Treasury.

In further reference to Mr. Barber, the Acting Director said:

He has been most cooperative and willing to take any assignment to help promote Savings Bonds in Joliet and Will County. According to our records, he was appointed Will County Savings Bond Chairman in April, 1948, and since assuming the chairmanship, the citizens of his county have purchased more than \$125 million in Series E and H Savings Bonds.

The patriotic spirit which has guided Mr. Barber's accomplishments over the year is inspirational. Mr. Barber has contributed substantially to the general welfare and progress of our country and is deserving of our commendation.

I am honored to have such an outstanding citizen in my district and extend my congratulations to him on a job well done.

BLOCK AID TO NORTH VIETNAM

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, whenever our country has attempted to placate international bandits by means of bribery, the attempt has failed. Yet today we are attempting to bribe the tyrannical Communist government of North Vietnam, who even at this moment is marauding our ally South Vietnam. The attempt must be halted; war payments to Hanoi must be stopped.

Many arguments for economic aid to Hanoi are cited: All are confused.

Some say that the proposed \$2.5 billion that the Nixon administration wants to give Hanoi is no different from moneys we gave to our former enemies, Germany and Japan, after World War II. This view is mistaken. The proposed payments are radically different in nature.

We have never before aided a government with whom we went to war. The dictatorships with whom we fought were removed from office and replaced with free governments. Germany and Japan surrendered and were scheduled to pay reparations to us, which we canceled to help them get on their feet. The North Vietnamese are not asking that their reparations be canceled—they are brazenly demanding that we pay them.

They demand money, and themselves lay down the only conditions under which they will deign to accept it. There must be no strings attached to the money. It must be given bilaterally. Nguyen Thanh Le, North Vietnamese spokesman at the international conference on Vietnam, refused to accept American money through multinational agencies. Said Le:

This idea is inappropriate and we do not approve of it. We demand that the United States comply scrupulously with Article 21 of the January 27 cease-fire agreement.

Le explained that "direct aid is more rapid," and that when there is a direct link "between donor and receiver," there can be "complete discussions" about it. This was hardly the attitude of Germany and Japan toward American aid after World War II.

When we gave aid to Germany and Japan, we gave it to prevent the war-

ravaged nations from turning Communist. Secretary of State Marshall, in proposing massive aid, said that if we did not support Europe financially, then we must accept the consequences of its collapse into the dictatorships of police states. This time, instead of being used to save people from communism, our money will be used to solidify the power base of a Communist regime.

This time, instead of nourishing the cause of freedom, American aid will be used to crush resistance to tyranny. Our money will be used to stamp out the forces for freedom that still exist in North Vietnam—forces that are strong enough to worry the Communist leadership. According to Nhan Dan, the daily organ of the Communist Party Central Committee in North Vietnam, there are "Counterrevolutionaries in our country," and although "they represent only a very small percentage compared with the great majority of our people, their plotting is very deep and their activities are very dangerous."

Truong Chinh, a high Communist Party official in North Vietnam, has been even more explicit about the danger to the Communist regime from those fighting for their freedom:

It is absolutely necessary for the people's democratic dictatorship to use violence against counterrevolutionaries and exploiters who refuse to submit to reform. Therefore, we must pay continuous attention to consolidating the repressive apparatus of the people's democratic state, the people's army, the people's police, the people's control institute, the people's tribunal. . . .

Aid to North Vietnam goes against the whole spirit of the Marshall plan. There is no similarity.

The scope of aid this administration is offering North Vietnam is also without precedent. It is far different in scope from aid offered to the defeated nations after World War II. The proposed \$2.5 billion is greater than all the aid given to Japan, and then Japan had a population of 73 million compared to North Vietnam's present 21 million. The \$2.5 billion figure is three times as much as Red China gave Hanoi in the 4 peak years of the Vietnam war, and half-billion more than the Soviet Union provided in the same period.

Some defenders of war payments to Hanoi say that American money will be spent for humanitarian purposes. They say that it will help the undernourished North Vietnamese peasants. This is not true. Prof. Nguyen Tien Hung of Howard University, in an article published February 25 in the Washington Sunday Star and Daily News, points out:

After 18 years in power, the Communist regime has left the living standard of nearly 24 million North Vietnamese peasants among the lowest in the world. In all these years Hanoi's Politburo has effectively mobilized the total resources of the country and concentrated them on building the welfare of the state, its international prestige, its armed forces, and some heavy industry.

In 1970, North Vietnamese Premier Pham Van Dong, in a reflective mood, lamented: "During the last 16 years, Vietnam has never been able to truly concentrate its energies on the building of a new life." The premier's remark was very candid indeed. It raises the question of what exactly Hanoi had been concentrating on during all those years.

Since the 1954 cease-fire, North Vietnam has had reconstruction plans and development plans backed up by sizeable foreign aid. Yet the well-being of its people has never truly been the target of economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, historian Henry Fawcett pointed out that—

War will be rendered less frequent if a whole nation is made to feel its terrible consequences, instead of concentrating all the horrors in the sacrifice of thousands of helpless victims who may be marshalled at the caprice of a despot.

Fawcett recommends that if a peaceful nation would check the vaunting ambition of a marauding nation, the peaceful nation should speak in unmistakable language. The defender should not hesitate to threaten to destroy all the public works upon which the wealth of the invader may depend.

Now the Nixon administration wants to move in a direction that Fawcett may not have been able to imagine. The administration wants to help build an industrial base of a warring nation, even while that nation violates a cease-fire agreement and commits acts of war. The administration wants the American people to donate money that would help create an industrial base in a nation, which, before her acts of war, scarcely had an industrial base. Our proposed gift of \$2.5 billion is almost twice the amount of the average annual North Vietnamese gross national product. With this aid, the administration would teach Hanoi that she not only can avoid the consequences of her illegal acts, but that she is better off for having committed them in the first place.

Let us take a look at the economy of North Vietnam, the magnitude of the proposed American aid, and the probable consequences of that aid. I again quote from Professor Hung's study:

The U.S. economic aid, apparently to amount to about \$2.5 billion, may spread over the next four years, averaging \$625 million per year. The \$625 million figure roughly corresponds to the annual economic assistance to North Vietnam in recent years from Russia and Eastern European countries combined. In addition, China is expected to increase its aid, which already amounts to about \$250 million per year. Japan's post-war contribution of perhaps \$200 million for North Vietnam out of \$750 million projected for all Indochina in 1973 will be added to this.

In sum, Hanoi may now confidently expect the inflow of foreign exchange for the next four or five years at a rate of about \$1.7 billion per annum, and amount three times higher than the annual U.S. economic aid to South Vietnam. In terms of the value of North Vietnam's output, \$1.7 billion is just about the size of its 1970 Gross National Product, and much higher than the GNP for 1972.

If Hanoi's leaders allocated a substantial part of the aid to building a new life for the people, then foreign assistance will certainly enhance the cause of peace.

If on the other hand, North Vietnam's planners concentrate only on rebuilding the welfare of the state, its army, and war-related materials, then it is uncertain whether peace will be well served.

The pattern of Hanoi's planning in the past led the country in a vicious circle: war (1945-54), reconstruction (1955-57), industrialization (1958-65), war (1965-68), re-

construction (1968-71), war (1971-72), reconstruction (1973 to perhaps 1975), and then, a question mark.

The economic planners in Hanoi today are the same men who authored the first reconstruction plan 18 years ago. The Marxist-Leninist ideological base of their planning also remains unchanged.

In his last will and testament, President Ho Chi Minh imposed two conditions on North Vietnam. He said: "The Americans must be kicked out of Vietnam, and the country must be unified." In doing so, he added, "our country will have the great honor of being a small nation but capable of courageously defeating two giant powers, France and America; as such, we will have contributed greatly to the cause of the national liberation movement."

The late president also wrote a poem, his last, saying,

"When the Americans are defeated,
We will rebuild our country.
Ten times stronger again."

In a very short time, the Americans will indeed be gone. It will then be up to Ho's successors to undertake the task of building the country 10 times stronger. But whether that strength will be used for peace and prosperity or for continuing the vicious circle of war, reconstruction, development, and more war is a matter for the aid-giving nations to ponder.

Why was there no provision in the cease-fire agreement for Communist China and Russia to give aid to South Vietnam? Both those countries gave vast amounts of financial assistance to the warring North Vietnamese. Why is only the United States held financially responsible for war damage? If we give this aid to North Vietnam we will be in effect announcing to the world that America has been the aggressor and that America, not North Vietnam, is the outlaw. A brief examination of the concept of reparations will bear me out.

In their customary meaning, reparations are levies imposed on a nation defeated in war, forcing it to pay the war costs of the winning nation. The assumption is that the defeated nation bears the guilt for the war. International legal opinion holds that the aggressor in a war is liable to compensate for all losses of lives and property suffered by her victim or by third states if such losses result from acts illegal under international law.

The United States has not been the aggressor in this war. Our role has been to help defend our allies against the incursions of a hostile power; our role has been to stop the invasion of North Vietnam into the sovereign territory of South Vietnam.

The implications of the Nixon administration proposals are clear, however. Either the administration believes we have lost the war and, as the aggressor, must alone accept the responsibility for war payments, or it knows that the so-called "economic aid" is really blackmail. I repudiate that reasoning. If only one American life was worth losing in the Vietnam struggle, we owe not a penny.

It is scandalous to ask a nation that has paid so high a price to fight off invaders to pay blackmail, because it dared to fight. It is grotesque for our leaders to have asked young men to give up their lives in this struggle, and then donate

money to the very regime that took their lives.

To those who would argue that it is less costly to pay the North Vietnamese to stay home than to fight them when they invade—I say, look at the record. Even now, before they have received our money, they continue their war acts. The North Vietnamese have not even lived up to the terms of the cease-fire agreement. I quote from Human Events, March 3:

Far from offering any sign that its troops plan to leave Cambodia, as is strictly required by the ceasefire provisions, Hanoi has urged its forces in that country to fight even harder and entrench themselves even further. In Laos, North Vietnamese regiments are not leaving that country, as Hanoi has promised they would, but occupy two-thirds of that nation's territory and are gulping up new territory each day. So aggressive have the North Vietnamese been in Laos since last week's cease fire there that Souvanna Phouma has been desperately urging us to renew the bombing.

Despite the cease-fire in Vietnam, U.S. intelligence sources last week reported that the North Vietnamese were pouring hundreds of tanks and thousands of fresh troops into the Laotian supply trails in recent weeks, with much of the armor and personnel headed toward South Vietnam.

Intelligence reports say Hanoi has sent more than 250 tanks, many powerful 122mm. and 130 mm. guns, about 50 armored personnel carriers and about 1,300 tons of supplies into southern Laos since early February.

These sources, related an AP dispatch, "also estimated that about 15,000 North Vietnamese troops have moved into southern Laos since the cease-fire. Intelligence analysts say about half are headed for the region near Saigon, some into the South Vietnamese Central Highlands, and others into the area below the demilitarized zone."

Meanwhile, a single motor-fuel pipeline which North Vietnam Army engineers laid across the DMZ last spring to support a tanked invasion is reported undergoing expansion with a second pipeline to increase the flow of oil and gas from North Vietnam.

Dr. Kissinger has said the Vietnam agreement includes a "flat prohibition" against the use of Laos and Cambodia for infiltration of weapons and personnel into South Vietnam. Under the agreement, moreover, Hanoi's troops are required to leave these countries they've invaded and return north. In addition, the agreement forbids the DMZ to be used for military purposes. Unfortunately, however, Hanoi has thus far decided not to live up to these critical provisions and, apparently, is violating them in the most flagrant manner.

The North Vietnamese will not live up to agreements when presumably they might flatter us by good behavior in order to secure their loot. If they break their word before we give them money, what makes the administration think they will keep their word after they get the money?

The U.S. Treasury is broke. We have enormous deficits in our balance of payments. The dollar can scarcely hold its own in the world market. To pay out billions to aid North Vietnam would be fiscally irresponsible, even if it were not a bad idea for so many other reasons.

This is not the first time in our history that America has been forced to deal with demands for tribute. Let us examine two incidents in American history and learn from them.

In the early days of our Republic, American lives and property were under

constant threat at the hands of the Barbary pirates. The demands of the despotic rulers of the Barbary States were blunt—pay up, or our pirates will plunder your ships and sell your seamen into slavery. For years the United States did pay up.

In 1800 the Bey of Algiers wanted Commodore Bainbridge to bring gifts from Algiers to Constantinople. Bainbridge said he had no authority to make such a trip, whereupon the Bey of Algiers showed the depth of his understanding of the relationship between Algiers and the United States. He told Bainbridge that no United States authority was needed. He said:

You pay me tribute—therefore, you are my slaves.

As America continued to pay the pirates off, their demands become more and more exorbitant. The Bey of Tunis actually demanded that we not only bring him supplies of naval stores, but jewelry—diamond-studded rifles and daggers were among his demands. Commenting on the situation, American diplomat Thomas Eaton said:

It is certain that there is no access to the permanent friendship of these states without paving the way with gold or cannon-balls; and the proper question is, which method is preferable.

But America continued to pay tribute, until the only alternative was cannon balls. In 1815, we were at war with the Barbary States.

During the same period in our history our leaders were asked to pay tribute to another foreign power; on that occasion, the demands were handled in a different fashion.

The foreign power was France. France was unhappy with the United States for its new rapprochement with England, and she also blamed us for a slave rebellion in Saint Dominique. French privateers, privately owned ships authorized by the French Government to attack enemy shipping, made a lucrative business of raiding American ships and stealing our cargoes.

The U.S. Government sent envoys to France to rectify the situation. One of these men, Charles Cotesworth Pickney, was contacted by an agent from Talleyrand. The agent told Pickney that if the United States would have France leave her shipping in peace, the Americans must pay.

"You must pay money, you must pay a great deal of money," said the agent. The agent then warned Pickney of the power and violence of France and what might happen if our envoys did not meet the demands for money. Pickney did not acquiesce.

"You do not speak to the point," demanded the French agent, "It is money, it is expected that you will offer money."

"We have given an answer to that demand," said Pickney.

"No, you have not, what is your answer?" Pickney rose from his chair and insisted:

"It is no, no; not a sixpence, sir."

When the American public heard of the scandalous demands of France, the cry through the country was: "Millions for defense, not one cent for tribute."

Historians note that the firmness and vigor of the United States in refusing the French demands prevented the escalation of this unpleasant situation into all out warfare.

Mr. Speaker, North Vietnam invaded the south. We certainly owe them nothing for that act. If we do not block this administration's proposal to give Hanoi \$2.5 billion, we will in fact be rewarding the invaders. We will in fact be endorsing the acts of war they continue to commit even after the cease-fire. Bribery did not work with the Barbary pirates, and it will not work now. Let us prevent one American cent from being used as tribute to Hanoi. I urge support legislation which I am introducing today.

WEST FRONT EXTENSION: ESTHETIC AND ECONOMIC OUTRAGE

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my unalterable opposition to extension of the west front of the Capitol as an unmitigated economic and esthetic outrage.

Less than a year ago, in our action in the Legislative Appropriation Act of 1972, we defeated this architectural assault on the Capitol. Now the Commission for Extension of the Capitol and the Architect of the Capitol have again resurrected this discredited proposal in defiance of authoritative consultant findings to the contrary. The measure is scheduled for a closed vote of the Appropriations Committee on tomorrow, Thursday, April 5, and floor action the following week.

The timing could not be worse. As we approach the 200th anniversary of the birth of this Nation, we are being asked to obliterate the sole surviving portion of the original Capitol structure. And at a time of fiscal constraints, we are being asked to indulge ourselves and our leadership to a \$60 million extravagance: more office space in the Capitol.

This project is totally unwarranted on the basis of historical and architectural considerations, as well as being an outrageously expensive way to obtain a limited amount of space.

That the west front is in a deteriorated state and in need of restoration is beyond dispute. George White, Architect of the Capitol, has conceded as recently as this week that were it not for the condition of the west front, there would be no thought of extension. But we need not destroy the west front to save it. It can and should be preserved as a priceless piece of our heritage and can be at far less cost than a bloated extension.

COST

Cost alone should doom the extension. At a \$60 million estimated cost, it would run \$222 to \$368 per square foot, depending on whose figures one accepts. This compares to \$15 for a Holiday Inn, \$30 for a home, \$50 for the Rayburn Building and \$58 for the new FBI headquarters,

until now the all-time record. The \$60 million extension estimate assumes no cost overruns, a hallucinatory expectation in view of our experience with the Rayburn Building.

By contrast, the architectural and engineering consultants commissioned by the Congress to study the restoration problem reported on December 21, 1970, that restoration of the west front wall could be done for \$13.7 million to \$14.5 million, depending on surfacing materials used. This has since been updated to \$17 million. Mr. White feels it might cost \$20 million, and could not exceed \$30 million. Even if one attributed \$20 million of the \$60 million extension project to west front restoration costs otherwise needed, the \$40 million in added space would work out to \$148 per square foot of gross space, three times that of the cost of the most expensive public building to date.

Furthermore, Mr. George Hartman, who testified for the American Institute of Architects before the Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch, House Appropriations Committee, on March 8, has said that restoration costs may well have been overestimated.

Mr. Hartman informed my office today that he has spoken recently with engineers for the consulting firm, Praeger-Kavanagh-Waterbury, and concluded that their recommendations represent—

The most comprehensive and expensive way to do it . . . It is my opinion and that of the AIA task force (on the Capitol) that less work may well be adequate.

SPACE NEEDS

Yet the extension is allegedly justified on the grounds of space needs. Mr. White personally inventoried space use and needs—concluding in the process that a fourth House Office Building is needed—and based his extension recommendations on an assessment of operations directly related to the operation of the Capitol. These include space for Members so they need not trek to their quarters in the House Office Buildings, a cafeteria, more space for the press, space for visitors—despite the \$20 million voted for a visitor's center at Union Station.

In his own words, he took the position of an architect designing bedrooms for a client, offering no advice as to the size of the client's family. In other words, he totted up a wish list. As one member of the client family, I protest. I appreciate the honor, but I would rather walk.

ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE

The Capitol is more than an office building. It has been aptly described as a working monument. I agree with the position expressed by Archiebald C. Rogers, first vice president, AIA, who said in testimony last month:

We believe the original sandstone walls of the West Front should remain forever, so that future generations of Americans may read their country's heritage in the face of the Capitol.

I also find merit in the esthetic argument that the extension would tend to obscure the base of the Capitol dome when viewed from the west, diminish its prominence and obliterate the impression of separateness of the House and Senate wings.

ALTERNATIVES

Finally, I feel our space needs should first be met by a better use of existing capacity in the Capitol and the House office buildings. Consideration should then be given to an AIA-proposed alternative, underground space, which could well be provided at far less cost. Significantly, Mr. White has said it is a valid alternative.

But I must confess skepticism over any proposal for increased space based on an estimate calling for the west front extension and another House office building.

Members would do well to recall that the Commission on Extension of the Capitol commissioned the Praeger study to determine if certain standards could be met in restoration relating to cost, feasibility, safety, duration of work and degree of disruption of space while it is in progress. Transmitting his report, E. H. Praeger stated:

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.

Mr. Speaker, we must defeat once and for all this recurrent move to extend the Capitol beyond recognition and set about the task of restoring the west front in time for our bicentennial observance.

NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, expanding horizons are vital to a free people and it is the purpose of National Library Week to provide effective channels for citizens to expand their knowledge and reading skills through the use of libraries.

The National Library Week program is sponsored by the National Book Committee in cooperation with the American Library Association. The first National Library Week, in 1957, was planned as a week of celebrations and publicity for the printed word. The overwhelming response to the first National Library Week led to this annual program.

With library use and reading development as its theme, the National Library Week program emphasizes the importance of libraries in providing free access to all types and forms of public interest. It is the objective of National Library Week to remind the American people of the role that libraries play in helping

citizens further their intellectual development.

The National Library Week program is pursued in the firm belief that through expansion of reading skills, and growth in knowledge and education, libraries can aid in our efforts to alleviate the social problems we face. A lifetime of continuing self-education through reading can help us keep abreast of any responsibilities to community and Nation.

National Library Week is also a means of recognizing the conscientious work and diligent efforts of the staffs of our Nation's libraries who provide essential services to assist library patrons.

Mr. Speaker, a salute to libraries is a salute to the storehouses of past and present knowledge. I am pleased to pay tribute to our libraries at this special time.

LEGAL AID SERVICE FUNDING

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking today to show my support of H.R. 5109 to extend legal aid services under OEO at full funding, introduced by Mr. BELL of California.

What I am worried about is time. On June 30, of this year, OEO will cease to be a viable agency. And although the legal services agencies functioning under OEO have had funds authorized through June 30, 1974, there is no present guarantee that they will ever see the money to let them last that long.

Already many agencies have stopped taking new cases, or have put a freeze on present ones. Many of the backup research offices are in danger of closing up shop completely. What Mr. Nixon has told us is that his administration will soon be presenting us with a bill for a Legal Services Corporation that will take over for OEO. But where is the bill, and can he guarantee that when we get it, it will float through Congress, and be in effect by July 1, of this year.

Mr. BELL has admitted this is merely a stopgap measure to make sure these offices can stay open until the Corporation takes over. But I must ask, "What is wrong with that?" It is much preferred I would think, for the Legal Services Corporation to step into the shoes of functioning agencies instead of sifting through the remains of scattered carcasses looking for traces of organization.

In closing I would again like to urge my colleagues' immediate support for this measure.

At the conclusion of my remarks I insert in the RECORD a petition sent me by Robert Fabian. This petition was circulated at the eighth annual conference of Bar Association Presidents, held at Newport Beach, Calif., on February 18, of this year:

PETITION

Whereas, budgetary commitments by the federal government are uncertain with respect to several legal service programs in California; and

Whereas, because of such budgetary uncertainties, many legal service programs in California are terminating client intake; and

Whereas, the withdrawals of so many attorneys from so many pending cases present grave ethical and practical problems to all members of the bar of the State of California;

Now therefore, the undersigned members of the Bar of California urge the President of the United States and the California representative in Congress to act promptly to maintain existing operations of California's legal service programs, pending legislative action to resolve issues associated with the establishment of a national legal services corporation to fund and administer such programs in the future.

Signed by:

Florence J. Westfall, President, Colusa County Bar Assn.

Dorothy L. Steeves, President, Humboldt County Bar Assn.

Charles L. Convis, President, Shasta-Trinity Counties Bar Assn.

Robert P. Praetzel, Vice President, Marin County Bar Assn.

Leonard Shaw, President, Marin County Bar Assn.

Virginia S. Mueller, member, Women Lawyers' of Sacramento.

Mary Ann Winters, President, Solano County Bar Assn.

John F. Guinee, President, Alameda County Bar Assn.

John Loper, Vice-President, Alameda County Bar Assn.

William A. Johnson, President, Berkeley-Albany Bar Assn.

Burke M. Critchfield, President, Livermore-Amador Valley Bar Assn.

Guy Blase, President, Palo Alto Area Bar Assn.

Richard G. Mansfield, Pres.-elect, Palo Alto Bar Assn.

Conrad L. Rushing, Vice-President, Santa Clara County Bar Assn.

P. Brien Wilson, President, Sunnyvale-Cupertino Bar Assn.

Robert H. Fabian, Pres.-elect, Bar Assn. of San Francisco.

Richard B. Morris, General Counsel, Bar Assn. of San Francisco.

Stephen Barnett, Vice-President, Fresno County Bar Assn.

Harold D. Sandell, President, Fresno County Bar Assn.

Kenneth N. Hastin, President, Kern County Bar Assn.

Charles E. Aguilar, President, Stanislaus County Bar Assn.

Anna White Garlund, President, Tulare County Bar Assn.

Lawrence Shostak, Vice President, Monterey County Bar Assn.

William A. Brace, President, Santa Barbara County Bar Assn.

Orlan S. Friedman, Pres.-elect, Beverly Hills Bar Assn.

Walter L. M. Lorimer, President, Beverly Hills Bar Assn.

Arnold J. Stone, Pres.-elect, Century City Bar Assn.

Dennis Schmitz, President, Harbor Bar Assn.

Marcus O. Tucker, President, John M. Langston Law Club of L.A.

Harold I. Chernes, President, Lawyers' Club of Los Angeles.

Walter J. Desmond, Pres.-elect, Long Beach Bar Assn.

Edwin J. Wilson, President, Long Beach Bar Assn.

Richard M. Darby, President, Pasadena Bar Assn.

LeVone A. Yardum, Vice President, San Fernando Valley Bar Assn.

Betty J. Morris, Vice President, Women Lawyer's Assn. of Los Angeles.

Roberta Ralph, President, Women Lawyers' Assn. of Los Angeles.

Ben Cohn, President, Inyo County Bar Assn.

James W. O'Brien, President, Orange County Bar Assn.

John L. Newburn, President, San Diego County Bar Assn.

Lucy K. McCabe, California Rural Legal Assistance.

Joel S. Primes, Gerald D. Shoaf, Richard J. Ward, William A. Carroll, Michael H. Clepper, James H. Kovacs, Robert D. Raven, William L. Todd, Jr., Shirley A. Schuster, Gerald Winerman, Roger W. Blakely, Jr.

STATE AND LOCAL AUTHORITY VERSUS FEDERAL DOMINATION

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the American people are increasingly being ruled by men and women whom they do not elect and who are not obligated to return to them at stated intervals for their judgment.

One result of this situation is that more and more citizens feel out of control of their own Government. They feel that it is not responsive to their own wants and needs and in many instances, they are correct.

The Federal system established in our Constitution is one of strict checks and balances and division of powers. It was the belief of the Founding Fathers that Government should be kept as close to the people as possible, and that the National Government should do only those few things that could or should not be done at the local level.

Today, the checks and balances and division of powers have seriously eroded. Today, Washington is involved in every aspect of our lives—from agriculture to health care to education—and beyond.

Discussing this unfortunate trend, Prof. Charles S. Hyneman, former president of the American Political Science Association, noted that—

Elected officials ought to be firmly in charge of the government . . . the men and women we put in charge of the national government are not now maintaining that measure of direction and control.

He predicts that—

This unacceptable condition is bound to get worse unless we reverse a long-developing trend.

The best answer to this problem, declares Professor Hyneman, is:

Putting a larger share of governing in our state and local governments. I am convinced that we can do this with rewarding consequences if we make up our minds that we ought to and must . . . Local self-government was invented so that each community could have its own preferred services and its own preferred regulations. The glory of the American federal system has been its provision that the people of each state should live under their own code of laws.

In addition, Professor Hyneman urges more autonomy and less Government interference in the lives of individuals. He writes that:

I am a strong believer in variety, in a diversity of policies and opportunities that pro-

vide for you to go your way and me to go my way. This means that I want to preserve the autonomy of businessmen and business firms and encourage free association in social organizations, and so insist that there must be mighty good reason for propelling government into some new area of American life. It means also that I think all government business that can be handled satisfactorily in the state house, city hall, or county courthouse ought to be put there and kept out of Washington.

I wish to share with my colleagues the thoughtful analysis of our current political situation by Prof. Charles Hyneman which appears in the April 1973 issue of the *Alternative*, and insert it into the *Record* at this time.

[From the *Alternative*, April 1973]

STATE AND LOCAL AUTHORITY VS. FEDERAL DOMINATION

(By Charles S. Hyneman)

I believe that the question of where to put the power to govern this nation is of great importance and calls for a most serious re-examination right now. I have been asking questions about it, reading about it, and thinking about it for some time and I shall tell you as simply as I can what I think we are up against and what are some alternatives available to us.

But first, you should know something about the presumptions which guide my thought and the prejudices which may limit what I see and shape my conclusions.

One: I am 100 percent committed to popular self-government. I believe that elected officials ought to be firmly in charge of all important business of government in which there are significantly different judgments as to what ought to be the main lines of public policy. This does not mean that I think judges of the U.S. Supreme Court and superintendents of Army Hospitals ought to be elected, but it does mean that I think we now let administrative bureaucracies fix a lot of policies that ought to be debated and voted on in Congress.

Two: I am a strong believer in variety, in a diversity of policies and opportunities that provide for you to go your way and me to go my way. This means that I want to preserve the autonomy of businessmen and business firms and encourage free association in social organizations, and so insist that there must be mighty good reason for propelling government into some new area of American life. It means also that I think all government business that can be handled satisfactorily in the state house, city hall, or county courthouse ought to be put there and kept out of Washington.

Three: I think the national government now has more business than the elected officials (Congress and president) can adequately look into and look after, and I have no doubt that they will succumb to public demands that result in their taking on additional burdens. Unless the American mind takes a turn which I do not foresee, this assumption of new business will not be balanced by returning an equal amount of old business back to the private sector. Government in the United States is destined to reach further and further into our lives, unless I am a much worse prophet now than I have been in the past.

So we have come to the first question that I want to ask you and express a few opinions of my own about. What can we do to make sure that the persisting and enlarging volume of public business is attended to intelligently, with minimum costs and maximum gains to the American people? It seems to me that our present answer, a policy of continuously delegating power to national bureaucracies, is unacceptable. We have more administrative organizations now than Con-

gress or the president can effectively oversee. Several of them are too big to be manageable even if Congress and the president did try to subject them to strict control. And finally, in my opinion, we are embracing a poor instrument for attaining the answerability to the people which the Founding Fathers had in mind—when we lodge a wide range of choices to fix public policy in officials whose names and reputations for prior achievements are unknown to the people they govern.

So I approach this question with two conclusions and a prophesy. A conclusion of principle—that elected officials ought to be firmly in charge of the government; a conclusion of fact—that the men and women we put in charge of the national government are not now maintaining that measure of direction and control; and a prediction—that this unacceptable condition is bound to get worse unless we reverse a long-developing trend.

What can be done, either to improve the ability of Congress and president to do well what they undertake, or to relieve them—more responsibly—of lesser business that hinders their addressing matters that ought to have first priority? Three possible alternative courses of action must be considered. Stated as questions they are: 1. Can we make the White House and Congress more efficient? 2. Can the congressmen allocate the public business among themselves in some way so that no congressman has to divide his attention among as many things as he does now? 3. Can we raise our state and local officials to a new level of importance by handing over to them sectors of public policy which up to now we have been entrusting to administrative departments of the national government?

I see little promise indeed in the first course of action—increased efficiency. As for greater efficiency in the White House, I think we can dismiss that from our minds altogether. The White House is one of our most revered national monuments. It must be visited by a few hundred thousand persons each year, and I suspect that a full third of the persons who go there are experts from the Bureau of the Budget who are trying to show the president how to use his staff more efficiently.

The Budget Bureau's experts stay away from Congress and no doubt a great deal more inefficiency abounds at that pole of the political planet. Congress took a magnificent step to improve the conduct of its affairs by restructuring committees and making better provision for research aids in 1946, and many congressmen think the time is ripe for another overhaul. But improvements of this order, desirable as they are, offer little promise, in my opinion, of freeing Congress for sufficient time to apply their wisdom to public policies. Far more would be gained if we could capture for more important uses the countless hours of time that congressmen give to constituents who insist on bringing little problems to the mightiest official to whom they have access. I am conservative in estimating promise of improvements in that sector, however, for I am one of those who believe that it is a good thing for a congressman to look a constituent in the face pretty often and be reminded that he was elected to serve the people and that he ought to know what the people are thinking.

The second suggested course of action, relocating within Congress the power to take final action, is one that I have not studied. The members of the lower house are relieved of a considerable amount of study and time in debate by not being required to approve treaties and advise and consent to the president's appointments. The Senate's time is conserved by the fact that it leaves most of the work on appropriation bills to the House of Representatives. It may be that there are other areas that can be turned over entirely to one or the other of the two legislative

chambers without loss of wisdom or risk of injustice to any sector of the population.

There may also be some kinds of business that can be turned over entirely to a joint committee of one of the two houses, as I believe was the case with claims against the government at a time when it was thought that the claims ought to be adjudicated by elected officials rather than a court. If public policies of signal importance are to be decided finally within a committee, it will of course be necessary to make sure that the members of the committee are representative of the people whose interests are affected by the committee's decisions. The difficulties I see in identifying publics that need to be represented and apportioning committee memberships among the different public strips me of any hope that much can be gained by this course of action.

So we are led up to the third course of action I mentioned: putting a larger share of governing in our state and local governments. I am convinced that we can do this with rewarding consequences if we make up our minds that we ought to and must. I am well aware that many people are fully convinced that this is not a feasible course of action. I am acquainted with the arguments they offer to support their point of view. I think they are influenced by two great errors in judgment. They put too high a value on equality of condition and uniformity in the application of public policy. And they have too low a regard for the ability of the American people to construct responsible governments, elect honest and intelligent officials, and put brakes on the excesses to which elected officials too often succumb.

It is a fact, and I attach great importance to it, that we are already engaged in a conscientious and persistent effort to improve our state and local governments. And with salutary if indeed not exemplary results in many places. Further, we have at hand a large body of thinking packaged and available for widespread distribution. Much of it comes to a head with precise proposals: formulae for replacing inefficient and haphazard government with efficient and responsible government, redrawing state boundaries, UNI-GOV for every metropolitan area, full-time state legislatures, and so on.

Personally, perhaps more as an incident of temperament than as a consequence of overpowering proof, I distrust formulas that are made to fit unexamined situations. The conditions that give a political jurisdiction its prominent characteristics and its most troublesome problems are various, not uniform and constant. The lesson I think I have learned is that every community presents its own set of problems, its own set of highly developed or underdeveloped resources of leadership and civic virtue, its own strengths upon which it can build and its own weaknesses against which it must guard. The needs of each place and the options available to it are not so peculiar, however, that nothing can be learned from the experience of people in other places. I am a great believer in models as a stimulant to thought and a guide to learning. Surely one of the first things to do in preparing ourselves for more vigorous, more costly, more important government at state and local levels is to spread across the nation succinct but reliable accounts of successes and failures in governmental improvement containing lessons from which people in other places may profit.

Hand in hand with the contention that state and local governments are not fit for further governing responsibilities goes the assertion that they cannot meet the costs involved in a bigger scale of operations. We encounter some difficulties in fitting income to costs, but I think they have been exaggerated. Possibly it will cost the American people more, but I do not see why it should cost them much more to regulate

themselves and provide needed services, through state and local authority rather than through the great national bureaucracies we now employ. We must make certain that when governmental responsibilities are moved to another level, the money necessary for the operation is part of the transfer. Congress now delegates enormous areas of authority to the administrative departments and it annually appropriates billions of dollars to pay for their work. It can turn that same delegating and appropriating machinery in another direction. It can devolute governing authority to state and local governments as readily as it can delegate administrative organizations, and it can allocate the money it controls to state and local governments as easily as it appropriates to the bureaucracies it nourishes in Washington.

But there is a hitch here—more than a hitch, a positive danger—and I hope not to underestimate it. Congress can hold the federal administrative department to some measure of accountability for its operations and its performance, and it does so in its annual budgetary review. I do not believe that Congress can hold the state governments accountable for the use of money with any comparable degree of success. The Washington administrative department is expected to have a rationalized program. Each sector of its operations seeks a high measure of uniformity in its impact on people wherever in the nation they happen to live. A veteran of the House Appropriations Committee learns enough about the program to ask sharp questions about the execution. But if we turn a billion dollar operation over to the state and local governments, the uniformity and the homogeneous character of the program ceases. The operation explodes. Diversity becomes the rule rather than the exception. Variation in styles of administration replaces the consistency in style which marked the administration when it was seated in Washington. This transformation from uniformity to diversity is inevitable because this is what we wanted to happen when we said: Get this business out of Washington and put it in the state house or city hall.

Some of Congress' concern to hold the spenders responsible for their use of money can be satisfied by setting up officials in Washington to maintain a watch, but that encourages a prospect that the small reviewing office will transform itself into a bureaucracy that insists on imposing uniformity on the local administrators just so that the bureaucrats can be sure they understand what is going on well enough to report it to Congress. Surely this is just what we are trying to get away from when we endorse devolution to the states and localities where the people live.

Shall we then instruct Congress to give the money to the states without strings attached, to give it without requiring those who spend the money to answer effectively for the way they use it? Or shall we require Congress to limit the amount it extracts from the taxpayers and tell the state and local governments to go directly to the taxpayers for the increased amounts they are bound to need. And if we do the latter, open up the personal if not the corporate income tax as a main source of state and local revenue, will the people back home impose any more or any less accountability upon the legislatures and city councils than they would impose upon Congress if Congress did all the taxing and made gifts to the states.

Judgments differ as to how we can best handle this problem of moving public revenues hand in glove with the transfer of government functions. Good minds are at work on the problem and I am impressed that we are advancing toward a full comprehension of what is involved in assuring that state and local officials will be provided with the money

they actually need under conditions that require them to justify the things they do with what they get.

One further point must be made about the obstacles which must be surmounted in bringing about a dispersion of government to the state and local capitals. I speak of a state of mind that has taken hold of the American people with increasing intensity during recent years. Not just our talk but our behavior makes it clear that we have a compelling commitment to equality, and that leads to a fixation on uniformity in the impact of government on individuals. Determined that individuals living side by side as well as far apart who are caught up in competition for something of value shall enjoy equal protection of the law, we leap to the conclusion that Americans living anywhere within the national boundaries must be subjected to identical law. The only way to guarantee that one rule of law will extend over the whole nation is for Congress to enact the legislation, for a monolithic bureaucracy to enforce it, and for a national Supreme Court to review and revise the variant interpretations of each statute.

Local self-government was invented so that each community could have its own preferred services and its own preferred regulations. The glory of the American federal system has been its provision that the people of each state should live under their own code of laws. I recognize the necessity of calling national authority into action when any lesser political jurisdiction withholds elementary justice from any part of the population. If it becomes evident that the only way a black man can be assured of the right to vote in Mississippi is for federal agents to register voters and sit at the polls on election day—if that is the only way they can be assured the right to vote—then I agree that local registration and election officials will have to move over and let the federal officers take charge. The assurance of elementary justice is not what I am talking about when I say we have an over-developed attachment to uniformity in the application of law. I am not talking about the need for the federal government to come into a state or community to make sure that a minority group gets the fair deal in public services which is denied to them by state or local public authorities. I think that redress of local injustice by the national government is imperative.

What I have in mind when I warn against an exaggerated affection for uniform application of laws is a supposition that the surest way to prevent injustice is to have one government govern everybody. What I deplore is the supposition that national rules and regulations must cover, say, the growing of tobacco in order to escape the disadvantage some one might suffer if the rules governing measurement of tobacco fields in Kentucky differ a little bit from the rules governing measurement of tobacco fields across the state line in North Carolina.

The issue now before the Supreme Court relating to the financing of public education invites inspection in this connection. It seems to me to be a sound principle that some of the money stripped off of the wealthier communities of the state by taxation ought to be invested in the improvement of education in the poorer communities of the state. If this is a good rule for education, then it seems to me to be a good rule for health services, care for the aged and the crippled, and a good many other services we expect government to provide. If the judges conclude that the equalizing of services is mandated by the Constitution, inherent in the laws' equal protection requirement, how can the judges escape concluding that the quality of essential services in poverty-ridden West Virginia must be brought up to the level of the same public services in the far wealthier states of Ohio and Pennsylvania? If all the communities of the nation must

be brought to the same quality of service, how would you guarantee that result except by a mass of ever-changing regulations of nationwide application enforced by a number of ever-enlarging federal bureaucracies? And if the great swarm of regulators bring all parts of the nation to the same level of public service, who will run ahead of the rest and set models for the less imaginative communities to imitate?

I do not predict that the Supreme Court will immediately project us upon this course of all plains and no mountains, all lock step and no pace setting. I do say that there is a mood hovering over the nation, a sentiment settling heavily upon great numbers of American people, which favors equality of condition and uniformity in the application of law. It is a mood and a sentiment which, if it persists and dominates our political philosophy, will negate any hope you or I may have of returning government of the American people back to the states and the communities where the people live.

LEGITIMATE ACCESS FOR AMERICAN GOODS TO FOREIGN MARKETS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the State of Illinois Senate adopted a resolution introduced by Senator Harber Hall which calls upon the Federal Government and, more specifically, the Congress to take the necessary steps so that American goods have a legitimate access to foreign markets. I believe this is a very timely resolution, and it demonstrates the responsibility and leadership which is reflected in the Illinois State Senate. I insert the resolution into the RECORD at this point:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, The State of Illinois, the industrial, commercial and agricultural center of the great heartland of the United States, has long been a leader in world trade, with 300,000 of its citizens engaged in employment related to exports; and

Whereas, Illinois ranks second in exports, with 1972 exports amounting to \$3.7 billion, with manufactured goods representing about 75 percent, and agricultural products about 25 percent, of the \$3.7 billion; and

Whereas, Growth in world trade is threatened by artificial trade barriers, in countries which deny our exports the same access to their markets which we allow their imports to ours; and

Whereas, The failure of some countries to carry out the intent of agreements is preventing the export of our products, and the import of some of theirs, with adverse effect upon some of our industries and their employees; and

Whereas, Open trade promotes the continuation of peaceful interchange between the nations of the world and improves the standard of living of the peoples of all nations; therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate of the Seventy-Eighth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that the State of Illinois, in its position as an international center of manufacturing, agriculture, trade and finance, reaffirms its vital interest in world trade; and be it further

Resolved, That we, the State of Illinois, in the spirit of fair and equitable free international trade and continuing progress, call

upon the Government of The United States to take urgent action to assure to all Americans access to the fruits of their labor in foreign markets equal to that which our nation grants to goods produced in foreign lands; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this preamble and resolution be transmitted by the Secretary of State of Illinois to each member of the Congress of the United States from Illinois.

LEGALIZING ABORTION

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Supreme Court handed down its January 22 decision legalizing abortion there have been numerous articles published around the country on the effect of the ruling and the rights of the unborn.

Today, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article by Philip Nicolaides that I feel is particularly enlightening on the subject:

A MATTER OF LIFE, DEATH: ABORTION RULING AND THE RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

(By Philip Nicolaides)

Today in America at least two little children are alive and well in adoptive homes because when they were developing in their mothers' wombs the Supreme Court of the United States had not yet concluded that their mothers had the right to have them killed before birth. They are the children of the two women (one in Texas, one in Georgia) whose appeals resulted in the court's Jan. 22 decision overturning the anti-abortion statutes of almost every state in the Union.

This is a fact worth contemplating for a moment. These two children are alive. They would not be alive today if the court's decision had been made a few years earlier. Their being alive reminds us that the court decided on a matter of life or death, the life or death of unborn human beings. And the court professed to discover in the "penumbra" of the Bill of Rights and the 14th Amendment—an amendment which guarantees the right to life—a new right, the 'right' to kill unwanted or inconvenient unborn children.

Much has been said of the arrogant judicial usurpation of legislative function which this decision represents. No one has put it more trenchantly than Justice White in dissenting (along with Justice Rehnquist):

"I find nothing in the language of history of the constitution to support the court's judgment. The court simply fashions and announces a new constitutional right for pregnant mothers and, with scarcely any reason or authority for its action, invests that right with sufficient substance to override most existing state abortion statutes. The upshot is that the people and the legislatures of the 50 states are constitutionally disempowered . . . (The decision) is an improvident and extravagant exercise of the power of judicial review . . ."

It is regrettably true that in this decision the Court has grossly over-reached its proper function. That is an important point. But not the most important point. For we are dealing here with a matter of life and death. And the Court has decided for death on the basis of a "right of privacy" which it admits is nowhere found in the Constitution. It is the substance of the decision, not the legalities, which makes it not just bad law but infamous.

After a rambling and superficial disquisition on the history of abortion law, Christian and pagan views on the subject (the Court candidly favors the latter), and other related subjects, the majority opinion concludes that the Court is incapable of determining when life begins and/or becomes protectable by any state.

It rebukes Texas for basing its law on the theory that life begins at conception and then perversely proceeds to impose on Texas and all the other states the theory that life does not begin at conception but possibly (it is up to the states to decide this) three months before birth.

Even here the states' power to protect the unborn is vitiated by the Court's insistence that the nebulous consent of the "health" of the mother can take precedence over the life of the child. And in the midst of this farrago of contradictions and obfuscations Justice Blackmun, the author of the decision, carelessly lets the cat out of the bag by using the phrase "unborn children."

That's what it's all about, unborn children, and their right to be protected from lethal procedures. The pro-abortionists use every smokescreen, every sophistry imaginable to obscure this fact. But common sense, common speech, medical evidence and even their own unguarded statements betray them.

It is a commonplace of medical parlance to say that when a woman becomes pregnant her doctor has "two patients." Dr. Lilley, the father of fetology (medicine practiced on the unborn), writes about "the same baby we are caring for before and after birth, who before birth can be ill and need diagnosis and treatment just like any other patient."

The "Declaration of the Rights of a Child," passed by the United Nations General Assembly in 1959 states clearly: "The child needs safeguards and care, including appropriate legal protection, before as well as after birth."

And in a pamphlet issued in 1963 by Planned Parenthood (an organization that now supports permissive abortion laws) the following revealing sentence appears: "An abortion kills the life of a baby after it has begun."

There are many other aspects to the abortion controversy, but this one is central. It is a matter of life and death. Tragically the Supreme Court by its 7-2 decision has sided with death. By supporting the amendments to overrule this decision, amendments being introduced by Congressman Hogan, Senator Buckley and others, Americans can still side with life.

In the Spring of 1971 President Nixon expressed his strong convictions on the "sanctity of human life—including the life of the yet unborn." We can urge him to speak out again and instruct the Solicitor General of the United States to intervene. It's a matter of life and death.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE LABOR-MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1973

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Federal Employee Labor-Management Act of 1973.

The Federal Government is the Nation's largest employer and there is no reason why the people who work for it should not have the same rights as those who work in the private sector of our economy.

Federal workers must have the right to engage freely in labor union activities, including forming, joining and running these unions, without any fear of reprisal from the Government. This includes negotiating contracts and disputes on behalf of union members.

This bill creates a Federal Labor Relations Authority consisting of three members appointed by the President of the United States. The three would be selected from a list of 10 submitted by the president of the American Arbitration Association.

I believe that enactment of this legislation will not only help protect the interests and rights of Government workers, but it will also make Federal service more attractive to potential employees as a career.

FIRE PREVENTION SEMINAR

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia Fire Department, the Nation's finest municipal fire department, will conduct its fifth annual Fire Prevention Seminar from June 13 through June 15, at the Philadelphia College of Textiles and Sciences, in Philadelphia.

The 3-day seminar will study fire safety and prevention in industries, institutions, hospitals, and schools, and the role of the fire service in the community today.

The fire department's fire prevention division is sponsoring the seminar in cooperation with the citizens fire prevention and public relations committees, which has formed a subcommittee chaired by Joseph T. Gibbs, safety coordinator, Smith, Kline, and French, to assist in promoting the meeting.

Fire Commissioner Joseph R. Rizzo said that the seminar is designed to improve fire safety and prevention practices in hospitals, schools, industries, and institutions through the exchange of useful and informative data that will promote the implementation of sound safety practices.

He added that it also hopes to be able to enlarge and develop new programs of fire prevention that may be successfully inaugurated throughout the country.

The four previous seminars attracted over 1,000 persons representing some 28 States and 126 cities from as far west as Las Vegas, Nev., and as far south as Tampa, Fla.

Registration fee for the seminar is \$50 and covers lectures, demonstrations, breakfast, and lunch all 3 days and a concluding banquet.

Registration for just 1 day of the seminar is \$20. The first day of the meeting will cover fire safety in industry, the second day, hospital and nursing home safety, with the final session devoted to fire prevention in schools.

For further information about the 3-day conclave, write Seminar V, Fire Prevention Division, Fire Department, 1328 Race Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19107.

FINANCING BALANCED TRANSPORTATION

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, as the present energy crisis becomes ever more serious, we become more and more aware of the need to find ways of conserving fuel.

In southern New Jersey, we have a fantastically successful rapid transit system called the Lindenwold High Speed Line, which carries over 40,000 people a day between Philadelphia and south Jersey at less than half the cost of driving their cars and with more efficiency and safety.

Louis T. Klauder, who has been selected Engineer of the Year in the Delaware Valley as well as in New Jersey, discusses the high speed line and the need for additional similar facilities throughout the Nation, in an address which he gave at a luncheon in his honor.

Mr. Klauder believes, and I agree, that we have got to shake loose from the philosophy that mass transportation must be entirely self-supporting and that, in the long run, it would be cheaper and more environmentally efficient, to finance, instead, good mass transit systems.

Mr. Klauder's address is significant and important reading, Mr. Speaker, and at this point I wish to share it with my colleagues:

FINANCING BALANCED TRANSPORTATION

(By Louis T. Klauder, P.E.)

I am of course very pleased to be Engineer of the Year in the Delaware Valley, and I am also pleased that the theme of Engineers' Week this year is the promotion of mass transit.

One of the goals of Engineers' Week is to encourage engineers to leave their comfortable shells and provide information and leadership to the community in those areas in which they have special competence. It is appropriate therefore that engineers should speak out and lend their support in solving the second most serious problem affecting metropolitan areas; namely, the problem of mass transportation. A recent Gallup poll found that this problem was second only to crime.

Ever since the depression the public generally, and decisionmakers in particular have recognized that there was a transportation problem, but any reasonable solution to the problem appeared to be so unattainable that they despaired, and did nothing, except build highways.

Suddenly, the situation has changed in a way that would not have appeared possible just a few years ago. Some new words have been added to our vocabularies, such as: pollution, ecology, urban sprawl, and energy crunch. For the first time in 57 years the United States Congress did not appropriate a single cent in 1972 for new highway construction. It is almost certain that in 1973 Congress will appropriate 3 billion dollars for mass transit on the same 90 percent federal funding and 10 percent local funding as is used for highway support. It is also anticipated that in most metropolitan areas, automobile gas taxes will be available to finance the local one-fifth share of any transportation project, not merely for highway

projects, as has been the situation in the past. A proposal of this type was proposed for Pennsylvania just last week.

The reasons for this very encouraging shift in public opinion are: a new appreciation of the importance to the entire metropolitan area of an economically healthy center city business district; the fact that automobiles hurt rather than help a central business district; the fact that high quality rapid transit is more attractive and less expensive to both the community and the user than equivalent highways; the fact that rapid transit reduces pollution and preserves the ecology; the fact that rapid transit requires only one-fifth the energy that automobiles need; the fact that rapid transit is so much safer than automobiles; and the realization that the public has a responsibility to provide transportation for children, infirm, aged, and those who don't own cars—the same kind of responsibility that it has to provide fire protection, water, sanitation and police.

All of these reasons can be summarized in a single sentence; namely, that "Good mass transit improves the quality of urban life for all the citizens in a metropolitan area."

The reason that it has taken so long for the public to accept these very simple and obvious facts is that in the early nineteen hundreds, the promotion, financing and operation of mass transit systems was a very profitable private business.

The public has finally been forced to accept the fact that no private interests are the least bit interested in financing mass transit systems today. Those private operators who couldn't sell their existing systems to some public body, raised fares as fast as possible and as ridership dropped, reduced the quality and extent of the service, until finally the lines just ceased to exist.

Perhaps the most critical question that can be asked, when considering the building of a new rapid transit system, is: "Do we really care if business leaves the central business district and moves to the suburbs?" In view of the fact that the city and the suburbs compete for new businesses and for the taxes that businesses pay, it can be assumed that the city would care a great deal if it lost any businesses, but that each suburb would hope that businesses would leave the city and relocate in it. Presumably, neither group would be happy if businesses just left Philadelphia for New York or some other major city. What really is happening is that no one wants the center city to deteriorate; the suburbs would just like to receive some of the taxes which center city businesses now pay. As businesses have left the cities there is a real question as to who should pay the taxes in a city if business doesn't. Certainly the suburbs don't want to. But there are a good many indications that city and county boundaries may prove to be very feeble barriers to the flow of taxes if the cities are no longer able to pay their own way. The financial bind in which the Philadelphia School Board finds itself may very well be the trigger which will cause the courts to order the suburbs to help pay the cost of education in Philadelphia. In the face of this threat, I suspect that there isn't a responsible suburban political leader around, who would claim that he had no interest in the future of the central city, or argue against a proposed rapid transit line, for the reason that it would help only the central city.

I live in Burlington County, New Jersey. This is really a distant suburb. I hear no comments that we don't need good rapid transit there, or that a new transit system would help only central Philadelphia. Just the opposite is true. I am constantly being asked when rapid transit will come to Burlington County. My neighbors feel that this will make us more accessible to the city; that it will increase land values; that old houses which have been converted to apart-

ments will be rebuilt into one-family homes; that executives will move to Moorestown and build high priced homes; and that the entire area will be more attractive. As I am sure all of you know, the lack of good public transportation has long impeded the economic growth of South Jersey.

For as long as I can remember we have solved our metropolitan transportation problems by building more highways. Those who still rode the old transit systems switched to automobiles as soon as they could afford it, and often before. The more highways we built the worse the traffic congestion seemed to be. The additional cars put pressure on parking lots. It became profitable to tear down buildings to provide parking space. The city lost taxes, the motorists paid high parking fees. Drivers complained of traffic congestion. Everyone dreamed of the clean air, the traffic-free roads, and the adequate free parking which were available in the suburbs, and the flight of businesses from the center city accelerated. In the center city the new highways created more problems than they solved.

During this struggle to solve urban transportation problems with highways, city after city found that the city taxpayers were subsidizing motorists, to a much greater extent than they had realized. The most recent report from Atlanta states that its taxpayers subsidize motorists to the extent of 13 cents for every gallon of gasoline consumed in the city.

In Philadelphia Mayor Richardson Dilworth persuaded the Delaware River Port Authority to build the Lindenwold Line. Once persuaded, the Port Authority decided that if it was going to have a rapid transit line, it wanted to have a good one. It insisted that it be much faster than a private automobile, 75 miles per hour top speed, and an average of 40; that it be comfortable, quiet and safe; that service be very frequent—even in the off-peak there is a train every 7½ minutes. Trains all night; a seat for everyone; fares no higher than local bus fares; half price transfers to the SEPTA system in Philadelphia; and enough free parking for everyone who wanted to drive to a station. It even insisted on air-conditioned cars, at a time when air conditioning in rapid transit cars was unheard of. In an effort to provide a gracious atmosphere for the riders, they prohibited advertising in the cars.

You all know the result—10,600 people a day who had not previously used any form of mass transit now prefer rapid transit to their own cars. The Line carries over 40,000 riders a day. That is double the ridership on the Paoli local, even though the Paoli local is 50 percent longer and runs through a much more densely populated area.

There of course is a very good reason for this patronage. No driver can possibly get to center city in his car as quickly, as easily, as comfortably, as safely, or as inexpensively as he can go by the Lindenwold Line. Little by little people are learning this, and no matter how much they love their automobiles, if they are going where the Lindenwold Line goes, sooner or later they try the Line, and once they try it, their car loses some of its appeal. Patronage is still growing at the rate of 13 percent per year, in spite of a recent 25 percent fare increase, and apparently it will continue to grow as long as the riders can find free parking spaces at the stations.

Everyone knows that the Lindenwold Line cost almost \$100 million, and that the average fare is sixty cents. This fare covers the full operating cost, but not the capital cost. No urban planner would dream of proposing an 8-lane highway and bridge which would have capacity for 8,000 passengers an hour in each direction between Haddonfield and central Philadelphia, but if such facilities were built, they would cost a great deal more than \$100 million and at least \$650,000 per

year in tax support for operation. In addition, the average cost to drive a car in town is \$3.00, compared with \$1.20 on the Lindenwold Line. Therefore, both the taxpayers and the riders save as a result of the construction of the Lindenwold Line.

Among engineers I need hardly stress the fact that rapid transit eliminates almost all of the automobile pollution and that it requires only one fifth as much energy as a comparable number of automobiles. If and when automobiles are equipped with the new anti-pollution facilities, the energy ratio between automobiles and rapid transit may increase to ten to one.

From the point of view of safety, there is almost no comparison. Highway deaths average 2.3 per 100 million passenger miles. Transit deaths are less than 0.1. This means that transit is 23 times as safe as an automobile. Actually, it is much safer even than that. The automobile figures are for all automobiles and there are more automobile accidents in the cities than there are on freeways. The transit figures include buses, and there are more accidents on buses than on rapid transit.

Rapid transit has another very important advantage that all rail transit riders appreciate, but of which motorists might not be aware. The transit rider looks forward to the ride as an opportunity to read on the way to or from work. For two 15 or 20-minute rides a day, this amounts to one-half to 3/4 of an hour a day. Most of us value this extra time very highly.

So everybody gains when a rapid transit line is built. The city which needs people but doesn't want automobiles, the taxpayers who would otherwise pay to build and operate the much more expensive highway alternative, the passengers who save time, money and lives, and finally the suburban communities which become much more attractive places in which to live because of their excellent transportation. After all, that was what made the Main Line so much more attractive than South Jersey for so many years. It had, for its time, excellent transportation.

During the same period that the Lindenwold Line was disproving the old myth that automobile drivers wouldn't ride mass transit even if it were free, new lines in Toronto, Montreal, Mexico City, San Francisco, Stockholm, London, Paris, Tokyo, Munich and Santiago were showing the world just how attractive rapid transit could be.

As a result, 40 cities around the world are now proceeding to build new rapid transit systems.

You may very well ask why we don't have a lot more Lindenwold Lines if they are so popular, save so much money and benefit both the center city and the suburbs. The answer is very simple. It is the problem of financing. Until the passage of the Urban Mass Transportation Act in 1970, all mass transit improvements had to be financed 100 percent with state or local tax money. The competition for these funds is of course very intense, with education, health, welfare and crime prevention having unavailable priorities. It is no wonder that most of the nation's rapid transit lines are relics of the period between 1890 and 1910 when private capital could still make money operating transit systems. Very few cities could afford the luxury of spending tax money on transit projects before there was federal support.

In comparison, most states, including Pennsylvania, had dedicated gas taxes. This means that the money which is raised by state gas taxes can be used only for highways. As a result, highway planners do not need to compete with education, health and the other necessary government services for the money with which to build highways. And, as if that were not sufficient reason for solving

all transportation problems by building highways, the Federal government also levies gas taxes which can be used only for highways. The Federal government provides up to 90 percent of the cost of new highways and requires as little as 10 percent to be raised by state and local taxes—usually by state gas taxes.

Transportation is not merely a highway problem. It is also a railroad problem, a transit problem, an airway problem, and to a lesser extent a maritime problem. All are inter-related and should complement each other. None can stand alone and ignore the others. Of course in metropolitan areas the major concern is mass transit.

Unfortunately, the availability of the almost unlimited funds from unseen gas taxes, which can be used only for highways, gave hard-pressed government officials no other option than highways. No matter how desirable a transit project might be, and no matter how much better or less expensively a transit solution might solve a transportation problem, the answer could only be to build more highways.

Over the years however public pressure has steadily mounted for a more rational method of deciding how to solve transportation problems.

In 1963 the Delaware River Port Authority decided to use money from highway vehicle, bridge tolls to finance the Lindenwold Line. In New York the Port of New York Authority decided to do the same thing to finance the acquisition and modernization of the old Hudson Tubes now known as PATH. Chicago taxed automobile parking lots for support of mass transit. In California the legislature authorized the Golden Gate and Bay Bridge Authorities to use automobile tolls to finance transit projects. Then California, Virginia, and Michigan imposed additional gas taxes specifically for transit projects.

In 1970 Congress appropriated one billion dollars a year for five years to finance transit projects on the basis of two-thirds federal money for one-third local money. Unfortunately, the federal and local funding both still came from non gas tax sources.

In 1972 there was a tremendous debate in Congress over the very critical issue of the diversion of gas tax money from highways to transit. A bill was introduced to make three billion dollars of federal gas taxes available for mass transit projects, in those instances in which local governments wanted to use these funds for transit. The basis was four-fifths federal funds to one-fifth local funds. This bill passed the Senate and was supported by the administration in the House. It failed of passage in the final rush for adjournment. To give you some idea of the strength of the transit forces in the House, they prevented passage of any bills for additional highway funds. This was the first time such a thing has happened since 1916.

The bill is being reintroduced and has a very good chance of passage—if for no other reason than that all presently appropriated highway funds will have been exhausted by April of this year. If an accommodation cannot be reached, all existing highway construction activities will grind to a halt at that time.

Of course the amount of the proposed transit appropriation is infinitesimal compared with the federal highway program, but the issue is one of principle. Are gas taxes highway funds or are they transportation funds? The highway forces give lip service to transit, but insist that the people who pay gas taxes expect those taxes to be used for highways. The weakness in their case has been their inability to suggest a source of funds for necessary transit projects.

The transit advocates argue that one dollar spent on transit (in those instances in which transit is the proper solution from an

overall point of view)—one dollar spent for transit will do as much to reduce highway congestion as 3 to 5 dollars spent on highways. They insist that each locality should be free to make its own decision in each case, and not be forced to build a highway in those instances in which it believes transit would provide a better solution.

I foresee passage of the bill in about that form, early this year. When that happens, there will be a host of new rapid transit systems. There will also be a concentrated effort to make existing transit facilities so attractive that anyone who could use transit will prefer it to driving his own car, just as 19,000 people in South Jersey do today.

If my crystal ball is correct, and the bill passes, the future for engineers who are involved in mass transportation looks very bright indeed. In fact, there just are not enough experienced rapid transit engineers in the country to do all of this work. I would not be at all surprised that some of you, who have never even ridden on a transit system, may find yourselves working on transit projects. And if that happens, I can guarantee that you will be just as enthusiastic about rapid transit as I am.

GUARANTEE PROTECTION

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the St. Marys County Commission recently passed a resolution urging Congress to approve a constitutional amendment that would guarantee protection of the unborn from the moment of conception, as well as the retarded, the aged, the infirmed, and others who might be legally defined as nonpersons.

On January 30, I introduced just such an amendment, House Joint Resolution 261 and on April 2, I reintroduced my amendment with seven cosponsors.

The text of the resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the recent Supreme Court decision to legalize abortion has demonstrated the need to speak out against the extermination of unborn children, and

Whereas, We oppose abortion as unjust and immoral in that the right of personal privacy takes precedence over the right of human life, and

Whereas, We further oppose abortion as being contrary to the fundamental principles of morality, and

Whereas, We contend abortion is nothing more than legalized murder and still a criminal action, and

Whereas, We feel that permissiveness in legalized abortion will eventually lead to euthanasia.

Therefore, We, the Board of County Commissioners of St. Mary's County, in order to avert the wholesale slaughter of unborn babies, do hereby urge all citizens to appeal to all U.S. Senators and Representatives and urge the support of the constitutional human life amendment that would guarantee protection not only to the child from the moment of conception, but also the retarded, the aged, the infirmed, the mental and other persons that may be legally defined as a misfit or a non-person, and

We further urge, all citizens to ask support for legislation prohibiting the use of federal funds or tax money for the establishment, maintenance and staffing of abortion centers.

TRIBUTE TO MAYOR F. EDWARD BIERTUEMPFEL

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, today marks a very significant anniversary for my hometown, Union, N.J. April 4 is the 34th anniversary of F. Edward Biertuempfel's assuming the office of mayor.

Mr. Biertuempfel is the dean of the Nation's mayors by virtue of his having held the office longer than any other incumbent in the United States.

He also has indelibly stamped his image on the community that is known widely throughout northern New Jersey as "Biertuempfel's Town."

In a sense F. Edward Biertuempfel has been in politics all his life. Born nearly 79 years ago in Newark—New Jersey's—Ironbound section, Mr. Biertuempfel learned politics at the knee of his uncle Al, a tavernkeeper and an officeholder in the early part of this century.

The future mayor moved to bucolic Union Township with his new bride, the former Christine Arnold, in 1923. Seven years later, he organized the F. Edward Biertuempfel Association and ran for Township Committee as a Republican. During the first of 16 successful autumnal campaigns, he went from street corner to street corner repeating his brief, but effective message—which he also had printed on a card he distributed everywhere he went:

The name is Biertuempfel (pronounced Beer-temple). I'll do all I can to help the taxpayers.

This proved to be a message that has sounded like sweet music to the ears of Union Township taxpayers for more than four decades.

Once in office, Mr. Biertuempfel became the acknowledged leader of Union Republicans, whom he drew under the banner of his association, the name of which was changed to the Regular Republican Club.

Curiously, he did not reach out initially for the title of mayor, a designation he could have obtained simply by passing the word. Instead, he deferred to Charles Schramm, who held the title. "I somehow didn't think I looked like a Mayor," is the explanation Mr. Biertuempfel once gave for declining to accept an honor that was his for the taking.

But on April 4, 1939, Mr. Schramm resigned because a new job was forcing him to move, and the man who did not think he looked like a mayor began his record run at the helm of Union Township's ship of state.

Mr. Biertuempfel and his fellow township committeemen had the foresight to have the township purchase several hundred acres of land that went on the auctioneer's block for unpaid taxes during the depression. In later years, this land bank provided the township with dividends in the forms of tracts for

schools, playgrounds, and many other public building sites.

Until a few years ago, Mr. Biertuempfel's fire-engine red Chevrolet sedan was a familiar predawn sight on Union Township streets. While most of the township was sleeping, Mayor Biertuempfel would be out touring large areas of the township. In this way, he kept his sensitive fingers on the pulse of every neighborhood, noticing potholes requiring repair and checking on work that township employees were supposed to have done the day before.

No matter was too insignificant for him to attend to personally. Newcomers to Union Township learned quickly that the mayor was the man to contact if anything, no matter how trivial, needed doing. Thus it was that distraught pet-owners would call him when their cats were caught in trees. The mayor would personally dispatch a fireman to extricate the animal. In this way, he earned the appreciation of grateful township residents.

An outgoing, gregarious man with an uncanny knack for saying precisely the right thing at the right time, the mayor was in demand as a speaker at various social and fraternal functions in the township. No store opening in Union Township could really be regarded as official until the mayor had cut the ribbon. Sponsors of fundraising drives believed their efforts were doomed to failure unless the local newspaper carried a picture of the mayor signing a proclamation urging support for the effort.

In addition to his strong influence in his home community, Mayor Biertuempfel was a leading Republican in Union County and the State of New Jersey. He served 18 years on the Union County Board of Chosen Freeholders. In 1964, he was a delegate to the Republican National Convention in San Francisco.

Mayor F. Edward Biertuempfel is proud to call himself a politician. He has stated that "politics is my life." And it has been the vehicle of politics that has enabled him to devote his life to public service. Because he has been in politics, he has been in a position to build Union Township into one of the finest residential communities in the State of New Jersey.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I urge you and my fellow Members of the House to join me today in paying a well-deserved tribute to a man who has brought honor to the profession of politics, as we salute the dean of the Nation's mayors, the Honorable F. Edward Biertuempfel, on his 34th anniversary as mayor of Union Township.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, for more than 3 years, I have reminded my col-

leagues 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?"

TRIBUTE TO CALVIN E. WRIGHT

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1973, our country will lose the services of one of the finest public servants I have ever known. On that day Calvin E. Wright, of Boise, District Director, Internal Revenue Service, will retire from his position and from 33 years in county, State, and Federal government service, the past 22 years in IRS.

The individual who follows Mr. Wright will find the greatest of cooperation and strength from his predecessor. Although Calvin Wright and I belong to different political parties, we have been friends for many years and I have always found his advice to be that of a good American who wanted only to improve service to the public. His integrity is of the highest and he has dealt fairly and honestly with all who took to him their tax problems.

John Corlett, the Idaho Statesman's political editor, has written a tribute to Mr. Wright which I insert into the RECORD.

The tribute follows:

WRIGHT WILL RETIRE AFTER 22 YEARS AS IDAHO
IRS CHIEF

(By John Corlett)

"Wright cannot be classed as a politician, as politicians are commonly known. A certain idealism clings to him, but he is always close to reality. He is a perfect gentleman in the vortex of state politics and intrigue. Soft spoken and almost timid, he is yet to be seen in an angry moment. He moves slowly toward the solution of his problems and arrives there with a minimum or no dissention. By keeping

himself above 'dirty politics' he stands out as a refreshing example of how not to play the game, yet paradoxically beats them all. . . ."

I wrote the above in my Politically Speaking column in March, 1941, two years and two months after Calvin E. Wright assumed office as state auditor. He was elected to that post in 1938 and again in 1940 and was to be elected to a third term in 1942.

On April 16, Cal Wright will retire as Idaho's district director of Internal Revenue, a job he has held for 22 years. He confesses that it is the pressures of a tax collector's job that has caused him to retire at age 64.

Somehow I doubt that this will be the end of public service for Cal Wright. This gentle man, truly a paradox in Idaho politics, has much yet to offer to Idaho, probably in apointive positions.

Cal Wright is one of the vanishing breed of those who grew up in the hurly burly of Idaho politics in the Great Depression years. His political training began almost immediately after he graduated from Stanford University in 1930.

His political mentor was the late Gov. C. Ben Ross, who was first elected as chief executive in 1930. And from that year until he was appointed Idaho's Internal Revenue Service director in 1951, Cal Wright was in the middle of Idaho politics.

His last entry into the political arena was in 1950 when he was the Democratic candidate for governor. In a Republican year he was defeated by Len B. Jordan in a campaign noted for being almost completely free of acrimony.

This was one campaign, however, that Wright, to use his words, "tip-toed" too much and allowed himself to get on the defensive. Later he told prospective office seekers that "you can never tip-toe into office, you must develop and be positive on the issues with all the conviction at your command."

In retrospect as one who is Wright's contemporary, I marvel at the rapport that existed between C. Ben Ross and Cal Wright because they were so dissimilar. But Ross saw in Wright the makings of a responsible and effective public official and he proved to be correct.

Cal Wright was then a politician through and through. He loved the life, both in the Democratic party and in public service. But his is a personality that belied the "consummate politician." Democrat though he was, he was basically non-partisan.

The late Tom Heath of Preston, a former Republican state chairman and state senator, said about Wright that "he had the full support of his friends and the full respect of his opponents."

Doubtless future historians will agree that Cal Wright is indeed a "refreshing example" of a different type of politician; a type, in fact that did not exist before him and has not existed since he quit trying for elective office after 1950. Such gentleness and idealism that he exhibited in the face of ruthlessness and in rapport with political giants who oftentimes represented ruthlessness, deserves to be specially recorded.

Wright served his party as Cassia County chairman. He was a prominent Young Democrat. Before he won his first election as Cassia County auditor in 1934, he taught school and worked for the Bulletin in Burley and the Minidoka News in Rupert.

Wright was recognized by his peers through the years as a "good newspaperman," and always in the back of his mind was a yen that perhaps someday he could afford to buy his own newspaper.

He sought and lost the Democratic nomination as state auditor in 1936 when Ross ran against the great Sen. William E. Borah and lost heavily. But in 1938, Wright at age 29, was elected state auditor and he was "hooked" as far as politics was concerned.

In his six years as state auditor, Wright

looks back to two accomplishments. One was his fight against the Republicans to dismantle his authority by creating the office of comptroller. Wright won that battle in the Supreme Court in a landmark suit that is known to just about every law student who has come along since. The constitutionality and authority of the office of state auditor was clearly defined in that suit.

The second accomplishment was his obtaining an appropriation of \$50,000 from the legislature, a big sum in those days, to install the state's first general and uniform accounting system designed for computer accounting.

After he left the auditor's office in 1945, there was a private enterprise hiatus in Wright's life. For a year he published the Minidoka County News and spent some time in business in Wallace. For three years he served as manager of the Raymond Hotel and Greyhound Bus Depot in Lewiston, both owned by the late Tom Boise, sometimes described as a ward-healer type Democratic politician. That was not an apt description of Mr. Boise, but he did have control of the Democratic party process in North Idaho.

Wright was called back into the political wars in 1950 and he handily won the Democratic gubernatorial nomination in a field of three. He lost to Jordan in the general election by 10,500 votes.

In 1951, Mr. Truman was literally a lame duck president. The Senate was holding onto his appointments until after the 1952 election when most everyone assumed a Republican president would be elected.

Wright was nominated as Idaho director for internal revenue. The Idaho senators were Republican Herman Welker and Henry Dworshak. Their respect and friendship for Wright was pre-eminent. They joined in sponsoring Wright and his nomination was promptly confirmed in the Senate. So the personal philosophy of a man whom the late Frank Burroughs, the Republic editor of the once-famous Idaho Pioneer, called a "square-shooter," paid off.

That appellation has paid off even more in the last 22 years. Despite the pressures of being a tax collector, Wright has demonstrated his basic "goodness" in talks before numerous civic and service clubs and other organizations about the job of collecting taxes for Uncle Sam.

He tells his audience that "almost everybody is honest about his income tax returns, which is a tribute to the basic loyalty and patriotism of the American people." Or, he says:

"Every year before April 15 millions of good citizens sit down with income tax form 1040, examine their books and records—and their consciences—and square themselves with Uncle Sam for the cost of the blessings and problems of living in America."

After he gets some rest, it might be smart for the Internal Revenue Service to hire their former Idaho director to spread his tax collecting gospel across the land.

His feelings for the basic goodness of people came through in one of his statements about the reason for his retirement:

"It's the pressures of a tax collector's job, particularly after 22 years in the responsibility, although I have appreciated working with dedicated IRS employees in our difficult and sometimes unhappy duties in enforcing the firm and complex laws of our country. Fortunately, most people understand and are conscientious about their tax obligations to the government."

Wright has never shirked his civic duties and he is proud of his five-year service as Idaho federal chairman for Radio Free Europe. He visited the RFE facilities in 1966 as a member of the American delegation.

Wright and Gwen Sathre of Burley were married in 1929. They have a son and a daughter and nine grandchildren.

THE ENERGY CRISIS IN PERSPECTIVE

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy of the House Committee on Public Works, I have had the opportunity to review a number of speeches, research materials, and other related data.

Recently, Reginald H. Jones, chairman and chief executive officer of the General Electric Co., spoke on the "Energy Crisis in Perspective" before the Commonwealth and Commercial Clubs in Cincinnati, Ohio.

I found the speech informative and interesting and for that reason commend it to my colleagues:

THE ENERGY CRISIS IN PERSPECTIVE

(By Reginald H. Jones)

There has been a shortage of gas and fuel oil supplies this year, and some electric utilities have had problems in keeping up with the demands on their systems. As a result, a few schools and factories have been obliged to close down temporarily, and some of the consumers of heating fuel and electricity have been asked to restrict their use of these energy sources. To Americans, who have taken abundant low cost energy almost for granted, this has been a startling experience.

Furthermore, responsible spokesmen for the gas and oil industries have stated that shortages could persist for about a decade, and our growing dependence on foreign oil and gas supplies could, by the 1980's, pose some serious balance of payments problems and security risks. At the same time, electric utilities have faced unwarranted delays in bringing power plants on line, particularly nuclear power plants, because of the intervention of environmentalists and a nearly chaotic situation with respect to siting and licensing of power plants.

These events have attracted headlines. Some critics have seized upon the current energy shortages to exclaim that unless we drastically slow down our economic growth and industrial progress, we're going to run out of energy sources and everything will some day run down and come to a halt. This is the way the "energy crisis" is portrayed to the general public.

While most knowledgeable people are aware that there is, in fact, an immediate, short-term energy shortage, the public is being led to believe that the U.S. faces an irreversible doomsday crisis.

Now, such a doomsday view could lead to very damaging policy errors in this country, and it is important that the energy situation be clarified.

My purpose tonight is a simple one. I want to take a closer look at this "energy crisis" and in doing so, provide some new perspectives on our energy requirements, on our energy reserves and resources, and on some of the short-term problems and the longer-term solutions that will help forestall an "energy crisis" either in this century, or the next, or the next after that.

U.S. ENERGY CONSUMPTION

First, the United States is a tremendous user of energy. This country would never have become the world's leading industrial nation, with the world's highest standard of living, if we did not have abundant energy available to us. And to continue in this leadership role we must have abundant energy available and use it wisely and with ever greater efficiency.

It's difficult to visualize just what we mean by "abundant energy," but let's look at the huge quantities of each energy source consumed in the United States in 1970 alone.

Coal—We burned 530 million tons of it. That's the equivalent of a pile of coal one mile long by one mile wide by 900 feet high. The energy content of that coal was 1.38 C units. What's a C unit?

In order to compare different energy sources, we need a common measure of their energy content. The British thermal unit or BTU is the amount of energy it takes to heat up a pint of water one degree Fahrenheit. But you can't deal in pints in discussing energy in the quantities we're talking about. So we take 10,000 million British thermal units and make them equal to one C unit—which happens to be just about the amount of energy it takes to heat up Lake Michigan one degree Fahrenheit. One C unit also expresses the energy generated by burning about 400 million tons of coal. In 1970, coal as an energy source in the U.S. accounted for 1.38 C units of energy produced.

Crude Oil—Nearly five billion barrels consumed in 1970. This is the equivalent of a pool of oil one mile long by one mile wide by 1,000 feet deep. Energy content: 2.96 C units.

Natural Gas—At atmospheric pressure as it comes out of a kitchen burner, about 150 cubic miles of natural gas was used in the U.S. in 1970. Energy content: 2.25 C units. This is the equivalent of the energy generated by burning 22 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

Falling Water—Hydropower as an energy source in 1970 corresponds to 75 cubic miles of water falling 1,000 feet—the height of the Empire State Building. Energy content: 0.29 C units. This is the equivalent of the fuel it would have taken in fuel-fired power plants to generate the amount of hydropower used in 1970.

Thus we have an idea of the total energy consumed in the United States, a total of nearly 7 C units in 1970, including only .02 C unit provided by nuclear fuel.

ENERGY SOURCES

Grouped into classes, the fossil fuels (coal, crude oil and natural gas) provided 96% of the energy consumed. A fourth form of fossil fuel—shale oil—is listed because it is a potentially significant energy source of the future.

A second classification of energy source is sunlight which includes hydroelectricity, since waterpower is renewed on a continuous basis by the extractive power of sunlight taking water from the oceans and making it available as rain. As we have seen, hydropower accounted for only 4% of 1970 energy consumption. However, sunlight provides an enormous additional potential energy source, much larger than all others combined.

Finally, we have nuclear fuels. Although nuclear energy accounted for less than half of one percent of the nation's energy input for 1970, in 1972 it was up to about 1%. The uranium 235 isotope is currently significant. The much more abundant uranium 238 isotope is potentially so, as is the element thorium—depending upon the course of future nuclear-reactor developments.

Having clearly established the picture of the United States as a tremendously heavy user of energy—and even granting the future energy potential represented by sunlight and nuclear sources—the "energy crisis" theorists usually go on to paint a picture of runaway growth in energy consumption—such that no reserves or resources could hope to accommodate for long. After an energy boom, they see an energy bust.

The public, upset by the current temporary shortages in heating fuels and natural gas, begins to believe these dire prophecies.

But I talked of new perspectives and, for one of these, we must look back, not forward.

HISTORIC TRENDS

Back in 1850 (the country ran on sunlight, collected via fuel wood, work animal feed, windmills, and waterwheels. Only 6% of the energy input in 1850 came from coal, the first of the fossil fuels.

The 120-year evolution from solar energy in 1850 to fossil fuel energy in 1970 was characterized by several great substitutions. Coal was substituted for wood in furnaces, fireplaces, and stoves during the last half of the 1800's. By 1900 coal was king. In this century, oil and gas are being substituted for coal. And motor fuel in internal combustion engines has been substituted for hay and oats in horses.

Another great substitution has been underway since shortly before the turn of the century. Electric energy generated in a power plant is being substituted for energy generated by direct combustion of fuel on the user's premises. In the last 40 years, the proportion of the country's energy input converted to electricity prior to use has grown from about 9% to about 25%, and is still on the way up. Where the growth of electricity is a reflection of this substitution, it does not represent new energy use so much as it represents a new energy form.

FUTURE TRENDS

Now, the doomsday prophets note that the use of fossil fuels, per capita, has increased 35-fold in the past 120 years. And on that basis, they project such enormous increases in per-capita use of energy that they come up with really frightening figures and a plundered planet in very short order.

But such frightening projections are wrong, because they do not recognize that the use of fossil fuels has replaced other fuels—fuel wood and animal feed—by which people kept warm and managed their work and transportation in years past. When you recognize that fossil fuels have been largely replacements of earlier energy sources, then we find that the true growth of per-capita energy consumption has been much less—only a factor of two, not 35, in 120 years, or about one-half a percent per year. Thus, projected out, this indicates that energy consumption per capita will only increase about 50% by the year 2000.

Expressed in C units, U.S. energy consumption will approximately double between 1970 and 2000, rising from 7 C units in 1970 to 14.9 C units per year in 2000. Thus the total quantity of energy required to get through these decades amounts to 330 C units.

U.S. RESERVES AND RESOURCES

Now with this total requirement firmly in mind, let's take a close and realistic look at our national reserves and resources.

First I think we should make very clear the distinction between mineral energy reserves and resources. U.S. energy reserves are deposits which have already been identified and are recoverable at current costs using current technology. U.S. energy resources include identified but submarginal deposits that cannot be economically recovered at current costs, plus those as yet undiscovered deposits that our geologists and mineralogists have every reason to believe exist. Our energy resources should be recoverable with progressively increasing costs or with progressively improving technology.

Looking first at U.S. energy reserves—already identified and recoverable today—we find a total of 985 C, or nearly three times the 330 C needed to get us to the end of the century. With the major reserves lying so heavily in coal, it is clear that the energy problems between now and the end of the century must be defined in terms of potential shortages in reserves of oil, natural gas, and uranium 235—not in coal, which alone could supply our projected energy needs nearly three times over.

But over the longer range, I believe that

even this presents too bleak a picture—and an unrealistic one in light of our truly vast energy resources. Here even the C unit—adapted to get rid of all those zeroes in helping us conceive of numbers in the tens of millions of millions—seems almost too small a unit to measure our energy resources.

Fossil Fuels.—Including coal, oil, natural gas, and shale oil, add up to a total of 23,800 C units. Add to that Nuclear Fuels—uranium and thorium adding up to 56 million C units. Remember, our total energy consumption in 1970 was 6.9 C units.

Let's put our reserves and resources into the context of future population and consumption estimates. It is our best guess that the U.S. population will stabilize at about a billion people in the next few centuries. Maybe less—who can say? But assume a billion people. In the next few decades we see per capita energy use stabilizing at 500 million BTUs per year, about 50% higher than now. Under these assumptions, energy consumption will rise to about 50 C per year—seven times what it is today—before it levels off.

With these conditions, U.S. fossil fuel reserves—the fuel we can get with today's economics and today's technology—are adequate to run the country for about 50 years. The fossil fuel resources, which require progressively higher fuel prices as they are developed, will be adequate for about 500 years more. Clearly the U.S. is blessed with bountiful energy reserves and resources, even without nuclear energy for which we have resources for a million years.

I suggest that these are not the dimensions of an "energy crisis" in the doomsday sense—one which would have us stopping growth, halting progress, even turning back the clock in terms of our ability to continue to improve the standard of living and to solve some of the serious social problems which only continued use of energy will permit us to solve.

TEMPORARY SHORTAGES

But the concerns about the decade immediately ahead are real, and we must realize that—despite the abundance of our total energy reserves and resources—we have temporarily gotten ourselves into a very tight energy situation. Utilities and other big users are properly concerned about fuel shortages and rising costs. As the National Petroleum Council has pointed out, some near-term shortages are inescapable.

Why? Why this immediate shortage in the face of such bountiful energy sources?

I believe we can identify four significant contributing factors.

It is my strong belief that if we had not regulated the price of natural gas, if we had not had low-cost foreign oil so readily available, if we did not have a major rise in concern for environmental protection, and if the prospect of nuclear energy had not temporarily diverted our attention from coal technology, there would be no talk of an energy crisis today. Indeed, the U.S. would have developed its fossil fuel reserves and would have made plans for earlier development of its vast resources. Even using current technology, coal refineries can supply a full range of clean hydrocarbon products. The Germans did it during World War II. With such development in place, we might now be paying more for energy and might be using a little less, but we would not be faced with the immediate prospects of shortages and depletion of developed reserves.

GAS PRICE REGULATION

Let's look in a little more detail at each of these contributors to current energy shortages. First are the inevitable effects of anchoring the price of natural gas at a level appropriate to the 1950's, while oil and coal prices are allowed to rise along with the prices of other commodities. By 1970, the owner of a gas well got only about half as much revenue as the owner of an oil well producing the same amount of energy.

He even got less than the owner of a coal mine for the energy in his fuel. Naturally, the motivation, for finding new gas declined while at the same time demand soared as the relative price declined.

Large quantities of cheap gas were used for industrial purposes, including generation of electricity, at a cost so low that it made little economic sense to improve plant efficiency to save fuel. The low price of gas also delayed the development of coal gasification and natural gas liquefaction.

LOW COST FOREIGN OIL

The effects of cheap foreign oil were almost as far-reaching as those described for gas. The availability of low-cost foreign oil let Europe, Japan and, to a less extent, the United States save money by importing it. A tremendous world trade was built up for transporting oil from the Mideast to Europe and Japan, and from Venezuela to the U.S. The motivation for developing our domestic petroleum resources simply eroded, while our oil and gas reserves dwindled to the point where we are becoming increasingly dependent upon foreign fuel—with the ratio of reserves to consumption now down to 10 years.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

Third is the shift from coal to oil by the electric utilities. The environmental movement has put increasing pressure on industry to burn clean fuel—especially the steel and electric-utility burners of coal and residual oil. These industries must either burn clean fuel or clean their smoke to get rid of sulphur and soot.

Unfortunately, the technology for refining coal is not ready, having—as we have noted—lagged because of the availability of artificially cheap gas and foreign oil. The technology for cleaning up smoke is not ready either, having lagged through failure on the part of nearly everyone to anticipate the seriousness of the environmental movement. Now these technologies are needed in a hurry—and on a time scale that cannot be met without switching temporarily from coal and residual oil to distillate oil.

NUCLEAR DELAYS

Finally there are the continuing effects of delays in starting up nuclear power plants. Partly because of the intervention of environmentalists and partly because of the growing pains of a new technology, the nuclear plants have not come on stream as fast as expected. Gas turbine power plants, which present little, if any, environmental siting problems, are being rushed into place to fill the gap—producing still another unanticipated demand for gas and distillate oil.

Because of the combined effects of all these factors, we now find ourselves in the temporary fix which many are calling "the energy crisis." Less dramatically stated—and more accurately, I believe, given our vast energy reserves and resources—we are faced with an immediate need for more clean, refined fossil fuel than we thought we would need. But, for lack of timely motivation we haven't developed the ability to produce it.

NEEDED: ENERGY POLICY

How do we effectively deal with this immediate situation? The basic need is for a coordinated national energy policy based on a comprehensive, long term look at the nation's energy needs. As many spokesmen have already stated, one path back to non-crisis energy development would be to allow natural gas gradually to seek its competitive (higher) price level. This would reduce demand and spur the development of large-scale coal gasification.

In developing a national energy policy, our government leaders should also consider ways to encourage more rapid development of our indigenous energy resources of coal, oil, gas, and uranium, and certainly not to reduce the incentives.

There will have to be something of a trade-off here because we will want to continue to take advantage insofar as possible (and while it lasts) of national savings achievable through low-cost imports of oil and liquefied natural gas, paying for them in large part by exports of food and industrial equipment. Much of the cost of imported fuel is the cost of transportation and, insofar as we finance the transportation, payment for this portion of the fuel cost stays with us. Of course, over the span of decades, we expect the price of imports to rise, reinforcing our motivation to develop our own fossil and nuclear resources.

Finally, we will need to move faster in bringing nuclear power plants into commercial operation. We need a more orderly and expeditious procedure for siting and licensing today's nuclear power plants, while pushing ahead with breeder reactor development.

General Electric has a huge stake in the effort to increase the nation's nuclear power capacity, and I have every confidence that we can do it—as a Company and the nation as a whole.

So you can see the energy picture is not a picture of doomsday crisis. We have a temporary shortage of certain clean fuels, the technology of refining coal has lagged for lack of incentives, and we must expect to pay more for energy as the most easily available resources are used up. Over the decades, the availability of cheap foreign petroleum products will come to an end.

ENERGY IN ABUNDANCE

But if we act now to encourage the development of the abundant U.S. energy reserves and resources, and to conserve them through improved energy conversion technology, our nation can return to self-sufficiency through a combination of nuclear and fossil fuel resources.

The best way of all to conserve resources and reduce pollution is to increase the efficiency of energy utilization in all its aspects. We at General Electric view this as a primary responsibility.

In future years still other energy sources may be tapped; we may learn to use solar energy economically on a large scale. But even without that, we need not fear for the future of America on the basis of an energy shortage. The U.S. can run comfortably on its own energy resources for millennia to come.

JOHN HEINZ REPORTS

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress over a year ago, I have sent regular newsletters to citizens of the 18th District of Pennsylvania and I am now inserting in the *Record* at this point a copy of the April, 1973, newsletter:

JOHN HEINZ REPORTS

DEAR FRIEND: The new 93rd Congress is getting down to business and as I start serving you as your Representative here, I want you to know that 1973 looks like it will be an extremely active year for me as well as an important one for you.

Critical and overdue legislation I hope and expect to see House action on this year includes a trade bill to better protect American jobs, a needed private pension reform and reinsurance measure, action to relieve the present energy crisis facing this nation, and a fight against rising food, rent, and other prices through an improved approach to price and wage controls. Quick congress-

sional action on this last item is a must because of the serious failure of so-called Phase III controls.

Moreover, as your U.S. Representative, I am acutely aware of the battle over whether Congress or the Executive Branch will set this nation's priorities. President Nixon has pointed out that failure to hold the line on his recently unveiled \$269 billion budget will result in inflation, higher taxes, and higher interest rates, and I am convinced we must not further penalize either the wage earner or those on fixed incomes. But up to now we in Congress seem unable to agree on how to establish and work within a spending limitation appropriate to available revenues. I personally feel that the Congress must manage its fiscal affairs responsibly, and I have appeared before the Joint Study Committee on Budget Control to testify and present my own bill, H.R. 630, the Government Expenditures Ceiling Act, which establishes a workable spending limitation procedure.

The continued failure of Congress to say "no" to programs that don't work abdicates to the Executive Branch and causes people to lose faith in government and their country. I pledge to continue to work hard to reverse this trend.

MY NEW COMMITTEE HAS BUSY SCHEDULE

I am especially pleased to have been recently appointed to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Our 18th Congressional District is a part of a business and commercial center of national and international importance, yet to my knowledge, Southwestern Pennsylvania has never been represented on this important and far-reaching committee.

We will be particularly active in such areas as public health and environment, transportation, communications and power, and commerce concerns such as no-fault auto insurance, securities, and product warranties.

In fact, my subcommittee, Public Health and Environment, has already been active nearly every day in holding hearings on over a dozen vital health measures up for renewal and other controversial and new proposals for cheaper and better health care. The photo on the previous page was taken at a recent subcommittee hearing and shows me with Chairman Paul Rogers (D-Fla.).

GIVING THE ELDERLY POOR A BREAK

I am trying to ease the hardship imposed last year by an amendment to the Revenue Sharing Act which severely limited social services for the aging, blind and disabled.

That amendment, which was not fully explored in our rush to adjourn, stipulated that in addition to a ceiling of \$2.5 billion, for such programs, 90 per cent of those funds would be spent on persons receiving cash welfare benefits and that only 10 per cent of this limited money be spent on the elderly poor or disabled who are not on public assistance.

The impact of that amendment is only now becoming clear. Many of our aging and disabled do not choose to receive public assistance, preferring to get by on Social Security or small pensions. Nevertheless, they depend on services such as transportation, house-keeping help and recreation to stay active and keep living with independence and dignity.

I have introduced legislation which will free the aging and disabled from this restriction and allow states to fund these programs from their total federal allotment.

My mail prompted me to take a first-hand look at one such service that was in jeopardy of being cut. I visited a senior citizen lounge operated by the Neighborhood Center Assn. on Chestnut St., North Side, and came away with the knowledge that this is one service that is vital to the well-being of our elderly. I had the pleasure of talking with Mrs. Margaret McWhorter, pictured here.

I can't believe that a law would be allowed to exist that forced proud, self-sufficient people onto welfare roles in order to qualify for necessary services. I already have 54 other Congressmen who have co-sponsored my legislation and I intend to work hard to see that it is passed.

AID TO NORTH VIETNAM? HOW ABOUT HERE?

Americans have every reason to believe that an enduring peace has been brought about in Southeast Asia by President Nixon. Hostilities for the most part have ceased, soldiers are being removed, and, most important, our POW's are coming home. I join with all of you who pray this peace is a lasting one.

But among the important issues that remain is aid to North Vietnam. Although I will ask your opinion on this controversial subject on my questionnaire to you later this year, I have taken a strong position opposing reparations or financial aid to North Vietnam.

There is a case for and I would consider supporting help to the innocent victims of that tragic war in the form of humanitarian aid, much the same as when we and others came to the assistance of earthquake, famine, and flood victims wherever they may be. But as to direct aid to North Vietnam, the fact is we didn't invite Hanoi's expansion into the territories of its neighbors and we cannot reward such tactics. We made a serious mistake involving this nation in Vietnam, but Hanoi was also wrong to use military force as an instrument of its own national policy.

Anyone seriously proposing aid to North Vietnam should be prepared to take it out of the defense and foreign aid budgets after we have met our own domestic needs. I would like to see a minimum of five billion dollars now targeted for the military reserved for domestic programs in such areas as health, pollution, education, housing, and community development. As a supporter of a \$269 billion spending ceiling for the 1974 fiscal year starting this July 1, I am convinced that we can live within that figure by taking a hard line on weapons cost-overruns, inflated retirement benefits, and military manpower levels. Our nation has the resources to provide every child a decent education. Perhaps a controversy over aid to North Vietnam will help us see our own needs here at home more clearly and cause us to act on them.

IMPORTANT VISITORS DROP BY OFFICE

We've had some important people visit us lately, namely Miss Barbara Beckman, of Etna, who is this year's Pennsylvania winner in the Voice of Democracy contest sponsored each year by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Barbara and I had a chance to meet and of course, have the traditional picture taken on the steps of the U.S. Capitol. I'm proud of Barbara and her accomplishment, and after reading her prize-winning essay, I'm convinced this country's future is in good hands.

Also helping convince me of that was Edgar Alan Boone, son of Mr. and Mrs. E. A. Boone, 911 Corbet St., Tarentum, who dropped by the office representing the Presidential Classroom of Young Americans program. These are top students who are selected to come to Washington for a first-hand look at what makes this nation run. Edgar was a fine choice and I commend him.

LET'S MAKE WAR ON CRIME AND DRUGS

The recent shooting of Senator Stennis has stimulated debate on how we can best fight crime and the increasing use of drugs, and the threat they pose to the stability of our society.

Drug abuse and addiction is Public Enemy Number 1 and must be combated with a strong effective enforcement program. Moreover, there is a clear correlation between crime and heroin as well as other dangerous drugs. I support mandatory jail sentences for conviction on the second offense for any such drug violation, no pre-trial or pre-sentencing

escape from justice through rehabilitation or treatment, a very high maximum penalty for offenders, especially to give the prosecution a chance to better identify the dealers, and I am seriously considering legislation to make it a federal offense for law enforcement officers to fail to enforce that law in dealing with drug-related crimes.

Although most crime in America does not fall under federal jurisdiction, money to local municipalities to expand law enforcement efforts is available under the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) and I have worked recently to keep those funds flowing into Western Pennsylvania.

INTERNS "SHAPING UP" CONGRESSIONAL OFFICE

My Washington staff has had the opportunity recently to work with a great group of young interns. These bright, energetic young people are encouraged by their schools to work in Congressional offices for limited periods of time for on-the-job training.

On board recently, learning and often teaching the regulars have been Susan Curry, 16, of Sewickley, a junior at the Madeira School; Landa Schmitt, 20, 1138 Greentree Road, a student at Georgetown University; Karen Miller, Blairsville, also from Georgetown, and Rachel Cohan, from Baltimore, a political science major at Goucher College.

Susan returned to school recently and the staff and I presented her with a small token of our appreciation for her hard work. Pictured here looking on as I say good-bye to Susan are, from left, Donna Malvey, Donna Barrett, JoAnne Bode and Steve Connolly.

MY STAFF AND I ARE READY AND EAGER TO SERVE YOU

Speaking of the staff, with the start of the new Congress, I think it's time to "introduce" you to all of them here in Washington, who you may know less well than my assistants in the Pittsburgh district office.

They are trained professionals who, like me, are here to serve you. Feel free, whether you have a problem with your Social Security benefits, the military, immigration, or a request for information, to get in contact with us.

Besides those pictured, others working for you here are my Administrative Assistant, Warren Eisenberg, and Jeannie Alexander, Mike Fruitman, Tim Gillespie, Russ Martz, Dolores Senalis, and Connie Wardrop.

"SPECIAL REPORTS" TO BEGIN

If you would like to be placed on our mailing list to receive periodic special reports I will soon start preparing, send me your name and address on a postcard. These reports will be more detailed on legislative matters and other activities I am involved with to better serve my district. I hope you will find them an additional way to keep informed of what's happening in your government.

It's another way I can serve you, and I cannot emphasize too much that that's why I am here. Through my committee work and my votes in the Congress I will continue to act with your best interest in mind. My door is always open, so please don't hesitate to write or call.

Sincerely,

H. JOHN HEINZ III,
Your Congressman.

OEO RECEIVING LITTLE SUPPORT

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Amarillo, Tex., Globe-Times reports that there is very little

support among lawmakers to keep OEO in operation.

Ever since OEO began, it has been riddled with mismanagement, financial scandals, and irresponsible local leadership.

I insert the following article:

OEO DIES, ENDING \$16 BILLION CAREER

(By Robert S. Allen)

WASHINGTON.—The scandal-splattered Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) is dead as a dodo—and neither Congress, the courts nor the rancorously protesting leftists, professional bleeding-heart agitators, black activists and hard-core welfare recipients can save it.

The ace cards are in President Nixon's hands, and he is certain to win the clangorous fight to junk this malodorous so-called "anti-poverty" agency on which some \$16 billion of taxpayers' money had been spent since it was created by President Johnson in 1964.

Not only does the President have the necessary congressional votes to block continuation of OEO, but time is playing into his hands.

On June 30, end of the current fiscal year, funding for OEO expires. There isn't a chance the more than \$300 million required to keep the furiously controversial Community Action program (crux of the whole uproarious issue) going can be rammed through Congress by that time—or later, for that matter.

The reason is simple. The votes are lacking.

Even if by some parliamentary stratagem or fluke the additional money were approved, the President would be certain to veto it—and that would be the end of that.

The legislation could never be passed over the President's veto. The needed two-thirds votes just aren't there—and even if they were, the President would still have the last word by impounding the money.

Further, there is another important factor operating in his favor—time.

With the fierce opposition that any attempt to preserve OEO is sure to encounter in both the House and the Senate, it's highly improbable new funding could be enacted by the June 30 deadline. The struggle against that would be long and acrimonious both in the Appropriations committees and in the full chambers.

Raiding the Treasury for more hundreds of millions of dollars for the begrimed and widely-assailed Community Action program is the core of the raucous melee over OEO.

Continuance of the Community Action Program (characterized by a leading member of Congress as "the first time in the history of our country the federal government financed the propagating of revolution by subversion and violence") is the sole issue at stake.

The other major OEO programs have been shifted to other agencies and there is no rowing over them. Examples: The generally well regarded Headstart, with a budget of around \$400 million, to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Manpower, with more than \$1 billion for training and related activities, to the Labor Department.

Only Community Action, in which professional poverty workers, inner city activists, career welfare recipients and assorted leftists and other agitators have a direct personal stake in the battleground.

Size and nature of this huge scandal-smear boondoggle is that in the course of its stormy eight years' existence it has cost taxpayers more than \$3 billion.

While OEO's funds (notably for Community Action) run out June 30, its continuance as a statutory agency does not expire for another year—June 30, 1974. That comes about through Congress' enactment last year of a two-year authorization for OEO.

That provision is the basis of the various suits challenging the "constitutionality" of the President's move to rid taxpayers of the costly burden of this overblown, wasteful and trouble-breeding bureaucratic empire.

The assorted OEO beneficiaries and partisans loudly claim the President has no legal authority to junk it, that the agency has a lease on life until June 30, 1974. What the courts will do about that contention remains to be seen. But whatever they do, the President retains one crucial asset.

To keep OEO (meaning Community Action) going after June 30 will require upwards of \$300 million. Only Congress can provide that, and even then the President has the final word by veto, and if necessary impoundment.

The judges can't compel Congress to vote the money, and if somehow one-third of a billion dollars is forthcoming, it remains to be seen whether the President can be compelled to allow it to be spent.

Since Howard Phillips, 32, was named acting OEO administrator three months ago, he has already whittled the inflated Washington staff of 1,500 by one-third. Many employees have been shifted to other agencies. So-called "untenured" workers have been let out.

Phillips, able, forceful and tough, is unmoved by the indignant walls and yowls. The President selected him for the specific purpose of dismantling OEO, and Phillips, is executing the job vigorously and efficiently—and with pleasure.

In 1967, a General Accounting office report scathingly assailed OEO on a number of counts—mismanagement, scandals, bungling, excessive costs, waste and corruption. It was particularly critical of Community Action, charging partisan politics and inciting and participating in riots and other violent disturbances and demonstrations.

NATIONAL FHA WEEK

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues that this week, April 1-7, is National FHA Week. Over one-half million members of the Future Homemakers of America and HERO organizations have chosen as their theme "Explore Roles—Extend Goals."

For over 25 years, the organization, through its FHA and HERO chapters, has provided many meaningful experiences which have enabled young men and women to prepare for their future roles as parents and adult citizens.

Because this organization is integrated into home economics classroom work, it makes learning a tangible experience and affords students the opportunity to make direct contributions to society.

Members of this outstanding group are involved in activities that benefit not only themselves, but also every community member. The organization of Future Homemakers of America effectively bridges the gap between the school, the home, and the community. The FHA program reaches far beyond the "pots and pans" image that many people envision and includes many community action experiences.

In the State of Kansas, there are some 9,500 members in 184 junior and senior high school chapters. This year's na-

CHXIX—703—Part 9

tional president, Miss Nancy Hodgkinson, comes from Kansas.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the contributions these young people have made to their communities over the years. They represent so well the fine ideals we have always honored in American youth.

INNOVATIVE MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAM

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of announcing a new training program for mental health associates at the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Brentwood. I am not only pleased by the structure of this innovative program, but take pride in knowing that it was first implemented in my district.

In the constant search for ways to advance the treatment of the mentally ill, it is refreshing to note the new approach contained in this program. Mr. Speaker, I am, therefore, placing the description of this "friendly" system of treating those in need of psychiatric assistance in the RECORD for my colleagues' perusal:

VA PROVIDES LEADERSHIP IN MENTAL HEALTH CARE

The fact that plain friendship, systematically pursued, can often be a key ingredient in the treatment of mental patients is being demonstrated through a still experimental training program for "Mental Health Associates" at the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Brentwood.

The program is designed to train "therapeutic friends"—non-specialists who can serve as concerned human links between individual patients and the professional treatment team, the hospital at large, other family members and the outside community. Early this year, 11 trainees completed the first half of a two-year cooperative course developed by the Brentwood Hospital and Los Angeles City College. All have been assured positions at the hospital, where four were already employed as nursing assistants and one as a ward secretary. Participants in the course were selected from 180 applicants. Even more hospital employees are to be included in the second group to be chosen.

The need for a non-professional mental health worker has long been recognized, and various training programs have been established to help fill it. The VA's approach, initiated at Brentwood and now being applied in a number of other locations, promises to overcome some of the recurrent difficulties encountered in the use of such workers.

Clinical experience in the hospital, working directly with patients and professional members of the treatment team, is an integral part of the course. This close working relationship, together with emphasis from the outset on the therapeutic value of the new worker's contribution, are said to increase his acceptance by the professionals and permit the effective use.

Throughout the first year, each student worked closely with one patient, serving as his friend and advocate and helping in this relationship both in and out of the hospital. When they join the regular staff, each will assume responsibility for as many as 150 patients.

The results appear to be working out along the lines envisaged when the program was established in late 1971, primarily through

the initiative of Dr. Howard Wallach, a VA psychiatrist, and Mrs. Charla Gallo who is in the Education Service at Brentwood.

"We had an idea," said Dr. Wallach, "that there was a person missing in the mental health profession, a person who would be a liaison between the staff and the patient. We saw someone who could be a friend to the patient, who would know what the social worker and the psychologist and the doctor do, a person who could go into the community and insure that the patient's care didn't end in the hospital, a person who would think that the most important thing is the interpersonal relationship with the patient."

Similar views have been expressed by some of the professional team members who have worked most with the trainees. This is how it was put recently by Esther Johnson, head nurse of a ward where several of the trainees did their clinical work, as quoted in the Los Angeles Times:

"The dependent role that the patients in the mental hospital develop makes it difficult for them to step into the independent life outside. They (the trainees) have been able to follow patients into the community and help with problems they have lost contact with, such as getting a driver's license, applying for federal benefits, or enrolling in school."

The present Brentwood program gives the trainees the option of receiving a certificate after completing one year or taking the full two-year Associate of Arts degree course. The eleven at Brentwood appear determined to go the distance. The course includes a full program of academic work, clinical training at the VA hospital, and additional experience in community institutions. Although somewhat different approaches are being tried at the other VA hospitals, in each case the hospital provides clinical training and VA staff members participate in curriculum development and teaching.

According to Mr. John Vallance, Director of the Brentwood Hospital, it is this combination of extensive clinical training and the active involvement of professional hospital staff that has proved to be the program's most promising innovation.

"We believe," he said, "that our staff and these pioneer students, together with their colleagues elsewhere in the VA system, may have made an important advance in the care of mental health. We need much more experience, and thorough evaluation before we can draw firm conclusions. If these new workers can help to smooth the return of mentally ill veterans to a more normal life, it will be a significant gain. There seems to be good reason to believe that they can, and that the gains in patient satisfaction may be applicable to other fields of health care. Surely, we are gratified by the response thus far by patients, trainees and members of the treatment teams."

THE CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES SECURITY ACT OF 1973

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I will soon be introducing the Controlled Substances Security Act of 1973 in the House of Representatives. For too long, dangerous narcotics have been criminally diverted from proper channels due to faulty security procedures. My proposal would involve the Attorney General in establishing complete and proper security standards for manufacturers in the storage and shipment of schedule II controlled

substances. These substances are considered to be highly addictive. Such narcotics as methadone, morphine, and types of amphetamines are listed in schedule II. Methaqualone, while not yet scheduled, will most likely be listed in schedule II. The Attorney General will have the authority to inspect places of manufacture to insure that proper standards are observed. Further, the right to suspend a manufacturer's license upon the loss of narcotics, or upon the failure to observe proper standards will be given the Attorney General.

The fight against drug addiction and illegal drug trafficking should involve us all. I welcome the cosponsorship of my colleagues on this proposal.

APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, I have come across an interesting article in the Wall Street Journal, which discusses the inflationary pressures which may result from low interest rates. The article analyzes not only several problems relating to rates of interest and capital investment, but also several alternative solutions.

In the past couple of weeks Washington has urged banks to keep their prime interest rate down. But as the article points out, low interest rates may only stimulate businessmen to borrow additional capital for investment, producing further inflationary pressures in an already booming economy.

In order to counter these pressures, economists suggest some kind of restraint of the sort that somewhat higher interest rates might help provide.

With the extension of the Economic Stabilization Act soon to be taken up by the House, I recommend this article to all my colleagues. I believe it will help clarify some of the issues.

The text of the article is printed below:
THE OUTLOOK—APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS
IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE
(By Lindley H. Clark, Jr.)

"The lower the rate of interest, the more substantial will be the style of building used for the hat-making factories and the homes of the hat-makers; and a fall in the rate of interest will lead to the employment of more capital in the hat-making trade in the form of larger stocks of raw material, and of the finished commodity in the hands of retail dealers."

Alfred Marshall, in his classic "Principles of Economics," thus pointed out the effect of lower interest rates: when credit is cheaper, businessmen tend to use more of it. And, in the past couple of weeks, the government has been trying to persuade the banks to keep down their interest rates on loans to business. Is Washington trying to stimulate a vast increase in the output of hats?

That would be nonsense, of course. Nearly everyone now recognizes that the economy is already booming, moving steadily closer to the limits of its resources. If manufacturers try for further sharp increases in produc-

tion—of hats or anything else—they soon will be bidding against one another for the available resources, and putting even more upward pressure on prices.

What the economy could use now, in the view of most economists, is a little restraint, of the sort that somewhat higher interest rates might help provide: when credit is costlier, businessmen tend to use less of it. So it wouldn't be reasonable, right at the moment, for the government to be trying to encourage cheap credit for businessmen generally.

But that may not be what the government has in mind. Amid all the discussion of whether a proper prime rate should be $6\frac{1}{4}\%$, $6\frac{1}{2}\%$ or $6\frac{3}{4}\%$, there was some conversation about a "two-tier" prime rate. (The prime rate used to be the fee the banks charged their highest-rated borrowers; what it is now is still uncertain.)

The idea of a two-tier prime seemed to appeal to Arthur Burns, the man who has the uncomfortable job of heading both the Federal Reserve Board and the administration's Committee on Interest and Dividends. Under such a split-level rate, said Mr. Burns, large companies with access to national money markets could get one prime rate, which would move in line with other market rates.

Another rate would apply to smaller businesses, which rely chiefly on local sources of funds. According to Mr. Burns, banks would observe "special moderation" with respect to rates for smaller firms.

How this would work in practice is anyone's guess. It's true that many small firms now borrow at rates a certain number of percentage points above the prime rate. It's also true, though, that many solidly profitable small companies borrow from their local banks at the prime rate—or below it.

The fact that a business is small should not by itself guarantee easy access to credit. Some small businesses, like some larger ones, may already be over-extended. Some may be badly located or simply badly managed. Neither the Federal Reserve, the CID nor the local bank does anyone any real favor by pushing good money after bad.

Of course, some of the recent confusing conversation involved more than an effort to distinguish between big and small businesses. Some banks thought that the CID might worry a little less about the prime rate if they promised faithfully to hold down their rates on mortgage loans and consumer credit.

From a purely economic point of view, though, it may not be wise to encourage a further large expansion of housing and consumer credit. For some time, economists have been hoping for a little slowdown in housing; the hope is that such a slowdown will moderate the boom and help to keep it from exploding into more inflation.

So far the hope remains unfulfilled. Meanwhile, consumer credit pushes to ever-higher levels, and at least some economists are beginning to wonder whether the public isn't overdoing the buy-now-pay-later notion. Nearly all economists would agree that the nation does not now need a sharp new surge in housing and consumer debt.

But there really was no reason why economists should have understood the recent conversation about interest rates. Participants in the discussions weren't talking economics; they were talking politics.

The political fact is that the administration is trying to get Congress to extend the President's wage-price authority for one year, and to do so in a fairly flexible way. Some critics of the administration, however, have been pushing proposals to freeze all prices—and interest rates. The hope apparently is that a hold-down on the highly visible prime

rate will help to head off an interest rate freeze.

An interest rate freeze would be an administrative monstrosity, to say the least. Money markets would cease to function. Some lenders presumably would simply refuse to lend. But no such considerations deter politicians who believe that credit should always be both abundant and cheap.

Alfred Marshall long ago saw the conflict between politics and sound economics—and did his best to steer clear of it. "Economics," he said, "avoids as far as possible the discussion of those exigencies of party organization, and those diplomacies of home and foreign politics of which the statesman is bound to take account. . . ."

Economics, Mr. Marshall said, helps the statesman to determine what is best for his country and also how to achieve it. "But it shuns many political issues, which the practical man cannot ignore: and it is therefore a science, pure and applied, rather than a science and an art."

Perhaps such a division was possible in Mr. Marshall's turn-of-the-century England. But in the U.S. in 1973 economists may need more art than science to persuade politicians to permit interest rates to perform their traditional role in restraining an economy that's in danger of overheating. As the demand for credit pushes against a restricted supply, a free interest rate channels credit to its potentially most productive uses.

If the economists aren't artful enough we may be in danger of drowning in a sea of hats.

H. CLARK JR.

IN MEMORY OF MARTIN LUTHER KING

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the ideals of brotherhood and justice are as old as civilization itself, but these ideals were never expressed so eloquently, or believed in more deeply, as they were by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

What was extraordinary about Dr. King was not the fact that he possessed these beliefs, for many people do, but rather, the extreme depth and strength of his commitment to insure that someday all men would be able to live in dignity with equal rights and opportunities.

Martin Luther King refused to remain silent when he encountered injustice. His moral conscience would never permit him to compromise his principles and beliefs. Whether it was a boycott of buses in Birmingham, or Dr. King's support for a strike, the people concerned knew that his involvement would not end until their goals had been achieved.

It has now been 5 years since the tragic assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. As we commemorate the memory of this man, we should further commit ourselves to the goals that he pursued. It is our responsibility to see that the ideals that Dr. King represented, lived, worked, and ultimately gave his life for are someday a reality.

WOUNDED KNEE

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 4, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut has recently issued a proclamation on the situation at Wounded Knee, S. Dak., urging the Congress to take immediate steps toward resolving the crisis. This resolution demonstrates that many people, and not only those in South Dakota, believe that this is an issue of ma-

for importance. I would like to bring this proclamation to the attention of my colleagues:

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS CONCERNING THE CRISIS IN WOUNDED KNEE, S. DAK.

Resolved by this Assembly:

Whereas, the people of Connecticut and the nation are increasingly disturbed by the worsening situation in Wounded Knee, South Dakota, seized two weeks ago by members of the American Indian Movement; and

Whereas, negotiations between the leaders of the Indians and representatives of the United States Department of Justice and Interior have so far failed to resolve the dispute; and

Whereas, lives and property are in jeopardy as the crisis deepens;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the general assembly of the state of Connecticut urges the Congress of the United States to take prompt action to restore peace to the historic hamlet of Wounded Knee and to investigate the claims of the American Indian Movement to determine their validity and the necessity for federal response to these claims; and

Be it further resolved, that the Clerks of the House and Senate cause a copy of this resolution to be sent to the speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate and the members of the United States Congress from Connecticut.

SENATE—Thursday, April 5, 1973

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 4, 1973)

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. following the recess, and was called to order by Hon. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, a Senator from the State of Maine.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, in whom we trust, put Thy hand upon the Members of this body to guide and strengthen them throughout this day and beyond. Bless them as they think together and work together in committee rooms and in this Chamber. Sustain them in moments of stress and tension. In weakness impart Thy strength, in fatigue give them renewal. Grant to them the moral and spiritual stamina to walk in paths of righteousness that they may fulfill their high calling in service to this Nation and in the advancement of Thy kingdom on earth.

We pray in the name of Him who went about doing good. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1973.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, a Senator from the State of Maine, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HATHAWAY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 4, 1973, be approved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination on the calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the nomination.

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Luther W. Jenne-jahn, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I request that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

MR. NIXON VERSUS THE CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Christian Science Monitor of April 4, 1973, there was a very worthwhile, pithy editorial, entitled "Mr. Nixon Versus the Congress." I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. NIXON VERSUS THE CONGRESS

A sentence in yesterday's report in this newspaper from our correspondent at San Clemente jolted us into a new concern about the state of affairs which now exists between the President of the United States and the Congress.

The report was discussing prospects for a continued flow of economic aid from the United States to the government of South Vietnam headed by Nguyen Van Thieu. This, it seems, was the main subject at San Clemente when President Thieu had his first meeting on U.S. soil with President Nixon.

"Administration officials," our correspondent wrote, "acknowledge both Presidents will have to improve their relations with the U.S. Congress first."

Here indeed is a startling change in affairs. Economic aid from the United States to South Vietnam has never before been in slightest serious question. True, Senate doves have long been chanting slogans about bringing the dollar home. And all of us have known for several weeks now that the Nixon program for economic aid to former enemies in North Vietnam was in trouble. It is in obviously greater trouble now that returning POWs have so much to say about torture. But until now economic aid to the people the United States has so long been supporting in South Vietnam has never before been in serious question.

In the past the use of dollars, credits and supplies of all kinds to sustain the non-Communist government in Saigon was just as routine a part of Washington life as the annual rivers and harbors bill, or apple pie. Yet now we are told that if President Thieu is to be assured of a regular and continuing flow of economic aid he himself will have to do his own lobbying with the leaders of the Congress of the United States. That flow is no longer something President Nixon can grant or withhold at White House pleasure. It is something that can be had only if President Thieu helps President Nixon persuade the leaders of the Congress to do what both want them to do.

Five months ago Richard Nixon was re-elected President of the United States by one of the great landslides of political history. Yet today—such a short time later—he has less influence over the Congress than he had during the first four years which were built on one of the narrowest of political victories. We are left to ponder the phenomenon of why a landslide is worth less in influence with the Congress than a narrow victory.

A large part of the explanation is probably to be found in the tone of voice used by