

and Welfare; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 6826. A bill for the relief of Viviana Giovannetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 6827. A bill for the relief of Arle Aviv (also known as Arle Abramovich); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 6828. A bill for the relief of Edith E. Carrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H.R. 6829. A bill for the relief of Mr. Jose

Antonio Trias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

149. Petition of the county council, county of Hawaii, Hilo, Hawaii, relative to Federal subsidized housing and community development programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

150. Also, petition of Tommy Brack, Scottsboro, Ala., and others, relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

151. Also, petition of Leslie A. Bates and other members of the Fraternal Order of Police, Lodge No. 70, Anne Arundel County, Md., relative to protection for law enforcement

officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

152. Also, petition of Harold Shea, Vineyard, N.J., and others, relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

153. Also, petition of Thomas M. Maloli, Bridgeville, Pa., and others, relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

154. Also, petition of Jim Drake and others, Claremore, Pa., relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

155. Also, petition of S. A. Hill, Palmerton, Pa., and others, relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

156. Also, petition of George P. Stack, Williamsport, Pa., and others, relative to protection for law enforcement officers against nuisance suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DR. RAYMOND PAZ OF LAS CRUCES,
N. MEX.

HON. PETE V. DOMENICI

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have on several occasions risen to speak before this distinguished body in praise of our fine New Mexico citizens. Today, I again stand to commend the work of one such man, Dr. Raymond Paz of Las Cruces, N. Mex. Dr. Paz was born in New Mexico, as was his father; he has a true love for the outdoors. By profession he is an optometrist, but he has given many years of his life to promoting outdoor recreation in our State. He has served on the Las Cruces Park and Recreation Board for the past 18 years and presently serves on two State committees—the Recreation Priorities Advisory Committee and the special ad hoc Committee on Solidar Canyon. He is chairman of the Recreation and Open Space Committee of the Southern Rio Grande Council of Governments and serves on the executive committee of the commissioners and board members branch of the National Parks and Recreation Association. I believe he serves as a fine example to millions of Americans who enjoy the outdoors; not only does he enjoy the environment, but he has given many years of his life to its preservation and development.

Dr. Paz recently was asked to participate in the dedication ceremony of the Aguirre Spring Recreation Site in the Organ Mountains 12 miles east of Las Cruces. Dr. Paz' love for the mountain, that has for years been part of the cultural heritage of his city, prompted him to write an inspiring poem about Organ Mountain. I think it reflects his deep love and respect for the earth and I request unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE CALL OF THE MOUNTAIN (By Dr. Raymond Paz)

I was created long before you,
To prepare this haven for your coming.
My mission is to serve you.
I need you to justify my being.
My friends—the Sun and Moon,
The Clouds, the Rain and the Snow,
All favor me with their graces,
And adorn me to delight you.
My gifts to you I offer,
And beg you to accept them.
And for your gracious kindness,
I shall give you lasting peace.
I offer you Adventure,
To challenge the spirit of youth,
And exhaust the youthful energy.
I offer you Beauty,
To delight the human senses
With reflections of our Creator.
I offer you Inspiration,
To lighten your weary spirit,
And dissipate the worries of life.
I offer you Peace,
To make the image of God
Glow with celestial splendor.
So come, come to me joyfully,
And drink deeply of the sweet refreshment
That I have for you
And your joys will be without ending.

WAYNE, N.J., SEEKS FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, the ever-mounting threat and crisis proportion potential of flooding in many areas of the United States hang like a "sword of Damocles" over our people. We have witnessed billions of dollars of property damage and untold misery in loss of life and personal possessions that have taken place over the years throughout our country. Congressional authorizations that have been written into our Nation's law books have been successful in many instances in bringing flood control measures to the people. In some instances, however, in seeking to implement these laws there is a long drawn out process of

study after study prompted by tremendous growth and development in the area where exploding populations have caused ever-changing patterns of consideration between each study, and finally we are faced with a problem of such magnitude in some of our regions that the community and the State can no longer afford the fiscal resources to provide the remedial action at hand.

This has occurred in the State of New Jersey, and particularly in the Passaic River Basin. A catastrophic flood in 1903 commenced the beginning of over a half-century of studies in this river basin and we have continued to experience heavy flooding and property damage, particularly since 1968 when on several occasions it became necessary to declare states of emergency in this region of our State through the exercise of the offices of the Governor and the President.

Prior to my coming to Congress in 1969, when I served in the Governor's Cabinet of New Jersey as Commissioner of Conservation and Economic Development, we were successful in securing the State's approval of the Army Corps of Engineers Comprehensive Plan for Flood Control-Water Resources Management and Development in the Passaic River Basin known as plan III or plan C. The State Legislature had adopted a resolution attesting to this plan as "the best plan" for the State of New Jersey and the Governor, on behalf of the State, had certified approval of the plan to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

This week the corps is planning another public meeting to discuss still another alternative plan for the Passaic River Basin relating to the flood control aspects only and having as one of its major variations the use of dry detention basins for the water supply reservoirs recommended by Comprehensive Plan III.

Meanwhile, the flooding problems persist and on February 23, 1973, in an effort to apply the Army Engineers and Public Works Committee's authorizations under sections 201 and 205 of the Flood Control Act of 1965 the Subcommittee on Investigations and Review of the Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, held hearings at the

Ridgefield Borough Hall in New Jersey. At these hearings we received testimony from municipal officials, engineers, and residents of the area on the frequency, extent of damage, consistency and consequences of flooding caused by certain streams and tributaries in the Bergen, Hudson, and Passaic County areas of New Jersey as well as the impact that flooding has had on the residents in the communities surrounding these waterways. It was significant to note that each of the communities represented at the hearings were well prepared with supportive data including technical and engineering studies and corrective measures to cope with the flooding problems of their respective areas with the only real obstacle being the fiscal resources to accomplish the remedial action.

Mr. Speaker, in testimony to the foregoing facts, I am pleased to present to you today a copy of the report of Wayne, N.J., which was presented at the Public Works Committee's flood control hearings in February to acquaint you and my colleagues here in the House with the continuing perseverance and hard work of the governing officials of communities in the flood-stricken areas in their deep concern for the people of the region and the frustrations that are being encountered in having the solution at hand but unable to implement it because of the lack of fiscal resources. With your permission I would like to insert the Wayne Township's report at this point in the Record with my compliments for the excellence of their report to Mayor Newton E. Miller; Councilmen Thomas Elm, Jr., Walter Jasinski, Charles Kabbash, James A. Mingo, Estele Perry, Leonard Pine, Harry F. Rudiger, Joseph Vadala and David Waks; and additional plaudits to Kenneth R. Mahony, business administrator; Anthony Buzzoni, public works director; and Lawrence Bednarz, assistant engineer; who participated in Wayne's formal presentation at the flood control hearings. The substance of the report is as follows:

FLOODING SITUATION REPORT, WAYNE, N.J.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this presentation is to acquaint the Congress with the flooding problems within northern New Jersey and Passaic County generally, and within Wayne Township specifically; to acquaint you with the possible solutions and steps taken by Wayne to effect these solutions and further to solicit the assistance of the Congress in carrying out program's beyond the scope of the single municipality, Wayne.

METHOD

The time available being too brief to even summarize the problem, briefing books are being presented, giving in greater detail, the situation as we see it and the proposed solutions. Attached by reference is the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers report entitled "Passaic River Basin" published in June of 1972. Enclosed is one set (5 volumes) of the Wayne Township Drainage Study completed in August of 1972.

PROBLEM

Wayne Township consists of 27.2 square miles bordered on the northeast and southeast by hilly terrain and on the west by the Ramapo, Pompton and Passaic rivers, 3.6 square miles in the flood plain. The major flood of record is the 1903 flood. Serious flooding has occurred each year since at all seasons of the year. Major flooding tragedies have occurred periodically since with the

spring flood of 1968 tropical storm "Doria" in 1971, "Agnes" in 1972 and the February floods of 1973 being the most significant. Three different types of flooding occur: 1) internal flooding caused by water runoff, 2) peripheral flooding caused by surcharge of the river beds, and 3) internal flooding caused by river and stream backup.

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

The Army Corps of Engineers has addressed the types 2 and 3 (above) in the "Passaic Basin" report and in their recommended action, Plan III and amendments. The Township of Wayne is addressing a partial solution to types 2 and 3 (above) in a current study by a consultant on the possible use of Beaties Dam improved by hydraulic gates; to lower the peaks of flood water in the Wayne area. Wayne Township has further attempted to reduce flood damage by the purchase of "Flood Way" land in the Old Wayne Park area. Pequannock Park area and in the Buttonwood area. Some land has been acquired but so far, Green Acres and Open Space funds have been denied. Wayne Township has conducted extensive and detailed studies of the runoff problems of type 1 flooding. River dredging is a possible partial interim solution.

DISCUSSION OF POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

1. Army Corps of Engineers, Plan III as amended: the pre-amended plan would provide greater benefit to Wayne Township. Even the relief offered by the amended plan would be welcome. This program is entirely outside the capability of any municipality or group of municipalities to implement. Wayne Township supports the plan without reservation.

2. Beaties Dam Hydraulic Gates would benefit Wayne Township lowlands by lowering the flood crest by an as yet undetermined level. Costs also are unavailable. The study when complete, will provide cost/benefit data as well as possible down stream effects and will be forwarded to you upon completion. Indications are that this project is outside the scope of municipal accomplishment both as far as cost and the fact that nearly all work is outside of Wayne Township.

3. Purchase of and return to the natural state, of lands in the floodway areas are classic methods of reducing flood damage and reducing flood intensity by limiting stream encroachment. Approximately \$20 million would be necessary to produce noticeable results in Wayne Township alone.

4. Dredging of the river has been attempted in several areas, namely on the Pompton River where the river divides Lincoln Park and Wayne and on the Ramapo River within Pompton Lakes. Since the river is in most parts the municipal boundary, cooperative agreements are necessary to effect the completion. Lincoln Park cooperated with Wayne and some deepening, desnagging and straightening was accomplished. Passaic County was less than cooperative. Fairfield, Pequannock and Little Falls showed no interest. By allowing continued silting and debris island buildup, the flow is impeded and slowed along with increasing the related turbulence. A regional authority could assist in establishing proper river profiles and maintaining them through dredging.

5. Internal drainage work has been emphasized by Wayne Township. Since the 1971 tragedy of Hurricane Doria, the Township has bonded over \$6 million for drainage. This is a continuing program. In September of 1971, the Township Council authorized a comprehensive drainage plan and Photogrammetric Topographic Mapping (1"-100, 2" contour intervals.) These studies will result in an additional \$5-\$6 million in drainage improvements over the next 5 years. Internally the results have been gratifying. The Township has modified its internal design criteria for drainage from a 10 year storm capacity to a 30 year storm capacity.

Wayne Township is the first municipality

in New Jersey to implement the 1973 New Jersey Flood Plain Law declaring a moratorium on construction in the flood plain until State regulations are completed. This legislation was passed by the Council on February 21, 1973.

6. Organization for flood emergency can alleviate suffering and avoid confusion. Wayne has a "Citizens Flood Committee" to advise the Mayor and Council on flood related matters. The Wayne Civil Defense Emergency Operations Center is skilled and unfortunately much practical experience has been gained in actual emergencies. All senior officials have completed the Rutgers University 16 hour Emergency Simulation Training Course. The Standard Operating Procedures of the Township are much studied and widely used throughout the State.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Major river and retention basin work is beyond the capability of any agency except the Federal Government. This work must be done.

2. Return of the "flood way" to its natural state is in the best public interest.

3. Cooperation as a method of doing work affecting multiple governmental units is unsatisfactory and therefore a regional authority controlling all aspects of water policy and flood control is needed.

4. Interior drainage and stream improvement is basically a local responsibility and must be handled as quickly as the finances of the affected municipalities permit.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CONGRESS

1. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers recommended Plan III for the Passaic River Basin be implemented expeditiously.

2. Funds be made available to States, Counties and Municipalities to purchase lands within the floodways of major rivers to be returned to the natural condition as conservation areas.

3. The Corps of Engineers be directed to identify high impact subprojects within Plan III for early implementation.

4. Funds be made available on a sharing basis to municipalities to resolve interior drainage problems associated with runoff and tributary streams.

5. An authority (including New York and New Jersey) be established to control all aspects of water policy and flood control within the Passaic River Basin.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to point out that remedial action suggested by Wayne Township and other municipalities who appeared at the flood control hearings in New Jersey can be accomplished in concert with the Army Engineers comprehensive plan for the Passaic River Basin, whether it be the previously State-approved plan III or the alternative plan II-B which will be considered at the public meeting to be held in my congressional district this week.

We are hopeful that as soon as the findings of the hearings have been properly reviewed and evaluated that we will be able to secure constructive Federal assistance to provide relief to these flood-stricken areas.

Thank you for your attention and consideration.

LET US STAY CLEAR OF QUAGMIRES

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., Mr. President, the April 9 edition of the Philadel-

phia Inquirer included an excellent editorial on the present situation in the Philippines and the relationship of the United States to that country.

President Marcos of the Philippines has requested increased military assistance from the United States. The editorial points out—correctly, in my judgment—that while America maintains important military bases in the Philippines, these installations are for protection of U.S. global interests and not for protection of the Philippine Government against insurrection.

As the editorial points out, it is vital that the United States resist any temptation to become involved in another distant guerrilla war.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial, "Let Us Stay Clear of Quagmires," be included in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

LET'S STAY CLEAR OF QUAGMIRE

President Ferdinand E. Marcos has been making frequent and pressing appeals for the United States to increase its military assistance to the Philippines. The consensus around Washington has it that the reaction within the U.S. government runs from cautious to chilly.

We will be pleased if it remains that way. The United States, it is often cited, has a special relationship with the Philippines, based largely on their colonial relationship from 1898 to 1946.

We believe the happiest aspect of that bit of history—from both parties' standpoints—is that it ended, and that the island republic is independent. The U.S. has subsequently and rightly made vast contributions of money, advice and such acts of friendship to the Philippines, all honorable gestures.

The Philippines has prospered from all that, and reasonably so; it also has maintained something which often has more closely approximated a democratic government than those of most other tropical Pacific nations.

In the last few months, President Marcos has suspended many of those democratic processes, on the argument that stable government is threatened by internal dissent and incipient guerrilla rebellion. It is to answer this putative threat that he seeks increased military support from the U.S.

Under treaty arrangements, the U.S. maintains in the Philippines its most important military and naval garrisons in the western Pacific. They are vital and they must be maintained.

But they are there to protect American global interests, not to support a foreign government against domestic disruption. We find even the small-scale involvement of American Special Forces teams in the Philippine countryside to be ominous, and believe it should be curtailed.

But most importantly, the American government must withstand every temptation and unseen tripwire that would involve it in an Asian—or any foreign—guerrilla war.

The one we're just emerging from in Indochina makes a case beyond caution.

TRUE CONSERVATION

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in recent months we have heard

a great deal of discussion about conservation and enhancement of our environment and many have spoken out as to what this Federal agency should do about it or what steps that Federal agency should take.

I am mighty proud in the Second Congressional District of California there is one area which did not wait for Uncle Sam or some other governmental entity to take the lead.

Trinity High School in Weaverville, Calif., serves an area which is largely federally owned. One would normally think that this community would turn to the major landowners for the direction in conservation moves. This is not true. The students and faculty at Trinity High School have established a conservation class.

This class has undertaken a variety of projects. In these they work in cooperation with the Federal agencies such as the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the State department of fish and game and the county farm adviser; but for the most part the initiative has been from the class and certainly the work has come from the students.

Let me cite some of the examples of the conservation class project which have been carried out this school year.

In cooperation with the California Fish and Game they have worked with the Lewiston Fish Hatchery in spawning fish, mucking ponds, cleaning screens, pulling weeds along ponds, cleaning out dead fish, picking dead eggs out of trays, and taking care of the carcass count on the river. In regard to assisting in bear research they have aided in setting culvert traps, removing bears from traps, weighing and measuring bears, tagging and moving bear to new areas if needed.

Further, they have helped in making Kokanee counts in Trinity River watershed. This is a management measure to detect increase or decrease in Kokanee population. As there are two separate runs, one in December and one in early fall, the group does a lot of wading and counting.

This brings us to a project that was carried on by the group to make it possible for spawning Kokanee to get up some of the streams. High water in the previous spring has washed debris, logs and sand into some of the channels. Since spawning takes place in periods of low stream flow—fish could not get through. So the group cleaned these streams wherever necessary.

Some streams off tributaries to the Trinity River were found to be barren of fish. The group measured their length, checked water temperature and natural food sources in hopes small steelhead could be planted.

In November the group organized and chaired a 2-day symposium on Trinity River problems. There were five Federal agencies and two State agencies represented. In addition Southern Pacific Land Co. and Pacific Gas & Electric represented private industry and numerous county agencies were on hand. This was a successful effort to establish better lines of communication between the administrators of the Trinity River project and the people of Trinity County.

This led to a survey by the student group of people living in the Trinity

flood plain to determine their feelings on flood plain zoning. These feelings to be passed on to the Trinity County Board of Supervisors.

Members of the group are taking turns visiting the eight feeder schools in the district to present slides or film of their fieldwork. They accompany these films with discussions concerning why and how these projects are carried out and relate these to conservation of natural resources.

Marlin Lee, Jennifer Proffitt, Christy Forero, and Diane Westbrook are deserving of special recognition since they provided the leadership necessary to carry the conservation message to other schools in the county and especially to the elementary schools. Others making a significant contribution are as follows:

Steven Abrams, Burke Adrian, Fred Anderson, Don Anondson, Larry Beckhaus, Richard Berrian, Cherie Bickle, Doyle Blaney, Curt Blough, Dan Chalmers.

Pat Chapman, Mike Dugan, John Eaker, Val Goodrich, Lori Green, Steve Harwell, Robbie Johnson, Jim Jopson, David King, Andrea Laing.

Keith Larkin, David Leavell, Fred Maddox, Mike Martin, Rich Martin, Sam Martin, Scott Morris, Ken Muir, John Payton, Jody Proffitt.

Tim Quinn, Jane Reese, Joe Rouchleau, Mark Smith, Michelle Spinola, Charlie Spratt, Star Trepanier, Jim Underwood, Pete Van Matre, and Gayle Weckerle.

This is not a complete list of student activities but I do want to call to the attention of my colleagues, the effort and dedication and hard work which has been put into it to make their program successful. Here, my friends, is where we will ultimately win the conservation battle of our environment, here at home and especially with the young people who are receiving in high school an indoctrination in practical conservation and this will follow them through their lives.

OUR PRESENT FARM PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAMS AND WHO ITS BENEFICIARIES ARE

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, one of the most accurate analyses of our present farm price support programs, and who its beneficiaries are, is contained in an editorial of the Minot Daily News of Minot, N. Dak., March 31, entitled "The End of a Good Deal?"

The farm price support program has been of great benefit to farmers, but few people realize that consumers also benefit as well and probably even more than farmers. If it were not for our abundant supplies of farm commodities made possible by the price support program, we would not have been in a position to export \$11 billion worth of farm commodities this fiscal year and still have adequate supplies to take care of our own consumers—and at a reasonable price.

It is true that prices of some farm commodities have risen, but if history

repeats itself, and it usually does, this will only be a temporary situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Minot (N. Dak.) Daily News, Mar. 31, 1973]

THE END OF A GOOD DEAL?

This outburst of housewives' talk of meat boycotts may be a signal that shoppers are catching a glimmer of what lies ahead.

A slow realization may be dawning that administration intentions in farm policy are moving in the direction of ending the good deal which Americans have had in food buying for the last 40 years.

Something deeper than concern about the current price of meat may well be agitating the customers. Perhaps they are beginning to realize that if the farmers are no longer to receive direct incentives to stabilize production and marketing, it will be the consumers who will suffer.

The milling and baking industry did not take kindly to the federal programs of production and marketing controls when they were first instituted. But the millers and bakers have lived with this system for quite a while now, and they know very well what it means to the consumer.

Morton I. Sosland, editor of Milling and Baking News, puts it this way: "To a great extent, U.S. farm programs that began in the 1930s have been more of a cheap-food subsidy to American consumers than their more widely criticized and publicized role as a subsidy to American farmers."

If federal farm programs—the so-called subsidy programs—are phased out, as Secretary Butz says the goal is, the era of abundant food in America at moderate prices will end with them. These programs have served to moderate the forces which would operate in a free market. These forces will inevitably, in the long run, push prices higher for those food items that the affluent consumer wants, and as consumers most of us have been living high on the hog until lately. If farmers no longer are to receive direct incentives from government to encourage plenty and stability, one can expect farmers' decisions to follow where the high prices are, instead of maintaining a well-rounded production for the good of the country.

Clearly food production in this country has become an increasingly expensive enterprise. The total amount of cultivated land is decreasing. At the same time total population will continue to increase for many years to come. At the same time, also, the administration is expecting agriculture in America to enlarge its export sector. Without continuation of production and marketing programs—yes, to some extent even with them—the consumer in the United States is likely to find himself paying over the counter for food shipped abroad to improve our balance of payments.

An important part of the increased cost of farm production is, as Sosland points out, the fact that the cost of land itself has increased greatly. Sosland observes: "Land suitable for crop production in the United States is limited. Witness the fact that farmers last fall, in response to the highest prices in a quarter of a century, seeded only one percent more acres to winter wheat. Inputs such as fertilizer, insecticides, herbicides and better seeds are, in a very real economic sense, substitutes for land. In the past relatively few American farmers have considered land as a cost. Accelerating the commercialization of farming will change that attitude. If we are approaching the limits of cropland, then prices very near the current high levels will be required to stimulate the inputs that substitute for land."

It appears that the administration has hardly begun to level with the American consumer on the matter of what the cost of abundant food supply will be in the future, once the built-in subsidy to consumers in our present production arrangements is phased out. Either that, or the administration is not yet aware that its policies for agriculture are, one by one, opening several rather large cans of worms. This is a kind of canned stuff which is going to be a disappointment to the consumer when he looks inside.

HILGEFORD HONORED BY ASSEMBLY

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, since the end of World War I there have been untold millions of servicemen who needed help with job training, pension, and compensation claims, and millions of widows and orphans who have required the expertise of a good service officer.

Mr. Wayne E. "Dutch" Hilgeford of Salem, Ill. has just completed 25 years of service to the sick and disabled veterans as a representative of the Illinois veterans commission.

Mr. Speaker, both the house and senate of the Illinois Legislature have passed identical resolutions saluting "Dutch" Hilgeford for his outstanding service. I know all of my colleagues in the Congress will salute this outstanding public official who has unselfishly served his fellowman for a quarter of a century.

Under previous order granted me, I would ask that the story appearing in the Salem Times Commoner of Salem, Ill. be printed in the RECORD in its entirety.

The article follows:

HILGEFORD HONORED BY ASSEMBLY

Both the House and Senate of the Illinois Legislature have passed identical resolutions, saluting Wayne E. "Dutch" Hilgeford of Salem upon completion of 25 years of service with the Illinois Veterans commission.

Hilgeford served Marion and Clay counties as service officer until July 1, 1955, at which time he was promoted to supervisor over an area including Sangamon and all counties south of it.

Born Oct. 29, 1910, at Joppa to the late John T. and Grace Hilgeford, he entered the Army on November 30, 1942, at Camp Grant and was a Staff Sergeant in Battery A, 497th Battalion, 13th Division Field Artillery, and was honorably discharged November 10, 1944, at Camp Barkley, Texas.

He has held the posts in the American Legion of adjutant, Americanism chairman, member of the board of directors, secretary to the Soldiers and Sailors Reunion association, served the 23rd district as Americanism, Veteran Affairs and Rehabilitation, and Distinguished Guests chairman, and Delegate to the National convention committee.

In its resolution, the House and Senate of the 78th General Assembly, expressed "its heartfelt appreciation to Dutch Hilgeford for his untiring service to his country, state and fellowman; we hold him up to the next generation as a shining example; and we congratulate him on these achievements and wish him many more."

NEW JERSEY MAYORS COME TO WASHINGTON

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today, the New Jersey congressional delegation met with 12 New Jersey mayors headed by Mayor Kenneth Gibson of Newark, N.J. We heard first hand from the men who are responsible to their people in trying to overcome very serious urban funding problems. Mayor Gibson's statement speaks for itself on the impact of the administration's budget for 1974:

Gentlemen: On February 21 I appeared before Senator Muskie's sub-committee on Intergovernmental Relations along with several other mayors of the U.S. Conference of Mayors Legislative Action Committee.

At that time each of us submitted our then estimates of the loss in Federal dollars for our respective municipalities due to the announced cuts in the Federal budget for FY '74.

I have here a copy of that testimony and our revised current estimates for the city of Newark. These figures include the loss in FY '73 due to executive impoundments, cutbacks and deobligations in FY '73 and the projected losses for FY '74 in five programmatic areas: O.E.O., Manpower, H.U.D., Education, and Health. Because information related to health is inconclusive these figures remain the same and are to be revised at a later date.

The changes are as follows:

OEO (COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS)		
February 21:		
Manpower	-----	500
Funds	-----	\$2,547,080
April 9:		
Manpower	-----	500
Funds	-----	\$2,877,933
MANPOWER (DOL)		
February 21:		
Slots	-----	17,916
Funds	-----	\$12,353,723
April 9:		
Slots	-----	17,916
Funds	-----	¹ \$14,875,850
HUD (EFFECTS OF MORATORIUM ON NEW HOUSING AND REHAB AS WELL AS LOSS IN MODEL CITIES AND PLANNED VARIATIONS)		
February 21	-----	² \$362,894,000
April 9	-----	³ \$371,494,000
EDUCATION		
February 21	-----	7,000,000
April 9	-----	⁴ 11,665,575
HEALTH		
February 21	-----	6,127,390
April 9	-----	6,127,390
GRAND TOTAL		
February 21	-----	390,922,196
April 9	-----	407,040,748

¹ Net loss FY '73 \$4,077,798 18.2% of \$22,929,386 authorized for FY '73 and 64.9% of the same total for FY '74.

² Correction on total of \$451,894,000 as recorded on page 12—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Feb. 21, 1973.

³ Represents an increased loss of \$8,600,000 in Model Cities FY's 74.

⁴ The maximum if all title I money is lost.

The total impact on the citizens of Newark is even greater when you consider the broad sweep of the cuts which we as local officials cannot begin to measure. I can cite as one example the loss of Federal assistance in higher education grants which will result in hundreds of Newark residents having to

drop out or dramatically curtail their college studies.

The dilemma we, as local officials and Members of the Congress, face because of the loss of this vitally needed money is how to continue to provide for the social well being and improvement of the quality of life of the people of our cities with less money in an ever increasing economic squeeze.

Our joint effort in making general revenue sharing a reality, for the city of Newark \$14,563,788 in 1973 as compared with this larger loss of \$407,040,748 for FY '74 is unfortunately playing itself out as a rather bitter sweet victory.

We are now faced with an ultimatum from the administration. It appears that we are being told take it or leave it at a maximum level of funding prescribed by the administration which is far short of existing levels of funding. In the event the Congress cannot negotiate a minimum break-even proposition

with the administration an all or nothing end result appears to be on the horizon.

I would ask each of you to join the mayors of New Jersey on the following prerequisites related to future Federal funding:

Whatever the new formula for the distribution of Federal funds, special revenue sharing or consolidation of categorical grants, the formula should contain hold harmless provisions which would guarantee at a minimum the present level of funding which each municipality is receiving through the categorical grant programs.

The new formula should contain equitable criteria based on need.

Prior consultation with local officials through their national representative groups should take place in the development of criteria and distribution formula.

The general revenue sharing money provided by the state and local fiscal assistance act of 1972 was not intended to sustain cuts

resulting from the new federal budget requests and that any effort to match the two would be a direct contradiction of the intent of general revenue sharing.

In short, what I am saying is that figures don't lie.

The gains in dollars on general revenue sharing are minuscule compared to the losses we will sustain if the administrations budget stands as it. Having experienced one very costly setback it is unlikely that the strong support which was generated for general revenue sharing will be forthcoming for special revenue sharing, unless the Congress can effectively convince those who must be convinced of the realities of our situation.

The "urban crisis" is not ended nor can it be resolved by merely lumping together the problems of people and killing major programs which have provided jobs, housing, health care, education and social services over the last several years.

FISCAL YEAR 1974 PROJECTED EFFECT OF BUDGETARY CUTS ON NEWARK'S COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY (UNITED COMMUNITY CORPORATION)

Program	Fiscal year 1973 authorized program levels		Fiscal year 1974 net loss		Program	Fiscal year 1973 authorized program levels		Fiscal year 1974 net loss	
	Manpower	Funds	Manpower	Funds		Manpower	Funds	Manpower	Funds
General Services.....	7	\$30,943	7	\$30,943	School age education.....	32	\$71,215	32	\$71,215
General Services to Senior Citizens.....	94	214,908	94	214,908	Central Administration.....	46	647,388	46	647,388
Neighborhood Centers.....	41	275,009	41	275,009	Outreach.....	16	141,853	16	141,853
Neighborhood Service Centers.....	69	589,926	69	589,926	Public Service Career.....	75	189,000	75	189,000
Newark Legal Services.....	32	343,171	32	343,171	Total.....	500	2,877,933	500	2,877,933
FOCUS.....	67	48,858	67	48,858					
Prevocational and Vocational training.....	21	325,671	21	325,671					

¹ With additional funds from: Schumann Foundation (\$22,000), Essex County Bar Association (\$9,533), N.J. State Department of Community Affairs (\$34,000).

FISCAL YEAR 1973 AND FISCAL YEAR 1974 PROJECTED EFFECT OF FEDERAL BUDGETARY CUTS ON NEWARK, N.J., DOL MANPOWER PROGRAMS

Program	Fiscal year 1973 authorized program levels		Fiscal year 1973 net loss funds		Program	Fiscal year 1973 authorized program levels		Fiscal year 1973 net loss funds	
	Slots	Funds	Slots	Funds		Slots	Funds	Slots	Funds
CAMPS.....		\$107,500		\$12,500	OJT.....	300	\$257,000		\$38,550
TEAM.....	2,800	3,558,210		173,160	Chamber of Commerce (NAB).....	944	2,217,061		\$713,324
NYC-in school.....	509	379,205		33,991	NAB administration.....		50,000		946,390
NYC-out of school.....	194	700,000		133,892	MDTA Skill Center.....	1,200	1,996,730		299,510
NYC-summer.....	9,000	2,540,440		2,540,440	North Jersey community miscellaneous manpower and employment.....	209	600,000		90,000
PEP.....	1,106	6,518,203		6,518,200	JOPS.....		275,000		41,250
COPE-in school.....	74	55,130		31,700	Recreation support program.....		100,000		100,000
Out of school.....	104	382,500		137,000	Total.....	17,916	22,929,386	4,077,798	14,875,850
Summer.....	680	286,960		286,960					
Newark Street Academy.....	300	210,000		80,423					
Welfare demonstration project.....	496	2,695,450		2,695,450					

Note.—Total loss percentage, 64.9 percent, net loss percentage, fiscal year 1973, 18.2 percent.

IMPACT OF MORATORIUM OF NEWARK PROPOSED HOUSING PROJECTS IN NEWARK UNDER 236 PROGRAM AND NOT UNDER COMMITMENT BY FHA-HUD OR NEW JERSEY HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY SUMMARY

Projects	Number of DU's	Construction costs	Loss of potential jobs, materials and services to Newark community	Total	Projects	Number of DU's	Construction costs	Loss of potential jobs, materials and services to Newark community	Total
I. New construction:					Effect of HUD budget cuts:				
A.....	944	\$28,320,000	\$19,824,000	-----	Model Cities loss for 4th and 5th action years.....				
B.....	350	10,500,000	7,350,000	-----	Planned variation cut after fiscal year 1974.....				
C.....	4,096	122,880,000	86,016,000	-----	-----				
Subtotal.....	5,390	161,700,000	113,190,000	\$274,890,000	Subtotal.....	-----	-----	-----	11,200,000
II. Rehabilitation:					-----				
A.....	1,894	37,880,000	26,516,000	-----	-----				
B.....	412	8,240,000	5,768,000	-----	-----				
Subtotal.....	2,306	46,120,000	32,284,000	78,404,000	Total.....	-----	-----	-----	371,494,000
Total new and rehabilitation housing units.....	7,696	207,820,000	145,474,000	353,294,000					

PROJECTED EFFECTS OF FEDERAL BUDGETARY CUTS ON NEWARK'S EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS, FISCAL YEAR 1974

Programs	Fiscal year 1973 authorized program level funds	Fiscal year 1974 net loss
Title I (ESEA) program for educationally deprived children (Newark Board of Education).....	\$9,028,784	\$902,878
Title II (ESEA) library resources.....	98,774	98,774
Title III (ESEA) projects to advance creativity in education.....	90,964	743,697
Title III, sec. 306, discretionary funds.....	743,697	
Title IV, Cooperative Research Act.....	100,000	
Title VI-B, education for handicapped.....	52,030	
Title VII, bilingual education.....	81,300	
Education Professions Development Act.....	525,245	170,845
Public Broadcasting Act of 1967.....	26,447	
Vocational Education Amendments of 1968.....	453,172	
Title III, adult basic education.....	254,000	254,000
Title II-B, sec. 222, EOA.....	607,177	607,177
Office of Program and Staff Development.....	962,298	962,298
Total.....	13,023,888	3,739,669

¹ The whole question of title I funding allocation for fiscal year 1974 remains unclear; therefore, it is possible that the loss can be anywhere from the figure shown (\$902,878) up to the fiscal year 1973 authorized funding level (\$9,028,784).

FISCAL YEAR 1974 PROJECTED EFFECTS OF BUDGETARY CUTS ON NEWARK'S HEALTH PROGRAMS

Programs	Fiscal year 1972 authorization program level funds	Fiscal year 1973 net loss funds	Fiscal year 1974 net loss funds
Columbus Homes Health Centers:			
HEW.....	\$100,000	\$100,000	
HUD.....	100,000	100,000	
Home management and training program: HEW.....	34,193	34,193	
Health services management course: HEW.....	16,375	16,375	
Nonemergency transportation: HUD.....	30,000	30,000	
Martland Family Health Care Center: OEO.....	275,000	275,000	
NJCU Health Center: OEO.....	825,000	825,000	
Maternal and infant care, college: HEW.....	599,157		\$599,157
Family planning, college: HEW.....	547,665		547,665
Mental Health, college: HEW.....	900,000		900,000
Lead poisoning and prevention: HEW.....	350,000		
Health services delivery: HEW.....	200,000		
Urban rodent and pest control: HEW.....	520,000		
Mental health, Mount Carmel Guild: HEW.....	1,500,000		1,500,000
Drug abuse, college: HEW.....	1,238,051		
Construction of 3 neighborhood health centers: HEW.....	1,800,000	1,200,000	
Total.....	9,035,441	2,580,568	3,546,822
Total, net loss.....			6,127,390

HELP TO HANOI? NOT YET

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, last Thursday the Senate, by a vote of 88 to 3, approved an amendment preventing use of Federal funds to aid North Vietnam without the specific consent of the Congress.

As the chief sponsor of that amendment, I was most gratified at the over-

whelming majority by which this legislation was adopted. I feel that the vote accurately reflects the feelings of the American people on this issue.

Excellent editorials on the vote by the Senate and the issue of aid to North Vietnam appeared in two Virginia newspapers.

The first editorial was published in the April 7, edition of the Northern Virginia Daily, published at Strasburg, Va. It states that—

It will take a lot of selling to convince us that we have any obligations at all to rebuild or rehabilitate North Vietnam.

And I am sure that a majority of the Congress and a majority of the people share that attitude.

The second editorial appeared in the April 9, edition of the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot. It points out that the evidence indicates that Hanoi remains more interested in conquest than in reconstruction.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorials, "Help To Hanoi? Not Yet," from the Northern Virginia Daily, and "No Heart for the Enemy," from the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot, be included in the Extensions of Remarks.

I also ask unanimous consent that immediately following the texts of the editorials, there be printed in the Extensions of Remarks the list of Senators who cosponsored my amendment preventing aid to North Vietnam without the specific consent of the Congress.

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

[From the Norfolk (Va.) Virginian-Pilot, Apr. 7, 1973]

NO HEART FOR THE ENEMY

Senator Harry F. Byrd Jr.'s amendment to block United States aid to North Vietnam is, as some of its advocates noted, "a message to the White House"—and a pretty clear one. Only three Senators opposed it. Even if the House drops it, it will continue to be evidence of powerful, in not insurmountable, Congressional antipathy to the January 27 peace agreement clause committing this country to pursuit "of its traditional policy . . . [of contributing] to healing the wounds of war and to the postwar reconstruction of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and throughout Indochina."

Although he consistently has said America's entry into the war was a monumental mistake, Senator Byrd wished to win it militarily. He has no heart for the Communist enemy. Recital by returned U.S. prisoners of war of brutalities practiced on them by their North Vietnamese captors no doubt has reinforced his attitude, as it has most hard-liners'. Meanwhile, Senators who opposed President Nixon's war policy are pleased to make the most of the paradox of his moving to restore what they didn't want destroyed. On the winning side of an 88-3 vote there are bound to be strange bedfellows.

Withholding money from North Vietnam may be the single effective means of expressing national outrage at the POWs' sufferings. Only a power that has won an unconditional victory can make war-crime charges stick, as Telford Taylor, the Nuremberg prosecutor, has observed. The North Vietnamese, who have denied the POW accusations, if forced to admit them could insist that their soldiers fared more poorly still as South Vietnam's prisoners. Could the United States deny responsibility? Mr. Nixon was prone to justify U.S. air offensives

against the North with the North's blood-letting in the South. Alliances work several ways.

Just how concerned Mr. Nixon is at this point about funneling money to Hanoi is not as clear as the peace-agreement language, which is more than a mite vague. He was pledged, before Mr. Byrd acted to ask for Congressional authorization prior to undertaking any reconstruction project, which is what the Byrd amendment demands. Perhaps he would sacrifice his aid plan in the spirit that he gave up his guaranteed family income bill—happily.

There is precious little to suggest, at the same time, that Washington's money is very high among Hanoi's preferences. The Communist command appears to be more inclined to keep on employing its rifle and armored people than to call in its labor battalions.

[From the Strasburg (Va.) Northern Virginia Daily, Apr. 7, 1973]

HELP TO HANOI? NOT YET!

An amendment to the dollar revaluation bill, introduced by Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr., and passed by the Senate Thursday, bars aid to North Vietnam without the specific approval of Congress.

The Byrd amendment also prevents the Administration from diverting funds already appropriated by Congress for other purposes into an interim aid program for North Vietnam, unless Congress approves.

Unassured by the Administration's assertion that no aid program has been requested for North Vietnam and none will be until the North proves it will live up to the cease-fire agreement, Senate trigger fingers are nervous as they man the pass to prevent a flanking movement.

The Byrd amendment is a wise precaution which makes it illegal to get involved in providing any aid to the North without the consent of Congress, which really means without the consent of the people.

Senate Majority Leader Mansfield commented that the amendment did not dispose of the question of aid to all of Indochina, including the North Vietnamese. Of course, it doesn't.

By the terms of the cease-fire the Nixon Administration is committed to devoting its energies to securing massive aid for the rebuilding of the North, estimated at over \$2 billion, so the Senate and the nation can gird itself for a campaign to make the U.S. conscious of its obligations to North Vietnam.

But, it will take a lot of selling to convince us that we have any obligations at all to rebuild or rehabilitate North Vietnam, and we suspect that a majority of our people feel the same way.

We regard the Byrd amendment as a wise intermediate step because it will avoid premature involvement, and because it requires full congressional debate of whatever aid program is eventually proposed by the White House, but most importantly because not one dollar can be spent in the North unless Congress puts its stamp of approval on the deal.

LIST OF COSPONSORS OF THE BYRD AMENDMENT

Mr. Allen of Alabama.
Mr. Bayh of Indiana.
Mr. Biden of Delaware.
Mr. Buckley of New York.
Mr. Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia.
Mr. Case of New Jersey.
Mr. Chiles of Florida.
Mr. Church of Idaho.
Mr. Domenici of New Mexico.
Mr. Helms of North Carolina.
Mr. Hollings of South Carolina.
Mr. Nunn of Georgia.
Mr. Proxmire of Wisconsin.
Mr. Randolph of West Virginia.

FRIENDLY COMMUNIST NATIONS GET U.S. BUSINESSMEN'S CREDIT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the American people have now been given an example of the new interpretation of the phrase "friendly Communist nations."

The U.S. Import-Export Bank has now agreed to extend to the Communist Party of Poland the highest credit classification, "Most Favored Nation." This means that Poland now has top priority equal rights to easy- and long-term credit, the same as free countries.

At the same time that we are embracing our new-found Polish Communist friends, the Soviet Union announces the movement of some 1,200 tanks into Eastern Europe, including Poland.

It just so happens that our new most favored easy credit ally is home base for the Warsaw Pact forces, which is the Communist equivalent to NATO or the leading military forces in readiness to intimidate or occupy free countries. Their military might is now estimated at three times that of NATO, over half from the Soviet Union.

The semantics of "most favored nations" are consistent with the new Alice in Wonderland rhetoric.

Interestingly enough, during the same week that we extended subsidized credit to Red Poland, the Federal Reserve tightened credit to American businessmen. This is more of the President's "new prosperity" in action. Somehow it just does not make sense to tighten credit to Americans so that we can extend easy credit to the Poles.

I include related news clippings:

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

POLAND GIVEN TOP CREDIT RATING

WARSAW.—The U.S. Export-Import Bank has agreed to give Poland the highest credit classification of any country in the world—"except those with surplus currencies," the bank's chairman said.

Henry Kearns, speaking to newsmen yesterday before flying back to the United States, where he will report to President Nixon tomorrow, said Poland will benefit not from bigger loans—since there was no ceiling in the first place—but by being charged less interest, "particularly for smaller purchases—like small equipment or spare parts."

Kearns' Polish visit ended a 14-nation tour which began Feb. 22 and included talks in Moscow with Soviet Premier Alexei N. Kosygin.

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

SOVIET ADDS TO TANKS IN EASTERN EUROPE

The Soviet Union has recently completed the movement of about 1,200 tanks into East Germany, Poland and Czechoslovakia, according to qualified sources in the Pentagon.

The Soviet Union now has approximately 8,700 tanks in its 16 armored and 15 mechanized infantry divisions in central Europe. The total tank strength of the Warsaw Pact forces in that area and northern Europe is estimated at 17,200 tanks, or three times that of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces in Europe.

The Soviet reinforcement, said to be primarily in new T 62 main battle tanks, is reported to be used as a counter in negotiations in Vienna on balanced force reductions. NATO sources said that a reduction in the Soviet advantage in armor is a prime object of the west in the talks.

The NATO sources condemn the Russian build-up as "needless," pointing out that the Warsaw Pact forces already had far more tanks than could be considered necessary for the defense of eastern Europe.

There are also reports in NATO circles that the Russians are moving two infantry divisions to central Europe. This reinforcement, which could not be confirmed in the Pentagon, would raise the number of Soviet divisions in the area to 33, the most in eight years.

[From the Evening Star and Daily News, Apr. 9, 1973]

BANKS WARNED ON CREDIT

(By Lee M. Cohn)

Banks are on notice that the Federal Reserve may tighten supplies of money and credit more severely to fight inflation.

Federal Reserve Chairman Arthur F. Burns issued the oblique warning in a letter, released yesterday, cautioning banks against committing themselves too deeply to business loans.

Burns expressed "concern (about) the heavy volume of bank loan commitments." He was referring to lines of credit—binding commitments by banks to lend customers specified amounts of money upon request.

Such commitments are a legitimate practice to assist planning, but must be "based on careful judgment," Burns said.

"The apparent large volume of bank commitments currently outstanding and sharply increased takedowns (actual borrowing on lines of credit) are indicative of the need for special attention to this subject at this time," he said.

Each bank should make periodic judgments on potential takedowns under varying conditions, and on the "credit risks involved" if borrowing under credit lines should increase, he said.

"Finally (each bank) should give adequate consideration as to how it would obtain the funds to meet such takedowns in sound and timely fashion, giving due allowance to the possibilities for changing conditions in the local and national economy and in the central money markets," he said.

This amounted to a warning that the Federal Reserve may curtail expansion of money and credit, which would make it difficult for over-committed banks to raise funds needed to fulfill lending agreements.

The Federal Reserve can drain money and credit out of the economy by selling Treasury securities in the market, and can squeeze banks by restricting its loans to them.

Monetary policy has been tightening progressively for the last year. The Federal Reserve is increasingly worried about the recent acceleration of inflation, and some analysts expect further tightening.

Burns' letter appeared to support these predictions. It echoed warnings issued just before and during the severe credit "crunch" of 1969 and 1970, when interest rates soared.

One traditional way to fight inflation is to curtail growth of money and credit and raise interest rates, in order to curb spending. Such restraints also tend to slow the economy.

Burns presumably hopes his warning will minimize the need for severe tightening of monetary policy by persuading banks to limit their lending voluntarily.

He said bank examiners "will henceforth ask the management of each bank they examine to demonstrate that it is giving adequate attention to the above principles."

calling for careful judgment on loan commitments.

The letter was sent to all state banks belonging to the Federal Reserve System and holding deposits of more than \$100 million. State member banks are under the Federal Reserve's direct supervision.

HEADSTART A FAILURE?

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a noteworthy article has recently provided us with a close examination of the early childhood program, Project Headstart. Its author, Dr. Edward Zigler, reviews the goals and accomplishments of Headstart and concludes the program cannot be dismissed as a failure.

For the information of my colleagues I include as part of my remarks the newly published article by Dr. Zigler, one of the creators of Project Headstart:

PROJECT HEADSTART: SUCCESS OR FAILURE?

(By Edward Zigler, Yale University)

As the nation continues its long and often bitter debate over the means by which equality of opportunity is to be achieved for all members of our society, a once popular solution to the problem—preschool programs for the disadvantaged—is frequently dismissed as a "failure." Criticism of compensatory preschool programs for disadvantaged children is widespread. Project Head Start, as the major federal effort and the largest nationwide program to provide comprehensive services for preschool children, serves as a case in point. The lack of measurable superiority in achievements in elementary school by Head Start graduates is cited as evidence that compensatory efforts for young children don't "work." In my view, to exclude such efforts from our total approach to solving the problems of poverty and dependence at this juncture would be foolish, even tragic. The following discussion is an attempt to illuminate the controversy surrounding Head Start and at the same time to address the broader question of what compensatory programs can and should achieve.

THE GOAL OF HEADSTART: SOCIAL COMPETENCE

It is important to note at the outset that whether Head Start is thought to be a success or a failure is determined by the factors which one chooses to consider in making such an assessment. Thus, if Head Start is appraised in terms of its success in universally raising the IQs of poor children, and maintaining these IQs over time, one is tempted to write off Head Start as an abject failure. On the other hand, if one assesses Head Start in terms of the improved health of the tens of thousands of poor children who have been screened, diagnosed, and treated, Head Start is clearly a resounding success.

The problem appears to be that, as a nation, we are not clear as to the exact nature of the Head Start program nor its goals. It is my belief that a realistic and proper assessment of Head Start proves that it has been a success. Furthermore, I believe that what we have learned from Head Start to date can give clear direction to those persons responsible for future compensatory efforts.

A basic requirement for any social program is that its goals be explicitly stated and widely recognized throughout the life of the program. This has not been the case with

Head Start, and its image has suffered as a result. While it will come as no surprise to those who conceptualized the program, it may come as a surprise to the nation that this preschool program was not mounted in hopes of dramatically raising IQ scores, nor of guaranteeing that all Head Start graduates would be reading at their age level at grade five.

Rather, the creators of Head Start hoped to bring about greater social competence in disadvantaged children. By social competence, we meant an individual's everyday effectiveness in dealing with his environment. A child's social competence may be described as his ability to master appropriate formal concepts, to perform well in school, to stay out of trouble with the law, and to relate well to adults and other children.

We have sought to achieve this broad goal by working with the child directly, with his family, and with the community in which he lives. The Head Start approach to helping children directly involves services to improve his health, intellectual ability, and social-emotional development, all of which are components of social competence.

HEALTH

With respect to health, it is recognized that social competence, as well as more specific achievements, is fundamentally dependent upon the child's physical well-being. A child who is ill or hungry cannot learn from or enjoy his experiences and relationships with those around him. Over one-third of Head Start children have been found to suffer from illnesses or physical handicaps. Of these children, 75 percent have been treated. While we can only be satisfied with 100 percent effectiveness, there can be no question that the health of the nation's poor children is much better as a result of the existence of Head Start, and to the extent that they are healthy, their opportunities for cognitive and emotional growth are enhanced.

INTELLECTUAL ABILITY

A second aspect of the child which Head Start seeks to influence, and which is important for the development of social competence, is intellectual ability. With respect to formal cognitive abilities, most Head Start programs have mounted efforts directed toward improving the children's linguistic, numerical, spatial, abstraction, and memory abilities. Many studies have indicated that at the end of the Head Start experience and prior to entering school, Head Start children have higher scores than comparable non-Head Start children on specific measures of these abilities, as well as on IQ tests. Head Start has also been directed toward developing those achievements, commonly labeled "intellectual," which are more often influenced by the child's particular experiences than by the quality of his formal cognitive functioning. (Thus, the child who cannot define the word "gown" may have a perfectly adequate cognitive storage and retrieval system, but simply has never heard the word.)

It should be noted that the experiences provided by compensatory programs can be expected to have their greatest effects on such specific achievements or contents of the cognitive system. While experts may argue concerning the degree to which a compensatory education program can increase the child's span of memory, there is no question but that particular experiences highly influence the specific bits of information stored in the child's memory bank. The failure to draw a distinction between a cognitive process (e.g., memory) and the products of that process (e.g., the ability to know what particular words mean) has frequently led to a simplistic assessment of compensatory education programs as well as a total misreading of what actually hinders the economically disadvantaged child in his school achievement. This point could perhaps best be clarified by examining the performance with

respect to a particular achievement of all children residing in San Francisco and New York. It would surprise no one to discover that many more of the 5-year-olds in San Francisco than in New York knew what a cable car was. We would not conclude, however, that San Francisco children were cognitively superior to New York children, but we would properly attribute the superiority in performance to the much greater contact that the San Francisco children have with cable cars. Unfortunately, when economically disadvantaged children cannot produce achievements of this sort, we are all too ready to conclude that they are less bright or that their cognitive system is less adequate, rather than attributing differences in performance to differences in experience. This error, which invariably leads to an under-assessment of the cognitive abilities of poor children, is compounded when these children are not credited by the school with those achievements in which they outdistance children from more affluent homes. In school, we rarely give the child from the ghetto any credit (nor do we fault the non-ghetto child) when we discover the ghetto child knows that "threads" means clothes and the non-ghetto child does not. Nevertheless, so long as our schools, whose values reflect those of society at large, prefer certain school achievements over others, helping poor children succeed in school and in life must involve providing them early in their lives with those experiences which make these expected achievements possible.

Head Start, of course, does exactly this; Head Start children are repeatedly found to do better on preschool achievement tests, such as the Caldwell Preschool Inventory, than do poor children who have not had the Head Start experience.

SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The other aspects of the child which Head Start seeks to influence, yet the ones least appreciated, are those social, motivational, and emotional attributes which are known to enhance a child's general social competence. These include an adequate aspiration level, a healthy self-image, expectancy of success, mastery motivation, curiosity, and independence. In the few studies of Head Start in which an effort was made to assess the impact of the program on socio-emotional variables, Head Start children have usually been found to be superior to non-Head Start children at the end of the Head Start year. These attributes are almost totally shaped by the environment, and are probably much more plastic than the child's formal cognitive development. Certainly, they are extremely decisive in determining how a child will function both in school and later in life. It is the rare person who does not possess the cognitive wherewithal to learn to read, to master the general subject matter of our schools, and to eventually learn occupational skills which will allow him to contribute to our society and to reap its rewards.

Our nation can live comfortably with the variations that we find in cognitive ability, independent of race and social class, if we would only realize that all children—with perhaps the exception of the severely retarded—have the cognitive potential to play productive roles in our society. Why then, one might ask, are we confronted with so many young people who do not even meet society's minimal expectations—our school dropouts, our juvenile delinquents, and those who have opted for the drug culture? The answer, I submit, is not that there is any widespread lack of that level of cognitive ability necessary to function adequately in our society. In most instances, the failure to function adequately can be directly traced to a negative self-image, to a "can't-do" philosophy, and to a wariness and/or hostility toward others, which in too many instances have been honestly come by. It is for this

reason that our early intervention programs must be just as concerned with the social, motivational, and emotional factors in development as they are with cognitive development. Ten more points of IQ will make little difference with respect to the malaise that afflicts so many of our young people. Even if we limit our discussion to lack of achievement in school, we can immediately see why such factors are so important to any early childhood intervention program. It is interesting that when children from affluent homes fail in school, we usually attribute this failure to under-achievement. There is, thus, recognition that children's school achievements result from some combination of cognitive factors, which determine the upper limit of performance, and motivational-emotional factors which determine the match between children's actual performance and their potential.

On the other hand, when assessing the performance of the economically disadvantaged child, we are all too ready to attribute his failures solely to poor cognitive ability. It should be noted that for all children only half of the variance on school achievement tests can be attributed to difference in IQs. The other 50 percent of variation is the ideal ground for intervention efforts, provided such efforts are explicitly directed toward influencing those motivational factors which in turn have so much to do with school as well as life achievements.

FAMILY INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNITY CHANGE

As noted earlier, Head Start's efforts go far beyond those directed at the child in the center. Central to the Head Start philosophy is the view that child development is a continuous process influenced by all the events the child experiences. Intervention efforts that ignore the parents or the child's life within the context of his family will certainly not produce optimal gains. Thus, parental involvement has been a cornerstone of the Head Start program from its inception, and a decision was made at the outset to provide families with both knowledge and services which would enable them to improve their economic status and their personal ability to provide a favorable developmental environment for their children. Today, it can be said that the escape from poverty for many families in this nation can be directly traced to the outreach and training efforts of the Head Start program. Furthermore, direct involvement of parents in policy-making roles as well as the provision to them of child-rearing information and social services has indeed led to an improved family life for thousands of parents and children.

A child's development is also influenced by the quality of the social institutions in his community. The 1970 Kirschner Report on the community impact of Head Start has made it abundantly clear that, throughout the nation, Head Start has served as a catalyst for communities to improve their educational, health, and social services to the poor.

What, then, are we trying to accomplish for children through the Head Start program? As stated at its inception, Head Start attempts to influence a broad array of a child's personal attributes, including his physical well-being, his formal cognitive development, his more circumscribed academic achievements, and his socio-emotional development. No one on these attributes should be judged as preeminent; all should be seen as interacting in order to enhance social competence. Furthermore, Head Start has had demonstrable success in meeting its goals.

THE OVEREMPHASIS ON IQ

Since one has so little difficulty demonstrating that the social competence of disadvantaged children has been enhanced as a result of the Head Start program, we must ask why so many people have become critical of the program's accomplishments. The

answer, I believe, involves the pendulum-like nature of our thinking concerning the developing child, as well as the tendency of educational decision-makers to adopt extreme theoretical positions provided they are both simple and enjoy some degree of popularity in the public arena.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL MYSTIQUE

At the time Head Start began, the favored theoretical position was what I have termed the "environmental mystique." This position held, essentially, that young children are so malleable that rather minimal interventions in the early years will have major and lasting impact. The theorists whose work gave rise to this mystique were themselves rebelling against an earlier view of child development which emphasized hereditary factors, a maturationally determined sequence of development, a relatively non-malleable child, and a fixed IQ. In the mid 1960's, the pendulum had swung to the extreme environmentalist position, and as a result we became immersed in pleas and promises that emphasized the cognitive system's openness to change, and therefore the ease with which intellectual development could be enhanced. * * *

THE POST-SPUTNIK REACTION

I believe that another element which led to our preoccupation with the importance of cognitive over social-motivational aspects of development was the post-Sputnik panic which swept the nation at about the same time that preschool compensatory programs were getting underway. That some nation could be slightly ahead of America in even one realm of technology seemed to be intolerable, if not to the American people, certainly to our decision-makers. The nation clearly needed a fall guy to explain this loss of face, and, as is so often the case, the fall guy turned out to be the American school. Admirals who had access to the public arena became pedagogical experts overnight and proclaimed the virtues of Soviet education with its emphasis on the rigorous learning of those skills which lead to engineering accomplishments, as compared to American schools with their tender-minded, dewy-eyed concern with personal adjustment. In short order, educators were extolling the virtues of teaching reading, writing and arithmetic, and the view that the school had some responsibility in producing the whole person who could take his place in society after leaving school was eclipsed. Unfortunately, many preschool educators capitulated to this one-sided view of the educational process, and in too many places preschools became rather awesome settings in which the rigors of the elementary schools were simply introduced to children at an earlier age.

The "whole child" approach, with its commitment to the view that a child's emotional and motivational development are just as important as his cognitive development continues to be suspect. The critics of this approach range from those who consider it tender-minded to those who see in it some "pinko" plot to undermine the nation. Whatever one's attitude might be, the fact that children are much more than cognitive automations will not vanish. The child is a whole person whose physical, cognitive, and emotional-motivational dimensions interest in a complex fashion. Those who insist on approaching the developing child as some sort of disembodied cognitive system to be trained to master academic skills strike me as being simple-minded rather than tough-minded.

THE "DISCOVERY" OF COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT

In addition to the "environmental mystique" and the post-Sputnik reaction to viewing "adjustment" as a worthwhile goal of education, other factors should be noted as playing a role in the overly cognitive emphasis in evaluating Head Start and other

remedial programs. One such factor was that, 15 or so years ago, American child development specialists discovered the work of Jean Piaget and his classic efforts in charting the sequence of cognitive development in children. Here again, the pendulum-like nature of so much of American thought concerning children manifested itself with investigators moving from too little emphasis to too much. Until the mid 1950's, American behaviorism held sway, and thought was considered by many to be an epiphenomenon not worthy of investigation; while a small group of researchers continued to be interested in cognitive development, the main stream of theoretical research with children during the 40's and early 50's had much to do with observable physical behavior, the learning of habits and response tendencies and the role reinforcements in such and response tendencies and the role of external reinforcements in such learning.

Indeed, it was considered bad form even to ask a child why he was doing what he was doing, since such "subjective reports" were considered highly suspect. As the result of this uniquely American behavioristic approach, the cognitive emphasis of such European thinkers as Piaget, Werner, and Vygotsky was almost totally ignored for many years. However, with the lessening of the behavioristic enthusiasm, American workers decided that thought and cognition were phenomena worthy of investigation, and Piaget in particular was discovered with a vengeance. Of course, one must applaud this belated discovery and be thankful for the contributions that have been made to our understanding of cognitive development by American psychologists such as Jerome Bruner. What I cannot applaud is the fact that cognitive development has so captured our interest that an inappropriately small amount of effort is being expended in illuminating the nature of emotional and motivational development. While there are certainly important researchers who continue to investigate such phenomena, usually under the rubric of "socialization," it is difficult for me to conclude that just as thought and cognition were considered unworthy of investigation by many child psychologists during the 40's, so emotional and motivational development became unworthy of investigation during the 60's. It is interesting to note that in her last editorial as editor of *Child Development*, Alberta Siegel was moved to comment on the inordinately high percentage of papers submitted concerning cognitive development and the comparatively few concerning emotional-motivational development.

MEASUREMENT PROBLEMS

Another factor which lead to an under-assessment of how Head Start and preschool programs in general influenced emotional and motivational growth is related to the greater difficulty of measuring these factors. It is easy to see why so many investigators focused on intelligence and cognitive development since in this are so many widely accepted and/or standardized measures are available. There is nothing in the socio-emotional realm akin to our age-related, standardized IQ measures. What must be emphasized is that this reflects nothing more than a problem of the state of refinement of socio-emotional theory and measurement and does not indicate that cognitive variables have some existence that is "more real" than socio-emotional variables. If I am correct in my suspicion that compensatory programs have a larger impact on motivational and emotional factors than on cognitive factors, we will never assess the magnitude of this impact by continuing to over-emphasize cognitive measures in our evaluations of compensatory efforts. Justifying the use of cognitive measures because of their easy availability reminds me of the old joke about the individual who lost a quarter in

the middle of the block one night, but decided to look for it up at the corner since the light was better.

DIFFICULTIES OF EVALUATION

In summary, it could be said that the distortion of the goals of compensatory programs was over-determined by the factors described above. However, even in the realm of cognitive development and academic achievement, the major thrust of the evaluations of Head Start has become murky, and a negative attitude toward this type of program has resulted.

Several monographs and well over a hundred papers have now been published evaluating the effectiveness of Head Start and other preschool compensatory education programs. It would be impossible for me to attempt to discuss this work here, just as it would be unrealistic for social policy planners to expect this work to generate a simple conclusion, since the studies themselves are a conglomerate of evaluations of different outcome measures across a wide variety of treatments or programs. Indeed, we have already reached the point where one can often predict the conclusions of the reviews of these studies by knowing the theoretical allegiance of the author. As one who is deeply involved in both research and social policy, I can appreciate the difficulty in detecting a clear signal in the midst of all this noise. I do think that on the basis of the evidence, a number of reasonable statements can be made, and at this particular point in time, these statements can be utilized in helping to determine our social action efforts.

What we have learned from the evidence is what we could have predicted at the outset, namely, that intellectual gains discovered at the end of a summer or one-year compensatory program often dissipate if nothing more is done for the child after he leaves the program. However, excellent or even some moderately good programs have reported more durable IQ and achievement score gains, with the magnitude of these lasting gains being determined in large part by two factors: (a) whether parents extended the remedial program to the home through their own efforts; and (b) whether the preschool program was followed by a further special educational effort once the child reached elementary school. The social action implications of these findings are obvious; more direct assistance to parents in child rearing, as in the OGD Home Start program, should be made available, and preschool programs should be invariably followed by school enrichment efforts, such as those authorized by Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

However, even if one recognizes that Head Start results in some unquestioned immediate gains and some less clear long-term gains, the problem in evaluating the program still exists. We will always have social welfare programs, all with laudable goals, competing for scarce resources, and we have little way of knowing whether the accomplishments of a program and the dollar cost associated with these accomplishments signal the continuation of a program or suggest instead that the money be spent to achieve some other social good. While some technocrats believe that "scientific" evaluations will lead inexorably to cost-effectiveness data upon which errorless social policy can be built, I believe that it makes more sense to admit honestly that we do not have totally objective means of assessing the dollar value of gains brought about by the Head Start intervention.

How many dollars is it worth to head off a case of measles? To raise the measured IQ 10 points by the end of the program? To reduce a child's wariness of strange adults? To discover that the presence of Head Start in a community led to the provision of more health and educational services to all economically disadvantaged children? Or to dem-

onstrate that a child has been given a set of experiences that clearly improve the quality of his life for that one year in his life's span?

As one of the creators of the Head Start program and the public official responsible for its management for the past two years, I readily admit that I have been more influenced by the positive than by the negative findings concerning the value of Head Start. By the same token, in the absence of specific, identifiable dollar gains, I prefer to attribute a high rather than a low figure to Head Start's identifiable accomplishments. This is to admit no more than that even sophisticated readers of evaluation studies must finally introduce some of their own values before drawing a conclusion as to whether a program is worthwhile or not.

SUCCESS OR FAILURE

What, then, is our conclusion? When we consider the broad goals of Head Start and realistically examine Head Start's real effectiveness across these many goals, the program cannot be dismissed as a failure. Neither should this rather fragile effort during one year of a child's life be viewed overly optimistically as the ultimate solution to poverty, illiteracy, underachievement, racism, delinquency, and failure in later life. We must respect the complexity and continuity of human development. The Head Start year in the child's life is important; the first five years are important. So are the next five, and the five after that. Intellectual achievement is important, but so is physical and emotional health and motivation if our goal is to enable the nation's children to take advantage of our best efforts to expand the range of opportunities available to them.

COL. GEORGE W. LEE

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, recently Col. George W. Lee, a good friend of mine and an outstanding figure in this country, was presented the second R. Q. Venson Memorial Award by American Legion Post No. 27, in Memphis, Tenn.

Colonel Lee truly deserves the honors which have been bestowed upon him. He is a great American and has served as an inspiration to all of those who know him. He is a man of high principles and has led a life which has brought to him many rewards as a soldier, author, lecturer, civic leader, and successful businessman.

He is known as a spell-binding speaker and his oratorical style can be matched by few. His acceptance speech in Memphis is an excellent example of his wonderful talents.

I have read a copy of this most magnificent speech and I would like to share these touching remarks with the readers of the RECORD, along with an article printed in the Memphis Press-Scimitar about Colonel Lee:

SPEECH OF ACCEPTANCE AT THE AMERICAN LEGION TESTIMONIAL BANQUET

(By George W. Lee)

I would, if I could, express my deep gratitude for this bright and shining hour you have given me here tonight in this Testimonial Banquet. It has stirred my enthusiasm which is strikingly devoted to Memphis and its great history.

Ingersoll, at the grave of Napoleon, cried out in a burst of eloquence: "I stand at the grave of Napoleon . . . and when I think of all the men who had to die for his glory, all the widows and orphans because of it, I say to myself that I would rather have been a French peasant, living in a lonely hut with the vines growing around my door, turning brown in the kisses of the Autumn sun; or I would rather have been that same peasant sitting by my evening fireside with my children on my knee and my wife knitting in the half light than to have been that imperial personator of genius and murder known as Napoleon the Great." Well, I am glad I haven't had to kill somebody or had somebody to die in order to attract your attention to my humble efforts. Despite slow lifting shadows, bruising words and unkind speech, all that I am and that I hope to be is written in the annals of Memphis and my native land. I am obligated to so many people for helping me along this way.

My mother, who in a sharecropper's cabin in the Mississippi River bottoms, lit a lamp of hope in an atmosphere of despair and kept it burning with the oil of kindness; in an atmosphere when my skies were without a single star. Nothing could put out the light of that hope and that dream that she wanted me to be in that number who would make substantial contributions to the future. I am obligated to the late Bob Church who steered me through the treacherous whirlpools of political actions. I am obligated to Carroll Reece, Howard Baker, Sr., and Guy L. Smith who pressed President Eisenhower into having a Post Office named for me and who caused the late Senator Robert Taft to choose me to make one of his nominating speeches when he aspired to the Presidency of the United States. I am obligated to Alonzo Franklin Herndon and Dr. J. E. Walker who gave me scope and opportunity when I suffered from the blight of poverty. I am obligated to James Weldon Johnson who helped me to find a publisher for my first book, "Beale Street—Where The Blues Began," which was a best seller and a Book-of-the-Month Club choice and was reviewed in 130 daily newspapers, including one in England and two in Scotland. I am obligated to Robert O. Ballou who guided me in the publication of three books. I am obligated to the late Sinclair Lewis, author of "Main Street," whose suggestions helped me to get my first two short stories published in Esquire and Charm. I am obligated to Bert Bates and James Moore, the friends of my youth and years whose help has made my Beale Street Elks Christmas Charity Program an outstanding success each year over a period of 34 years. I am obligated to the Legion and the Commercial Appeal and hundreds of other donors who made my Beale Street Elks Charity Program an outstanding success. I am obligated to the late J. Finley Wilson and Hobson Reynolds who helped to place me at the head of the National Scholarship Program of the Negro Elks which for the last 43 years has raised four million and one half dollars for scholarship aid to young black and white Americans. I am obligated to my pastor, Dr. W. H. Brewster, who dedicated himself to do my praying while I do his cussing. I am obligated to my daughter Gilda who stimulated my soul of struggle—my reason for survival. I am obligated to the Lincoln League who gave loyal support to my political ambitions.

I am grateful to President Richard Nixon who sent on to me on this occasion, "The Presidential Star," with a personal message in which he said: "The original of this design, a gift from Ambassador Walter Annenberg, was sculpted in crystal by Steuben Glass, and now occupies a place of honor on my desk in the Oval Office. This replica comes to you with my special appreciation for your help and support . . ." I am grateful to Governor Winfield Dunn who sent a mes-

sage: "I am highly honored to have this opportunity to send my congratulations and special best wishes to my good friend, and a commission as Colonel on my staff." I am grateful to Representative Ira H. Murphy and the other representatives from Shelby County for having the Legislature of Tennessee to pass a special Resolution of Commendation. I am grateful to Representative Harold Ford who presented a plaque with a replica of the Seal of the State of Tennessee. I am grateful to Mr. L. E. Mitchell who represented the Elks with a plaque; and Mr. Dudley Martin who represented the Lincoln League with a plaque; and Mr. Charles W. Greene who represented the Atlanta Life with a plaque. I am grateful to Mr. and Mrs. George Turner of Iowa, and Mrs. Annabelle Reid of New York for their gifts.

I appreciate this Testimonial from men who have defended their country, who laid in the murk and mire of No Man's Land, who under moon drenched skies, looked down the peepside of an infidel rifle and with deadly aim shot down the enemies of Democracy.

Black soldiers have made a tremendous investment in this country, in blood and sweat for the fulfillment of the American dream, a dream symbolized in what Lincoln said at Gettysburg about "a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." Through the black soldiers the Declaration of Independence in whose text is found a divine flavor, was proved. The Constitution vindicated, and freedom itself was loosed from the ugly grasp of night. They saw the lantern in the tower of the Old North Church. They followed Paul Revere as he dashed through the night and when Pitcairn charged up the embattled slopes of Bunker Hill and shouted: "The day is ours!" A black soldier named Peter Salem stepped forward and cried, "It's not the day sir, but the deed that counts!", and in a moment, Pitcairn lay dead at his feet. Daniel Webster, speaking at Bunker Hill, 100 years later, cried, "We stand on the spot where the blade of Salem flashed against the sun of victory. They were there to take the field against German arms that had harnessed science to the chariot of death and destruction and tried to quench every spark of freedom in rivers of blood. They were there at a time when the French Armies were in retreat and old men with bleeding feet were stumbling back over the stones of the road, and women were running to save their virtues. They plunged up the rocky slopes of glory without stumbling over a stone and helped snatch victory from the jaws of defeat. But they are still waiting for the sunrise of American fair play to reap their full share of the blessings, of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

I can appreciate this recognition from the American Legion. It was one of few organizations in the country to include in its membership black soldiers. It was one of the first in the country to recognize the most important issue in the country—a nation that lays bare the soul of the American dream. Equal rights is the issue of a nation that holds out to all mankind their greatest hope. Should our nation plunge up the rocky slopes of glory and hang the flag of victory on the foremost ramparts of the world; should our nation conquer the moon and people it with the mighty creations of science; should our nation prize open the stony lips of geology and discover all the mysteries in the bosom of the earth and still not overcome the clash of race and tradition and make equality a reality then we have failed as a nation that the founding fathers dreamed about. For what does it behoove a nation to conquer the world and lose its own soul. "Then it has failed to know that the destiny and dreams of all men repose in it as a child in its mother's womb." America is the dream of the prophets. Here is the thought of Plato and Socrates, of Jesus and

Buddha. Here is the experiment conducted by God to discover whether man has come of age. I believe as the late Bruce Barton once believed: "God has set going here an experiment to which all His resources are committed. He seeks to develop superior human beings, victorious over fate. No single kind of human talent or effort can be spared if the experiment is to succeed." With the help of God it shall come to pass.

LIEUTENANT LEE GETS SPECIAL STAR FROM
PRESIDENT NIXON

(By Robert Johnson)

There's another star by the name of Lt. George W. Lee, Beale Street's laureate, historian, and diligent worker for causes and mankind, and he's been promoted again. The star is special, sent by President Nixon himself, with a personal message, and was presented to Lt. Lee when he was honored with the R. Q. Venson Appreciation Award by American Legion Post 27 before 400 at a dinner at the Downtowner March 17.

The Presidential Star was sent with this message. "The original of this design, a gift from Ambassador Walter Annenberg, was sculpted in crystal by Steuben Glass and now occupies a place of honor on my desk in the Oval Office. This replica comes to you with my special appreciation for your help and support in the 1972 campaign and for the recognition given you there in Memphis. With every good wish for the years ahead, Richard Nixon."

The Presidential Star is a crystal emblem, about the size of a table clock. And where will you keep it? I asked Lt. Lee. "Why I'm going to keep it on my desk, like the President keeps it on his," he replied, surprised that I would ask such an obvious question.

Lt. Lee—beg pardon, he got promoted a long time ago—also was commissioned a colonel on his staff by Gov. Winfield Dunn, who sent a message: "I'm highly honored to have opportunity to send my congratulations and special best wishes to my good friend, Lt. George W. Lee, on this momentous occasion when he is presented the R. Q. Venson Appreciation Award by Legion Post 27. I commend Post 27 for its selection of Lt. Lee, for all know the outstanding contributions he has made to Memphis, the state and the nation . . ."

The Legislature passed a special resolution of commendation and he was awarded a plaque with a replica of the seal of the State of Tennessee. Actually, Lt. Lee was already a colonel. He was named a colonel on the staff of Gov. Buford Ellington. He got the Lt. the hard way, as first Negro officer in WWI. But I personally had long since promoted him to General, because he is general guardian of Beale's history and tradition, general spokesman for its people and their welfare, general custodian of its anecdotes and humanity, generally the man to see—which rates four stars.

Percy Williams, post and state commander, was master of ceremonies.

WHY? WHY AIM?

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Ronald A. Campbell has written an excellent article in the South Dakota Churchman on what the American Indian Movement means to South Dakotans, red and white alike. I think my

colleagues will be interested in the observations offered in the article:

WHY? WHY AIM?

(By the Reverend Ronald A. Campbell, St. Paul's Church, Vermillion)

As a growing Indian boy one learns a lot from nature as well as from the watchful eyes of experienced parents. The little girl learns from the mother, the boy—he learns from the father. I remember many times my father's advice and instructions on many things that I would encounter in my future life.

In my lifetime as a growing Indian boy, like all Indian boys of that time, I was taught to hunt and trap for food. I clearly remember father's instructions when I was to practice, for the first time, with a 22 caliber, single shot rifle. I remember aiming at my first target, a tin can. I squeezed the trigger, the rifle fired and dirt jumped into the air about ten feet in front of the target, and my Dad said, "Raise your sight a little higher, Son, and aim above your target." I followed instructions and hit the can. I felt then as I feel now that a person's aim, in life as well as in hunting, is most important. We set our goals in life, then aim a little higher so if we miss and hit a little low, we should still reach our goal.

My Dad was a wonderful guy; he also told me that one of the most important things in life is to learn to get along with people of all races. I must respect them if I want them to respect me. So, armed with this wisdom, I felt ready for the world and went out and set my goals (more than one), raised my sights a bit, respected people and hoped to earn respect from all nationalities.

One day while in Berkeley, California, I was reading the San Francisco Chronicle and came across an article which told of a new "movement" called AIM (American Indian Movement). This really said something to me. I thought to myself, "What a great thing for my Indian people." I immediately wanted to be a part of it. I was a little envious in thinking that, "Why couldn't I have thought of this instead of someone else?" And at that time I wanted so much to be involved, too. My thought, then, was "When I finish Seminary and return to one of our Indian Reservations in South Dakota, I will do all I can to contribute to this movement."

Upon reading this article, "this 'New Song' that was being sung," as someone said, I visualized many wonderful things that would or could take place on our Reservations with our Indian people. The biggest dream was—Self-Determination! In my thoughts were big, six-bottom plows being pulled by giant tractors operated by Indian men, who were the owners of land and machinery, turning over black dirt, acres of it, and sowing the seed and reaping an abundance in harvest, selling and buying and getting rich off their own land, paying taxes, gaining a kind of different respect that we never had before.

And in our Western Reservations I visualized great herds of cattle grazing on Indian owned land with many Indian cowboys riding herd at round-up time, roping and branding calves, selling young steers and beef cattle, making an honest living the hard way, but receiving a lot of joy and satisfaction from it. But this dream could only come about through "self-determination" and the help of this new Indian Movement called AIM. I am very proud to be an Indian, but I was prouder at that time because of the many good things I thought would come about when we all worked together toward our goals.

Then one day again in the San Francisco Chronicle, I read of members of AIM who wanted to take over Alcatraz. This gave me mixed feelings; I didn't know what to think. Maybe if, what was termed as "public domain" land were to go back to the Indians when not in use, was a true fact, then maybe

this was a good thing. Later I read that our Indian people were going to be taken off the island because of their misuse of the buildings. But this action still didn't put my feelings against the Movement. Instead I felt "more power to them," after all they have to gain experience somewhere before they come back to our Reservations and begin to realize results from this great aim. I still felt there was a great chance left and that things would begin to happen on our home Reservations where we needed help the most.

Not too long ago I read where one of the leaders of AIM had confronted the Episcopal Church at their Convention and spoke out against the Church and what the Church pretended to be. By this time I was finished with my seminary training and was home working on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, the Home of the Oglalas. I didn't care for the statements that were made against my Church because I knew what the Church was doing and had done for my people. It was also at this time that I had found out that our Church was one of the denominations which were supporting or had supported this new movement financially. I couldn't help but think, "Why should the hand that is doing the feeding get bitten?"

While I was at Pine Ridge, a murder was committed against an Indian man in a small border town by White men. The AIM was called in to protest and to march on the town council. This, I thought, was all right because a lot of organizations in the country were doing the same thing on issues they thought were unfair. But at Pine Ridge it was carried too far when destruction of property and the beating of a minister became part of their protest. I felt that this had no bearing on the main purpose for AIM being in Pine Ridge and was really unnecessary. It was at this point that my feelings toward the American Indian Movement changed. No more were dreams dancing in my head about giant tractors and great herds. Instead I began hoping more and more that the Church would never cease supporting our Indian Missions, and at the same time I hoped that the Church would discontinue their financial support to AIM because, by this time, they were doing us more harm than good with their actions.

While at Pine Ridge AIM had humiliated our white teachers to the point that they slacked down in their teaching responsibilities; a lot of them found teaching jobs elsewhere. They had also managed to turn some of the minds of our young people against the Church, or tried to. They caused 175 young students to drop out of high school. They had created hate in the minds of some of our Indian people toward the White man, which we did not need then or ever. At that time it seemed that the efforts of our Church in the past years were going to be destroyed in a few days.

Not too long ago this group went to Washington, D.C., on what was called "The Trail of Broken Treaties." It sounded great to the people who were asked to go. It was going to be a "dream come true" to the innocent people who went. Upon returning, some of the people said they had no idea that the leaders could become so violent so quick, and this is what happened in the Capital.

So now we come to our historical town of Custer, located in our beautiful Black Hills, and the violence which took place there by this AIM group. I asked myself over and over again, "Is this right? Is it right to endanger the lives of children and adults, both Indian and White? Is it right for the Church to support such a group when they are making the efforts of the Indian people to become self-supporting harder instead of easier?" The Episcopal Church and the Presbyterian Church are the only denominations in the state of South Dakota that have ordained Indian Clergy, and we are few. But it is we who have to try to heal the wounds that are

left behind when the group moves on to other parts of the Nation. We have to try to restore love where hate was placed. We have to try to bring back the respect from the White man which took us years to build and seconds to destroy. I am thankful that only a very few White people have turned against all Indians for the acts of a few. I am also thankful for people like the mayor of Rapid City and Mr. Rockshaw of Custer. Mr. Rockshaw lost his Texaco station, or part of it, but when asked, he said, "I have nothing against the Indian in South Dakota. It is just these few who are doing all the damage." It is this kind of thinking from our White brothers that will help us restore what was lost. We have close to 60,000 Indian people enrolled on our Reservations in South Dakota. There are approximately 1,500 who took part in this demonstration, which is mighty few, and they are not all from South Dakota. But we all suffer for the acts of a few.

Just recently I was on a journey to another part of the state and stopped for lunch in a tiny cafe. I was in the company of two college students. When we entered the cafe a strange feeling came over me. It seemed that, at once, everyone became very quiet and we were the subject of many staring eyes. When I looked around the room I realized that we were the only Indian people in the cafe, and I began to wonder about this strange feeling. I thought I would try a little test, so I nodded "hello" to one of the men, and he quickly turned his back toward me. Is this man to be blamed for his act? A man whom I know, was passing through one of our midwest towns and was refused service at a gas station because the people claimed he was affiliated with AIM. Are these people to be blamed? A young Indian University student was hit in the mouth by one of the AIM leaders because he refused to go with them to Custer and take part in their demonstration.

So, on behalf of the many Indian people who think the way I think and share these experiences with me, but who do not know where to turn or with whom they can talk or where to receive advice, I write this letter in protest to the Churches of all denominations involved to discontinue their support to the AIM group. Is it Christian to refuse help to such a group. Is it Christian to help a group that will destroy friendship, faith, brotherhood, respect and condemn the Church? I think that help should be given to the Priests on Indian Reservations so they can do their jobs better and help restore what has been torn down. I also think that our Colleges and Universities where Indian students are enrolled should be helped with certain Church programs so our Indian kids in college would like staying in school and maybe attend Church. It would seem that education should be a major area which our Indian leaders and their programs would focus upon and do something about.

I have received reports that people who contribute highly to the National Council on Indian Work will stop their support of this program because they are not too happy with NCIW supporting the AIM movement. So, if the NCIW is supporting this movement financially, I ask that they discontinue.

The NCIW is a worthwhile program and needs the support of the National Church and the wonderful people who contribute toward the program. I can see this program filling a great need in our Dakota states ("Dakota" in the Sioux tongue means "Indian"), because it is funding our Dakota Leadership Training Program in South Dakota. Through this Program we were able to ordain two Indian men to the Priesthood and two to the Diaconate. And this is where we need leadership, now more than ever. Right now this Dakota Leadership Program is training five men for the ministry and two

young ladies to the Church Army organization.

Maybe it will be a special program such as this that will make the people's dreams come true. Maybe this will pave the way for my children and grandchildren and the vast future of my Indian people. One thing that we will have to keep in mind now and always is that this dream will not come about by violence, but by peace and careful negotiation. Our White brothers understand our situation and have helped in a lot of ways in the past. It is this understanding, this friendship, this help that will make our "dreams come true" on the Reservations. Then, maybe, in the future my dreams of giant tractors and plows, great herds of cattle and many Indian cowboys will become a reality. It could happen in my time, and maybe with a lot of faith, hope and love it could even happen with my generation. But right now, with the way I have been made to feel, the way things are and problems created. I can think only of the dirt jumping into the air ten feet in front of the target. And I say to myself, "Why? Why AIM?"

LAMENT FOR THE LANGUAGE TRAINING CENTERS

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, among the many federally assisted programs which appear in trouble this year is one which has made little demand on the Federal budget, but which has been of real value. I refer to the study of foreign languages in this country. Should it be necessary to close down the various language training centers because of the curtailment of Federal assistance, the impact could be serious. And there seems no doubt that these centers are in serious financial difficulties.

The following article, from the New York Times of April 3 by Prof. Marshall D. Shulman, director of the Russian Institute at Columbia University in New York, demonstrates the nature of the problem.

The text of the article follows:

LAMENT FOR THE LANGUAGE TRAINING CENTERS (By Marshall D. Shulman)

There is an old Russian story about a mouse who dived into a hole in the wall for safety from a pursuing cat. Waiting for the cat to go away, the mouse heard a dog barking, and came out, confident that the cat would not remain in the vicinity of a barking dog. Whereupon the cat, as he pounced upon the emerging mouse, said exultingly: "How useful it is to know a foreign language!"

The story is pertinent today, in considering what President Nixon's budget proposals will do to the study of foreign languages in the United States.

From the narrow perspective of national security, is it more important for us to acquire one more F-111 than to ensure that we have at least a moderate flow of future citizens trained to know something about other parts of the world and their languages?

President Nixon's proposed budget wipes out Government support through the National Defense Education Act, of a program which now supports 4,500 courses in a more than eighty modern foreign languages and all foreign areas—at a cost of less than the price of one fighter-bomber.

Among the lessons of Vietnam, it is safe to say that one reason we were not in a position to make sensible judgments about the issue as it arose in the middle nineteen-sixties is that in the entire country we did not have a handful of people who knew the language, the politics or the culture of Vietnam. Our decisions were made in ignorance.

However much the Nixon Doctrine reduces our commitments abroad, and however peaceful our coexistence with the Soviet Union, it should be a top priority to insure that our national level of ignorance about other parts of the world, reflecting our long tradition of parochialism and isolation, be remedied. Even under the most optimistic of assumptions, our nation will be called upon to make judgments about the Soviet Union, China, Africa, Asia and Latin America, for which we as a people are wholly unprepared.

Whose responsibility is it in our society to see that this national need is not neglected? The universities are in deep financial trouble and cannot do this job without help. The foundations are withdrawing support, preoccupied with other problems and intimidated by restrictive Federal regulations. The Federal Government's modest defense education support, which provided an average of 12.3 per cent of the cost, is now threatened with extinction, as is the National Defense Fellowship Loan program. This withdrawal will result in the closing down of many, if not most, of the language and area centers across the United States. These training programs represent a national necessity, and by any philosophy of government, however conservative, the Federal Government should play its part along with the universities, foundations, business and private donors.

The case for study of the Soviet Union should not rest upon the national security argument alone, but even from this point of view, the priorities of the proposed budget are difficult to understand. Last year we had about 12,000 enrollments (with some duplications) at centers supported by Defense Education centers in courses on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and their languages; about 3,000 of these were in the Russian language. This is not a large number if one considers at how many levels our future depends upon having enough people around who can follow and understand developments in the Soviet Union. Our policies are based upon assumptions regarding the Soviet economy, the Soviet political system, its military capabilities, its foreign policies; our businessmen are becoming acquainted with the Soviet economy and Soviet trading institutions; in problems of the environment, health, space, science and technology, ocean resources, etc., we are beginning to learn to deal with each other.

Where will people come from, five years from now, who will be equipped to do these things, if even this small flow of training is sharply reduced?

Our present "limited adversary relationship" with the Soviet Union is much more complex than the simple polarities of the cold war. We are engaged with the Soviet Union at many levels: strategic weapons competition, conventional military competition, economic competition and trade, cooperation on some common problems, and a competition for political influence in Europe, the Middle East, Asia and elsewhere. To follow these developments intelligently, as well as the changes now in progress in Soviet society and the Soviet political and economic systems, requires a cadre of highly trained specialists—trained to a much higher level of competence than was thought necessary during the past two decades.

The Soviet Union understands this. It has given a high priority and ample government resources to the training of an increasing number of "Americanists" and the development of an institute on the U.S.A.

THE CONSTITUTION OF MAN

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, a number of prayer breakfast groups convene each week in our Nation's Capitol and those who attend find fellowship, strength and inspiration in the work that they do. Recently, the Reverend Eddy Ie Swieson, associate pastor of the Fourth Presbyterian Church in Washington, D.C. spoke to the Capitol Hill Staff Prayer Group on the subject of "The Constitution of Man." Those in attendance thought it was an outstanding address and I wish to share it with my colleagues:

AN ADDRESS TO CAPITOL HILL STAFF PRAYER GROUP: "THE CONSTITUTION OF MAN?"

(By Rev. Eddy Ie Swieson)

WHO AM I?

Isn't it ironic that at the apex of modern technological advancement man begins to turn into himself?

And, isn't this particularly true among the potential and promising youth of today?

As adults, we need to pause and ponder on that burning question; and, whenever possible, we should try to help supply the answer for our children. Because, that is a crucial issue of life which contributes to one's outlook positively or negatively.

Hence, the Bible begins with the genesis of man, providing both direct & indirect answers to the questions:

Who am I?

Whence do I come?

Why am I here?

EXPOSITION

For instance, the Book of Genesis chapter 2 gives us the original picture of man and his tremendous responsibility.

"—then the Lord God formed man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life (Nishma), and man became a living being." Gen. 2:7

Two things to note here.

(a) Obviously, because of the God given Nishma, man, then, became a living, responsible being.

(b) Moreover, man is not merely constituted of body, which according to the Scripture originated from dust or clay, and therefore, shall return to dust; the book of Genesis explicitly states that man is endowed by the Creator "the breath of life" in Hebrew it is called "Nishma" which issues forth from the Spirit of God (Ruach Ha-Elohim).

The Bible, again and again, speaks of man as God's direct creation. Consider Job 33:4. "The spirit of God has made me, and the breath of the Almighty gives me life."

In addition to body and spirit, God has endowed man with intelligent and understanding mind. This is apparent in the creation record.

"So out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field and every bird of the air, and brought them to man to see what he would call them; and whatever man called every living creature, that was its name." Gen. 2:20

Notice, his brilliant ability to name every beast of the field, the birds of the air, and all cattle. And the amazing thing is, he was able to remember the individual names without keeping a catalog or creating name tags. Undoubtedly, he must have a supersensitive mind.

Where did such an intelligence come from? Again, the record of Job gives us a valid and objective insight.

"But it is the spirit in a man, the breath of the Almighty, that makes him understand." Job 32:8

For your information, the word, understand, is a translation from the Hebrew word "bin" which means, to be prudent, to perceive, to discern and to distinguish.

It is not just an accumulated knowledge, but a keen insight—both penetrating and prophetic. Hence, it is God endowed. It issues forth from the breath of the Almighty.

Note how man is wholly dependent upon his Creator. Yet, many of us don't want to recognize this. We are afraid of being labeled as fanatic religionists.

As we can see from the preceding exposition, man is constituted of 'body', 'mind' and 'spirit'. The painful fact is, that we don't pay much attention to that third and vital element of life, called 'spirit' or 'nishma'.

We spend so much money and consume so much food to achieve a maximum satisfaction for our bodies. We complain and protest when this part of our being is undernourished or uncomfortable.

We also spend so much time and energy to assure excellent mental growth and adequate education. We would fight to discourage any symptom of unfair and unequal distribution of talents.

Yet, how many of us recognize the need to nourish and nurture the human soul, the God given Nishma?

No wonder, many of our youngsters are seeking some spiritual experience in Eastern religions, like Hinduism and Buddhism. Man can't neglect his intangible and vital principle of life. Here is a classic passage which all parents ought to read and reflect on, Psalm 42:1-3

"As a heart longs for flowing streams, so longs my soul for thee, O God. My soul thirsts for God, for the living God. When shall I come and behold the face of God? My tears have been my food day and night, while men say to me continually, 'Where is your God?'"

Again, for your information, the word, soul, is a translation from the Hebrew word 'nephesh', which refers to that vital principle of life, called anima or psuche. As you know, our word psychology is derived from the Greek 'psuche'.

Now you see that psychological problems are really precipitated by spiritual poverty. Unbalanced persons—i.e. heavy weight, loaded with human knowledge but spiritually starved, suffocated and stupefied cannot perceive well or penetrate the total and reality of human life. The Bible describes such individuals as those who don't know their right hand from their left.

Take as an example, the matter of abortion. If we think of an embryo or a fetus as a mere product of heterosexual relationship, naturally we will be less concerned for its fate.

However, if we take into consideration the Nishma which makes the embryo or fetus a living being, then we shall naturally be less aggressive.

Consider the following passage in Psalm 139:13-16

"O Lord, you . . . know everything about me. You made all the delicate, inner parts of my body, and knit them together in my mother's womb."

Thank you for making me so wonderfully complex. It is amazing to think about. Your workmanship is marvelous—and how well I know it. You were there while I was being formed in utter seclusion.

You saw me before I was born and scheduled each day of my life before I began to breathe.

Such a point of view is called "creationism".

Of course, there are exceptions which must be taken into consideration. Even God recognizes the individual and existential dilemma of each person.

Realizing now the importance of the con-

stitutional balance of our being, you may ask the practical question: "How can one's life be adjusted to a healthy and equal proportion?"

The biblical answer is found in Jesus' statement to Nicodemus, when he revealed God's desire and readiness to re-breathe into man His divine spirit. Here is what Jesus said:

"Unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God."

The Spirit like wind, blows where it wills, we hear the sound of it, but we don't know whence it comes or whether it goes. So it is with every one who is re-breathed of the Spirit." John 3:5,8.

The wonderful thing to realize is, that it is the will of God that we all experience this marvelous recreation. For God loved the world so much that he gave his only Son so that anyone who believes in him shall not perish but have a balanced, fullest and lasting life.

PRODUCER'S SIDE OF THE STORY

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, through the meat boycott and amendments to the Economic Stabilization Act attempts have been and will be made to roll back the prices paid to the producer of agricultural products. I for one do not believe this is the right approach to take.

In a letter to me, my dear friends and neighbors, Mr. and Mrs. Roger Anderson of Milroy, Minn., described the plight of the American farmer expertly. And no one knows better than a farmer himself.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the Anderson's letter, and recommend highly its reading by my colleagues.

The letter follows:

MILROY, MINN., April 6, 1973.

HON. JOHN ZWACH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ZWACH: We appreciate having you as a representative for the people of this area, and especially appreciate your voice for the farmer in the Agriculture Committee and elsewhere. We have sent the following letter to news media, congressmen, etc. expressing our views:

"If the boycott on meat succeeds in rolling back the prices paid to the producer, it will be the saddest thing that ever happened to the American consumer. The American farmer is justifiably proud that we are the best fed nation in the world on the least percentage of the consumer's paycheck. The producer, however, has reached the point where he will no longer sell his product for the same price per pound and per bushel that he did 25 years ago. We cannot do this because our living costs and production costs have risen along with every other consumer's—largely due to labor's regularly increased wages. When these people that are protesting the first major raise in our income in the past 25 years are willing to go back to the paycheck that they were receiving 25 years ago, we also will be willing to take a cut in our income. We will put no more livestock in our feedlot unless we are reasonably assured of a profit when we sell it."

"Maybe our consumers would like to import their meat—it only sells for \$3.50 to \$5.00 a lb. in Europe—and their meat is a tough product compared to good midwest

cornfed animals. Any cheap imports will have to be subsidized by the taxpayer.

"We would appreciate equal consideration for the producer's side of the problem."

We hope you will continue to make people aware that it is through necessity, not greed, that the producer must ask more for his product today than he did 25 years ago.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. ROGER ANDERSON.

REMARKS OF HON. FRANK SANDERS TO THE SHIPBUILDERS COUNCIL OF AMERICA

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, following are the remarks of the Honorable Frank Sanders, Under Secretary of the Navy, made recently to the Shipbuilders Council of America. I am sure that my colleagues will be interested in this statement which I am submitting to the RECORD:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE FRANK SANDERS ON AMENITIES

What is security?

Today, I would like to comment briefly on this matter of security, the role of the Navy in this important area and set forth what I believe is your role and mine.

First, let us look at the world briefly. Not the world as you would like it to be but the way it is. If you were to ask the average American the one national goal to which we could aspire, I think you would find that goal to be peace. This is not new. It has always been our oft elusive but constant goal. It has been said that in the last 3,425 years of recorded history only 268 have seen no war. George Marshall stated: "If a man does find the solution for world peace it will be the most revolutionary reversal of his record we have ever known." The real key to world peace lies not in war or disarmament but through the peaceful resolution of conflicting national interests by negotiation.

This approach has recently resulted in far-reaching and successful initiatives in our nation's foreign policy—initiatives unprecedented in our time. The record of progress in those initiatives speaks for itself. The initial agreements with the Soviet Union on the limitation of strategic armaments, the large trade treaty, the Sea Beds Treaty, the agreement on reversion of Okinawa, together with the visit of the President to Moscow and the historic lifting of the Bamboo Curtain through his visit to Peking, followed by the visits of other leaders, have redefined reality. We have already begun a second phase of talks with the Soviets looking toward more comprehensive agreements in the strategic arms area. Preparatory talks and initiatives have taken place for a Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and for talks between the NATO and Warsaw Pact nations on Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions in Europe.

Certainly, we have made significant strides on the long and difficult journey toward our elusive goal of peace. The success thus far achieved can be attributed, of course, to the willingness of the negotiating parties to accommodate conflicting interests. Let there be no mistake, however, that this willingness is directly related to the relative bargaining power of the parties concerned and—where we negotiate in the military area—bargaining power is synonymous with military strength. I do not have to tell you that the

best negotiator is a man who negotiates from a position of strength.

As we approach our immediate goal of a generation of peace, we must avoid actions which those at the bargaining table, with or across from us, will regard as weaknesses, or the loss of our will to be strong.

The President has forcefully presented such a position of strength in his proposed budget for fiscal 1974. Already we are hearing cries to drastically reduce that budget. It calls for \$79 billion in defense outlays, but what does that really mean? Our critics point out that in 1964 the pre-Vietnam budget year, the total request was \$51 billion, but they stop there. We all know the built-in costs to our economy which we have experienced. If we adjust the proposed expenditures for 1974 for pay and price increases—in other words, put this budget on a constant dollar basis with the Fiscal Year 1964 budget, we will be \$8.7 billion below that level. As a matter of fact, we will be \$34.8 billion below the wartime peak of 1968. Our active duty military strength is at its lowest level since the Korean War. The new budget represents 6% of our gross national product, the lowest level in over twenty-five years. The percentage of our total Federal budget devoted to defense is 23.5%, the lowest level since the Korean War, and a reduction of 14.1 points from the 1968 peak of 42.5%. As it should, and as it has for the past year or so, the Federal budget for human resources significantly exceeds the budget for defense. Simply stated, as people clamor for shifts in priorities, I can only say that the priorities have already shifted and that we cannot look at the defense budget as a panacea to solve other domestic problems if we are to maintain the defense potential we require and that I feel the American people demand of us. As the President has started, we must "never fall short of the minimum needed for security."

We have not and will not fall short of this minimum.

It is widely recognized that the balance of power is shifting. The old dual power environment is giving way to a multi-centered world where as many as five major governments or collection of governments exert power. To protect our national power we must keep a clear-eyed, level-headed approach not only to our international commitments but to our dependence upon them. You are all well aware of the extent to which our nation is dependent on the sea—for the trade which is so vital to our economy and for those many raw materials not available here at home.

This is where one of my favorite subjects comes into the forefront. The role of sea-power in support of our national security. We are an island nation, dependent upon others for the health of our economy and our essential well-being. Without control of our sea lanes of communication, our successful commerce and the fate of our allies will come at the mercy of others. Yet, at home a lack of understanding by the man in the street of his own dependence on the sea for his way of life and for the necessity for strong national defense, can lead to apathy.

In addition, Soviet seapower has risen as a result of the greatest buildup in history to the point where it now rivals our own. This is very evident in certain key areas, such as the Mediterranean, where Soviet ships have frequently outnumbered ours in recent years, or the Indian Ocean where the Soviet Navy outnumbered ours by a factor of 3 or 4. It is perfectly obvious that we cannot meet our national security demands without a strong Navy as an integral part of a strong and credible defense. In these days and times we simply cannot afford to be Number Two.

You must realize that we made a conscious decision to modernize the fleet, even though it requires us to retire substantial numbers

of older ships. With the acquisition of 3 new nuclear carriers, the new Spruance class DD's, the nuclear submarine building program, plus new initiatives such as Trident, SCS, SES, PF, and PHM, we will maintain our U.S. seapower as number one in the world.

We cannot have this strong Navy unless we have these trained and dedicated people to give life and direction to it all. For navies are only ships and planes, and those are hardware, cold and immobile without living, breathing people.

In this era of the All Volunteer Force—and make no mistake we are there now as draft calls have ended and we are completely dependent upon volunteers—there are two factors the Navy must consider.

First, your attitude and the attitude of our young people toward the Armed Services. We are trying to present to them the very real advantages of services, as preparation for life, as education, as a chance to contribute, but this will go for naught unless we—you and me—can show them with their strong motivation for the building of a better world, that their idealism is typified by men and women in uniform—that their contributions to the greatness of America is the devotion of their lives to keeping it strong through full time service—that they stand in the forefront of those ready to make the supreme sacrifice for the freedom which we sometimes take so much for granted. Only as we who are older manifest our respect for them and support the goals for which they stand can we expect our young people to reflect the same respect and to seek military service as a rewarding and satisfying career.

Secondly, we want everyone to know that opportunity in the Navy is real, solid opportunity.

The Navy is a microcosm of the world around us—we are not perfect. But we are making strides. Guaranteed school quotas and improved counselling are going far toward helping us meet our goals.

Our efforts to interest, recruit and retain young men and women, including all minority groups, are proving increasingly successful. The opportunities are real, ready for the grasping.

We have better pay, more travel, and a high potential for upward mobility. The average salary in the military services today is \$8,832, plus fringe benefits such as outstanding medical care, commissaries, post exchanges, housing and an excellent insurance program. Education—at all levels—is our high selling point. In the Navy we spend \$680 million a year on education. Eighty-five percent of the skills for which Armed Forces train are directly transferable to the civilian market. A dollar for defense is not a dollar thrown away. It is a dollar multiplied for America many times over.

I say again. The Navy is opportunity.

Let me summarize then the situation in the world today and what we can expect for the future. We see the movement from an era of confrontation to an era of negotiations, looking toward a generation of peace. We have proven through the negotiations culminating in the first SALT Agreements that we can maintain a strong strategic position and enhance our security by agreeing on mutual arms limitation. We are committed to future negotiations of this type. They can be at least equally as successful only if we continue to depend on the military strength and the strength of the people of this country.

There is a stirring of the breezes of peace, but it is a peace founded on our nation's strength, a strength which makes it possible for our President to negotiate from a position of power, not one of weakness. Those of us who are with or in the military service of our country know that a just and lasting peace must always be our ultimate objective. This is that to which the man in uni-

form is dedicated, even to the sacrifice of his own life to achieve it. This strength exists solely to secure the interests of the American people.

Last month a lonely man walked down a ramp leading from an Air Force aircraft—the first time in over seven years his feet had touched land over which the American flag flew. Then very quietly Captain Jeremiah A. Denton, Navy pilot, former POW and father of seven, including two with service in Vietnam, said: "We are honored to have the opportunity to serve our country under difficult circumstances. We are profoundly grateful to our commander-in-chief and to our nation for this day. God bless America."

When we are the recipients of such dedication we have no choice but to respond in kind.

How we respond as individuals and as a nation is the measure of the national security we will have. The choice is strictly up to us—to you and me. I ask from you the same support for them and for those who lead us so that together we may continue to strive successfully toward our ultimate objective.

May God truly continue to bless America through our dedication to the ideals that have made this the greatest nation in the world.

WE CALL THIS WAR A CEASE-FIRE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, there is great confusion as to how successful the cease-fire has been in South Vietnam. We are all aware that a true cessation of hostilities has not yet occurred nor do we seem to be making much progress in that direction.

The American Friends Service has published a report on this important issue and appears to bring the situation into a more understandable light.

There is a great gap in the information available as to which side seems less interested in procuring a cessation of hostilities. Given this gap in information, however, the available evidence compels a conclusion that the Government of South Vietnam has decided to continue to seek a military decision as to control of territory and people. If that is a correct conclusion, and I believe it is, the fragile nature of the peace effort is greatly threatened by the South Vietnamese. If we truly desire a political settlement of those issues rather than a military solution, we must insist upon compliance by both the South Vietnamese and the Vietcong with the Kissinger accords. That compliance is not now evident.

I include the report of the American Friends Service as a part of my remarks. The conclusion of this report will be found in tomorrow's RECORD.

The report follows:

WE CALL THIS WAR A CEASEFIRE

(By Dave McFadden)

"In 1984, Orwell has us calling war peace," a European diplomat said early last week. "This is only 1973, so we don't dare go quite that far yet, and we only call this war a cease-fire."—JOHN WOODRUFF, Baltimore Sun, February 25, 1973.

"I have seen burned houses, suffering and death since the cease-fire. But I haven't seen

peace."—woman in bombed out home, Tan Dien hamlet, RON MOREAU, Newsweek, April 2, 1973.

A cease-fire did not come to Vietnam on January 28, 1973. Nor has one come since. More people have been killed since the signing of the "Agreement to End the War and Restore the Peace in Vietnam" than in the same 2-month period in 1972, when no one pretended the war was over. As of March 28, 18,000 Vietnamese had been reported killed and 15,000 wounded in eight weeks of "cease-fire."

It is hard for anyone to tell exactly what is happening in Vietnam. The Government of the Republic of Vietnam (GVN) has charged the "communists" with over 7,500 separate violations of the cease-fire. The Provisional Revolutionary Government (PRG) and Democratic Republic of Vietnam (DRV) have charged Saigon with over 46,000 violations. No one has been able to devise a method to confirm or deny these various charges. The reports or records of the International Commission for Control and Supervision and the Joint Military Commission are not available.

But a careful survey of the American press is revealing. While US newsmen in South Vietnam rely heavily on US and Saigon official government and military sources for news of troop movements and battles, some correspondents have managed first-hand coverage of military operations since the cease-fire. Since most American newsmen in South Vietnam do not speak Vietnamese, their coverage is limited to those areas in which interpreters and guides can be found. At present, the Saigon government controls foreign entry to South Vietnam. Newsmen who venture into PRG controlled areas do so at their own risk. Such ventures are discouraged by GVN troops. Reports unfavorable to the Saigon government can result in nonrenewal of a visa.

To date, since the cease-fire, we have been able to locate in the American press only 8 reports from PRG-controlled areas—6 filed by American correspondents and 2 by British correspondents. Two of the six Americans have since had their visas expire, and they have been unable to renew them. All other reports have been from GVN controlled areas, or the GVN side of a battle. This study attempts to get below the surface of charges and countercharges of the GVN and the PRG and focus on the first-hand reports of American newsmen in the post-cease-fire period.

A careful survey of major American newspapers reveals more than 30 first-hand reports of cease-fire violations by Saigon forces between January 28 and March 27. Every major American newspaper with a correspondent on the scene in South Vietnam has reported some of these eye-witnessed violations.

In contrast, not one single PRG or DRV initiated violation has actually been observed and reported by a major US newspaper in the eight weeks since the cease-fire went into effect.

I. THE GROUND FIGHTING

"All acts of force on the ground, in the air and on the sea shall be prohibited.

"All hostile acts, terrorism, and reprisals by both sides will be banned." Agreement, Article 3(c).

First hand reports from American correspondents were particularly numerous in the week to ten days following the cease-fire. These reports were all similar. They showed hamlets and villages bombarded from the air and ground by Government of Vietnam (GVN) troops advancing on them. The story came from Bui Chi, Xom Suoi, Pleiku, Kontum, Phong An, Tay Ninh, Binh Tanh, Kien Hoa, Phuoc Tanh, Trang Bang, An Loi Tan, Phan Thiet, Binh-Phu, and Hoa Long. It was reported by the Los Angeles

Times, the Wall Street Journal, the New York Times, the Washington Post, The Baltimore Sun, CBS Evening News, AP, UPI, The New Yorker, Newsweek, and the Philadelphia Bulletin. A few examples of these stories follow:

"At eight o'clock in the morning of January 28th, the moment the cease-fire went into effect, I was in a car with a couple of other correspondents near the town of Twang Bang . . . listening to an announcer read President Nixon's peace proclamation. Just as he had read the words hailing 'the beginning of a new era of world peace and understanding for all mankind,' and calling on all Americans to 'observe this moment with appropriate ceremonies and activities,' the first of twenty-six five hundred pound bombs were dropped by South Vietnamese fighter-bombers a hundred yards ahead of us."—Robert Shaplen, New Yorker, 2/24/73

"This is a combat assault, about noon Monday, today, well over 24 hours past the cease-fire cutoff, South Vietnamese regulars from the 48th regiment, 18th Division are attacking a hamlet called Hoa Long, only 49 miles outside Saigon."—Don Webster, CBS News (film clip), 1/29/73.

"On Sunday and Monday, many newsmen, including this correspondent, saw fights in which it appeared the Saigon government was violating the truce in similar fashion or preparing to do so by advancing on hamlets clearly held by the Communists at the time of the cease-fire."—Arnold Isaacs, Baltimore Sun, 1/31/73.

From accounts like these, a picture emerges. In the days before the cease-fire signing, the PRG forces launched a military and political offensive. They took over villages and roads. Their flags dotted the countryside. By January 28, the PRG's control throughout the countryside was widespread.

After the signing, Saigon launched its offensive. In March, President Thieu boasted that his army had recaptured 400 villages in the other side's hands on January 28. Despite his minister's signature on an in-place cease-fire, Thieu claimed the right to keep fighting for areas "historically" under his control.

The GVN's most blatant violations have been its ongoing bombing of PRG areas. The Agreement banned all flights by military aircraft in South Vietnam. Nonetheless, Saigon planes were flying from one to two hundred bomb runs per day during the first three weeks after the signing.

According to John Woodruff of the Baltimore Sun, members of the ICCS were treated to frequent exhibitions by Thieu's Air Force:

"South Vietnamese dive bombers and the smoke of ground battle are often visible from two small Chinese hotels where the four nation Vietnam ceasefire commission has its temporary regional home. They put on one fine fire-works show for us, Maj. Ernie Poole, a Canadian said, gripping a can of beer . . ."—Baltimore Sun, 2/16/73.

The next day, the Joint Military Commission (JMC) specifically called on Saigon to stop its bombing. President Thieu agreed. A week later, however, the New York Times reported that GVN forces in the field had not yet received any such orders.

Saigon's only change in policy was to stop reporting the number of air strikes its planes were flying.

Nonetheless, on-the-scene observers from Bac Lieu in the Mekong Delta to Ap Lan Dinh to Pleiku in the Central Highlands have recently placed the numbers as high as ever. Bombing was observed by the ICCS and sometimes admitted by the GVN:

"In the Central highlands, a South Vietnamese spokesman in Pleiku willingly described major operations to clear a village and a strategic highway. . . . The spokesman acknowledged the use of air power in the battle to retake the village, even though the top command stopped reporting combat air strikes several weeks ago."

American newsmen offer other evidence of heavy GVN air and ground warfare. According to Peter Osnos of the Washington Post, "Commercial suppliers of fuel to the South Vietnamese Air Force say that consumption by government war planes is as great as before the ceasefire. . . . Diplomatic sources, with access to highly classified South Vietnamese reports, say that in the northern region alone, government troops have been firing an average of 35,000 rounds a day."

Many of the problems since January 28 might have been avoided if opposing commanders could have made direct contact—and the process of reconciliation could even begin. But Thieu has opposed such a process. At Saigon's insistence, the February 17 appeal by the JMC to stop fighting did not refer to Article 4 of the Protocols, which called on commanders of local units to meet together to work out ways of stopping hostilities. As Richard Blystone of the Associated Press reported March 7, "One high ranking South Vietnamese officer on the northern front, asked whether any leaders of his division had met with the communists on ceasefire morning, simply made a face."

The "other side" has fought back the attacks of Thieu's forces. Several western correspondents have reported that "There is no doubt about the continued Communist attacks" or "there is ample evidence that the PRG has been responsible for its own share of cease-fire violations." Invariably, however, such reports describe areas held by the PRG at the ceasefire deadline, later attacked by ARVN, in which fighting has continued—or the reports cite official Saigon government sources. In some cases, the alleged violations cannot be confirmed by first-hand accounts one way or another.

Saigon has charged the PRG with over 7,500 violations. It should be noted that the press articles reveal that Saigon considers it a ceasefire violation for PRG supporters to move, without shooting into neighboring villages to discuss their government's program or to resist when the GVN moves, to capture a village.

In our survey, we could not find one firsthand report by an American journalist of post-ceasefire fighting started by the revolutionaries.

II. THE CONTROL COMMISSIONS

"The parties shall provide full protection and all necessary assistance and cooperation to the Joint Military Commissions at all levels, in the discharge of their tasks."

"The Joint Military Commissions and their personnel, while carrying out their tasks, shall enjoy privileges and immunities equivalent to those accorded diplomatic missions and diplomatic agents."—Protocol on The Ceasefire, Article 16.

The task of investigating alleged violations of both sides rests with the International Commission of Control and Supervision (ICCS) and the Joint Military Commission (JMC). The JMC is made up of equal numbers of PRG, DRV, US & GVN military officers.

The ICCS cannot operate without the support, particularly at the sub-regional levels, of the JMC. There have been many difficulties in getting the JMC into operation anywhere but at the headquarters in Saigon. The major reason for this has been the GVN's refusal to allow PRG officers in the field to be picked up at sites under their control and flown to the seven regional and 26 subregional peace-keeping team sites. Saigon is reluctant to admit that any area, particularly in contested zones, might be under PRG control. In several cases, pickup sites have been designated, and the Saigon government has moved in troops and called in air strikes. And even when a pickup site is designated, Saigon has refused to guarantee the safety of PRG officers in GVN zones. The PRG and others have charged that some delegates have been killed trying to reach their areas. Only one

subregional JMC site has any PRG delegates. Since each side is responsible for the safety of JMC members when operating in its area, only GVN charges have been investigated at those sites where there are no PRG delegates.

In addition, there have been numerous attacks on JMC delegates by mobs of South Vietnamese. DRV and PRG truce team members were attacked in at least five separate incidents, by American press accounts: 1) In Hue, a crowd of at least 50 civilians threw eggs and rocks at DRV delegates; 2) In Binh Dinh province a demonstration of several thousand surrounded an aircraft and shouted abuse at the DRV delegates inside; 3) a crowd of Vietnamese civilians threw rocks at a group of JMC members arriving at Ban Methuot in the central highlands; 4) At Da Nang, mobs forced their way into the compounds where JMC members were staying, and began damaging the buildings; 5) 3000 refugees from Quang Tri province attacked the DRV truce team quarters at Chu Lai. After the first major attack, at Da Nang, "Saigon radio warned that the communists could expect repeated attacks on their delegates, 'if they continued to provoke the people.'" The Saigon government must have at least condoned all these attacks and demonstrations, since only pro-Thieu demonstrations are permitted in areas governed by the GVN—and Saigon is adept at quickly suppressing any unauthorized demonstrations.

An indication of Saigon's opposition to any cooperation with the PRG and DRV is evidenced by the virtual imprisonment in which the JMC members at Camp Davis in Saigon have been placed. Far from enjoying the privileges of diplomatic immunity, they have been housed in Army barracks, kept behind barbed wire, prevented from meeting with the press or the Vietnamese people. PRG and DRV delegate charges of bad conditions and virtual house arrest were confirmed when a bus load of western correspondents was allowed into Camp Davis March 17. Under a compromise arrangement, press are now allowed in once a week to talk to the delegates. But the Saigon government still refuses to drop other restrictions surrounding living and working arrangements.

III. THE UNITED STATES AND THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

"The United States will not continue its military involvement or intervene in the internal affairs of South Vietnam."—Agreement, Article 4.

"The dismantlement of all military bases in South Vietnam of the United States . . . shall be completed within 60 days of the signing of this agreement."—Agreement, Article 6.

The response of the United States to its ally military violations of the ceasefire, continuously reported since January 28, has not even been mild reproach. More than a week after the Joint Military Commission appeal to all sides to stop fighting, Henry Kissinger declared in a television interview that he was not worried about violations because "after all, how are the two sides going to establish their areas of control except by testing each other?"

And President Nixon has been very unconcerned about violations on the ground. The United States has focused major press attention on a charge of DRV infiltration of men and materiel along the Ho Chi Minh trail to Laos and the border areas of South Vietnam. The United States now claims that up to 450 vehicles, including 300 tanks, 30,000 men and a greater number of trucks, are massed along border areas in Laos and South Vietnam. It has been pointed out that "almost all the intelligence is coming from highly biased South Vietnamese sources. US intelligence confirms these sources, but disagrees concerning the meaning of the buildup and whether it is a violation of the ceasefire. There is a substantial body of opinion

within the administration, including the CIA which believes that the equipment and supplies left the DRV and began winding down the trail in November and December—before the ceasefire agreement was signed—and in response, to the tremendous shipment of arms and materiel which the US made to South Vietnam in October and November. This supposition is strengthened by recent reports of a significant reduction in the number of troops and equipment that have "recently" begun entering the Ho Chi Minh Trail, according to US intelligence reports.

The United States, for its part, has apparently failed to "dismantle, remove, or destroy" its military bases and war materiel and equipment in South Vietnam, as required by the Agreement and Protocols. In a press conference January 26, just before the ceasefire took effect, Pentagon spokesman Jerry Friedhelm was asked about plans for dismantlement of US bases. His answer was that all US bases in South Vietnam had been turned over to the South Vietnamese. Former Defense Secretary Laird said earlier that "more than \$1 billion worth of United States-built facilities was turned over to the South Vietnamese armed forces," and a UPI report of March 10 put the figure at \$5 billion. Long Binh Army headquarters was turned over "officially" to the GVN in a major ceremony in mid-November, and other bases have been transferred more quietly. The PRG and DRV do not accept the validity of the "transfer" of control and insist that all former US bases be dismantled, removed, or destroyed.

It certainly does appear that the US is sensitive about the subject. Reports from Da Nang Air Force Base indicate that orders are for "all visible traces of the American military presence" to be removed, even to the 'Kilroy was here' graffiti on barracks walls, in order that 'no one will ever believe we were here,' in the words of one GI.

"Military advisors or military technicians" and "advisors to paramilitary and police forces" are not permitted to remain in South Vietnam beyond 60 days following the ceasefire. Although the full dimensions are not yet clear, there are many signs that the United States intends to stretch this provision and to violate its spirit, if not its letter. There is evidence that the United States intends to keep civilian technicians in Vietnam to help the South Vietnamese armed forces in maintenance and repair of their bases and aircraft. Some of these civilians are already employed by corporations under contract to the Department of Defense—and some of them are directly employed by the DoD in civil service capacity. In addition to these personnel—estimated at between 6,000 and 20,000 the US will keep military attaches and marine guards at the four different embassy branches in South Vietnam. Air America will take over functions of US military helicopters, and the paramilitary pacification and Phoenix programs will be taken over by the State Department.

IV. INSURING THE "DEMOCRATIC LIBERTIES OF THE PEOPLE"

"Immediately after the cease-fire, the two South Vietnamese parties will:

Achieve national reconciliation and concord, end hatred and enmity, prohibit all acts of reprisal and discrimination against individuals or organizations that have collaborated with one side or the other.

Insure the democratic liberties of the people: personal freedom, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of meeting, freedom of organization, freedom of political activities, freedom of belief, freedom of movement, freedom of residence, freedom of work, right to property ownership and right to free enterprise."—Agreement, Article 11.

The extent to which essential freedoms have begun to be implemented by President Thieu since the time of the ceasefire is best summed up by Peter Osnos of the *Washing-*

ton Post, reporting from Saigon. "If anything, the South Vietnamese government has become more restrictive since the agreement took effect, rather than less." As one Thieu official has put it, the GVN is "a garrison state." South Vietnam remains under martial law: Thieu's army and the police force rule everything, from the courts to the press—all the way down to the hamlet chiefs.

As for "achieving national reconciliation," Thieu is taking steps in the opposite direction. Being a suspected communist or neutralist or even "one with neutralist sympathies" is a capital crime for which one can be imprisoned or even shot. There is evidence of a new wave of police repression since the ceasefire—with arrests of civilians for political reasons. Many of these, however, are being charged under criminal statutes to avoid their release as "civilian detainees," as required by the Agreements.

According to USAID figures, there were 641,000 people living in refugee camps at the time of the ceasefire, and probably several million refugees in the urban areas. These are "official" refugees, and US Senate estimates of "unregistered" refugees range much higher. Since the time of the ceasefire, Saigon officials of USAID have estimated that 78,000 new refugees have been "generated" and another 182,000 have been "displaced temporarily." Most of these refugees would like to return to their homes. Since their homes are in rural areas, and most of the rural areas are controlled by the PRG, Saigon is doing everything within its power to restrict refugee movement, and to allow persons to return only to "secure" areas, where they can be counted on to support the Saigon government. This "controlled" movement has already begun. Several thousand have been relocated to Quang Tri Province, and the movement of nearly 100,000 has begun to unsettled land near Saigon. Always, the moves are from refugee camps to government controlled areas, or to other refugee camps. At least 25,000 refugees from Binh Dinh province, friendly to the PRG, "will not be allowed to return."

In any election, the great bulk of former rural people, now refugee, holds the key to political power in South Vietnam. Saigon is now beginning to push for a presidential election, while the PRG wants local and legislative elections. Obviously, with present Saigon control over refugees as well as an election law prohibiting communists from running for office, a free election could not be held. Saigon's recent ordering of the resumption of village elections changes nothing. Village councils have entirely advisory duties. Village chiefs have been denuded of their power—which now rests in the hands of appointed deputy chiefs and hamlet chiefs—both of which are directly appointed by and responsible to Thieu's military apparatus.

Gen. Duong Van Minh, a Thieu opponent but a strong anti-communist, expressed the situation best in an open letter to the International Conference on Vietnam, in a demand that Article 11 of the Agreement be implemented: "Without the democratic freedoms guaranteed in Article 11 the whole concept of self-determination is meaningless."

LAW ABIDING CITIZENS BEING STRIPPED OF THEIR FREEDOM

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, recently, the President of the United States sent to the Congress his message outlining his proposals in the field of criminal law. The reaction on the part of some of our

colleagues was immediate and expected. Cries of receding to the dark ages during this "enlightened period" were heard and the wailing and gnashing of teeth over these poor benighted disadvantaged criminal offenders was enough to move strong men to tears—tears for their victims, Mr. Speaker. I am reminded of the statement of an Illinois State legislator who is, incidentally, black, during the recent debate of the death penalty. Someone had stated on behalf of abolition of the death penalty "most of the condemned are poor and friendless and black" to which the legislator responded "and most of the victims, my colleagues, were poor and friendless and black and dead."

A responsible constituent, Mr. Cleon Lingwood, of Bakersfield, has written me a letter I would like to share with my colleagues in the House. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how many other people in America share his views. I rather imagine an overwhelming number. Need I say more?

The letter follows:

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF.,
March 14, 1973.

HON. WILLIAM KETCHUM,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: Within the past six months two fellow employees of mine, one whom I know personally, were murdered. One was killed, during a work day, while he was on his job, and the man I knew well was hatched to death in his home. In both instances robbery appeared to be the motive, but in both there was pitifully little to steal—this fact surely obvious to the killers. Both killings were totally senseless.

At no time during my half century plus have I felt such a growing concern. Wither do we wither? When do the decent people of this society demonstrate indignation over this senselessness which involves all of us—has all of us potential victims of a bullet or hatchet? Who are the very starry-eyed idealists who work so tirelessly at various reforms and programs which seem to benefit the criminal—while protection is being stripped away from the law abiding citizen? Who stands in with the same zeal for the honest citizen?

This society has been reacting almost insanely in many areas since someone dubbed it a "Great Society." Individual rights have supplanted group or community rights to the point where an individual can commit an outrage against the whole and his right to do so is protected by the courts and their interpretation of the law. The group, the community, the society be damned. The primitive cave man seemed to have better sense. He tossed the recalcitrant out into the jungle to protect the little society in his cave. We permit the jungle to grow into our living rooms.

The group, the community, the society is becoming imprisoned behind doors by the growing criminal element within, this element running more freely with each passing day for the reason that a maudlin clot of do-gooders rush, expenses be damned, to the assistance of any individual at the same instant that individual commits his outrage. The rights of the group, the community, the society slide away. No one realizes that within the whole are only individuals whose rights slide away more quickly than do those of the criminal sub-strata of the whole.

The law abiding citizen is becoming a sucker and a patsy. He must suffer indignity upon indignity because we fail to face up to crime. We prefer to slip in the back door with prison reforms, rights of criminals, reduced or abolished punishments for the con-

demned, all after-the-fact approaches which make crime more attractive—maybe to all of us. Consideration for the law abiding amounts to pressure to take his gun away from him, make him retreat from his streets, make him submit to searches before he boards a plane, keep him from fighting back. In Marin County this past year the taxpayers and their children were harassed when they tried to use civic center facilities paid for with their tax dollars. A rather infamous woman and her entourage of wild-eyed bleeding hearts held sway over the whole of the beautiful facility. My fifteen-year-old niece had to submit to search and frisk before she could use the library purchased in part by tax dollars contributed by her father.

As an individual, where were her rights?

The starry-eyes were concerned only with the woman detained there and her rights. The citizens of Marin County had their rights trampled wholly. Would it have made any difference if these citizens had lined up in single file, as individuals, and demanded their rights? Probably not. The idealist can see them only as a hazy mass. His tunnel vision cannot focus to this extent.

To rationalize that any of us will receive the same attention to our rights if we commit an abomination is a fallacy. The whole is not going to commit abomination. The rights of those few who do cannot be protected by an approach which shackles the freedoms of the majority. Any good solution to crime must be a face-to-face confrontation with crime. The solution cannot be restrictive upon those in a society who will never be involved in the commission of a crime. But, so it goes, all in the name of freedom so-called. We grant license to all but a license used by those whose kinky and flawed thinking has them welcoming the granted license. The remainder, the well-intentioned bulk, retreats behind locked doors and barred windows while certain do-gooders work to even strip further its defenses.

I have stopped fishing a stream I have fished for years. In very recent times the activity along the highway which parallels this stream has been broadened to include harassment of drivers out to enjoy the scenery. The type of "free" individual who wanders the length of this highway has grown to be unpredictable at times. I found too much to be uneasy about as I would stand on a boulder beside the stream, my back turned to this traffic. The sensation became identical to that I felt in New Guinea and the Philippines many years ago when I went about my duties under known and accepted observation by the Japanese. The new breed of killer for kicks the abolishment of the death penalty had to release, added to those individuals who had already created a poor situation along the river, made fishing a little like Russian Roulette. I am not a coward, but the old South Pacific prickly at the spine was something I never intended to experience again—at least not in this country.

It was a small retreat, possibly not justifiable in all minds, but it was a retreat being made by countless others in this country each day, justified and prudent in their minds. None of us need a loosening of vagrancy laws, none of us profit by the new right to produce a pornographic movie, not a soul of us is overjoyed by the fact we can get ball if we murder, and few will profit by the abolishment of the death penalty. We are not granting free and unfettered rights to all. We are lifting restrictions which never were restrictions upon the decent and law abiding at any time. Much of our "individual rights" legislation is only license to a few and damaging to the whole.

Here, we must be careful—but the misguided zealot continues to push for more license—in the name of individual rights.

The opinion of Supreme Court Justice White which assisted in abolishing the death penalty was rather typical of the fuzzy thinking which permeates our "through the back door" approach to crime. His opinion contained something based on a rather peculiar premise—that we were executing too many poor people and too many black people. A member of our highest court did not go to the cause. He went to the effect, the courts themselves. He sits back content and these courts will still render the harsher decisions against—too many poor people and too many black people. The sphere of his thinking excluded the premise that all executions by a society followed the execution by an individual of one or more of his fellow men. Rather than repair the courts, he chose to rationalize. I expect it would not be possible to sentence the Specks, the Mansons, or the Sirhans to a six month term as "live in" houseboys to members of this high court before they are relegated to a term of clean sheets, three meals a day, a better standard of living than some have ever experienced. No? I suppose not, but it is proper to loose their likes against me in a manner just as inconceivable.

The abominations continue. Our concern revolves about a comfortable life style for the individual who commits the abomination—if the courts decree that such will be. The so-called "free" citizen continues in his retreat from his freedoms. If we should ever apprehend the person or those persons who chopped my friend to death, I suppose again it would not be proper to prop his corpse up in court just to have the victim present as is the case in any crime less than murder? The victim of rape is usually present, the victim of assault, mayhem or swindle. These victims usually sit silently and cause little upset to our carefully regulated courts machinery, but they are there for all to see and to contemplate.

My friend would sit silently. He would not say a word which could influence a soul.

Sincerely,

CLEON M. LINGWOOD.

WELFARE SCANDAL—X

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Americans spend billions of dollars each year to help their needy fellow citizens under programs of public welfare. Many of the truly needy are not assisted enough. But many others have victimized the welfare system either as dishonest employees or recipients bent on defrauding the Government. It is time to call a halt to the abuses of our welfare system and tighten up procedures to assure that the needy, and only the needy, receive benefits.

For 2 weeks, I have been inserting into the RECORD the serialized articles from the Milwaukee Sentinel which grew out of a 3-month investigation of the Milwaukee County Welfare Department by Sentinel reporters Gene Cunningham and Stuart Wilk. Today's 10th installment indicates that some recipients are violating State and county laws prohibiting payments to those with cash assets in excess of a minimum amount. Other evidences of mishandling of welfare checks are detailed.

I hope the Members realize that welfare problems will not just go away. Welfare reform may not be "fashionable" this year, but it is more pressing than ever.

The article follows:

CHECKS FATTEN BANK ACCOUNTS

(By Gene Cunningham and Stuart Wilk)

Some welfare recipients have savings and checking accounts amounting to several thousand dollars and are regular customers of Milwaukee banks.

Last December, a welfare recipient walked into one Milwaukee bank with \$1,553 in welfare checks and deposited them in her account, an official of the bank said.

"She had seven to nine checks" for various special needs grants given her by the department, he said.

Another welfare recipient came in with enough welfare checks to buy a \$1,500 time certificate of deposit, the banker said. However, he said, she later cashed the certificate before its interest maturity date.

The banker said he decided he would make it difficult for the woman to get back the money so he "kept her coming back for a while."

He said he had her sign papers and go through a waiting period before he gave her the \$1,500—without interest.

"I was damned if I was going to pay her interest on my tax money!" the banker declared.

There are hundreds of welfare recipients who bring in welfare checks and deposit them in their savings and checking accounts, he said.

Some, he said, bring in several checks at a time—usually checks given them by the department for special needs such as clothing, household items, furniture and major appliances that they tell the department they must have.

"I know we have people on welfare who have thousands of dollars in the bank," the bank official said.

The majority of welfare recipients who cash their welfare checks at the bank also have accounts at the bank, he said.

The woman who brought in the \$1,553 in checks to deposit, he said, "hadn't even been in Wisconsin long enough to have any Wisconsin identification. All she had was an out of state driver's license."

[Families receiving Aid to Families With Dependent Children (AFDC), by state law, must not have more than \$500 in cash including the cash value of life insurance.

[Persons receiving general assistance, a county program financed entirely by county tax money, must not have any cash assets other than life insurance, which cannot exceed \$300 in cash value.]

Savings accounts are not the only strange places to which welfare checks find their way.

"I got a welfare check in the mail last month and I'm certainly not on welfare," a local businessman said.

He said the check was addressed to him. The spelling of his name on the check has one too many "n's" in it, but otherwise the name was correct and the address on the check was his, he said.

The check was for \$56.

There was a notation in one corner of the check saying that it was for "Hampton, James L."

"I don't know any James L. Hampton," the businessman said.

He said he hadn't decided what he would do with the check, but "I'm sure not going to cash it."

Another welfare check was used to pay for bowling shirts, but more than a year later the endorsement on the check was declared a forgery and the sporting goods store lost the \$70 it had been paid.

RECALLS CHECK

The operator of the bowling and billiard supply store said that he recalled a customer giving him the welfare check in payment for bowling shirts—in 1971.

But last month, more than 16 months after he had deposited the check in his account, he was notified by the bank that the check had been found to have a forged endorsement.

The operator of the store showed a Sentinel reporter the forgery affidavit signed by the woman whose name was on the check. The affidavit was signed last December, 14 months after the check was issued.

The bank deducted the \$70 from the store's account to make up for the welfare check.

Another businessman said a welfare check for a person he does not know comes regularly to a house he owns on the Northeast Side.

He said the tenant who lives in the house has lived there for three years and is not on welfare. The tenant recently told him about the welfare check, the businessman said.

CHECK PICKED UP

He said the tenant told him that the check had been coming to the house for three years. The tenant said he was told to leave the check in the mailbox and that someone would pick it up the day it arrives—and someone always does.

The businessman said neither he nor his tenant knows the person whose name is on the welfare check.

The person "has never been a tenant of mine and has never lived at that address," the businessman said.

The Sheriff's Department Fraud Squad told of a similar case.

A woman who had been on welfare in Milwaukee County moved to Michigan but for a year and a half continued to receive her welfare checks.

A deputy said the checks kept going to the house where the woman had lived in Milwaukee. Each day when a check was to arrive, the woman's sister would go to the house, take the check out of the mailbox and mail it on to her sister in Michigan.

That routine went on for a year and a half before the department discovered the woman no longer lived here, he said.

AMERICAN COMPANY PRINTS ANNUAL REPORT IN JAPAN

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, articles such as this one appearing in the Wall Street Journal on March 15, 1973, show the uncompetitive state of our economy as it stands now.

Mr. Joseph Fox from Pleasant Hill, Calif., who sent me the article is correct in his judgments on how these actions hurt our balance of payments. Facts such as these are especially disturbing as they point out that the uncompetitive stance of our economy can only lead to further trade deficits:

AMERICAN COMPANY PRINTS ANNUAL REPORT IN JAPAN

Latest Japanese import is an annual report. LaBarge Inc., a St. Louis company listed on the American Stock Exchange, farms out the printing of its 1972 annual report to Dai Nippon Printing Co. in Tokyo. It figures it saved at least \$3,000 by having the job done abroad.

**THE LEAGUE OF UNITED LATIN
AMERICAN CITIZENS PARAMOUNT
COUNCIL NO. 357**

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the League of United Latin American Citizens—LULAC—Paramount Council No. 357 says:

We can be proud because we believe in our youth, contribute to their welfare, and work for the greatest institution on earth . . . Education.

The members of Paramount's LULAC are rightfully proud of their group's goals and accomplishments.

I, too, am proud of Paramount's LULAC.

This organization's scholarship program of about 10 years has aided around 50 local students to attend the college of their choice.

Some educational projects of LULAC aimed at younger persons include leadership and parliamentary procedure classes and a summer tutorial program.

Other programs include aiding the Casa de la Esperanza, an orphanage home in Tijuana, and providing shoes for children to wear to school.

Adults are not neglected by LULAC. The Paramount Council was the first in our community to sponsor adult classes in English, citizenship and Civil Service preparation.

For our local group's many educational projects over the years, the LULAC National Convention has on three occasions awarded the Paramount Council No. 357 the Raymond Telles Education Trophy for the best education program—thereby giving the trophy to the Paramount council permanently.

During the 12 years of the Paramount group's existence, members have represented the organization effectively at all levels of government.

One member, Jose Pacheco, was named to a recent White House Conference on employment and immigration problems of Spanish-speaking persons in the United States.

Mr. Pacheco has also been active on the district, State, and national level of LULAC and has been awarded a certificate by the Paramount Rotary Club for outstanding community service.

Member Jess Vela has served on all three levels of LULAC administration and was named Man of the Year in Norwalk. Mr. Vela is presently serving as a member of the Norwalk-La Mirada School Board of Education.

Again serving LULAC up to the national level, member Paul Garcia was awarded the District Director of the Year Award. Mr. Garcia and Mr. Pacheco were also awarded a plaque for outstanding community service by the Paramount Chamber of Commerce.

Art Salazar, Paramount's current president, was awarded the local, district, and State LULAC Man of the Year Awards.

These members are just a few of the outstanding persons working toward the

goals of education, youth, and the welfare of the Latin American in LULAC Paramount Council No. 357.

Mr. Speaker, to all the members of LULAC Paramount Council No. 357, I offer my sincere appreciation for a job well done.

MEAT BOYCOTT NO ANSWER

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, amidst all the irrational charges and countercharges being hurled involving meat prices, Bill Sumner, editor of the St. Paul Pioneer Press and Dispatch, has just produced a masterpiece of good, common-sense. Mr. Sumner says some things that need to be said, and I include it for the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

[From the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer Press, Apr. 1, 1973]

WHY NOT BOYCOTTS ON MORTGAGE COSTS, CARS?—MEAT PRICE FREEZE, BOYCOTT ARE BOTH IDIOTIC

(By William Sumner)

President Nixon's freeze on meat prices seems to have followed a fit of panic, the scare being furnished by groups of housewives who say they are going to boycott meat.

The freeze is as idiotic as the boycott. It won't do anything about the inflation that caused the higher prices and it will hurt farmers, small packers, meatcutters and the rest of those in the chain that get the livestock from farm to market.

I suppose that emotion has played a part here, plus a certain feeling of confidence: it is fairly easy to get at a farmer or handler of perishable materials, as was demonstrated in the holy grape and lettuce wars; as for Nixon's part, he won't be running for reelection and the farm states have been losing their power anyway.

Why don't they go after the whole mess, though? I don't recommend ripping the system apart, but where has there been a boycott over the cost of mortgages, the price of homes and automobiles, of carpenters and plumbers, of radios and TV sets, or snowmobiles or skis or boats or any of the many items enjoyed by our affluent society? Has anyone priced out the same suit of clothes then and now?

What has been attacked is a high-demand food product most of the rest of the world can't afford once a month, one that is still cheap in terms of income.

Why don't they boycott government? There's something that has gone out of sight.

Of course it has been a jolly time for the Secretary of Agriculture, Earl Butz, who must feel like one today. Just a few days ago he opined that anyone who was for ceilings on meat prices was a "damned fool."

I believe in the man, much as I would believe in a saint. His boss acted in panic. Here was one market in which supply and demand would have had a real effect.

Here is a boycott and a reaction without sense, one that is going to hurt the small farmer and cause him to think more and more about the cushier living one might have on welfare.

It is the farmer attempting to supplement his income and not the conglomerate farm-to-package producer that is going to get it in the neck once again. I don't know why we don't give him a chance to make it.

There was a suggestion made here a couple of weeks ago about meat prices. It went

something to the effect that if the meat was too expensive, buy something else. You don't need meat every night, and as a matter of fact the richer cuts aren't good for you.

No boycott, you understand. If you can't afford something, you don't buy it.

But that is not the way we operate.

There is a great desire to have a Big Brother. We can over-eat, drink too much, smoke too much and in other ways abuse the body God and Darwin have given us, and then when we get sick because of it we are owed.

We don't even argue about this anymore. Now it is meat. We are owed cheap meat. Pretty soon someone is going to wonder about federal aid for auto or TV repair.

One might run for political office by guaranteeing a free-flowing and unstopped John for every bathroom. He could be one-upped by a fellow offering two bathrooms for every house.

You see, folks, it's this way:

It cost so much to raise a steer and some more to feed it for market. It costs money to transport the steer, because those bad old teamsters want to get paid for driving trucks. And the meatcutters haven't yet been made aware of the fact that they are not in it for the money but, rather, are performing a public service. Where has dedication gone to in America?

With Nixon, I will stand with Butz's earlier assessment. With the noble housewives who are fearlessly leading a boycott, I would challenge them to state their incomes as a matter of comparison with those earned by the meatcutters, the teamsters and—God help them—the farmers.

This is more foolish than Wounded Knee and, like it, has been aided and abetted by foolish communications media. Many don't know yet that this last stands for radio-TV and newspapers; it is a good way to hide and blush.

THE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the energy crisis is becoming increasingly a rhetorical phrase, invented by experts, and increasingly a reality facing every consumer. Because it is better known and carries a larger part of our energy burden, oil has been the commodity highlighted as bringing us the threat of shortage, but long before oil runs out, gas will be in short supply as far as the usual cheap wellhead source is concerned.

Considering the heavy reliance on this fuel in the average home and particularly in the West, the news that present delivery rates from local sources will begin to run out in 1975 is particularly bad news. Housewives and their workingmen husbands have been exercised over food price increases with resulting pressures to increase supplies and reduce the price. Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that utility and gasoline bills will soon be rising dramatically. No amount of consumer pressure by boycott or otherwise will increase production or decrease prices. The single impressive warning to all of us is that we must use less energy and pay more for it.

I submit for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, a sober assessment which appeared in the Oil and Gas Journal of March 5, 1973.

The documentation of efforts by gas utilities to provide for the replacement of present local and controlled prices gas holds its own grim prediction for dramatically increasing costs. I commend this piece to the Members as preparation homework. You will no doubt be called upon to explain this particular kind of inflation to your constituents in the near future.

The article follows:

GAS SUPPLY DRYING UP FOR VAST CALIFORNIA MARKET

(By Howard Wilson)

Despite the cutbacks they have suffered, suppliers of the huge California natural-gas market believe they will "make it" in the immediate years ahead.

But long-term it's strictly a race against time. Dependence on traditional sources of supply would lead to certain disaster. Hence, the suppliers have embarked aggressively on a many-pronged program to acquire new gas from a variety of sources.

While the near-term outlook is not considered bleak, it is hardly satisfactory to the large interruptible customers. The optimism simply means that home dwellers and other noninterruptible customers will have gas at their burner tips until the late 1970's.

Electric utilities, such as Southern California Edison Co. and the Los Angeles Department of Water & Power, will continue to get less and less natural gas and be forced to burn more and more alternate—and far more expensive—fuels.

The chief suppliers of gas to the California market are, except for a line from Canada, no longer able to match past performance.

The two largest suppliers, El Paso Natural Gas Co. and Transwestern Pipeline Co., are struggling to meet contract requirements, and California gas producers are losing the battle to replenish dwindling reserves with new field discoveries.

Only Pacific Gas Transmission Co., which helps supply northern California gas, has the prospect of keeping up its output at past levels—but even here the prospect for an increase in deliveries depends on Canadian willingness to oblige.

Pacific Lighting. According to a top executive of Pacific Lighting's gas-distribution subsidiary, Southern California Gas Co., the reserves on which the companies' gas deliveries are based have reached an alarmingly low level.

"This is the most serious gas-supply challenge that Southern California Gas has faced in its more than 100-year history," Vice Pres. John C. Abram recently told the California Manufacturers Association.

Without new gas supplies, service to interruptible customers will come to an end altogether during this decade and service to firm customers will be curtailed starting in 1979.

The company's out-of-state suppliers, El Paso and Transwestern, face rugged competition for gas in their traditional Permian basin hunting grounds. Newly discovered gas goes primarily to higher-paying intrastate buyers who do not have to clear their prices with the Federal Power Commission.

El Paso, which was scheduled to provide 1,750 MMcf of gas last year to Pacific Lighting, was curtailing by as much as 76 MMcf from Nov. 1 to the end of the year. This minus figure will grow sharply this year and will reach several hundred million daily within 2 years unless El Paso comes up with new supplies.

Transwestern was able to maintain its 750-MMcf commitment last year, but unless new supplies are forthcoming quickly, cutbacks are certain.

Another loss to Pacific Lighting will be its purchases from Pacific Gas & Electric Co., San Francisco, which has been able to sup-

ply its downstate neighbor with 120-164 MMcf of gas since 1967. This arrangement may be phased out this year as PG&E's own needs escalate.

Pacific Lighting's take from southern California fields also has dropped drastically. In the past 3 years it has fallen from 660 MMcf to 300 MMcf because of rapid depletion of reservoirs and failure to find new fields. This year it will drop again to 240 MMcf and eventually will fall below 200 MMcf.

Despite the bleak outlook for new gas in the short-term and continued growth in demand, Pacific Lighting is optimistic that its 3.2 million firm customers will continue to get service without interruption until late in the decade. And by that time the company's efforts to generate new sources of gas should start paying off.

The search: As the state's largest gas utility, using just under 3 billion cu ft of gas daily, Pacific Lighting has many specific and potential new-gas projects in the works. Among them:

Alaska's Cook Inlet. The company has been negotiating for several years with operators for their gas but cannot agree on price. The LNG project would start at 200 MMcf and rise to 400-500 MMcf.

North Slope and northern Canada. Pacific Lighting is a member of the Canadian Arctic Gas Study Ltd. group, which expects to file an application later this year for a 48-in. gas pipeline from the Northwest Territories of Canada and possibly from Alaska's North Slope into the U.S. Also Pacific Lighting can expect to be a prime customer in the event El Paso's study of a Prudhoe-to-South Alaska gas route leads to a pipeline-LNG project.

Australia. An agreement has been reached to acquire gas from Central Australia's Palm Valley field for an LNG project. Pacific Lighting is financing drilling of a confirmation well. The big issue is whether Australia will allow export of gas.

Indonesia. Pacific Lighting holds a letter of intent from Indonesia for acquiring gas for LNG shipment.

South America. The company has looked at reserves in Ecuador's Gulf of Guayaquil, but ownership of the discovery area is in dispute, and negotiations are suspended. Also Pacific Lighting has concession interests in Colombia and Panama.

U.S.S.R. Both El Paso and Texas Eastern Transmission Co., parent of Transwestern, are talking to the Soviet Union about developing Siberian gas for LNG shipment. Pacific Lighting is not a participant but a prime potential customer.

Exploration. In partnership with Texas Eastern, Pacific Lighting has invested heavily in gas exploration in Transwestern's gas area of West Texas, New Mexico, and Oklahoma. The joint venture, started in 1970, has resulted in one discovery, one extension, and four completed producers. Also the company has advanced large sums for exploration by others in northern Canada and the Arctic.

Gas from coal. In another venture with Texas Eastern, Pacific Lighting has asked the FPC for authority to build a 250-MMcf coal-gasification plant in Northwest, New Mexico. If approval comes soon, gas would move by 1977. Additional plants would raise the capacity eventually to 1 billion.

SNG. Pacific Lighting is studying seriously a plan to produce gas from naphtha or other light hydrocarbons in southern California. Capacity would be 125-250 MMcf, or more. Feedstock would be imported crude. The plant could go on stream 2 years from start of construction.

PG&E: Up the coast in San Francisco, Pacific Gas & Electric is not as hard-pressed as Pacific Lighting. But it, too, has down-the-road problems which can be solved only by finding new sources of gas.

PG&E's ace in the hole is its proximity to Canada and its reserves position there.

Through its affiliate Pacific Gas Transmission, it gets nearly 1 billion cfd of Canadian gas—and this is firm.

PG&E would like to move more through PGT, but can't get the required export license. It was turned down by Canada for an extra 200 MMcf in 1971. The company has a call on 10 trillion cu ft of Canadian reserves but has export licenses for only 6 trillion.

The company's second major source of supply is El Paso, which supplied 1.125 billion cfd last year. This is expected to decline as the demand on El Paso increases and its deliverability sags. Cutbacks this past winter have been as high as 14% on some days.

PG&E's third source of gas is the northern California gas producer. The take varies widely since PG&E relies on it heavily for winter peaking.

The company has been fairly successful keeping its interruptible customers in gas. But this will change. It expects to reduce progressively such sales until the cuts are substantial by the mid-1970's. Where last year it met demands of interruptible customers by 99%, this may drop to 60% by 1976 unless more California production is developed or the take from present reserves is increased.

PG&E, like Pacific Lighting, is investing in potential new sources of gas, but not on the same grand scale. It is participating in drilling ventures in the Rocky Mountains, in northern Canada, and on the Alaskan North Slope. Also it is studying coal-gasification and LNG projects but has made no specific investments.

Edison. The single biggest interruptible gas user in California is Southern California Edison Co., electric utility and customer of Pacific Lighting.

Edison has resigned itself to being phased out almost entirely as a purchaser of gas for power generation. In 1968 its total take for the year was 276 billion cu ft. Last year it got 205 billion. This year the figure will plummet to 138 billion.

"By 1975 we expect to get essentially no gas at all," says a company executive.

While Edison questions Pacific Lighting's ability to supply it with needed gas in the future, Pacific Lighting takes the position that interruptible customers are valuable because they help absorb new gas increments that come on the market and must be phased into the system. For this reason, Pacific Lighting hopes to keep Edison as a customer by bringing in new gas before phaseout occurs.

Edison, long aware of the shape of things to come, has beefed up its other energy sources—fuel oil, nuclear, coal-fired, hydro.

Its chief alternative fuel to gas is fuel oil, which costs double the price of gas and four times that of coal. But Edison can get low-sulfur fuel oil from California refiners—who, in turn, get the low-sulfur crude from Alaska's Cook Inlet, from Indonesia, and other foreign points.

Edison has a multimillion-dollar program to develop new energy sources—gas, coal, uranium, geothermal. Its gas exploration consists of joint ventures in the Rocky Mountains and on Alaska's North Slope.

Los Angeles. Another major Pacific Lighting interruptible customer, the Los Angeles Department of Water & Power, is depending almost wholly on fuel oil to make up for its loss of natural gas for power generation.

The department, which furnishes electricity for the city, says it received about half the gas it could have used last year. Curtailment now is year-round instead of seasonal.

The department got 103.3 billion cu ft in 1968, about 84% of its needs. Last year it was down to 77.9 billion, about 54%. It expects to get half that amount this year, or about 25% of what it would like.

The price. While the supply of gas goes

down, the price of gas goes up. And, of course, the alternate fuels cost much more than gas.

One observer of the price scene in California estimates that the cost of gas to the gas utilities has averaged a 3¢ annual increase since 1968.

The largest interruptible customers are paying on the order of 40¢/Mcf, compared with 30¢ in 1968, but they are getting about half as much gas as then. For the alternate fuel they are paying around 80¢ for the equivalent energy.

The smaller interruptible customers, who are getting about 80% of their needs compared with 97% in 1968, are paying about the same 40¢ rate as before, but their standby fuel, usually diesel, costs them about 80¢ equivalent.

For the residential user, the price increases haven't really hit home yet. The rise has been around 10% to 12% over the 4-year span.

The heavy blow to the customer is yet to come—when he starts paying for LNG, North Slope gas, and gasified coal. One estimate puts the consumer cost up an average of 8¢/year, thus increasing the homeowner's gas bill by 80% in the 1980's.

Local production. While the search for new gas supplies moves apace in faraway places, the search at home has stepped up in northern California.

But the prospects for bringing in huge new reserves in California are dim.

Several new pools have been discovered in the Sacramento Valley, and there has been a flurry of deep drilling in the state. But the results of the deep drilling have been discouraging. And the new finds in the Sacramento Valley, while satisfactory to some producers, are not sizable enough to make an appreciable impact on California's overall gas shortage.

The producers argue that a more realistic treatment of their problem will produce more gas for California.

In southern California, where most gas is produced in association with oil, the depletion of existing fields coupled with absence of new finds has severely restricted gas output.

The one place where California could expect to get important new supplies of local gas—the Santa Barbara Channel—has been virtually closed to development.

Back in 1969, Pacific Lighting and anticipated it would be getting 150-200 MMcf of gas from the channel fields by 1973. Instead it will get about 30 MMcf this year.

The huge Santa Ynez oil and gas field remains undeveloped while going through a severe and time-consuming environmental checkout. Extension of Dos Cuadras field has been vetoed by the Interior Department. And the State of California has halted all drilling in state waters ever since the 1969 Santa Barbara oil spill.

Much as California needs the gas, public policy is saying, "Get it somewhere else." That's what the gas-supply companies are trying to do.

POOR RICHARD'S ALMANAC OF QUOTATIONS ON TAXES FOR 1973

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 months the Ways and Means Committee has been holding public hearings on tax reform entertaining testimony from large and small corporations—professors

from our universities—and tax men representing every imaginable type of business. As one of my colleagues so aptly described the various interest groups:

There have been two types of representatives before our committee, those who pay no taxes and those who want to join them.

The following are selected quotations on the subject most dear to their hearts—taxes:

Continental Oil, A. J. Alexander:

Oil companies on the average do pay a lesser effective rate of U.S. federal income tax than the average for manufacturing companies, for example. This is because of specific tax incentives Congress has put in the law to encourage the search for oil and gas. The tax law intends that we pay a lesser effective rate.

Humble Oil:

Oil and gas are so important to all of us in the United States that a case can be made for differential tax treatment, even in the absence of any other unusual circumstances.

Hon. Wayne Aspinall:

The right tax policy can help channel private capital into oil shale development. I urge this Committee and the Congress to make the necessary changes in the tax code for this worthwhile purpose.

American National Cattlemen's Association:

The cattle industry does not now enjoy nor has it ever been the beneficiary of agricultural subsidies.

The capital gains treatment of breeding animals should be retained.

National Coal Association:

The committee should raise the depletion allowance for coal to 15%. . . . The investment credit should not be restricted. . . . The minimum tax should be repealed. . . . current capital gains treatment for coal should be continued. . . . If America is to choose to develop indigenous energy resources, that encouragement must be in the tax structure. . . . I'm a coal man, so perhaps I'm prejudiced.

Prof. J. Reid Hambrick, George Washington Law School:

Percentage depletion and the treatment of intangible drilling costs are both open to attack as unjustified tax subsidies to the oil and gas industry.

The Cooperative League of the USA—Dreyer:

The Cooperative League seeks to preserve the principle of the excludability of patronage refunds by cooperatives.

We believe that no roadblocks in the form of punitive taxation should be placed in front of cooperative development at a time when government policy is to encourage cooperatives.

The President stresses self-help in solving our nation's problems.

National Tax Equality Association:

In today's world, cooperatives are big business. They sell nearly \$25 billion worth of farm produce and farm supplies a year, their growth continues. . . . For the most part the tax payments of this group were nil.

Norfolk & Western Railway:

This is a particularly good time for Congress to begin permitting tax deductions with respect to our significant existing investments in grading, tunnels and track. The need of our industry for the cash flow which could be produced by such deductions is particularly compelling.

Prof. Robert Eisner:

Subsidization of American business by means of general equipment tax credits or depreciation allowances in excess of true economic depreciation is quite unnecessary.

Independent Business Association of Wisconsin:

My graduated corporate income tax schedule will enable the small businessman to retain more of his own profits. I repeat, my graduated corporate income tax schedule will enable the small businessman to retain more of his own earnings.

Iron and Steel Institute:

Today some people are calling those provisions loopholes—and giveaways to business. Such accusations aren't supported by facts.

Prof. Richard Musgrave, Harvard:

There are no valid grounds from the point of view of tax equity to accord special treatment to capital gains.

Robert M. Spann, Virginia Polytechnic Institute:

Percentage depletion does distort the allocation of resources in the U.S. economy.

We want all our industries to be strong, but we can't afford to subsidize them all.

The American consumer pays for the subsidy.

Forest Industries Committee:

We urge your committee not make any changes, which, under the guise of tax reform, would result in little if any additional revenue over the long run and would cost the nation so much in many other ways.

Oregon Environmental Council:

It has long been recognized that in indirect subsidy through taxation is an inefficient subsidy. If tax aids are needed to promote good forestry practices, then direct federal aids can be substituted.

Vinson, Elkins, Searis, Connally, and Smith, Houston, Texas:

On capital gains at death—

The one who retains the property should not have to pay an income tax at death if he is willing to take the greater risk of holding an asset indefinitely; after all death is usually not a voluntary step. . . . If this is a grave problem (no pun is intended), then it would be easy to allow a credit against the estate tax of capital gains taxes paid by the decedent in the previous years—say ten years.

The National Association of State Racing Commissioners:

Gentlemen, whatever incentive there may be for a horse breeder to challenge 62 to 1 odds is removed by any hardening of the farm-loss deductibility.

Deffet-Real Estate Development Co.:

It is my personal opinion that present real estate tax incentives—I really prefer to call them tax shelter loopholes—perpetuate a totally unfair form of taxation. Indeed, they are perversions of the progressive tax system. The shelter gimmicks related to our industry promote, in my judgment, waste and inefficiency.

James C. Cox and Arthur W. Wright, University of Massachusetts:

On balance, the existing special tax incentives for energy do not appear to be the best available choices of public energy policies. More over their elimination would not aggravate energy problems and would increase efficiency and equity.

Atlanta Life Insurance:

Accordingly the proposed amendment is drawn sufficiently narrow to carry out the

Congressional intention with respect to the Herndon Foundation without permitting abuse of its provisions by organizations which Congress did not intend to be protected by the 1969 savings provision.

Prof. Stanley Surrey, Harvard:

The prime objective of tax reform is to achieve greater fairness in the federal tax system and thereby restore the confidence of the public in that system. This confidence has been seriously diminished.

DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the Postal Service has implemented increases in second-class postal rates of over 125 percent. The second step of a 5-year phase-in of the increases is scheduled to take place on July 6, 1973. In addition, the Postal Service is imposing a per-piece surcharge which has the same impact no matter what the weight of the piece mailed or the distance it is sent. These rates threaten to eliminate the subsidy this country has from the very beginning given to periodicals devoted to disseminating news, information, opinion—the intellectual grist for our political and cultural mill—and it obviously discriminates against the lighter and smaller publications.

We all know about the failure of the giants—magazines like *Life*, *Look*, and the *Saturday Evening Post*. They do not hesitate to tell us of the cost problems they face. But what about the smaller publications—those that provide us with the rich variety for which we, as a people, are famous? As Senator NELSON has often stated, it is those publications which are most seriously threatened.

It is also clear that the modern age contains massive pressures for conformity, particularly conformity in political views. The administration's hostility to the exercise of freedom and independence in the press is documented fact. The power of the mass media to command attention, the need to make a profit, all conspire to rob media programming of expressions of differences. The smaller publication, the specialty magazine, the periodical expressing political ideas—these are counted upon to offer the analysis and the dissent we need for a full, well-rounded view of the world.

Now, subcommittees in both the Senate and the House will consider legislation to ameliorate the worst effects of the increases. I am submitting testimony to the House subcommittee and endorsing the Nelson bill, which would protect the small publications. Their problems have been ably described in a column by Marquis Childs, printed today in the *Washington Post*. To emphasize the importance of congressional action, in time to cope with the big July increase in rates, I am inserting it in the RECORD:

STAMPING OUT SMALL PUBLICATIONS

(By Marquis Childs)

"These are the times that try men's souls." Those often-quoted words of Thomas Paine,

the great pamphleteer of our revolution, have an echo today. It is the echo of the lonely dissenter, the angry dissenter, speaking out against the great bland mass that bears in our time the spurious label of the conventional wisdom.

With the overpowering force of television the dissenting voices are having an increasing out against the great bland mass that matter, even surviving. And the U.S. Postal Service, the hybrid creature that seems to have embodied all the ills of the old post office, is proceeding with rate increases threatening the existence of small publications, many of them nonprofit or skirting close to the edge.

With *Life* the last in a long series of fatalities, the carnage for the printed word has been terrible. When the postal rate increase on second-class mail was first announced, *Life* said in an editorial that this would mean finding an additional \$130 million in revenue by 1976, which was more than twice the profit earned by all magazines in 1970. Reports today have it that at least one surviving mass publication is in trouble.

But it is not the big commercial operation that is the concern of Sen. Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.) in the measure he is pushing in the Senate. His bill is a response to the threat to the dissenters, and also to the pressure that sharply increased postal rates would put on the religious, labor and agriculture press. Following the practice of 178 years, prior to the creation of the postal service, it would restore the subsidy for publications that might not otherwise survive.

From Human Events on the right to the New Republic on the left the margin of survival is increasingly narrow. Across the country are many lively, stimulating monthlies and weeklies that may be crowded out. The Progressive in Wisconsin, carrying the flag for the great LaFollette tradition, and the Texas Observer in Austin, so far standing up to the powerhouse of money and Texas-style politics as an independent critic, are two examples. In presenting his measure Nelson quoted Walter Lippmann:

"The unexamined life, said Socrates, is unfit to be lived by man. This is the virtue of liberty, and the ground on which we may best justify our belief in it, that it tolerates errors in order to serve the truth. When men are brought face to face with their opponents, forced to listen and learn and mend their ideas, they cease to be children and savages and begin to live like civilized men. Then only is freedom a reality, when men may voice their opinions because they must examine their opinions."

The way in which the President can command the television networks is a phenomenon unknown to the era of the printed word. It is a power increasingly great, as authority is centralized in the White House. With a notice of only an hour or two the President can order up an audience of millions.

Requests for equal time, if the address has political implications, as it almost invariably has, are more often than not refused. Many disturbing signs point to a concerted intention within the administration to narrow the channels of dissent. The attacks on the media, both direct and indirect, have had a cautionary effect, particularly on the networks.

If non-small independent journals are to be forced out—and among the number are many weekly newspapers—the flow of ideas, of criticism, protest will be further narrowed. Nelson notes that for small, diverse publications the postal rate increase can be many times 127 per cent, which is to be effective beginning July 6 and phased in over five years. For many of these publications postal rates represent a large percentage of their costs.

The senator has a number of cosponsors for his measure, and it is believed that the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service

Committee, Sen. Gale McGee (D-Wyo.) leans toward it. Opposition to the subsidy in the past has come from the conviction that wealthy publications, such as *Reader's Digest*, were getting a free ride at the taxpayers' expense. At one point the subsidy to the *Digest* was estimated to be \$17 million. But with the whopping increase in the rates the giants, or those that have survived, are no longer so happily situated.

Billy Graham, who runs one of the largest religious publishing houses in the country with a big operation in Minneapolis, would be hit by the increase. He could put in a word to his friend the President if he would. But it is the small publications that are caught in the switches. With its lamentable performance the United States Postal Service has drawn a growing chorus of anger and disgust, coming not from publishers but from outraged citizens across the land.

NATIONAL WORKING MOTHER'S DAY: A COMMITMENT TO CHILDREN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing a systematic attempt by the Nixon administration to block the development of our children.

Not only has the administration vetoed the efforts of Congress last year to enact a comprehensive child development program, but it is also slashing funds for social service programs, including day care. The administration's antipeople budget provides for more missiles and fewer child care teachers.

In my own city, New York, the proposed restrictions on child care services mean that mothers who want to work will be forced to go on welfare because they cannot afford private day care services. This means that their children will be deprived of critically needed educational, health, and nutritional services which could be provided by qualified day care staff. This also means a further handicapping of the children of low- and middle-income families when they enter the public schools.

On March 26 and 27, the Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities of the House Committee on Education and Labor held hearings in New York City on the administration's proposed budget cuts.

As a host of those hearings, I believed that the subcommittee should understand the impact of the budget cuts on human needs in America's largest city. Witness after witness testified as to what would happen if the White House proposals became a reality. The nightmare of budget slashes in the area of human services was made especially clear by Georgia McMurray, commissioner of the Agency for Child Development of New York City.

Commissioner McMurray's remarks several weeks ago at the hearings are most appropriate today, on National Working Mother's Day. The subcommittee members and I were deeply moved as she described how the commitment of our Nation to child development lags far behind that of the world's other lead-

ing countries. As Commissioner Major Owens of New York City's Community Development Agency pointed out, the administration seems to find enough money to pay for massive cost overruns in the defense field. When it comes to human problems, human programs and human needs, Commissioner Owens graphically detailed the administration's miserliness and heartlessness.

Witnesses at the 2-day hearings came from public and private groups and from the local communities. There was no question that the administration's proposed budget cuts would result in millions of human casualties.

National Working Mother's Day is an opportunity for Congress to reaffirm the commitment it made last year to America's children. It is a chance—a desperate needed chance—for us to make human needs the highest priority of our government.

AMERICA STRONGER FOR ITS ETHNICS

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, a member of the Latvian community, whose center is located at 4146 North Elston Avenue, Chicago, Ill., in the 11th Congressional District, which I am proud to represent, has written a letter on the occasion of St. Patrick's Day, one of the great ethnic holidays.

Mr. Tedis Zierins points out, in a most beautiful and appropriate way, the great strength ethnic peoples have given to America and closes with an appeal to us all to hold high St. Patrick's spirit the year around.

Printed in the April 4 edition of the neighborhood newspaper, Community Publications, I enclose this inspirational letter in its entirety.

The letter follows:

ETHNICS OFFER MUCH

St. Patrick's Day is gone, but I would like to share with you some thoughts, which still linger on in my mind.

"Join the crowd, Be Irish and have the St. Patrick's spirit for a day!", said a stranger.

Why have this spirit only for a day when St. Patrick's life can give us inspiration and many wonderful lessons for every day?

Patrick himself was a foreign born who as a youth was taken to Ireland against his will. By brutal force he was torn away from his parents and everything dear to him and brought as a slave across the sea to Ireland. But instead of seeking revenge for his suffering he decided to give to Irish people the best he had ever known.—He gave to the Irish nation the belief in one God.

If Patrick had renounced his heritage, his past and accepted the Irish way of life as it was in those days, without trying to enrich it with the best he brought within himself, nobody would remember him today and also Ireland and Irish people would be much poorer in their spirit today. No doubt, Patrick was asked to give up his heritage and belief in one God but he dared to be

different and not just melt away into Irish society. Because of his strong convictions and love of God he is honored as the greatest Irishman year after year and century after century. I am a foreign born in the United States of America and on St. Patrick's Day in 1964 I became an American Citizen. How many times I have been asked to renounce my Latvian heritage, my past experience and accept the American way of life as it is today!

But I feel, also I can bring from my native Latvia something which can make America a better and greater nation. Although I am not another St. Patrick, still I have something good to offer to this great country.

And if you or your ancestors come from Italy, or Africa, from Poland, Mexico or Scandinavia, from Germany, Japan or any other place on earth, let's follow St. Patrick's example and instead of seeking revenge for any injustice, let's search in ourselves for something good to give to make this a better and greater nation under God. Members of each ethnic group have something good to offer to America thus making it a beautiful bright mosaic where each contribution shines like a precious gem.

But communists, who destroyed the freedom of my native Latvia and made me leave my homeland, are working hard to destroy St. Patrick's ideals and any belief in God everywhere, including America. Therefore let's pray for strong convictions and faith in one God and his truth like St. Patrick had, so that like St. Patrick despite the dangers of losing his life buried and overcame paganism in Ireland, we bury and overcome godless communism. Only then freedom and true peace will also be assured for our generation and our children.

St. Patrick's Day is gone again but let us keep his spirit for everyday!

TEDIS ZIERINS.

REFLECTIONS ON OUR SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, there are occasions when sober reflection about our system of government is very much needed. Now is one of those times and one of our most respected Members, CHARLIE BENNETT from the Third District in Florida, has stepped out to discuss the essentiality of our two-party system and the need for maintaining both parties with Representatives of both the liberal and conservative viewpoints.

CHARLIE BENNETT's speech on this subject was selected by Vital Speeches for their March 1, 1973, issue. This fine publication is characterized as "the best thought of the best minds on current national questions." Certainly, CHARLIE BENNETT fits this category. I would like to recommend to all my fellow Congressmen the reading of "The Two-Party System" and I know they will join me in commending CHARLIE BENNETT for his very fine speech.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate Congressman BENNETT for having his speech selected for Vital Speeches.

The speech follows:

[From Vital Speeches of the Day, Mar. 1, 1973]

THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM—THE FUTURE OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

(By CHARLES B. BENNETT)

Mr. Speaker, it is essential to American political life that we have two strong political parties. There is a need for one party, through the process of election, to be the one in power at a particular time; and a need for the other party to be the party of constructive criticism. Only in this way can the people of our country have the best possible government at a particular time.

As an officeholder who was elected as a Democrat and who has held office as such for more than 25 years, I would like to express my views at this time concerning the future of the Democratic Party, and to say some things about the two-party system, and the two fine parties we have here in the United States.

There has been much gnashing of teeth among loyal Democrats since the election, caused by the failure to elect the Democratic nominee to the Presidency. Many persons who have previously been registered as Democrats in my home State of Florida have switched their registration to the Republican Party in recent years. Of course, they have a perfect right to do so, and they should do so if they find the other party one more suited to do what they think should be done in the country. Many people suggest that there should be a realignment of parties in America, so that all conservatives would be in the Republican Party and all the liberals in the Democratic Party. This would be a great mistake, for the polarization of parties in this fashion would not best serve our country.

There is a need within each party for liberals and conservatives to express their views and to come forward with a party platform based upon the adjustments and compromises that are needed to bring about progress within the realms of reality and fiscal commonsense.

By having both liberals and conservatives in the same party, the stance of each party will achieve more realism and more practicality than would be possible if the parties were polarized into one massive group of liberals and one massive group of conservatives.

After these adjustments of reality occur in each party, then the clash, or competition, takes place between the parties; and another adjustment takes place again in the direction of realism and practicality. The result of this type of party structure is that the people obtain their idealistic goals in the context of practicality, and that is how it should be. This provides the stability in government we need.

Although we do not have the parliamentary system of England, we do have the constitutional system which grew out of the English system and it might be wise for us to look briefly at the English system from which our system came.

The right to oppose government was won by Cromwell and his Roundheads in England. There was established from then on, with brief interruptions, a government and a loyal opposition.

This system contrasts with the one-party system of such countries as Russia and China today. The foundation of those other systems is the suppression of political opposition. Khrushchev put it succinctly when he was here in America some years ago and he said in response to a criticism of the one-party system "Why should I let any man put a flea in my shirt?"

All free men knew that political society is healthier and does more for the people when a loyal opposition or constructive criticism is allowed.

The purpose of political parties is to provide for the orderly transfer of power. Another major function is the stating of a platform of general objectives; and the third purpose, without which the others must fail, is to win elections.

Charles Merriam in his "American Party System" said:

In the United States and Great Britain there has never been a time when there were only two parties, but in these countries the minor parties have been relatively insignificant, and the central tendency has always been toward a twofold division of the voters. Under this system the important fact is that the predominant party has the power to operate the machinery of the government by itself.

Criticisms against the two party system have not changed the liking of Americans for it. The system has provided strong governments in times of crisis and it has avoided ministerial crises such as have been common in France. In a country, as large as the United States the system has been useful as a means of integrating diverse elements that must be brought together to form a government.

Thomas Jefferson said:

In every free and deliberative society there must, from the nature of man, be opposition parties and violent dissensions and discords; and one of these for the most part must prevail over the other for a longer or shorter time. Perhaps this party division is necessary to each to watch and relate to the people the proceedings of the other.

We should contrast our two-party system with a multiple-party system of other countries. France is a good example of a country which has had multiple parties through its history. America has had many minor parties but they have never been a major factor in our political life. We have had such parties as the Loyalists, the Anti-Constitutionists, the Anti-Masons, the Nullifiers, the Greenbackers, and the Single Taxers, to name but a few.

All of these parties live, grow, and die with a relatively single cause or purpose. Outside of the impact that they have had upon the two major parties, these other parties have had little thrust for our country because they have been myopically looking at relatively insignificant problems and not concerning themselves with a general field of responsibility.

Alex de Tocqueville wrote:

The political parties which I style great are those which cling to principles more than to consequences; to general, and not to special cases; to ideas, and not to men. These parties are usually distinguished by a nobler character, by more generous passions, more genuine convictions, and a more bold and open conduct than others. In them private interest, which always plays the chief part in political passions, is more studiously veiled under the pretext of the public good; and it may even be sometimes concealed from the eyes of the very persons whom it excites and impels.

The White House today is in the hands of the Republican Party, and the Congress is predominantly Democratic. Under these circumstances, the Democratic majority in Congress should play the role of constructive criticism whether the issues place the party in the position of conservative or liberal on any particular matter.

A recent widespread publication stated "It will be argued that the American people have been moving to the right," and it went on to say that this was an invalid argument on the loss of the election of the Presidency in 1972.

This seems to assume that the Democratic Party should be to the left on every issue, and that is certainly an invalid assumption if we are going to have good government in

this country. If that philosophy were to be pursued in the Democratic Party, then all the President has to do in order to keep power for his Republican Party is to espouse causes of a very liberal nature because he can be assured that under those circumstances the Democratic Party can only criticize by moving further to his left.

The inevitable result would be that our country will rush headlong to the left on the liberal side despite the wishes of the majority of Americans, and despite the requirements of good government, because the President would always be able to occupy the relatively conservative position which at the same time forcing the Democratic Party ever further to the liberal side of every issue. Certainly this would not be in the best interests of our country.

It is also not consistent with the history of our political development in this country. The most outstanding Republican Presidents have, in fact, been liberal Presidents, such as Abraham Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt. Some of our Democratic Presidents have been, in fact, basically conservative individuals, and that is the way it should be, with a pragmatic posture for what is best for the country regardless of whether it places the party or its leadership in a conservative or liberal position at any particular time or on any particular issue.

Each time I am elected to office I take office as if I had just been elected for the first time. In this way I approach my job in the realism of what has already occurred. Perhaps sometimes this was with my adverse vote on an issue in the past.

As an example, I mention the fact that when President Truman asked for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to be established, I voted against it because I felt that education was not a field given under the Constitution to the Federal Government, but reserved for localities under our federal system. When President Eisenhower revived the Truman request, which had been defeated, he was successful and the Department was established. Many of his own party changed from their adverse votes when Truman requested it, to affirmative votes when the Republican President requested it.

Now, that is something that has already occurred and the Federal Government is now established in a program of spending many billions of dollars a year in education.

But I maintain that the main thing that the Federal Government should logically be expected to do in the field of education has not been done; and that is to equalize educational opportunities throughout all of the United States. This is something that the States cannot do themselves because of their varying capabilities and incapacities. I, therefore, have introduced a constitutional amendment which would give this power to the Federal Government and I favor it. Some people say this is inconsistent with my former position. Perhaps it is but I think that what I have proposed makes sense in 1973 as things now are.

Consistency is certainly not one of the highest virtues. Ralph Waldo Emerson said of it—

With consistency a great soul has simply nothing to do. He may as well concern himself with his shadow on the wall.

And at another place Emerson said:

A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds.

For the Democratic Party to lock itself in cement, always to be on the liberal side of every issue, might appear to make it more consistent, but it would certainly not be in the best interests of good government.

Perhaps the greatest issue facing this country today is fiscal responsibility or budgetary control; and the only leadership that is needed in this in 1973 is one in the direction of conservatism. The Democratic

Party should furnish it, and I believe it will. I and many other Members of Congress have legislation pending to accomplish this, and I believe it can and must be done.

Another area in which the Democratic Party has been criticized as well as the Republican Party, is the area of congressional reform. Progress has been made, but it has been very slow, and it has not been significant or as significant as should be.

The people of the country believe, and properly so, that the present system is not likely to provide the American people with the fresh and new leadership needed to produce constructive changes in changing times. They also realize that the present system of forever putting the chairmanship in the hands of the most senior member on a committee discourages many able persons from staying in Congress, or from coming here in the first place. They wonder why we cannot find a better system.

Election of chairmen has been suggested as a reasonable alternative to strict seniority, but this has been available for several years and even with the recent reforms on that system it still offers no substantial results for various reasons. The first reason is that to deprive a chairman of his chair would almost be tantamount to impeachment in the minds of the public and in Congress, and it would be a heavy implication of wrong doing or incompetence. So Congressmen can be expected to go on reelecting the most senior members without exception. Under these circumstances, reform simply by election of chairmen offers no real reform at all.

Even if real elections became feasible in fact it might well be that palace guard politics and log rolling might bring about worse results than anything we now experience. Lobbying interests might see an opening here that they had not had before, and the defects of such a system might far exceed anything now thought of, or presently experienced.

A real reform is possible in limiting the term of the chairman to 6 years, as this would give each chairman a reasonable time and a concrete challenge to use these 6 years for constructive leadership. Then the outgoing chairman could become chairman emeritus. It would give others, just less senior, adequate time to prepare for such leadership in the future. And it would tend to retain able men in Congress by giving them a reasonable chance for future effective leadership opportunities. It is reform such as this that the American people are looking for and they have a right to expect that Congress will bring it about.

Yes, there is an infinite variety of opportunities for the party in power, and for the party of loyal opposition or constructive criticism. If the Democratic Party will approach its responsibilities from the standpoint of progress in the context of realism, its future is great. I am sure that the party will do this; and that its future is great. Of course, the same opportunity and responsibility lies with the Republican Party.

Parties, after all, are but means of working for good government. Regardless of how the power is distributed between the parties in America we are Americans first and partisans later and we should all work together for what is in the best interests of our country.

Franklin D. Roosevelt once well expressed the genius of America in this when he said:

The dictators cannot seem to realize that here in America our people can maintain two parties and at the same time maintain an inviolate and indivisible Nation. The totalitarian mentality is too narrow to comprehend the greatness of a people who can be divided in party allegiance at election time but remain united in devotion to their country and to the ideals of democracy at all times.

The Democratic Party has a great future and a great present if it will, without abandoning its idealism, perform the needed func-

tion in government of constructive criticism wherever needed, regardless of whether this places the party in a liberal or conservative position on a particular issue. It should not fall to undertake the responsibility of constructive criticism even if on a particular issue it may be required to take the conservative side of an issue. For instance, consider the fields of national defense, budgetary controls, rearrangement of priorities and the defeat of wasteful and extreme welfare proposals. I feel sure the party will measure up to these needs of this day.

OEO AND THE WELFARE GRAB

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, a number of statements have been made in recent days regarding OEO. One aspect of this organization's overall operation that has escaped notice by many Members is where OEO employees have joined forces with welfare rights organizations to lobby for increased welfare payments. Such conduct by OEO staff members only aids in maintaining the level of poverty and does nothing to help the poor rise out of poverty.

To illustrate this point, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention the following editorial from the Phoenix Gazette.

[From the Phoenix (Ariz.) Gazette, Oct. 6, 1972]

THE WELFARE GRAB

The Arizona State Welfare Department is asking a 59 per cent increase in the money it gets from the state treasury, and giving the doggonedest set of reasons you could imagine.

The department wants a good, fat \$25 million more from the state, boosting the total from \$44 million to \$69.4 million. That would be in addition to an anticipated \$51.2 million in federal funds.

In any such year as this, when property taxes are pushing against blue sky almost to the point of confiscation in some cases, a boost of over half again as much in the welfare budget would be ridiculous. Werder still, however, are some of the "factors" listed by the department in justification of the requested increase.

They include: Welfare recipients are allowed to have more income than in the past. (So therefore does the state have an obligation to give them more income?) The "public" is becoming more aware of available "benefits." (Translation: Welfare clients are finding out new wrinkles to increase their take.) Education and training is lagging, so the welfare clients aren't suited to available jobs. Family ties and responsibilities are breaking down, putting more people on welfare. Divorce and illegitimacy are growing.

The list itself is a damning indictment of the welfare system. It shrieks to heaven that the system, which was set up to overcome these very factors, has now turned around and is feeding upon them. It is using them to increase its own bureaucratic empire.

The lobbying Welfare Rights Organization and activist elements in the federal Office of Economic Opportunity are actually cited as having, in essence, increased the demand among welfare clients for the raises the state department now wants to allow.

We realize the department has money problems outside this list, some legitimate.

The great bulk of what it is asking, however, is pure surrender to defeatism and perpetual welfarism.

JUVENILE JUSTICE

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following second article in a series on juvenile justice published by the New York Times.

JUVENILE JUSTICE: HELPLESS FRUSTRATION (By Lesley Oelsner)

Juvenile crime is skyrocketing, and the city's juvenile justice system finds itself able to do little to stem it.

Recidivism is so high that a Legal Aid Society defense lawyer says it's "almost perfect," that judges of the Family Court call their tribunal a "revolving door" and that child after child graduates from the juvenile system into the jails and prisons for adults.

Yet at the same time, judges are ordering fewer children incarcerated, saying that jailing them is often useless and even harmful. A five-week study by the New York Times of the juvenile system here found that many judges and other officials are in what one judge, Joseph D. DiCarlo of Bronx Family Court, calls "a state of limbo," feeling helpless in the face of rising crime, and unsure what they can or should do.

"I think to one extent we're coddling these kids too much," says Judge DiCarlo. "I don't think we're severe enough. They come in, they're paroled back to their parents." Nevertheless, he says, he does not think that he himself will become more severe.

"I think if anything I would lean more toward leniency," he says. "I don't think we've even tried—really tried—a full schedule of rehabilitation."

Judge DiCarlo's frustration is shared by others in the system, by judges as well as lawyers, probation workers and policemen. Many feel that not only are they failing to stop juvenile crime, but also that sometimes they may be fostering or adding to it.

A girl named Anna was sent by the Queens Family Court to Callagy Hall, one of the city's "temporary shelters" for children, pending placement in some more appropriate home. After 12 months she was still there, and one day, she assaulted a Callagy worker.

"After a year, I don't blame her," says Judge M. Michael Potoker, who handled the case.

A 15-year-old youth accused of burglary and grand larceny comes to Brooklyn Family Court and stands before Judge Philip D. Roache. Several other cases against the youth, ranging from an attempted purse snatching to stealing from a truck, have already ended in either withdrawal or probation. And there is another dismissal this day, for the complaining witness refuses to come back to court.

"Send him home. What can I do?" mutters Judge Roache as he looks at the youth. "Home to murder someone. What can I do?"

Juvenile crime has been mounting for a number of years, especially serious crime. In 1972, police say, 12,772 children under 16 were arrested here on felony charges, 5,343 for misdemeanors—a 22.5 per cent increase in the former, a 23.2 rise for the latter.

VIOLATIONS DECLINE

The only decrease over the previous year was in the number of youngsters arrested for violations—the petty offenses—which fell 15.5 per cent, to 257.

A breakdown of the statistics indicates the seriousness of the crimes: 3,743 youngsters were arrested on robbery charges in the first 10 months of the year, 3,151 for burglary and 809 for felonious assault.

And on a recent day, 13 youngsters were being held at Spofford, the city's main children's jail, all accused of murder.

"I used to sit in Family Court 10 years ago, and I'd think in 50 per cent of the cases, 'I used to do that,'" recalls Leah Marks, deputy administrative officer of the court. "Now it's 1 per cent, and I don't think it's because I'm 10 years older."

Judges, social workers and psychiatrists in the juvenile system give a number of reasons for juvenile misbehavior—both for juvenile delinquency, as the criminal conduct is termed, and for the behavior (such things as truancy and running away and being "uncontrollable") for which children are declared "PINS," or "persons in need of supervision."

A FANTASY LIFE

Emotional problems and mental illness are cited, for instance. There is some debate within the system as to whether this has become an increasingly significant factor, or whether it is simply being looked for more carefully, and hence found more often. But there is no debate that it is a major contributor.

A 9-year-old boy accused of truancy turns out to be spending his days and nights riding the subway, living a fantasy life in which he believes he is in a movie.

A second boy is picked up on a car-theft charge and then picked up again, after stealing underwear from a store in full view of store personnel. He has a tough and hated older brother, it turns out, and a distant and noncommunicative mother.

Still other youngsters, in several unrelated cases, stab playmates or relatives; they each explain later that "voices told me to do it."

"Most kids don't have the finesse to make that up," says Edith Frazier, a social worker in Brooklyn Family Court. "You can see it as a pattern. After a while you can look at a child and see he's not well."

PARENT-CHILD CLASH

According to Dr. Denise Shine, a psychiatrist in the Brooklyn court, three patterns occur repeatedly: A child has very severe psychiatric problems, being psychotic, for example; he has "deep emotional problems" stemming from conflicts within his family or he has a "group delinquent reaction," in which he does something because of peer pressure from, say, other members of a gang.

Cultural factors also add to the flow of cases into Family Court—particularly the cases in the PINS category, where parents and guardians come to court complaining their child is "uncontrollable."

For example, many families come to New York from Puerto Rico, where children are expected to come home early and girls are often chaperoned. But in New York the children want to do as their playmates and classmates do; often the result is a parent-child clash and a trip to court, with the parent not understanding the consequences.

Thus the child gets a court record and perhaps some time in jail, because, in Mrs. Frazier's words, "the parents refuse to be Americanized."

"Parents and kids who aren't adjusting to adolescence," Mrs. Frazier says, constitute one of the biggest groups of court cases.

Neither the parent nor the child, she says, knows what should reasonably be expected of a teen-ager. Sometimes, too, the parent or guardian does not know what should be expected of an adult either.

A case in point is that of the 15-year-old whose burglary charges were dismissed by Judge Roache, after the main witness refused to testify.

The youth stands before Judge Roache,

rocking on his feet, as the judge announces his ruling; the youth's aunt, with whom he is to live, is sitting next to him and clutching a bag on her lap.

Suddenly the aunt drops a bottle. It crashes, breaks, splashes; in a moment, the courtroom smells only of gin. The aunt—who has previously told the judge that she takes care of the boy because the boy's mother is an alcoholic—clutches nervously at a large cross hung on a chain about her neck.

AUNT IS WARNED

"What kind of example are you setting for this kid?" Judge Roache demands. He shouts at her to keep the boy "out of trouble;" he tells her he'd put her in jail if only the case weren't already dismissed; he warns her that "clutching a cross isn't going to help you."

Then he waves them away, shouting, "Go while you can!" Later shaking his head, he mutters: "What can we expect of that poor kid?"

"If we had more power over the parents, it would be a much easier task," Judge Richards W. Hannah, another Brooklyn judge, remarks. "A lot of parents aren't interested in the children. They don't want to be bothered with their children, so they let them run wild."

Drugs are also credited with causing some juvenile crime—though at least in the Bronx, judges say they are getting far fewer cases involving drugs than they used to, two or three years ago. Many Bronx cases, they say, are now gang-related.

The school system shares some of the blame for juvenile crime and misbehavior, too, court personnel say.

Saul Moskoff, administrative judge of the Queens Family Court, complains: "The school system is sending the child through without reading. Of course, a child loses interest if he can't read." The result is often truancy.

SCHOOLS DELINQUENT

The schools, moreover, frequently fail to notify the court that a child is a truant until the child has skipped months of classes—months during which the child may have found his way into a gang or otherwise gotten himself into trouble.

"They bring in a PINS case and say the school hasn't seen her in 111 days," recounts Luigi E. Morano, administrative judge of the Brooklyn Family Court, noting that 111 days is a semester. "Where was she? Why don't they bring her in sooner? Why didn't someone bring her in before?"

And then, as a root cause of juvenile delinquency, there is what the judges and others refer to as "society" or "the environment," the ravaged slum neighborhoods in which children grow up.

To many in the city's juvenile justice system, this is perhaps most responsible for youthful misbehavior. "What else can you expect?" is the constant refrain heard among court personnel. "There are junkies on the streets, the mother's an addict, the kid grows up with violence. That's his model."

Yet for all the varied causes of juvenile crime and other misdeeds, many in the justice system feel that the system itself contributes—even beyond the generally accepted fact that it rarely rehabilitates or deters.

SOME GET "DISPOSITION"

Children are allowed their version of the plea bargaining that goes on in the adult courts, for example. The youngsters admit to certain acts, and, in return, the more serious charges against them are dropped. Sometimes they get a "disposition"—the Family Court version of a sentence—which the judges admit is hardly less severe than the disposition that might have occurred if the children were tried on the original charges.

This directly violates a basic premise of the Family Court, which is that the disposition is to be matched to the child's needs

rather than to the specific acts he is found to have committed.

Then, too, judges have such heavy case loads that they make what Judge Morano calls "snap decisions." Prosecutors (a job filled in Family Court by the office of the city's Corporation Counsel) are so overburdened that, as the chief of the office's Family Court unit admits, they almost never investigate a case; cases are thus dismissed for insufficient evidence.

The initial charges, termed petitions rather than complaints, are, in fact, often dropped for insufficiency before trial. Drafted by nonlawyers, again because of the Corporation Counsel's understaffing, the petitions are often inadequate.

Long criticized within and without the system are the institutions in which children are placed—including the city-run jails (which officials prefer to call juvenile centers even while admitting that they are secure, locked houses of detention) temporary shelters and the state-operated reform schools, called training schools.

"Large institutions do for many children a great deal of harm," says Wayne Mucci, after a year and a half as the director of institutions for the Special Services for Children division of the city's Human Resources Administration, and thus the man in charge of the jails and shelters. "Certainly, it's not a good way to treat kids."

Milton Luger, who as director of the state's Division for Youth became responsible last year for the training schools, comments: "Too many of our facilities are irrelevant as far as kids' needs are concerned. Too many facilities don't know how to work effectively with kids."

Many judges have come to agree, and one after another now says he or she will "do anything" to avoid sending a child away. The result is that placements have dropped in both jails and training schools. Training schools to which children can be sent after being found delinquent or in need of supervision are now being used mainly for what Mr. Luger calls "the more hard-core cases."

As a consequence, probation workers are complaining that they are getting too many difficult or dangerous children—children, at any rate, who are too difficult for the limited amount of time and care that the overworked probation staff can provide.

Judges generally give children advice and warnings before placing them on probation. But as Judge Marano says, "We don't have facilities available to make the kids do what we say. They're taking it with a grain of salt."

Although the situation has begun to change somewhat under programs set up by Barbara Blum, director of the Special Services for Children division, and Mr. Luger, experts say there are still insufficient alternatives between the extremes of incarceration and outright dismissal. And a judge, restricted in his disposition of a case to either training school or probation, often chooses probation, when what he really wants is something in between.

"It's true, kids are let out who then commit other acts," concedes Mary Bass, director of the Corporation Counsel's unit for the Family Court. "On the other hand, kids are sent to training schools that don't do much good either. It's a tremendous problem. There aren't enough alternatives."

The tendency to try to keep the children out of the system, in fact, often shows up much earlier—in the period between the incident and the initial court appearance.

As the system is set up now, each case must be processed through a department in the courthouse called "probation intake" and run by the city's Office of Probation, before a petition can be filed in the court itself. The probation officers there are authorized to "adjust" cases—to dispose of them either by throwing them out or by arranging some program for the child.

At the moment, according to judges and probation workers, at least half of the cases are adjusted out, with the other half going to court.

RECIDIVISM NOT SHOWN

But whether this is good or bad, no one is really sure. While experts in the juvenile field say that children should be diverted from the system wherever possible, the premise of their thinking is that appropriate services (such as counseling and education) are available for the child. In New York, as nearly everyone in the system complains, this is not exactly true.

Probation, moreover, according to John A. Wallace, its director, does not keep records showing recidivism rates for the adjusted-out cases.

But court records do show that the number of cases that are filed in court are not increasing as rapidly as the arrest figures. As Merrill Sobie, chief administrative officer of the Family Court, puts it: "No one seems to be sure what's going on, except that there are a lot less cases coming to court."

Does the system's easing-up on children mean any added danger to the community? Mr. Sobie is asked. "That's a logical conclusion," he replies.

Is the system then failing? he is asked. "We know that," Mr. Sobie answers. "One way to measure that is adult crime. Most adult criminals start as children."

Al Castro, director of information for the city's Department of Correction, which supervises detained defendants aged 16 and up, reports that "practically all" of the 16-year-olds who come into the Adolescent Remand Shelter at Rikers Island have Family Court records of four or five years' standing. Judges of the State Supreme Court's criminal term say that they, too, see one after another adult defendant with a Family Court history.

So, says Mr. Sobie, if anything is to be done to cut down the amount of adult crime, "it has to be done on this level," the juvenile system.

A UNIQUE EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I will have the opportunity this weekend to again participate in what I consider to be a unique educational experience. Stetson University, in DeLand, Fla., will sponsor its second annual U.S. Model Senate, a program which seeks to duplicate as closely as possible the activities and atmosphere of the U.S. Senate.

One hundred students, representing 50 colleges and universities across the Southeast, will each assume a senatorial characterization and participate in four days of committee hearings, party caucuses and Senate floor sessions.

The students have already been actively researching some of the major proposals we, in the Congress, are now considering.

Mr. Speaker, this particular form of simulation is an important learning tool for our Nation's future lawmakers. The interchange of ideas which occurred last year and is sure to occur again this weekend is stimulating and productive for both students and congressional representatives.

Joining in the Model Senate program

this year are Senator MARK HATFIELD, Senator HOWARD BAKER, and my friend and neighbor, Congressman LOU FREY. I welcome these colleagues to the fourth and foremost district of Florida as they visit our State's oldest institution of higher learning. By their presence and participation, they are helping to provide our young people with a deeper knowledge and understanding of our governmental process.

Mr. Speaker, I believe one of the most remarkable features of this program is that it was initiated and is carried out by the students themselves. These young people have planned the program, invited the congressional representatives and handled the local arrangements. It is a bipartisan effort, as evidenced by the presence of the State Democratic and Republican party chairmen and congressional representatives from both sides of the aisle. I believe it is well to note here that the distinguished Governor of Florida, the Hon. Reubin Askew, has proclaimed this week as "Stetson University Model U.S. Senate Week" in Florida.

President John E. Johns is to be commended for providing an educational atmosphere at Stetson which encourages this kind of learning experience. Dr. T. Wayne Bailey, chairman of the Political Science Department, and his associate, Dr. Gary Maris, have inspired the students to continue the program; however, as I noted, the implementation of this program has rested with students. I should like to commend the student chairman, Miss Cynthia Horton, of Winter Park, Fla., for her effective leadership. In order to insure the success of the program, Miss Horton made a visit to Washington in January to personally meet the congressional representatives who will appear on the program this weekend.

Other Stetson students vitally involved in the program are Sandy Blackenburg, Tulsa, Okla.; Kathy Kimbrough, Lancaster, N.Y.; Linda Mattheison, Jacksonville, Fla.; Rick Harwood, Lighthouse Point, Fla.; Rhonda Wilson, St. Petersburg, Fla.; Barb Cox, Davenport, Fla.; Maryesther Murrill, Arcadia, Fla.; Cedric Bryant, High Springs, Pam Waxler, Stuart, Fla.; Tom Stapleton, Sanford, Fla.; and Henry Teel, Birmingham, Ala.

Mr. Speaker, my only regret is that the students did not choose the more important House of Congress to emulate, but perhaps much improvement may be suggested for the other House during this program.

IN SUPPORT OF GENEALOGY

HON. GUNN MCKAY

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. MCKAY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which would make available to genealogists and historians, under controlled conditions, certain information which otherwise would be permanently out of reach.

As a Representative from Utah, and a Mormon, I have an interest in facilitating

genealogical research. The Mormon Church places strong emphasis on a close family unit, and, concurrently, on genealogical work. Members are given a definite responsibility to trace the genealogy of their own families. The church has organized genealogical societies, with 135 branches throughout the world, to assist in the efforts of Mormons and non-Mormons alike to trace their ancestry.

Genealogists meet with many frustrations in their work, but are a remarkably persevering breed. Their search for data is motivated by religious/familial interest—not by professional reasons. Much information can be obtained from local records and other sources. However, the most useful source for birth dates, marriage dates, places of residence, and so forth, is often the census.

My bill would allow a very limited access to the demographic portion of the census surveys, after 77 years had elapsed from the taking of the census. Access would be limited to designated agents of organizations which have a legitimate interest in the records for genealogical or historic reasons. These agents could copy the demographic information and the organization then would be allowed to make it available to members for historic or genealogical purposes. The bill specifies that information obtained by these means cannot be admitted as evidence in a court of law. The 77 year lapse of time between the census survey and its availability makes it unlikely that information contained therein would be of any but historical interest, and it also allows the records to be released during years when the Census Bureau is not involved in census surveying.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the right to privacy is an essential tenet of a free society. I do not seek to interfere with that concept, and this bill does not violate that right. What it does is to make available, under very limited conditions, information needed by those who have a legitimate and worthwhile interest in it. Census information obtained prior to 1900 has already been released without adverse effect, and my bill would simply provide for the continuation, under controlled conditions, of a similar practice.

I would hope that my colleagues would join in support of the measure.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID JONES OF NASHVILLE, TENN.

HON. RICHARD H. FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, very rarely do we have an opportunity to learn of extraordinary acts of heroism such as the one performed by David Jones, 14, of Nashville. Calling upon a maturity and resourcefulness particularly impressive for his age, as well as his extensive Scout training under the guidance of Mr. Dwayne Cline, David saved the life of his 9-month-old sister when she strangled one Friday in February. In recognition of his quick, capable response in the face of an emergency, David is to receive the Alert Youth

Award from Mr. W. L. Simpkins of Mid-Tennessee Insurance, Inc., on April 19.

I would like to share with you the article printed in the Nashville Banner which tells the story of how a young man reacted to a crisis in a manner which should be admired and remembered by us all:

SCOUT TRAINING PAYS OFF AND A LITTLE GIRL LIVES

(By Frances Meeker)

David Jones, 14, always took his Boy Scout training seriously and he believes in the Scout motto, "Be Prepared."

And his nine-month-old sister, Marsha, is alive today probably because of David's Scout training.

David, a star scout in Troop 247 at the Church of the First-born, 208 Gatewood Ave., administered mouth-to-mouth resuscitation to his little sister when she strangled Friday, and revived her after his parents had given her up for dead.

"There is no doubt in my mind that if David hadn't been here Friday, Marsha wouldn't be here now," said the children's mother, Mrs. Robert H. Jones.

Marsha is suffering from the flu, which has swept through the Jones family who lives at 3112 Hillside Road, and about 5:30 p.m. Friday—after she had been taken to a physician—she began vomiting as she lay in her bed.

"I grabbed her up and saw that she was choking," said Mrs. Jones. "I screamed for my husband and both of us worked frantically with her."

Jones said he cut his fingers on the baby's teeth as he tried to force his finger into her mouth to clear her throat.

"But her jaws were locked and I couldn't get her mouth open," he said.

Marsha's body went limp, her breathing stopped and her face turned blue while he was working with her, the father said. Still holding the child, he called the telephone operator and asked her to get an ambulance.

David had returned home sick with the flu from Isaac Litton Junior High School, where he is in the ninth grade, and had gone to bed. He heard the commotion and rushed from his room.

Taking in the situation of a glance, he said, "Let me have her, Daddy."

"It's too late, son, she's dead," the father replied. But he handed the child to David because, "I wasn't able to do anything and there wasn't going to be time for help to get here."

David laid the baby on the floor, "gave her a breath" by mouth-to-mouth resuscitation, and then turned her head to the side.

"I got my finger in her mouth—I'm not sure how," David said, "and pushed the blockage down her throat."

He then administered resuscitation again and got a response. Then a third time he "gave her a breath" and she let out a cry.

"That was the happiest sound we ever heard," said Mrs. Jones.

Neighbors rushed the family to Baptist Hospital where a doctor examined Marsha and said she was all right except for the flu.

"The doctor said her throat was so swollen from having the flu that it became clogged when she vomited," said Mrs. Jones. "He said that David had done what had to be done to save her."

David, who has been in scouting three years, took the first aid training several times as he was working on his second and first class scouting badge, including one course, at Boxwell Reservation. Later, he helped instruct younger scouts, in the course. His scoutmaster is Dwayne Cline.

"When I saw Marsha, what I had learned just came to me, step-by-step as I worked with her," the young scout said.

"He was so calm while he was doing it," such a blessing."

marveled his mother. "His scout training is

PRESIDENTIAL RHETORIC

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, the following front page editorial from the March 31, 1973, edition of the Quincy, Mass., Patriot Leader is an incisive summary of the present administration's irrational approach to the problems that now confront this Nation. My respected colleague, Representative JAMES A. BURKE of Massachusetts, joins me in commending the Patriot Leader and in offering to our colleagues the text of this editorial as a clear and perceptive analysis of Presidential rhetoric:

NIXON SPEECH

"Let us, therefore, put aside those honest differences about the war which have divided us and dedicate ourselves to meet the great challenges of peace which unite us."

The words, from President Nixon's TV address Thursday night, express a noble sentiment. But the nobility was greatly flawed by the remainder of the speech which was a hard-nosed, hard-line attack on the Administration's foes.

The President characterized some of those who had honest differences with him about the war as "those who advocated peace at any price—even if the price would have been defeat and humiliation for the United States."

He portrayed the complicated issue of his fight with Congress over federal spending as being a choice between an acceptance of his budget or higher taxes and prices. At the same time he denounced any effort to cut defense spending, saying it would destroy any possibility of negotiating further arms and to troop limitations treaties.

And, the chief executive threw down an additional ominous gauntlet, warning the North Vietnamese of the possible "consequences" for failing to carry out the terms of the Paris agreements.

This is very dangerous rhetoric.

The dangers of the warning to the North Vietnamese are obvious. The "consequences" were not specified. Perhaps the President is only thinking of cutting off U.S. aid for Indochina reconstruction which is called for in the Paris accords. But, he could also be threatening to resume the bombing and drag the United States back into the war.

However, the domestic political effect of Mr. Nixon's rhetoric is a matter of greater concern.

The oversimplified description of the choices facing the nation, and his no-compromise attitude can only increase divisions rather than heal them.

It may be politically advantageous for the President to claim, for example, that the alternative to approving his budget as submitted would be higher prices or a 15 percent tax hike, but the fact of the matter is that there are many more alternatives, and some of them may be more attractive than Mr. Nixon's.

Congress has the constitutional responsibility to raise and appropriate federal money. It has the power and the obligation to review the President's budget and to make changes in it. Congress could decide to set different budget priorities than the President did, while remaining within the \$268 billion ceiling.

Congress also could decide to raise additional money through a program of tax reform. And it is just possible that the public may be prepared to pay additional taxes in order to receive additional services such as national health insurance.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

In taking his hard stance, the President also risks provoking an equally absolutist and irresponsible reaction. In trying to force his opponents into a corner, they may wind up opposing him even when he is right.

For example, Mr. Nixon is absolutely correct that world peace would be put on a firmer foundation if strategic arms limitations (SALT) and European troop reductions (MBFR) were done through international agreements and treaties.

But it seems absurd to say, as he did, that the pending SALT and MFBR talks preclude any attempt to cut the defense budget.

There is fat to cut in the President's \$83 billion defense budget request. A lot of the increase involves personnel costs prompted by the all-volunteer army, and have nothing to do with strategic arms.

There are excess bases, cost overruns on defense contracts, and costly new weapons systems that would be needed only if SALT fails.

A long, long time ago, the President asked Americans to lower their voices. That process ought to start at the top.

HONOLULU RESOLUTION

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I recently inserted into the RECORD resolutions sent to me by the councils of the counties of Maui and Kauai concerning the President's proposed budget cuts.

An even more detailed resolution was passed by the council of the city and county of Honolulu indicating how the elimination or reduction of various Federal programs will adversely affect the citizens of Honolulu.

In the belief that this resolution, which supports the position that programs should not be arbitrarily reduced and deleted, will be of interest to my colleagues, I include it in the RECORD at this point:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the preamble to the Constitution of the United States affirms one of our nation's basic objectives to "promote the general welfare"; and

Whereas, recent federal budget announcements indicate severe reductions and deletions in many programs designed to promote the general welfare of the people of each state, including Hawaii; and

Whereas, major reductions and deletions include, but are not limited to the following which directly affect the operations of the City and County of Honolulu:

The scuttling of the Model Cities program which on Oahu has helped thousands of residents to become active in their communities and has improved social, physical, and economic conditions;

The freezing of funds for new water, sewer, and open space projects, public facilities loans and grants to small communities for building water and sewer systems;

The elimination or reduction of numerous manpower programs designed to reduce unemployment, including Concentrated Employment Program (CEP) and Manpower Development Training Program institutional training, Public Service Careers and CEP on-the-job training programs, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and Operation Mainstream;

Proposed shifting to the uncertain fate of Urban Community Development revenue sharing of programs for rehabilitation loans,

neighborhood facilities grants and urban renewal; and

Whereas, the following reductions and deletions of other such programs on the state level will adversely affect the health and welfare of the people of the City and County of Honolulu by:

The complete dismantling of the Office of Economic Opportunity and important agencies related to it, including the Community Action Program which in Hawaii has involved many hundreds of our low-income citizens in taking a direct role in decisions affecting their lives and improving their conditions;

The stoppage of housing programs designed to bring relief to the thousands of people in our state who live in overcrowded and dilapidated units at prices they cannot afford, including Section 235 and 236 programs which, along with others, are designed to stimulate construction of moderate income housing; and including U.S. Department of Agriculture loans for low-income rural families and credit for farm labor housing and rural rental and cooperative housing;

The elimination of federal funding for education aid to federally impacted areas amounting to some \$10 million in Hawaii alone; and similar elimination of funds to libraries, vocational educational training of personnel, new careers in education, training institutes and summer fellowship, P.L. 815 school construction, programs for strengthening state departments of education, drug abuse education, environmental education, and vocational rehabilitation services;

The proposed shifting to the uncertainty of revenue sharing of many educational programs, including education for deprived children, supplementary services, programs for the handicapped, vocational and adult education opportunities;

The cutting of the distribution of social service funds to the states by 40%, leading to the probable loss for Hawaii of 9.5 million to \$17.5 million in federal funds for welfare programs through both public and private agencies, including up to \$7.5 million in social services and \$2 million to \$10 million in food, clothing and medical care payments;

The reduction of vital programs for senior citizens including the elimination of dental care for the aging under Medicaid, the stoppage of all research and training under the Administration on Aging, the deletion of expected and necessary expansion of the Retired Senior Volunteer Program, the Foster Grandparent Program, the Senior Corps of Retired Executives, and research on aging under the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development; and

Whereas, the above federal cutbacks, along with many others, will have a serious social and economic effect on the City and County of Honolulu and on the State of Hawaii; now, therefore;

Be it resolved by the Council of the City and County of Honolulu that it does hereby call upon the President of the United States and the Congress to re-evaluate funding for social programs and restore monies proposed to be deleted; and

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, Hawaii's Congressional delegation, and the Mayor of the City and County of Honolulu.

A WORLDWIDE PROBLEM OF INFLATION

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the excerpts from the following article contain

some illuminating comments on what may be a worldwide problem of inflation:

EVERY MAN'S MEAT

It has really come to something, you will agree, when the president of the richest country in the world has to eat left-overs. It's no job. "President Nixon," according to the White House, "has put his own taste-buds behind his cheaper food policy and is eating more chicken, fish and stews made from left-overs and fewer expensive sirloin steaks."

The aim, apparently, is to set an example to the American housewife, who right now is experiencing the biggest rise in food costs for more than twenty years. Wholesale farm and food prices have gone up at an annual rate of 56 per cent in the last three months, and are threatening to make a mess out of Nixon's whole prices and incomes strategy. Shoppers are bewildered and, the President's cost of living council admits, "outraged".

Sirloin steak costs 23 per cent more than it did a year ago, and other cuts show an even bigger increase.

President Nixon's main response, so far, has been to echo Mr. Heath's appeal to shoppers. "The greatest and most powerful weapon against high prices in this country," he declared at a press conference the other day, "is the American housewife. Whether she buys something that is more expensive has a far greater effect on price control than anything we do here."

To many people it seemed like a thinly disguised invitation to boycott meat, and this is indeed what many shoppers have been doing. Various consumer associations have called for a national "Meatless Week", beginning on April 1, and have distributed pamphlets containing meatless menus. Congressman William Cotter, one of the chief supporters of the boycott, says he picked April Fool's Day "because we will no longer be fooled by a price control program which simply does not work." Cotter has also asked consumers to "send a message to the White House" by mailing their grocery bills to Mr. Nixon.

The boycott has already cost a number of meat workers their jobs and has, inevitably, led to an increase in the price of chickens and fish. Not surprisingly, Mr. Nixon is being urged to impose an all-foods freeze. Phase three of his prices and incomes policy (he is one ahead of us) is called a failure, and there are widespread demands for drastic action.

Mr. Nixon says he would impose controls "instantly" if he thought they would work. He felt, though, that they would simply lead to a decline in farm production and the setting up of black markets. His Secretary of Agriculture says that people who want ceilings put on food prices are "damn fools". He went on to say, however, that such ceilings were "a possibility". Why? "Because there are a few damn fools who don't agree with me."

Past experience suggests he and the President are right to be skeptical. Panic buying set prices rocketing in the Korean war and controls were imposed. A series of five government orders cut meat prices by ten per cent. It brought nothing but trouble. Within weeks there was a cattlemen's revolt which closed down big meat packaging plants for lack of supplies. Feed lots emptied and black markets were developed in Omaha and Chicago.

Logic, however, sometimes has to bow before political considerations. Mr. Nixon (whose prices and incomes policy has, until recently, looked quite successful) may well

have to resort to the unworkable in order to prove that he is not complacent.

The cost of living council blames the latest crisis on a long list of impersonal market forces. A major factor, it says, is that people have never had it so good. The economy is expanding, incomes are up, unemployment is down. So there is more demand for food. Another is that the Russians bought a fourth of last year's grain crop. This raised meat as well as bread and cereal prices, since a lot of grain goes to feed livestock. (This particular explanation amazes many Americans. They find it hard to understand why they should, apparently, be expected to subsidize the commies.) A third factor is that, while demand everywhere is up, domestic production of food-stuffs has actually been declining. Part of that is due to bad weather, including the damage done by Hurricane Agnes.

The council is doing its best to boost supplies by easing crop restrictions, selling government-owned grain, and suspending limits on food imports. It has also asked cattlemen to send their herds to market faster. But it accepts that prices are likely to rise further. Its main advice to housewives: "try to eat a little less".

Some experts here insist that the "crisis" is due to a unique combination of circumstances which will not recur. Others argue that it represents a "true watershed for production and demand", not only in the U.S. but probably in the whole of the industrialized world. "Malthus," they say, "was right after all."

Malthus, you will recall, was a clergyman who began to worry about the population explosion long before any of today's worriers were born. The Malthusian doctrine is simple: unchecked breeding of man causes the population to grow by geometrical progression, whereas the food supply cannot grow so rapidly.

"I think," he wrote, "I may fairly make two postulates. First, that food is necessary to the existence of man. Secondly, that the passion between the sexes is necessary and will remain nearly in its present state."

Man, he suggested, could apply the remedy by prudence and self-restraint, just as he could avoid illness due to gluttony or drunkenness. He advocated late marriage, which he maintained would be good for the human character and for the institution. Everyone should have no more children than he could support. This moral code, he felt, should be reinforced by society, through the simple expedient of refusing charity or public support to any families which could not support themselves.

It was Malthus' doctrine, and his solutions, which first earned economics the label "dismal science". He was right about the passion of the sexes, but in countries like Britain, the United States, and Germany his gloomier predictions have failed to come true, largely because of substantial increases in agricultural and industrial productivity which he did not foresee. But he still has a considerable influence on social thinking.

Latest estimates for Britain and for America suggest that fears of a "population explosion" are, in fact, unjustified. Both countries are at, or near, zero population growth. Prosperity, it seems, checks breeding more effectively than any amount of government control. But prosperity is also putting the kind of pressure on food supplies which Malthus forecast more than a hundred and seventy years ago. As living standards rise around the world the situation is likely to get worse, not better. . . .

A SALUTE TO A HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT IN AMERICAN LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that many great and profound challenges face our people and our Nation today. Among the very highest, I believe, is the imperative need to find the ways and the means and the formula to encourage management and labor, while negotiating wage and working conditions differences, to continue their broad productive efforts in the vital public interest as well as their separate welfare.

With respect to this most desirable objective it was heartening to observe, not too long ago, that the eminent president of the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, himself, was reported as indicating that the combined council's resources would be exerted to achieve this end as a matter of obvious benefit to both industry and the working man and his family. Such an indication from a source of such tremendous influence, coupled with expressions of equal concern from respected industrial leaders, can be rightfully regarded as a giant forward step in the attitude and disposition of mutual tolerance and understanding that is absolutely necessary for the attainment of this long sought goal in the overall national development.

No one, Mr. Speaker, at all familiar with the complex history of labor and management disputes would be impractical enough to think that "utopia" in this area is just around the corner. But those of us who have long been urging and hoping for progress toward this objective can, I think, because of these recent pronouncements and projections, renew and strengthen our activities with the feeling that, at least, some light is being shed upon what has been previously regarded as a very dark and dismal outlook for the realization of our purposes. In any circumstances we do well to emphasize that there is nothing under the sun that men, who are moved by right reason and good will, cannot accomplish for their own mutual benefit and the progress of their country.

However, we can be even more practically and materially sustained in our hopes and activities in this field by observing and saluting the recent landmark agreement of the major steel companies and their employees to restrain from any production disrupting strikes through mid-1977.

As we hail this historic achievement, that so very few would have thought possible, even a few months ago, and emphasize the good sense and good will that inspired its accomplishment, let us exhort those in other areas of vital economic production to "go thou and do

likewise" for your own mutual benefit and the "good of all Americans." This is the spirit and admonition contained in the very timely editorial that appeared last Saturday, April 8, 1973, in the Washington Star-News and I am very pleased to include the article at this point.

THE STEEL PEACE

The unprecedented agreement by the United Steelworkers and major steel companies to rule out strikes through mid-1977 is a most encouraging development in American labor relations. It also should provide an important boost for the flagging steel industry in its efforts to increase productivity and fight off foreign competition.

The union and 10 big steelmakers have agreed, 18 months before the expiration of current contracts, to submit to binding arbitration any issues that are still outstanding a year from April 15. The workers are guaranteed 3 percent annual wage increases plus cost-of-living adjustments in the next three-year contract period and a \$150 bonus, in October 1974, for contributing "to stability of steel operations."

Both workers and companies stand to benefit from that kind of thinking ahead, as does the national economy. The industry's efficiency and competitive position, and the security of wage-earners, have been seriously hurt by the strike deadlines of past years, even though there has not been a general shutdown since 1959.

As contract negotiations loom, nervous industrial users of basic steel characteristically stockpile against the possibility of a strike, and place orders with foreign suppliers. Then with a steel settlement concluded and a strike averted, the industry slows down and workers are laid off as customers use up their steel inventories. This kind of boom-and-bust cycle is costly to both companies and workers, besides providing an entree for foreign steelmakers.

The labor-management understanding in basic steel, based on mutual interest in stable operations, is worthy of emulation elsewhere in American industry. Such a voluntary pattern of labor peace could lessen pressure for additional legislation to prevent major strikes.

SCANDAL-RIDDEN OEO IS ON ITS WAY OUT

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago our colleague from Texas (Mr. COLLINS) inserted in the RECORD an article written by Robert S. Allen, which began thus:

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 real truth is that the OEO has since it was created in 1964 done far more harm than good. It has wasted a good portion of the \$16 billion the Congress has appropriated for it.

Acting Director Howard Phillips and his assistant, Stanley Armstrong, deserve the plaudits of the Nation for their courageous and forthright moves in pursuance of the dismantling process.

Instances of the waste and extrava-

gance which have characterized the administration of OEO would shock and amaze the uninformed. There have in fact been few radical and subversive organizations in this country that have not been favored at one time or another by the OEO.

Members of Congress will recall last February 20 when hundreds of busloads of OEO lobbyists descended upon Capitol Hill, bringing thousands of demonstrators. A Detroit News article revealed recently that a week prior to that protest function \$50,000 from an operating account was put into a "slush fund" by the Nassau County, N.Y., OEO, and much of this money was diverted to charter 68 buses which were used to transport 3,000 from Nassau and adjoining Suffolk Counties, Long Island, to Washington.

A footnote to that incident was the firing of Mrs. Nancy Reimer, of Rockville Center, Long Island, by Nassau County OEO Director John Kearse for her failing to join his group for that trip to Capitol Hill on February 20. And several others were let out for the same reason.

CRYSTAL CITY, TEX., BOONDOGGLE

About 2 years ago, OEO announced a grant of \$502,413 to the Crystal City, Tex., school system. The announcement said it was to pay for an assistant superintendent, a curriculum writer, two counselors, and five additional teachers.

In addition, the grant was to pay for at least 50 \$1,200-per-year college scholarships—for 2 years—on behalf of local high school graduates. What this had to do with "poverty" was never revealed.

It happened that the Crystal City school at that time had come under control of a local radical party known as La Raza Unida, headed by one Jose Angel Gutierrez, who had recently been elected president of the school board and was an avid admirer of Fidel Castro.

This unusual generosity by OEO was undoubtedly due to influence Gutierrez was able to exercise in the upper echelons.

Not long after the Crystal City grant was announced an article appeared in the local newspaper—the Sentinel, which began—

If there was any doubt as to the teachings received by our children in the Crystal City schools, it was spelled out Friday night at the halftime activities on the Crystal City Javelin Field.

The Crystal City band, composed of junior high and high school students, marched on the field and executed the international communist revolutionary symbol of the clenched fist—the same "strike" symbol used by Fidel Castro in Cuba, Communist China, and all other areas where Communist influence is in operation.

Last year, Gutierrez was able to wangle another sizable grant of \$391,206 from OEO—this time for a medical clinic in Crystal City. But Gov. Preston Smith blocked that one.

Mr. Speaker, hundreds of instances of waste and extravagance could be listed. Did you in local papers the other day about a \$225,000 fund that was set up in 1971 with OEO money to aid "minority businesses" in the District of Columbia, and the money was lent to an

outfit whose officers are charged with administering the fund?

The records are replete with examples of OEO-controlled tax money being used to promote militant political action organizations, even to the extent of advocating "boycotts and strikes" to achieve certain objectives. Party hacks and political favoritism are commonplace.

For the RECORD, let me list a few cases that have been recently reported in news media.

In Harlem, Mont., a local attorney who was city attorney of another community received from OEO a \$20,000 salary as a "tourism specialist."

In Elizabeth, N.J., an employee was reported to have rented a house to the project for \$383 a month. He was buying it for \$128 a month on a VA loan. A member of the CAA board of directors rented another house to Headstart for \$225 a month. He was paying \$55 a month to a realty firm for it.

There are scores of instances where OEO directors have resigned and then made contracts with OEO for a variety of services.

Down in Fort Lauderdale, a community action employee and director were convicted for being parties to an auto theft ring.

In Oklahoma, a regional project bought a \$39,500 building from the brother of one of the project lawyers. Six months earlier the property was appraised at \$15,200.

In Jersey City, an OEO project was taken over by the Black Panther Party which used the organization's funds to spread hate literature and provide bail bonds for party members arrested on criminal charges.

Literally hundreds of these examples of waste and extravagance, and sometimes theft and fraud, could be cited. At the same time, a good many projects have been directed by honest people, with laudible objectives, and sometimes desirable results. But these examples seem to be the exception and not the rule.

A recent audit report, based upon spot checks, by the General Accounting Office, charged OEO with failing to account properly for millions of dollars spent by its antipoverty agencies.

The Congress must share much of the blame for this sorry record, because of the blank-check authority repeatedly granted to the OEO in so many respects. I am sure it would be correct to say that never in legislative history has so much undisciplined authority for expenditures of tax money been delegated by the Congress to an executive agency.

As I understand it, under the dismantling process all community action programs are to be discontinued, unless financed locally or by revenue sharing or other Federal sources. Other OEO functions are, according to reports, being retained and transferred to other agencies. Let us hope they will all be carefully audited and scrutinized.

The present administration embraced OEO for 4 years, and only this year belatedly decided to dismantle it. But it is better late than never. The present move undoubtedly enjoys widespread support.

INNOVATION AND CREATIVITY IN EDUCATION

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, in our Nation's constant striving to upgrade and maintain the highest standards in our educational system, one man in particular stands tall among those who championed this effort. That man is my constituent and friend, Msgr. Joseph E. Schieder, P.A., pastor of St. Andrew's Church, town of Tonawanda, N.Y. He has never failed to meet and exceed the educational demands and needs of the present and has always exemplified great insight into the learning needs of our youth.

St. Andrew's School, which rates high among primary schools in the State of New York, is indeed the "school of tomorrow." In its pleasant surroundings, it offers closed-circuit TV, courses in the arts, journalism, languages, and training in the social niceties—and no student is required to pay tuition. St. Andrew's School, with a student enrollment of 850, sets an example and truly serves as an inspiration for other institutions of learning. In the January 28, 1973, Sunday magazine section of the Buffalo Courier Express, Grace Goddard depicts Msgr. Schieder and the school, and shares with readers the myriad possibilities for innovation and creativity in education. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues and insert it at this point in the RECORD:

BRIDGING THE GENERATION GAP

(By Grace Goddard)

Recipient of the first Bishop James A. McNulty Award, recently established by the Diocese of Buffalo as a memorial to the late Bishop, is the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph E. Schieder, P.A., pastor of St. Andrew's Church, town of Tonawanda. The award will be given annually to a priest or laymen deemed outstanding in the field of youth work.

The dynamic Msgr. Schieder, whose recent and well-publicized controversy over busing pupils from beyond a parish "perimeter" resulted in a Supreme Court decision in his favor, is known nationally and internationally for his concern for young people. He formerly served in Washington, D.C., as national director for Catholic Youth of America and on the executive committee of the International Federation of Catholic Youth. He founded the National Catholic Camping Assn., and is one of the founders of the National Council of Catholic Youth.

A President of Italy awarded Msgr. Schieder the Star of Solidarity for his accomplishments in the field of youth throughout the world. A mayor of Rome honored him for his assistance to youth in the Eternal City. He was personal adviser on matters concerning youth to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, an appointment that was renewed by President John F. Kennedy when he came into office.

Although he obviously served youth well in an official capacity, it's his regard for young people on an individual basis—especially in St. Andrew's School—that academically rates highest in the state, according to the official state Pupil Evaluation Program (PEP) for grades three and six. Amidst current problems and perils to parochial school education, Msgr. Schieder stands tall and points to his school, where every possible

advantage is offered—including thorough training in social niceties and respect for others that used to come under the general heading of "Deportment."

At St. Andrew's, where no student is required to pay one penny of tuition, most classrooms have wall-to-wall carpeting, draperies on the windows, closed-circuit television and indirect lighting, and French and Spanish language courses are available to pupils in grades four through eight.

Children in grades one to three are ungraded, in keeping with the most advanced theories in education. Music and art is emphasized as is English composition, including classes in journalism.

An extensive and extremely up-to-date program of religious activities is carried on at St. Andrew's by its two young and popular associate pastors, the Rev. Carl Kuehneier and the Rev. Daniel Palys. Both offer daily Masses, religious celebrations, penitential services and show modern movies based on religious themes. The latter are followed by open discussion seminars that invite student participation.

This is in addition to the regular full courses of religion and catechetics taught by 40 nuns and lay teachers under supervision of Sister Edmundine, C. SS. F., St. Andrew's principal.

But perhaps best of all the other advantages of this 850-pupil school is the availability to its pupils of Msgr. Schieder, who advises: "Never talk down to a child. Their problems are as serious to them as any world-shaking event would be to adults. I always see the worth in what they are trying to say. We adults simply must listen, for they are the future."

The main purpose of this school is to serve St. Andrew's Parish. But when the parish quota is filled, non-Catholic pupils are welcomed and also are not required to pay tuition. A Jewish mother in Niagara Falls brings her daughter daily to St. Andrew's to enjoy its educational advantages.

Msgr. Schieder makes no secret of the fact that bingo is a mainstay of school support. In the nine years he's been at St. Andrew's, the school has been enlarged, the Msgr. Donovan Building that houses a parish center and the gymnasiums has been built, and the interior of the church modernized according to the wishes of Pope John XXIII, Vatican Council Two, and beautified in keeping with the impeccable taste of Msgr. Schieder.

Respect for the traditions of the Church is coupled with a most modern approach to today's trends in all actions of this extremely active priest.

He tends to disregard age differences; his encouragement of ecumenism, his modern approach to social problems of our day is truly amazing. For several years he hired as a gym instructor an octogenarian who, despite his years, did pushups by the dozens daily during gym workouts. Msgr. Schieder saw far back in those 80-plus years of this man's life, and knew how the gym teacher had been influenced by the great Pop Warner of football fame.

The children at St. Andrew's thus enjoyed the memories of this man—Thomas O'Brien—and their lives have been enriched by his sharing of them. This venerable athlete still spends part of every day in the school gymnasium with the children.

Msgr. Schieder, whose church has been the setting for many cooperative programs and services with Town of Tonawanda Protestant churches and whose choir has performed with theirs, does not require that his school's faculty be entirely Roman Catholic. He seeks out teachers who not only excel in their field but who have deep spiritual values.

"I want teachers who maintain wholesome discipline, not buddies for the pupils. The scholastic eminence we've reached at St. Andrew's depends on discipline—a discipline that results in courtesy which in turn allows

students to pursue their studies without any annoying interruptions," said Msgr. Schieder recently while he was doing something he obviously likes to do—serving as escort for a tour of St. Andrew's imposing church, school and parish center at the corner of Elmwood Ave and Sheridan Dr.

Several educators have termed St. Andrew's "The School of Tomorrow." Certainly some of Msgr. Schieder's views are as modern as tomorrow. The school, for many years staffed by the Sisters of St. Mary of Namur, presently is administered by the Felician Sisters. Sisters of both orders and outstanding lay people staff the school.

When one of the latter teachers was married at Kenmore Presbyterian Church, Msgr. Schieder and some of the nuns were present at the ceremony. Msgr. Schieder later gave the blessing at the wedding reception at the Shriners' Ismailia Temple Mosque, West Seneca. When that same teacher anticipated her first child, Msgr. Schieder made the kind of offer that even Women's Lib would applaud:

"There's no need to resign; babies are welcome in this school. If you or any other good teachers have small children, this is the place to bring them. Novices from Mount St. Mary's can alternate caring for them while doing their homework. No mother should have to discontinue her employment. There should be a place where her child can be cared for, a place easily accessible to the working mother. This is how it should be in offices, schools and factories. This is how it is at St. Andrew's," said Msgr. Schieder.

Msgr. Schieder has entertained outstanding churchmen, including the late Richard Cardinal Cushing. Guests—and each visit was an occasion in which the school and entire parish took part—also included Terence Cardinal Cooke of New York and Archbishop Binn of St. Paul-Minneapolis, Minn.

Msgr. Schieder traveled to Germany during a survey of youth work for chaplains of the United States Air Force and was a member of a special mission to Japan for UNESCO. Locally he has served as diocesan director of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, chairman of the diocese's Interfaith Committee, chairman of the Committee for Public Decency, and as director of the Buffalo Police Department's Youth Bureau.

A graduate of St. Joseph's Collegiate Institute, Msgr. Schieder received a BA degree from Niagara University, an MA from St. Bonaventure University and a Ph.D. from Ottawa (Ont.) University. An honorary doctorate in humane letters was from St. Vincent's College, Latrobe, Pa. He also holds honorary degrees from Seton Hall University in South Orange, N.J., and LaSalle College, Philadelphia, Pa.

He is the author of several books, and more than two million copies of his "Spiritual Lifts for Youth" have been sold.

His holiness Pope Paul VI elevated him to the rank of Prothonotary Apostolic in 1968, with the privilege of pontifical ceremonies, for his outstanding work at St. Andrew's and the Diocese of Buffalo. The late Francis Cardinal Spellman presented the Manhattan Medal to Msgr. Schieder for his work with college students during a special convocation at Manhattan College. Pope Pius XII appointed him a Papal Chamberlain in 1950 and a Domestic Prelate in 1952.

Msgr. Schieder served on President Eisenhower's Physical Fitness Program which was under the chairmanship of the then Vice President Richard M. Nixon. In 1972 he was appointed to the board of the United Fund, the advisory board of Kenmore Mercy Hospital and the board of trustees of the Can-talician Center.

When asked about the future of Catholic education, Msgr. Schieder said: "I hope it is secure. I think it is, because society recognizes its importance. I believe this is evidenced in the fact that the New York State

Board of Regents is endeavoring to give more money to private colleges in order to keep them going.

"There's more—much more—to education than books and the old three Rs, although they're important. But of inestimable value is an all-out effort to give depth to children's lives, to help them to develop taste and appreciate the beauty of God's world, to help them to see and try to ease the problems of others.

"This is what we're trying to do at St. Andrew's, and what I'd like to see done in all schools—public and private," said this first Bishop James A. McNulty Award recipient. The award was presented January 18 by Bishop Bernard J. McLaughlin, administrator of the Diocese of Buffalo.

FOOD PRICE HEARING

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, I sponsored a public hearing on food prices in New Britain, Conn. This hearing gave citizens an opportunity to express their views on the crisis in food prices.

Spokesmen included representatives of civic clubs and consumer groups, farmers and poultry breeders, food wholesalers and retailers, the fish and meatpacking industries.

The recommendations and observations of the participants were made available to members of the Banking and Currency Committee as they drafted legislation in this area.

For the benefit of all my colleagues, I am inserting in the RECORD today the statements of Senator ABE RIBICOFF, Dr. Donald Stitts, agricultural economist at the University of Connecticut, Marty Rogol of the Connecticut Citizen Action Group, Thomas Cesaro of Torrington who represented the New England Wholesale Food Distributors Association, and Mark Gordon of the Bostonian Fish Market in Hartford:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ABE RIBICOFF CONTROLLING FOOD PRICES

I am pleased that the President has acted to freeze the cost of beef, pork and lamb. This is an excellent first step toward controlling the rampant increases in the cost of food. Meat prices have skyrocketed at record rates recently. The cost of beef rose 6.7% in the last month to a record average of \$1.30 a pound. And the cost of pork went up 3.2% to an average for all cuts of 97.1 cents.

Much more needs to be done, however, if we are to succeed in controlling food prices. As every housewife can tell, meat prices are only part of the problem. The cost of almost every item in the American shopping basket—from chicken and fish to bread and vegetables—has been rising.

The men and women of America who have had their wages restricted by the President's economic policies often find they cannot afford an adequate diet. In the last two months alone, the cost of food has gone up by over five percent.

The consumer pressure exerted in the market place as a result of this inflation has had its effect in forcing the President to take some action to stem the rise in food costs. A more comprehensive and long range

solution is needed, however, to bring stability to the market place.

I have been urging the President and Congress for weeks to freeze all food prices. This action is needed now more than ever.

In addition, tariffs and quotas which raise the price of foreign commodities in short supply should be suspended. And finally, the archaic multibillion dollar farm subsidy and price support programs which force artificially high prices on the American consumer must be eliminated. By eliminating these programs which pay farmers not to grow food, more acres of land can be put into production. Food supplies will increase and prices will go down.

Inflation in food prices begins at the farm and yet no controls have ever been imposed at that level. As a result the farming and ranching industry is prospering at the expense of the American shopper.

The biggest share of the recent price increase in foods went directly to the farmers. Of the \$109 rise in the annual cost of the average "market basket" of food during the last year, \$93 went to the farmer and \$16 to the middlemen. Prices to farmers rose 21% in the last year even though the prices paid by farmers for commodities, equipment, wages, interest and taxes had gone up only 9%. Farm cash receipts and profits are at record high levels.

It is not the small farmer who is profiting. It is the large agribusiness concern. Three-fourths of all farm sales are made by 19% of all farmers. Seven percent of the nation's cattle ranchers produce 80% of the nation's beef. These corporate giants are prospering while the consumer is being pushed against the wall.

The steps I have suggested to control food price inflation will strike at the root causes of the inflationary spiral we now find ourselves in. It is time to move the American farm and food production system back to a free economy basis. Every consumer will be the beneficiary.

SUMMARY OF STATEMENT

(By Dr. Donald Stitts, Agricultural Economist, University of Connecticut)

Beef producers, middlemen, retailers and consumers have been blamed for the high prices of beef. While each group points an accusing finger in the other direction, the situation has become so confusing that it is more difficult to fix the blame (if indeed there is a "blame" to affix).

The reasons for the rise in beef prices over the past months have been a very strong consumer demand due primarily to an increase in income, a build-up of herds by producers which reduces the number of marketable cattle, and increased costs experienced by middlemen, especially labor, transportation and taxes.

The alternatives of beef substitutes will have little immediate effect on beef prices. Consumers demand beef and they have shown little interest in substituting pork or poultry in any large quantities. Protein fillers such as soybeans, to date, have had very little general acceptance. However, the easing of import quotas will have a short run dampening effect on meat prices. Unfortunately, other industrialized countries are developing a taste for beef which over time will probably increase world beef prices.

Farmers, packers and retailers may be cost conscious, but in the long run, it is going to be nearly impossible to contain the upward movement of food prices, since the costs of assembling, storing, transporting, processing and selling food products will continue to increase.

It probably doesn't matter whether farmers, packers, retailers or consumers caused the February price hikes. What does matter is that the problem has only been relieved temporarily. The inflationary forces which

create excess demand and higher prices are still at work in the economy.

STATEMENT

(By Marty Rogol, Connecticut Citizen Action Group)

This hearing is being held at a very crucial time. It must be made clear to people that the ceiling imposed Thursday night by the President is as short run a solution as the upcoming boycott of meat.

The efforts by numerous consumers throughout the country, and more particularly this state, have amply demonstrated to elected officials that the consumer is not to be toyed with. It is clear to those of us at the Connecticut Citizen Action Group that this is only a first step—that it is the responsibility of the Executive and legislative branches of government to bring an end to the continuing increases. The question asked is, what is the solution?

We have heard a great deal of rhetoric. We have heard that it is a simple economic problem of supply and demand. According to Administration spokespeople, we have more affluent people and therefore greater demand without corresponding increases in supply. Why was supply not increased over a long enough period of time so that the constant crunch facing the consumer each week was avoided?

Consumers in the Northeast also hear of the depleted supply of energy materials and the possibility of gas rationing this summer. How effective has the Administration been in establishing policies that would provide for government action—absent an air of crisis?

We have heard that one of the reasons for the high cost of meat relates to the higher cost of grain to feed the animals to fatten them for slaughter. We have also heard about the profits that friendly grain dealers made in the big shipments to Russia.

We have heard about the diminishing supplies of gas and oil, and we have heard about the oil import quotas which cause the Northeast to pay a higher price for their energy supplies.

How many special interest groups are there in this country that receive special protections from competition from foreign sources, and how does all that affect consumer prices?

The Administration had acted in a fashion that does not provide the consumer with great faith as to its ability to resist pressures of the special interests, as evidenced by the questions raised by campaign contributions from dairy associations and the recent increases in their support payments.

It is therefore the responsibility of the Congress to review all such arrangements whereby price supports exist and limitations on competition against inefficient American industries have been provided. There needs to be an investigation as to the costs to the consumer for all these price supports and whether there is any corresponding benefit. There needs to be an investigation as to whether the government is being run by special interests seeking favors or whether there is a "government by the people and for the people."

Supply and demand are not terms alone and without political meaning. The marketplace does not function freely in this country, and we need Congress to determine whether the walls to the open marketplace are politically made to the detriment of the consumer. If so, we demand that Congress act.

SUMMARY OF STATEMENT

(By Thomas Cesaro, New England Wholesale Food Distributor's Association)

The price of beef in the United States today is at an historic high. At the wholesale level in January, according to the United States Department of Agriculture, it had gone up 18.2 percent over the past three months, and at the retail level—what the

consumer pays at the checkout counter—it had gone up 8.4 percent during the same period of time. The rise is continuing, with experts foreseeing the possibility that wholesale prices will climb another 8 percent before the summer.

No one can blame the housewife for fussing and fuming over high beef prices. It does little good to tell her that the price she is paying for beef is less than that paid by her counterpart in other countries. Nor does it help much to know that she is spending less of her disposable income for food than in other countries. What really matters is that her dollar is shrinking, and she sees the results regularly at her checkout counter.

Who is to blame?

This paper has attempted to show that no one in the beef-raising process—from range to counter—is profiteering.

The rancher, who gets approximately \$1.08 for every \$2.00 spent for beef at the retail counter, finally, after years of operating at a loss, is receiving a fair return on his investment, perhaps fair enough to justify increasing his production. That's the only way supply can meet demand.

The feedlot operators, who get about 40 cents of that \$2.00 is fattening the cattle, not his pocketbook, and the cost of those fattening ingredients—corn and hay, silage and protein supplements—is skyrocketing.

The packer, who gets about 4 cents out of that \$2.00, gets his profit out of what is left after he has cut and processed the steer down to marketable size. It's the hide, the fat, the bone, the blood, that keep him in business.

The supermarket operator, who gets 44 cents for cutting the beef, packaging it, refrigerating it and having it available when the shopper wants it, ends up with little more than the satisfaction that he has provided something that is desired.

To round out that \$2.00, add in 4 cents for transportation—the journey of the beef through the channels of distribution—and you have the total picture.

People do want beef, and only when supplies can meet demand is there a chance for the prices to level off and perhaps go down. No one can accurately predict when that might happen, just as no one can accurately predict now what the weather might be like next fall, or winter, or spring. And always, it seems, there's that thing called inflation.

STATEMENTS

(By Mark Gordon, Bostonian Fish Market in Hartford)

The high price of seafood can be attributed to two basic factors. First—foreign fishing.

The offshore waters of the U.S. will soon become a dead sea. The overfishing of marine species that has doomed most European fisheries will be repeated in our own waters. This will happen shortly unless we do something about it.

At this time, while we are in this room, at least 650 to 750 huge foreign fishing vessels are extracting from America's offshore fishing grounds a tremendous tonnage of food, sport and industrial fish, wherever these species haven't already been depleted by the same craft's activities over the past decade.

Having destroyed the fisheries in their own waters, foreign fleets, primarily from Iron Curtain countries, started ranging into American waters in the early 1960's.

At first we assumed that these vessels, bristling with electronic equipment, were interested only in spying.

However it soon became clear that there were even greater stakes than electronic surveillance involved in the arrival of the Soviet fleet. The ships were there because of the vast stocks of fish available on the rich North Atlantic fishing grounds off our coast, and they meant to extract all they could get.

Within a few years, the fleet had grown from a few outmoded trawlers to a huge armada of modern stern trawlers, mostly 270 feet long and up, equipped with the most sophisticated devices for locating and catching fish and shellfish. There are now 17 nations fishing our waters. Hunting in packs (search vessels find the fish and call in the fleet), they soon commenced what has come to be known as "Piuse" fishing. This consists of directing intense effort to a particular fishery until it is no longer feasible to continue.

When I entered the seafood industry nearly 20 years ago, I was amazed to learn there were about 80 species of fish and shellfish caught in New England and brought into local ports. I then realized that production records showed a tremendous lack of balance—overfishing of perhaps 10 species on one hand and underfishing of at least 70 species on the other.

There are two reasons for this situation. First, of course, is the obvious fact that some species are more easily caught or more abundant. Second, and more important, is the lack of demand for the neglected 70. The public is unfamiliar with them and hesitates to try new species it knows nothing about.

Lobsters, haddock, flounder, scallops, clams, cod, ocean perch, halibut and Boston bluefish are the usual choices of fresh fish-lovers. These are the species the public demands. Therefore, the Boston, Gloucester and New Bedford fleets concentrate on them.

If New England fisheries are to yield the full quota of seafood now and in future years, fishing must be shifted from the few species that now make up the bulk of the catch.

I sincerely believe that once a housewife can be enticed to try a new species, she and her family will nearly always find it delicious and enjoyable.

Seafood doesn't have to be expensive to be good. Most people are always complaining about high prices, and yet when it comes to seafood, they want to eat costly lobsters and shrimp. Years ago, New Englanders were content with mackerel, shad, cod and herring. It seems to me that unless a seafood product can be equated with luxury or wealth, the general public sneers at it.

During the Connecticut shad season, a whole unboned shad can be purchased for less than a dollar. A fish of this size could easily feed a family of four.

There is nothing wrong with an inexpensive mackerel or white perch or striped bass. In many areas these are favorites. In our area, I've found that certain ethnic groups appreciate these fish the most. I would say that they know their fish.

WHAT OF THE AGREEMENT?

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, is Japan living up to the voluntary agreement to limit the shipment of its low-priced, Government-subsidized steel to this country?

The question has been pertinent since our State Department people some years ago took the negotiations route to ease the seriousness of the steel import situation here.

Some 180,000 steel plant jobs, according to union estimates, have been lost to these imports. The effects of this have been profound, of course, in the steel-making district which I represent.

But what of the Japanese agreement? Is it working to keep down the Japanese

shipments? Has it opened the once blocked markets to our products in Japan? The Wall Street Journal has sought answers and, in a recently published article, told of finding much evidence of cheating.

Item 1. A Detroit customs inspector told the Journal of interrupting a ship loaded with \$1 million worth of steel coils supposedly made in Canada. Stenciled markings, however, listed each coil's weight in kilos, the Japanese weight unit, and not in pounds, the Canadian unit.

Item 2. Other steel shipments from Canada and some from Mexico, the Journal reported, have carried Japanese lettering.

Item 3. A New York importer purchased flat-rolled sheets from a London trader. They were listed as having been produced in Taiwan. And yet, according to the Journal, Taiwan has no mill capable of this kind of production.

Other shipments equally suspicious have taken place and the Journal deserves credit for bringing them to national attention and especially at a time when Congress awaits President Nixon's new trade bill which is to give him broad authority in tariff matters. The U.S. steel industry, properly in my opinion, is asking for protection against the imports in this coming Presidential measure.

The Journal also has learned that countries not involved in quota agreements with us are using every device possible to sharpen their penetration of the American market and markets elsewhere which once were important customers of our steel makers. United States Steel, for one example, has filed a complaint against Mexico for allegedly dumping steel here at below cost and thus in violation of our trade laws. Sweden and Austria have boosted shipments to us of expensive stainless and tool steel to the detriment of our own specialty steel firms.

Japanese raw steel, the Journal asserts, is moving into Korea and Taiwan which have only the beginnings of a steel industry, built undoubtedly with a lot of our aid money. This metal then is changed into cold-rolled sheets and galvanized steel and shipped to us as Korean and Taiwanese products which are under no import restrictions. I am particularly interested, because of the pipe plant in my district, in the Journal's statement that pipe from Japanese steel is being accepted here as Korean and Taiwanese origin because of the substantial transformation made in it in those two countries. This is damaging double-talk.

We now are in a period of heavy steel buying worldwide and U.S. plants currently are busy. But should this be used as an argument against protective measures over the long run? The steel business is highly cyclical in nature and today's brisk demand could ease quickly and the import problem return in even greater degree. And even so, despite the present boom, foreign steel continues to enter our country in large volume and the most optimistic forecasts are that this year's decline will be no more than 25 percent from 17.7 million tons imported in 1972.

Temporary improvements in the imports situation are not enough. Our steel

industry, once the basic element in the Nation's entire industrial complex, has a right to grow and to continue to set a pace for the national progress. How, then, is it doing on this point? As I have mentioned, steel employment is down 18,000 union jobs. Few new plants are being built or even contemplated. United States Steel and Bethlehem reportedly have called off plans for new integrated plants because of the foreign inroads. United States Steel's costly new Texas plate mill is in trouble with Mexican imports, a condition which prompted the complaint of dumping to the Treasury Department.

So the industry is at an expansion standstill, fighting indeed in a time of brisk product demand to hold its position relative to international competition. And now we learn from the authoritative Wall Street Journal that those easy remedies sought by the diplomats—the voluntary agreements on import quotas—are not working, and particularly in the case of Japan. We are getting the run-around and this disturbs me greatly as a Congressman and it should disturb every Member of this House. Our steel companies need a fair deal in world trade and it is the responsibility of Government to see that they get it.

MIDWEST TRANSPORTATION CRISIS WORSENS

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the Second Congressional District of Minnesota, which I represent, many farmers and grain elevator operators are experiencing grievous trouble in getting corn and other feed grains shipped to markets. We are in the midst of a transportation crisis, and one that is bound to worsen without remedial action.

Don Spavin of the St. Paul Pioneer Press writing staff recently compiled an excellent account outlining our transportation problems, and I wish to bring it to public attention by inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TRANSPORT CRISIS HITS FARMERS, CONSUMERS
(By Don Spavin)

SLEEPY EYE.—A transportation crisis caused by a combination of factors—a shortage of boxcars, inadequate rural roads and a government call-in of sealed corn—could result in economic disaster for Minnesota and Midwest agriculture.

And it could ultimately affect consumer prices of farm products.

"In all of my years in agriculture, I have never seen the problem as it now faces not only Minnesota but all the farming states to some degree," said Russell Schwandt, president of the Minnesota Ag-1-Growth Council.

A former agriculture commissioner under Govs. Karl Rolvaag and Harold LeVander, Schwandt has helped lead the fight for better transportation service for rural America.

It is a fight, which on the surface at least, appears a losing battle and which has resulted in farmers, elevators and some banks in being pushed up against the wall. It could

even contribute to higher food prices for the consumer, not because of a lack of raw material but because of inability to get the raw material to market.

The fault can be laid in part at the feet of the U.S. government; part at the feet of the farmer, and part at the feet of some railroads.

From such Minnesota counties as Renville, Redwood, Jackson and Cottonwood comes much of the food that feeds Minnesota and the nation. Much of the area is served by the Chicago & North Western Railroad.

"The trouble with that railroad and with many railroads today is that they have not kept pace with the growth of agriculture," said Schwandt. "While the farmer has been increasing his production every year, the railroads have been abandoning lines either through Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC) order or by neglect. Today we have a rail service that no longer serves. We have antiquated trackage over which trains can move only at a snail's pace or not at all. We also are faced with continuous requests of the railroad to abandon even more miles of track."

Shortages of grain cars have been a problem in Minnesota for many years, but they usually existed primarily at harvest time.

It is different this year, because a shortage has been in existence since harvest without a let-up and it appears it might get worse.

That's where the government steps into the villain's role. Since the Depression of the 1930s, farmers were allowed to store corn and other feed grains in sealed bins. They were loaned money for this sealed corn at a government-regulated price.

The idea back of corn sealing was to guarantee the farmer a floor on the price of corn, for example, to loan him operating capital, and to guarantee that there would be a steady supply of the grain without the ups and downs caused by supply and demand. For instance, if the market price of corn climbed on action of speculators, the government could call in sealed corn to stabilize the market by increasing the supply.

This program worked. Now comes a government order calling in the sealed corn for four years—1969 through 1972 corn—even though the current price of corn is less than what farmers believe they need to make a profit.

However, the chief concern is not that the price will drop with this flood of sealed corn, but that there are 191 million bushels of this corn now sealed on Minnesota farms. It must be shipped by May 31 for the 1969, '70 and '71 years and by July 31 for the 1972 crop.

How will it move from farm to market?

That appears to be the million-dollar question. At a recent hearing before the Minnesota Public Service Commission, dozens of elevator operators testified that their storage capacity is now overflowing; that they have been unable to get more than half the grain cars requested; that storage terminals all over the United States are full and refusing more shipments.

To add to the problems of moving the grain in storage in elevators plus the government-called sealed corn, many rural roads in Minnesota are not strong enough to support heavy transport trucks—the alternate to rail transportation.

"Allowing double-bottom trucks is no answer," said Richard Neudecker, elevator operator at Clements. "What good are bigger trucks if the roads won't carry them."

He said a road must be able to support eight tons in order for a grain semitrailer rig to operate within the law. Many Minnesota roads are limited to five or seven tons.

In order to comply with load limits, as imposed by the Minnesota Highway Department, some elevators would have to load small trucks for transportation to a better highway where the load could be transferred

to a larger truck. It would mean double handling and would increase the cost and reduce the amount that could be paid the producer.

"Even now," a Buffalo Lake elevator operator testified, "we are paying 52 cents a bushel under the Chicago market—cost of transportation makes up the difference."

He said his elevator is on the main line of the Milwaukee Railroad but he also has a freight car shortage problem. To handle his bare minimum of deliveries of corn and soybeans, he said he would need 649 cars.

"The most I have ever received at one time has been seven cars," he added.

Inability to get the grain to market may bring financial disaster to some elevators, an operator testified, and could affect banks and businesses in many of Minnesota's small towns.

At the Public Service Commission hearing conducted by Commissioners Robert Carlson and Karl Rolvaag, it was brought out that some elevators are now paying as much as \$150 a day in interest and penalties and unless some way is found to move the grain it may bankrupt some elevators.

In a letter read at the hearing, Leslie Peterson, president of the Farmers State Bank at Trimont, declared that elevators in this area have been able to ship only 15 per cent of their holdings; that penalties and interest have and will eat up the profit; such action has disrupted the cash flow and he sees elevators facing bankruptcy unless something is done rapidly.

It works like this: To buy corn from a farmer, the elevator often borrows the money from a bank. In turn, the corn is sold to a brokerage firm for delivery in the future. As an example, corn is purchased in November for delivery in January. In the interim, the elevator pays interest on the borrowed money. Then comes the time, as it did this year, for delivery in January. There are no rail cars available for delivery. The brokerage firm then (in some instances at least) charges a penalty for nondelivery.

"Lack of transportation is costing my elevators \$80 a day in interest," said Warren Eric of Dunnell, "and that's a lot for a small business to be paying. I ordered 50 cars for January and have received to date 18 cars. I have contracted for a half million bushels of grain and at the rate I'm getting rail cars it will take me until August to deliver the January corn."

In all, the Chicago & North Western has orders for 49,000 grain cars on hand, Ronald Elslow, a regional representative for the railroad, told the commission hearing. The railroad, he added, has 20,000 cars capable of carrying grain.

"There is no way we can move the volume of grain on hand as fast as you would like," he told the meeting of farmers and elevator operators.

He added, "We intend to build a strong and viable company. To this we are committed." Farm leaders see it in another light.

"This country needs an in-depth study of transportation as it relates to agriculture," Schwandt said. "Our problems are immediate. We have outproduced transportation, and yet the railroads counter by abandoning or attempting to abandon more and more branch lines. It doesn't make sense."

In a letter addressed "To Those Interested in the Future of the Midwest," Larry S. Provo, president of the Chicago & North Western wrote in part: "In the past three years, the North Western has eliminated some 1,100 miles of obsolete branch lines—but many little used lines still exist and continue as a major drain on our resources—a drain on cash for companies that can ill afford such losses—approximately 40 per cent of North Western's mileage generates approximately four per cent of the total revenues."

The railroad president added that the company now operates approximately 10,600 miles of track in 11 Midwest states. "It

should be reduced to a total of 7,500 miles," he wrote. "What this means, of course, is that between 2,000 and 3,000 miles of track should be abandoned . . . not five or 10 years from now but as soon as possible."

From the record, the ICC apparently agrees. As an example of 241 applications for abandonment by railroads in 1971, only three were denied.

"It seems strange," Schwandt said, "that when production has continued to climb, the railroad insists there is not enough business to warrant operating many lines. If they would just bring up many branch lines to handle 20-mile-an-hour traffic, they would find the business. Now there are trains—the Sleepy Eye to Redwood Falls branch as an example, that travel slower than a man operating a tractor in a field."

ELLIOT RICHARDSON'S ADDRESS

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, last week Secretary of Defense Elliot Richardson took time from his busy schedule to talk with a group of students from 45 colleges from States throughout the country. It is indeed gratifying to know of his interest in communicating with the young people of our Nation and of the importance he attaches to it. I would like to insert in the RECORD the transcript of his extemporaneous remarks.

ADDRESS BY ELLIOT RICHARDSON

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I'm delighted to have an opportunity to meet with you. I was afraid that I wouldn't have because I was scheduled to testify this afternoon before the Senate Committee on Armed Services. As it turned out, the Committee wasn't able to meet this afternoon, so I got out, and that does give me the opportunity to meet with a group which I regard as important to the Department of Defense, second only to the Congress, and that is this group here.

I'd like to spend just a few minutes outlining some rather general ideas, and then invite your reactions, questions, comments.

Most essentially, it seems to me, we need to view the role of the Department of Defense and our Armed Forces as directed toward the promotion of peace. Now, if there is any fundamental difference in point of view between those of us who are in responsible positions in the Defense establishment or in the foreign policy establishment, and the members of your generation, it is a difference in perception about the world in which we live.

The biggest single difference between us, I suppose, is that we remember vividly as part of our own lives the whole process of which emerged the Cold War. We remember the Soviet encroachments on Eastern Europe; the takeover of Czechoslovakia; the invasion of Hungary, the re-invasion of Czechoslovakia, and the other events which piece-by-piece came to convince the American people that we were up against a powerful expansive force, and which although we had rapidly dismantled our Armed Forces after World War II, led us, in the face of this experience, to reassemble our strength in the years beginning about 1948 and then going on after the war in Korea into the 50's and 60's.

For a long time, and indeed until very recently, the United States had massive military and economic superiority. It wasn't until the last few years of the 60's and the beginning of the 70's that the Soviets really caught up in strategic nuclear weapons. They had at all times during this period much larger numbers of ground forces, much larger numbers of tanks, much larger numbers of interceptor aircraft. The U.S. did have, as I said, overall superiority until recently in thermonuclear weapons; we still have some superiority in bombers; we still have some superiority in numbers of naval vessels. We are, in a sense, an insular power where they are a continental power.

The question really is: how do you go about promoting peace from where we are now, and in a word, the approach of this Administration is that you do it through patient piece-by-piece negotiations, which have essentially two overall objectives. One is the reduction of situations of tension through agreements dealing with those situations. The Berlin agreement entered into in 1971 was a major step of that kind. The negotiations we pursued in the Middle East also belong under that heading, although there the only major gain was a ceasefire between Egypt and Israel that was entered into in 1970, in the summer, which still prevails. In the case of Vietnam, of course, the signature of ceasefire agreements also represents a step toward the reduction in that instance of actual hostilities, which, so long as they went on, involved some possible risk of escalation and mutual confrontation between the super-powers.

The other major heading involves negotiations designed to reduce investments by each side in aggregate weapons systems and forces in being, and the major milestone there was the agreements in SALT I. We are pursuing now, actively, right at this moment in Vienna, steps toward a more comprehensive and permanent limitation of intercontinental missiles to follow on the permanent agreement that was reached on defensive missiles and that would replace the present temporary agreement on intercontinental missiles.

We are at the same time, at this very moment, actively pursuing negotiations with the Warsaw Pact countries that would lead to mutual and balanced force reductions in Central Europe.

When you think about how you get there from here, I think it should be clear that we're dealing in a very tough negotiating situation. Just think for a minute about who the people are who head the governments with which we are negotiating. There is Brezhnev and the members of the Soviet Presidium; there is Mao and Chou En-Lai and the other aging leaders of the People's Republic of China whose memory, whose active experience goes back to the Long March. These are people who will not give us anything for nothing.

One of the perceptions, I think, that also differs as between your generation and ours, may be that you tend perhaps to think in terms of the goodwill of peoples towards each other, the fact that we are all human beings sharing very much the same kinds of aspirations, facing the same kinds of problems, seeking the same kinds of satisfactions. If relations between nations really were relations between peoples, then perhaps we would have a world not only of worldwide peace at the present, but we would have a relatively assured generation of peace—the objective that the President refers to so often.

But the fact is that this is not the way in which relations between nations are conducted. They're relations between governments. So when we bargain with the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China,

we are not dealing with the 250 or 60 million people of the Soviet Union, or the 800 million people, more or less, of the People's Republic of China.

We are dealing with the handfuls of very tough-minded individuals, who, over a long history, have fought their way to the tops of those governmental systems. You just cannot achieve agreements under either of the major headings I've touched on, either agreements that reduced tension or agreements that bring about mutual reduction of forces, unless you have something to bargain with.

This, of course, is what is meant by negotiating from strength, and here is where the role of the U.S. Armed Forces comes in, in the pursuit of a generation of peace.

We need to be in a position where we are worth bargaining with. If we are bent on going forward with unilateral concessions, obviously, those unilateral concessions are accepted, and we get nothing in return. The consequence is all too likely to be the destabilization of even such relative stability and equilibrium as now exists. If we create vacuums in the overall balance of power, then we, in effect, invite the exploitation of those vacuums. So what we are seeking to do is to maintain stability for the present, to pursue continuing stability, but at lower level of aggregate investment of our resources, as well as the resources of the other side, and to bring about the resolution of the kinds of potential conflicts that exist which, if unresolved, could lead to the escalation of those tensions and possible confrontation and ultimate war.

There's one more point I'd like to make because I think it needs to be emphasized. We are seeking to maintain our force levels and our weapons systems in order to pursue stability and promote peace at a level of aggregate U.S. investment lower than at any time since 1950, which I take it is before many of you here were born. We are, for example, investing a percentage of the Gross National Product in defense lower than at any time since then; now about 6%, down from over 9% in 1964. Our total troop strength is below not only, of course, the Vietnam war peak, but below 1964 and lower than at any time since any time since 1950. The proportion of the total U.S. budget for defense is lower than at any time since 1950.

When President Nixon took office, more than 40% of the entire budget went into defense. It's now just below 30%. Investment in human resources has gone from below 30% to about 45%. In current dollars, which have to be discounted by inflation, spending for defense has gone up about a billion dollars since President Nixon took office. Spending for other purposes at the Federal level has gone up by about \$94 billion. Spending by state and local governments has gone up by an even larger amount. So there has, in fact, been already a major reallocation of resources and a reordering of priorities. This is true, I think, to a much greater degree than is generally perceived. That is one reason why we think that it would be dangerous for the security of the United States and destructive to the opportunity to pursue further agreement if we were to go below this already relatively low level.

I might remind you that one of the reasons which undoubtedly led to the Korean War was the perception on the part of our potential adversaries that we would not react if North Korea invaded the South. Of course, we did react even though from a relatively low level of capability. This in turn was one of the reasons why, following the Korean War, there then took off a major long-term escalation of total U.S. force strength which didn't begin to be turned around until President Nixon came in and brought about the withdrawals from South Vietnam.

TESTIMONY OF JACK P. NIX, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS IN GEORGIA TO COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on April 6, Jack Nix, Georgia Superintendent of Schools, delivered remarkable testimony before the House Committee on Education and Labor in Miami, Fla.

At the regional hearing on Federal funding of public elementary and secondary education, Superintendent Nix expressed his dissatisfaction with the administration proposal to reduce Federal participation in education, describing in some detail what the administration proposal for the allocations of special revenue-sharing funds to programs for the disadvantaged means to Georgia.

As one who is directly involved in public education at every level and whose comments, consequently, reflect firsthand knowledge, he commends the efficacy of existing programs such as those under title I—existing programs that provide for remedial instruction for the disadvantaged, public kindergartens for the poor, and the hiring of teacher aides. It is unfortunate that these are the kinds of advantageous, people-oriented programs presently facing substantial loss of funding.

I commend to all Members of the body the superintendent's remarks on education as "the concern of Federal Government, responsibility of State government, and a function of local government":

STATEMENT OF JACK P. NIX, GEORGIA SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, ON H.R. 69 AND H.R. 16

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I am Jack P. Nix, Superintendent of Schools in Georgia.

I am distinctly honored at the privilege accorded me by your invitation to address this regional hearing on federal funding of public elementary and secondary education.

Let me begin my comments on a positive note by commending you, Mr. Chairman, and the Congress for your demonstrated support for the public schools of this nation through the years. We in Georgia are well aware of your constant concern that the education of children be supported generously and fairly at all levels of government—federal, state and local. I am in complete agreement with the often-stated position that education should be a concern of the federal government, a responsibility of state government, and a function of local government. Mr. Chairman, if we could achieve that distribution of authority we would have reached a Utopian state in public education.

I believe the federal concern for public education should be not merely a philosophical admonition or a regulatory statute, but that it should be tangibly expressed in dollars amounting to approximately one-third of the total national spending for education from all governmental sources—federal, state and local. As you know, federal participation now amounts to only about seven percent. I believe, since federal tax dollars are collected from the most rapidly growing source of revenue in the country—the personal income tax—and since states and local education agencies are limited to property

taxes and other, less lucrative sources of funding, that the federal share of education funding *must* be increased. I am astounded that the administration is proposing instead to effectively *reduce* federal participation in education for *whatever* reason. My personal belief in the need for more federal money for education programs is reinforced by the results of a nationwide Harris poll in January indicating that 66 percent of the general public supports increased federal aid to education, with 27 percent opposed. The survey clearly defines education as a priority of a majority of citizens in the United States.

Given a higher level of federal education funding, there are some comments I would like to make concerning the allocation of funds. First, whether grants are made on a categorical or a general aid basis, the formulas on which funds are distributed must somehow reflect each state's ability to pay for education considering all the resources available to the state. Some of the formulas being proposed now would penalize the poorer states at the expense of the more wealthy. As an illustration, let me use the administration proposal for the allocation of Special Revenue Sharing funds to programs for the disadvantaged. The plan as I understand it would first allocate funds to the states on the basis of 25 percent of the average state or national current expenditure per pupil, whichever is higher. On the face of it, this seems fair. But when you stop to analyze this proposal, it becomes apparent that those states having a higher expenditure per pupil than the national average would receive the bulk of the money while those of us spending the national average or less—the poorer states, if you will—would come out on the short end of the stick.

Another proposal—the suggestion that 1970 census data be used in distribution of funds for Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—would have the effect of penalizing those states that are experiencing rapid economic growth, yet are still behind the national average. Georgia, for example, according to the 1960 census by which funds under ESEA are currently allocated, had 239,789 children ages 5 to 17 from families with incomes less than \$2,000. If 1970 census data are used as printed in the Congressional Record of March 6, 1973, and allocations are made on the same basis, Georgia can claim only 93,139 children in this category and we would stand to lose approximately \$18.5 million in federal education funds for the disadvantaged.

Of course it is encouraging to know that the average income of Georgians has risen at such a spectacular rate in the past ten years; yet it seems grossly unfair to penalize the remaining large numbers of educationally disadvantaged children because they no longer fall into an arbitrary economic category. As a matter of fact, in Georgia and I am sure in every other state, even the current formula sets up limitations that in effect eliminate approximately one-third of the children who need Title I services. In FY 1972, for example, in Georgia we had 243,342 children eligible for Title I services. In fact, only 159,389 children actually received services. In 1971, we had more than 243,000 eligible children and only 181,234 received services. This discrepancy between need and service occurs because of the formulas relating to concentration of children.

I know you are aware of the discrepancy between what the Congress has authorized for ESEA and what has actually been appropriated. Using the formulas now written into ESEA, full funding of the bill would provide about \$6 billion annually and would serve 12 million children.

The implication is clear, Mr. Chairman. There just is not enough federal money appropriated to meet the needs of disadvantaged children. We need to increase the appropriation, not decrease it. And we *must*

allocate funds on a fair and equitable basis. I am in complete agreement with your proposals in House Resolution 69 and House Resolution 16 and the priorities reflected in these two pieces of legislation.

I would wholeheartedly endorse the idea of setting first priority on federal funding for education of the disadvantaged at the rate of at least \$3 billion annually. The use of a \$4,000 poverty level figure would insure a high level of funding. Then I would like to see House Bill 16 implemented to provide for additional monies for the improvement of education for all children at your proposed rate of an additional \$100 per child or according to an elective formula that would help reduce the inequities of state and local education resources.

Let me just mention one other aspect of the allocation of funds. It has been proposed in the Quile bill (H.R. 5163) that funds for disadvantaged children be distributed on the basis of the number of children who fall below a certain level on criterion-referenced mathematics and reading tests. I am in complete sympathy with Representative Quile's motives in introducing this bill. I agree with him that we need more individualized instruction. And I have already said that we are not now reaching large numbers of children who need Title I services. Representative Quile is also correct in saying that economic deprivation and education disadvantage are not always directly related. Yet I cannot, knowing the present state of the art of testing, endorse the criterion-referenced test as a conclusive basis for the allocation of federal education funds for disadvantaged children.

The whole business of how money is allocated is a difficult question. I would very much like to see the federal share of education funding, whether it is 33 percent, 20 percent or seven percent, be transmitted to the state agency having the constitutional or statutory authority for public elementary and secondary education to meet that state's educational needs. If that is not agreeable to the Congress, then the next best alternative would be to give federal education funds to state legislatures, which would in turn appropriate them to state education agencies. *Under no circumstances* should funds bypass the state agencies and go directly to local school districts. As the Supreme Court ruled in Rodriguez, education is a responsibility of the states and local districts. It is hard to justify any system of allocation that would not channel federal funds through the state agency. State agencies are certainly in a better position to insure that federal funds are effectively used than are federal officials. The state should be held responsible for providing a plan for their use and the federal agency should audit the state program to determine whether funds were used effectively and according to plan. Somehow we must reduce the amount of paperwork and red tape necessary in the processing of federal funds. Certainly I am opposed to federal auditing of programs before they are operative or monies expended as is happening now in some categorical programs.

In this regard, permit me to say that I am opposed to the administration's plan for Special Revenue Sharing—introduced a few weeks ago as the Better Schools Act. This bill is a farce and a sham. Not only does it contain less money for all areas of education, it is falsely presented as general aid when it actually contains more restrictions, more categorical limitations and more cumbersome administrative provisions than the acts under which we are now operating. As an example I would point out the restriction upon the use of funds for education of the disadvantaged which requires that 75 percent of the state allocation be used in the areas of reading and mathematics. Does that sound like non-categorical aid? Not to us in Georgia, it doesn't.

It is true that the administration of education programs at every level needs revision and simplification. But before we rush headlong into the effort, we must insure continuity of services to the individual child. And we must agree that our purpose is to provide better educational opportunities for that child. Any change must improve educational program administration by resolving the present uncertainties, encouraging leadership at the state level and providing incentive for higher levels of state funding. The states and local districts have carried the burden of educational funding and administration for more than a hundred years. The federal government is welcome to assume part of the task, but it must not use its tremendous powers to usurp or disrupt the successful efforts that are being so conscientiously worked out by the states and districts.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have talked at length about my feelings as they relate to assorted proposals for allocating federal funds, my strong belief that more federal funding is needed, rather than less, my reservations concerning the administration's special revenue sharing bill, and my ideas about what positive steps should be taken to improve the administration of education at every level.

At the risk of repetition, let me say that House Resolution 69, Mr. Chairman, is an eminently satisfactory proposal to us in Georgia. I am particularly pleased that it is so comprehensive, including not only a high level of funds for programs for disadvantaged children, but also allocations for school library programs, aid to federally impacted areas, education of the handicapped and others.

Title I—funds for the education of disadvantaged children—has been one of the most effective, stimulating and positive programs ever introduced in public schools through federal initiative in spite of red tape injected by the administration. I have a copy of an evaluation document to submit to you for insertion in the record of these hearings, but let me just take a few moments to quote for you three paragraphs from the "State of Georgia, State Annual Evaluation Report for Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971 for Projects Supported by Title I ESEA Funds." These statements on pages 55 and 56 are supported by many pages of data:

"In all three instructional areas—reading, math and English—among pupils in Title I schools, Title I pupils consistently made larger gains than did non-Title I pupils . . .

"What is encouraging . . . is the fact that in Title I schools Title I pupils, who are more likely to be academically disadvantaged, made consistently greater gains per month, as measured by standardized achievement test results, than did non-Title I pupils . . .

"Pupils who were assigned to a Title I reading or math activity made greater gains in both reading and math than did pupils who did not participate. This might be interpreted that pupils who receive Title I instructional effort in one academic area are likely to benefit not only in that but in other academic areas as well."

Let me go into a few specific examples of what Title I has meant in several school systems in Georgia.

In Brooks County in 1972 a Title I mathematics activity involved 840 students in grades 4 through 12. Ninety-five percent of the participants attained at least a full year's gain in mathematics achievement as measured by the California Achievement Test. This is significant because previous school experiences had enabled the children to achieve at far less than the normal rate. Just getting that many students to a point where they attained a full year's progress during a year of classroom work is an accomplishment.

In a smaller but even more dramatic Title I mathematics activity in Gwinnett County,

a calculator was introduced and used to solve long arithmetic problems. All 65 participants gained two full grade levels in math achievement on the California Achievement Test.

A successful reading program was carried out in Henry County. Eight hundred participants reading at least one grade level below normal were expected to achieve one grade level of improvement in the Title I English/Reading activity. Actual results indicate that the average improvement was 1.3 years.

In kindergarten activities, the focus is on school readiness skills. An outstanding example was the activity conducted last year in Carroll County, where test results on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test indicated that 70 percent of participating children scored above the national average.

Certainly disadvantaged children must actually be present in school before Title I activities begin to meet their needs. Title I financed attendance programs which employ a social worker to visit the homes of chronically absent children can do much in terms of dealing directly with the causes of low attendance among disadvantaged children.

In Bryan County, such an attendance program last year resulted in a 50 percent reduction both in rate of absenteeism and number of dropouts. The system average daily attendance is now well over 90 percent.

Georgia has many more successful programs currently operating and funded under Title I. A number of them are described in our Title One Annual Report, "Title One-ers," which I will also submit for the record.

In addition, in Georgia we have had the happy experience of having Title I money stimulate a wide variety of far reaching and effective educational programs that might have taken years to develop and implement with the limitations imposed by inadequate state and local funds.

For example, in 1965 when ESEA was passed, Georgia had public kindergarten programs in only two school systems, which were funding them from local funds. With Title I money, numerous systems established kindergartens for disadvantaged children. Seeing their success, several systems extended the program to all children and assumed responsibility for a systemwide kindergarten. Today, Georgia has 32,000 children in some type of public kindergarten in almost every school system.

The story of teacher aides in Georgia is similar. In 1965, we had almost no paraprofessionals in local schools. Title I made it possible for systems to hire aides, and their demonstrated advantages encouraged the hiring of others. Last year, partly to the credit of Title I, there were 4,630 teacher aides in Georgia public schools.

Title I influence has also been felt in the area of remedial instruction. Although hampered by limited state and local resources, school systems had some remedial programs before 1965, but not many. Partly because of the success of Title I remedial programs, Georgia now has a \$7 million instructional assistance program funded entirely with state funds and designed to provide remedial instruction and paraprofessionals wherever the need is most critical.

There can be no doubt Title I has been a positive influence in public education in Georgia. Additional examples of the program's influence can be found on pages 60, 61 and 62 of the evaluation report from which I quoted earlier.

Mr. Chairman, your proposed extension of ESEA for five years includes another program I would like to comment on briefly. Title V has made substantial impact in Georgia on the relationship of the State Department of Education to local school systems. Funds for strengthening the Department have ranged from \$328,000 in 1966 to \$682,000 in the current year. These federal dollars have been

used in a diversity of ways to enable our staff at the state level to give better, more efficient and effective service to school districts. Our publications and public information office in 1965 consisted of two people and a secretary, funded haphazardly with whatever could be scraped up. Today we have a comprehensive communications program that reaches the educational and lay public through every possible medium. In almost every state in which I travel I am told the Georgia communications program is looked upon as an example to be followed.

We have a personnel office in Georgia today that is active and effective in employee recruitment and training, thanks to Title V. Before 1965 we had only minimal personnel services. We are supporting ten positions in our curriculum leadership division—subject matter consultants who work with local school systems constantly. Title V funds are supporting our statistical services operation and are augmenting the division which serves as the direct link between the State Department of Education and local school systems in administrative matters. Title V has made it possible for the Department to design and implement staff development and planning activities, staff training aids and state procedures for evaluation of programs at the local system level. We are supporting a federal-state relations person and we are working with several other states in developing curriculum guides and workshops in ecology education. We have used approximately one-fourth of our Title V allotment each year to support our data processing operation; as a result we have made major progress toward a total, computerized information system. Last fall we involved the entire professional staff of the Department of Education in a management seminar conducted by the American Management Association. The impact of this training on operation of the Department was immediate and positive, and we will feel its influence for years to come.

In our use of Title V we have consistently tried to apply funds where the need seemed greatest and where the potential for effectiveness was obvious. We have used these funds as the impetus for a wide range of Department operations that would otherwise have been weak or non-existent.

Mr. Chairman and members of this distinguished committee, you have heard a lengthy and detailed testimony from one who has been involved in public education at every level. My experience is broad and long, and my comments are based on direct knowledge. I can sincerely say to you this morning that the federal role in education has never been more in need of clarification, simplification and solid support from every quarter. It is time for those of us who believe public schools have a job to do, and who believe they can indeed accomplish the task they have been assigned, to stand up and be counted. You did this eight years ago, Mr. Chairman. And we are still realizing the benefits. I commend you for your continued staunch support of education. Thank you for this opportunity. I will be glad to answer your questions.

ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, each spring we all experience a strong urge to do something to preserve the beautiful aspects of our natural surroundings.

One manner in which we bring this

to everyone's attention is to focus special emphasis on the environment by proclaiming the week of April 8 as Earth Week and the period beginning April 15 as National Clean Water Week. For many Americans these special periods simply mean that 50 weeks of accumulated trash and unabated pollution should be cleaned up in a matter of a few days by the local Boy Scout troop or some other civic minded organization.

It is not my purpose to criticize special environmental awareness periods, for it is through these methods that we renew our pledge to do something about the environment. What I wish to emphasize is that the small flame these special weeks generate too quickly dies, and we go back to living in our wasteful, careless ways.

In pointing out the difference between himself and the average man, George Bernard Shaw once said:

Most people think only once a year. I think every day.

In a similar sense, the average American spends about as much time cleaning up his environment as he does thinking. Obviously, once a year is not enough.

I am sure most Americans know full well what we are doing to our environment. And I am equally sure some Americans are willing to continue the current rate of environmental disruption with little more than a shrug of their shoulders. Too often we humans act like a colony of weevils in a flour bin. While we wallow in what appears to be an endless supply of milk and honey, our own wastes befoul the food supply we must have to survive. It was Aldo Leopold, I believe, who made the profound observation that man is the only creature on earth that will knowingly and willfully befoul his own nest.

With the enactment of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, there was a heartening upsurge of public participation in cleanup campaigns across the country. Since then, however, there has been a steady decline in such activities. With the passage of the Environmental Act of 1960 we have a good start on cleaning up our environment but we must not now sit down and admire what good works we have done long before the task is complete.

Water quality, which we highlight with National Clean Water Week, is still one of our biggest problems. Most of the major river systems in the United States are still as polluted as they were in 1969—many are worse. Visitors to the Nation's Capital are still warned not to come in contact with contaminated Potomac River water. About 20 percent of the Nation's shellfish are still contaminated by human excrement, toxic bacteria, pesticides, and heavy metals. The list appears endless and we have done little thus far to correct these terrible developments.

Unfortunately, many of the steps we have taken in Congress to correct some of the water quality problems in this country have been thwarted. Last year the Congress passed a tough water pollution control bill, but so far the administration has stood in the way of its implementation. First the President vetoed it, but Congress overrode the veto.

He then impounded the funds appropriated for pollution control. California was seriously affected by his action, losing more than \$293 million in 1973 and an equal amount for 1974. These funds were destined to be used for construction of treatment facilities to reduce pollutants entering California waterways. By the year 1985, we were to have had pollution under control, but due to the President's action we will fall far short of our goal.

Handling solid waste is another problem which cities and industries need assistance with—and they need assistance year round, not just during 1 or 2 weeks a year. Reports from around the country indicate that there has been a steady decline in the tonnage of paper, bottles, and metals which are being recycled. Obviously, some housewives are no longer bothering to separate their trash. Store owners are becoming lax toward their collection of bottles and cans since housewives no longer criticize those who are not environmentally attuned. And at the same time, civic clubs and local groups are dropping more and more of their environmental projects.

We are getting lazy again and I want to take this opportunity to remind everyone that we cannot depend on someone else to do the job for us. Every citizen has an individual responsibility to keep America clean. May Earth Week and Clean Water Week this year be the start of another upsurge of environmental concern which will not flicker and die.

MINNESOTA EDITOR PENS SOUND RESOLUTIONS

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, shortly after Congress convened this year, Mr. Emmett Engesser, publisher and editor of the New Richland Star in my Congressional District in Minnesota, penned a list of resolutions which he thought it would be appropriate for Congress to honor. I still have Emmett's list, and I believe it grows more timely with every passing month.

Accordingly, I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point for the benefit of House and Senate colleagues:

RESOLUTIONS FOR CONGRESS

Now that the dust has settled and the new 93rd Congress is ready to settle down and go to work, we suggest a few guidelines for their 1973 endeavors. As a starter we propose the following resolution:

We the members of Congress of the United States of America resolve during the year 1973:

To bear in mind the declared objective of the Administration, and the wishes of the people, that our currency shall not be further depreciated through inflation.

To keep before us the awareness that mighty nations have been destroyed by the debasement of their money, and that a cardinal wish of the enemies of the United States is that our government will spend itself into bankruptcy.

To be ever mindful that John Maynard

Keynes advocated small—repeat, small—deficit spending to tide our recession years, not massive and ever-expanding deficits every year.

To remember that the power of tax, granted by our Constitution, was not intended to mean power to impose impossible burdens upon the people.

To vote for no projects that do not stay within reasonable limits—that is, within the resources of the country.

To act in behalf of all the people, not as Democrats vs. Republicans, or Republicans vs. Democrats, but in the interests of the nation as a whole.

To take a responsible attitude toward the role of the United States in Vietnam, keeping the global stakes of our country and the free nations in mind, and not forgetful of the unremitting hostility of the Soviet Government and the Communist empire.

TVA'S 40TH YEAR

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, this year of 1973 marks the 40th anniversary of the Tennessee Valley Authority. In recognition of this milestone, a joint resolution has been adopted by the Tennessee General Assembly to officially congratulate TVA and to memorialize its service to the people.

In bringing this resolution to the attention of my colleagues, I want to join in the recognition which this singular enterprise merits for the record of progress it has written.

It was largely because of TVA that the Atomic Energy Commission located its facility at Oak Ridge. And it is this combination of facilities—TVA and the Oak Ridge operations—which makes this area the energy capital of the world.

In addition to its responsibility as the country's largest power system, we should not overlook TVA's role in flood control. This has been brought into focus just recently because of the floods in the Tennessee River and the Mississippi River valleys. Although there was flood damage again this time, it was minimized, because of the TVA water control system. In TVA's 1972 annual report, it was estimated that cumulative flood damages averted by the system since TVA's first project went into operation in 1936 exceed \$395 million, of which more than \$347 million is in the Tennessee Valley, primarily at Chattanooga. Increased values on 6 million acres of lower Ohio and Mississippi Basin land provide additional flood control benefits of \$150 million. Last year, TVA also assisted 43 Tennessee Valley communities in preparing flood plain regulations as part of its community flood damage prevention program. This effort focuses on localized flood problems in communities situated on upper tributaries and small streams beyond the full control of the regional water control system. The same kind of assistance is available again this year.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate to

honor this 40-year-old youngster in this anniversary year and to keep in mind always the important role the Tennessee Valley Authority has played and will continue to play in meeting the diverse and changing needs of our society.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

A resolution to honor the 40th anniversary of the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority

Whereas, the Tennessee Valley Authority is celebrating its 40th anniversary in 1973; and

Whereas, the Tennessee Valley Authority has contributed greatly to the well being of the State of Tennessee and other states; and

Whereas, the Tennessee Valley Authority is a source of pride to the entire United States and has attracted visitors from throughout the world to the Volunteer State; and

Whereas, the Tennessee Valley Authority should continue to provide progress within a framework of common sense and reason for the people of this region and state; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-eighth General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, the Senate concurring, That the Tennessee Valley Authority is officially congratulated on its 40th anniversary and urged to continue to assist the people of this state and region in planning for progress in ecological, environmental and industrial terms.

Be it further resolved, That copies of this Resolution be sent to the Honorable Aubrey J. Wagner, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, to each member of the Tennessee Congressional Delegation, and to the Honorable William L. Jenkins, Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority Board of Directors.

FLORIDA SUPPORTS ITS PRESIDENT

HON. L. A. (SKIP) BAFALIS
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. BAFALIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the results of a recent public opinion poll taken in Florida. It shows the overwhelming majority of Floridians support President Nixon and approve of the job he is doing as Chief Executive.

The poll, commissioned by the Orlando, Fla. Sentinel-Star and published in that newspaper's April 1, 1973, edition, shows the President draws support not from any one segment of the population, but from all. It also shows that this support is not limited to any one particular section of the State.

Because Florida is a microcosm of the entire Nation, I submit the results of this poll to my colleagues for their study:

MOST FLORIDIANS APPROVE OF NIXON

Two-thirds of Florida voters approve of the way Richard Nixon is handling the job of President, according to the Florida Poll. About one-fourth disapprove and 7 per cent have no opinion.

Approval of Mr. Nixon was highest in the Panhandle, next highest in Central Florida and lowest in Broward County.

Disapproval was highest in Dade County and lowest in the Ninth Congressional District composed of Orange and Brevard Counties.

Of 1,618 interviewed, the statewide total of 67 per cent approval of Mr. Nixon's performance coincided almost exactly with the percentage of persons who said they voted for him last year.

The percentage saying they voted for Mr. Nixon was 65; George McGovern, 23. Two per cent said they voted for other candidates; 9 per cent said they didn't vote and one per cent refused to answer.

Those interviewed in the 35-39 age bracket gave Mr. Nixon his strongest support in the election—73 per cent saying they voted for him.

Half of those 18-24 who were interviewed said they voted for Mr. Nixon and only 31 supported McGovern.

Other percentages by age groups for Mr. Nixon were: 25-34, 65 per cent; 50-64, 67 per cent; 65 and over, 64 per cent.

Regarding the current question of how Mr. Nixon is handling his job, the most enthusiastic endorsement came from the \$10,000-14,999 income group, in which 74 per cent of those responding supported his policies.

Next was the \$15,000 and over group with 71 per cent. Those with income of \$0 to \$4,999, however, gave him a 61 per cent rating, and those in the \$5,000-\$9,999 gave him 64 per cent.

A whopping 87 per cent of those who said they voted for Mr. Nixon in 1972 said they approve of what he is doing. On the other hand, those who said they voted for McGovern gave Mr. Nixon only a 24 per cent rating.

Those who listed their party affiliation as Republican gave Mr. Nixon an 88 per cent approval rating; Democrats, 59 per cent; independents, 63 per cent.

Female respondents were 2 per cent more enthusiastic than males at 67 per cent.

Agricultural workers were, at 77 per cent, 4 per cent more approving of the President than clerical and sales people at 73 per cent.

Manual laborers indicated 56 per cent of their number approve; professional and managerial, 71 per cent; craftsmen and foremen, 66 per cent.

By congressional districts, here is the way Floridians responded to the question, "Do you approve or disapprove of the way Richard Nixon is handling his job as President?"

District	Approve	Disapprove	No opinion
Statewide.....	67	26	7
1.....	81	18	1
2.....	59	31	10
3.....	68	23	9
4.....	70	20	9
5.....	78	19	3
6.....	67	28	5
7.....	77	19	5
8.....	77	17	6
9.....	77	14	9
10.....	71	22	7
11.....	59	23	18
12.....	46	42	12
13.....	64	32	4
14.....	51	46	3
15.....	68	29	4

THE SMALL NEWSPAPER AND NEWSMEN'S PRIVILEGE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues already know my views on the urgent matter of protecting the confidentiality of newsmen's sources of information. However, they should be made aware of the statement issued by Mr. Ronald H. Einstoss before the House

Judiciary Committee. Mr. Einstoss is the editor of the Visalia Times-Delta; as such his views represent those of the Speidel Newspapers, Inc., a chain of 11 small- and medium-size daily newspapers. There is, however, no reason to believe that his views do not represent the views of other small newspapers.

May I remind you that small newspapers—those with circulation under 100,000—represent 92.6 percent of the entire U.S. industry. The subscribers to these daily newspapers represent 486 of a market that is in excess of 62 million; and that 1,451 papers or 83 percent published in communities of less than 100,000. The majority of these newspapers, 1,244, have less than 25,000 subscribers.

Mr. Einstoss stated that—

The problems of small newspapers are somewhat different than those of the large metropolitan newspapers in that we, the small newspapers, do not have large financial resources. This money enables larger papers to hire lawyers to work full time and to act as consultants for their staff. If we run into a legal problem, we have to consider the high cost of seeking legal advice, and occasionally, as much as I hate to admit it, we have to shy away from the story.

We believe that threats to a free press hit the small newspapers of this country as hard . . . if not harder . . . than the large newspapers. Fighting these threats can jeopardize the economic health of small newspapers. For the press to remain free, it also must remain financially strong. Prolonged and frequent defenses in court will weaken the ability of small newspapers to do their job: Providing a free flow of information to the public.

BALANCING ISRAELI AND ARABIC RELATIONS

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, there is no more sobering aspect of the present world scene at this moment than the condition of confrontation between Israel and the Arab countries. What is increasingly disturbing is the absence of a candid and constructive expression of a relationship with Egypt and the other Arab countries that reflects our obvious national interests.

It seems to me if we can maintain assurances of firm support for Nationalist China while we are pursuing aggressively an improved and normalized relationship with the Peoples Republic of China, we certainly ought to be able to make more meaningful progress with the countries and principalities of the Arabian peninsula without diminishing our commitment to support the integrity of Israel.

I am not unaware that certain overtures have been made to the Arabs by this administration. But reports lead to the conclusion that Mr. Sisco was about as adroit as a bull in a China shop and not impressive in overall accomplishment. In spite of protestation predictably elicited by this criticism from both the White House and the Secretary of State

what they are now doing and have done is not getting the appropriate results.

What is needed, Mr. Speaker, is a firm statement from our President that we intend an even-handed and fair policy in Arab countries as well as standing firmly to protect the integrity of the new nation of Israel. The State Department actions should be geared as much toward normalizing relations with the Arabs as in assisting and urging an acceptable truce between the Middle East conflicting parties. We should decry any violence by either of the parties of their agents and should also express our opposition to injustices visited upon the nonmilitary civilians of all national origins.

We hope to see some meaningful expressions of policy demonstrating equality of treatment in the whole of the Middle East and feel such expressions are very much in the true national interest of the United States.

"PLEASE, IS THERE ANY WAY FOR CONGRESS TO ACT TO STOP ALL AMERICAN INVOLVEMENT OVER THERE?"

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Miss HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disturbed at our continuing involvement in Indochina, and I could talk at length about the quicksand we are treading on, the unconstitutionality of the President's decision to bomb Cambodia, the horrible specter of American dead once again strewn across a small Asian land, American men held captive, and innocent Asian people destroyed.

I prefer, however, to share with you the simple but powerful feelings of one of my constituents who wrote me recently, Mrs. Mary Rosa of Brooklyn. She is a woman whose anxious questioning reflects, I feel, a growing desperation in this country. What we have to ask ourselves today is the same question Mrs. Rosa poses:

Please, is there any way for Congress to act to stop all American involvement over there?

What is our answer to her?

Her letter follows:

Congresswoman ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN HOLTZMAN: I am writing to you because as a woman you might understand my deep concern for this present situation in Viet Nam. I think the American people were under the impression that when we had all our prisoners of war returned to us our commitment would end. Easing the papers it seems that President Nixon has again threatened to bomb North Viet Nam.

Miss Holtzman, my son is stationed in Thailand since December. I cannot go through what I went through last December. My God we have had enough. Please is there any way that we can bow out gracefully from a situation that is endless. They will never stop fighting—it's their way of life over there. The present peace is more nerve wrecking than the actual war was.

Please is there any way for Congress to act to stop all American involvement over there?

Thank you for your time in reading my letter.

I am,

Very truly yours,

MARY ROSA.

FACT SHEET ON WASHINGTON POST ARTICLE CONCERNING FLIGHT PAY

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, on April 1 the Washington Post published an article alleging that the Department of Defense pays about \$76 million annually in flight pay to nearly 30,000 military officers who hold nonflying jobs.

The article in question, written by Mr. Jack Taylor, is purportedly based on a General Accounting Office report that was prepared at the request of Representative LES ASPIN of Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, the allegations in the article misrepresent the intent of Congress in authorizing payment of flight pay to officers in nonflying jobs and distort the facts presented in the GAO report.

I have a fact sheet that answers in detail the allegations concerning the payment of flight pay to officers in nonflying jobs and puts in perspective the facts of the GAO report.

My concern, Mr. Speaker, is with the overall impression created by this news article that the Department of Defense is squandering the taxpayers' money on officers who do not fly. The statement that the Pentagon "pays more than \$75 million each year to nearly 30,000 officers who hold nonflying jobs" is misleading and is an unfortunate case of misinforming the public and misinterpreting a GAO report.

Mr. Speaker, I insert this fact sheet in the RECORD:

FLIGHT PAY TO NONFLIERS ALLEGED

(By Jack Taylor)

Issue: The Pentagon pays more than \$75 million each year to nearly 30,000 officers as flight pay even though they are in non-flying jobs.

Fact: Some 9,000 officers of the 30,000 in non-flying jobs fly a limited amount to maintain their ability to rapidly fill flying jobs—in contingency operations. An additional 5,000 officers are attending schools where flying is prohibited by public law. The other 16,000 have been precluded from flying by the Department of Defense in response to repeated Congressional direction to reduce flying hour costs. The payment of flight pay on this basis was initiated by the Congress in 1954. It has been affirmed annually since then.

Issue: These officers are being paid for something they don't do. The \$75 million represents about one third of the total \$228 million.

Fact: The Congress, in title 37, U.S. Code, describes flight pay as one of the incentive pays for hazardous duty which is defined as the "special pay additives/are/awarded to officers and enlisted members as an incentive to voluntarily specialize in certain hazardous duties." It is not intended to compensate

for the hazards of flight or to compensate for actual flying.

Issue: Last year the House Appropriations Committee voted to eliminate flight pay for colonels and generals unless the Pentagon proposed a new flight pay program by May 31 of this year.

Fact: The House Appropriations Committee voted to eliminate flight pay to colonels and generals assigned to non-flying jobs in non-combat assignments. The Senate Appropriations Committee voted to delay the effective date to May 31 of this year to provide time for the Department of Defense to review incentive pays and propose corrective legislation without a precipitous loss of pay by those affected.

Issue: With the deadline approaching, I understand that the Pentagon is desperately trying to work out a proposal to keep many of these 29,000 officers on flight pay even though they don't fly.

Fact: The Department of Defense is working out the details of a proposal to optimize the incentive effect of flight pay with minimum impact on the defense budget. The objective is to propose legislation which addresses Congressional concern, meets service needs, and is acceptable to individual service members.

Issue: 9,000 officers still participate in some form of practice flying, a practice discouraged by Congress because of excessive expense of maintaining and operating extra training planes.

Fact: Air Power is expensive. The 9,000 officers who proficiency fly are required to satisfy mutual defense commitments and facilitate a rapid expansion of our air forces if needed. The separate services reduce the number of crews flying first line aircraft during normal peacetime operations to the minimum to reduce operating costs. The additional pilots maintain their basic skills in training and mission support aircraft which are operated at a fraction of the cost of first line aircraft. Termination of flying by the officers would preclude the air forces from meeting combat manning requirements during the first two years of a contingency or general war.

Issue: Unless a pilot is actively flying, he should not be paid one dime of the taxpayers money in flight pay.

Fact: The Congress, in 1954, authorized payment of flight pay to officers with over 20 years of flying duty and urged the service to make maximum use of the authority. The services used the authority very sparingly until 1962 when the Congress directed full implementation. The services position was that pilots should be actively flying to collect flight pay, and reluctantly used the authority to preclude salary reductions by officers precluded from flying by Congressional action. The services, as a result of Congressional action, have so deeply integrated the authority to pay fliers in non-flying jobs into their personnel management systems over the past 19 years, precipitous denial of the authority may well erode flight pay as an incentive for an individual to elect a military flying career. The net result may be recurring training costs far in excess of the costs of flight pay. Initial training costs for an Air Force jet fighter pilot are over four times the amount paid in flight pay to the same pilot over a 30 year career.

PIPELINE

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, during the next few months there will be a major

congressional debate on the issue of the trans-Alaska against trans-Canadian pipeline. I believe, that if a pipeline must be built, that it should be through Canada. The Canadian pipeline offers both overwhelming environmental and economic advantages to our Nation.

One question that continuously arises is the Canadian view of the entire situation. For their part, the Canadians are extremely wary of the enormous adverse environmental impact that a trans-Alaska pipeline would cause when inevitable tanker accidents occurred off their Pacific Coast and willing to consider a Canadian route. In response to a reporter's question recently—on April 3—Canada's Foreign Minister Michael Sharp said:

We have one very strong objection to the proposals that have been put forward for the Alaska Pipeline and the movement of oil down the Pacific Coast. Our objection is on environmental grounds, we are very strongly opposed and have made the most vigorous protests against the proposition that big tankers should supply American refineries by passing through the straits of Juan de Fuca and other narrow straits of the straits of Georgia. We believe that the chances of an oil spill there are very serious, these are very narrow waters, there is a lot of traffic, and if there were to be an oil spill, it would damage for years and years to come the most beautiful part of the North American continent, including both Canada and the United States. Now, that is our principle objection to the Alaska Pipeline . . . if the American oil companies after looking at the problems that are involved and looking at the dangers to the environment that would be involved in building a pipeline across Alaska and tanker route down the Pacific Coast feel that they would want to build through Canada, they will find the Canadian authorities willing to give serious consideration to their request.

This is the latest in a series of statements from Canadian officials indicating their concern about the environmental impact of a pipeline route, and more importantly, their willingness to entertain an application for the trans-Canadian route.

A JOB WELL DONE

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, we find a great paradox in America today with our great rivers. Part of the year we have droughts with too little water and in other times our rivers and streams are overflowing their banks with floodwaters. I am sure you and my colleagues have been following the dangerous and costly floods that have been occurring along the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers in Illinois and other States.

Mr. Speaker, in the old-fashioned American tradition, we always find Americans willing to help their less fortunate neighbors. Mr. Ed Akin of the Murphysboro, Ill., Employment Service Office, has called to my attention the heroic work recently performed by Southern Illinois University students and the various civil defense units. Army

Corps of Engineers, Coast Guard organizations, Peace Corps, and Gov. Dan Walker and his State administration officials who helped sandbag levees, participated in rescue operations, and performed many other acts of kindness.

Mr. Speaker, we hear so much about unrest on university campuses and how irresponsible a small number of our students are, but when the masses do good, it does not warrant press coverage. Therefore, I wanted to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that over 400 students from Southern Illinois University, at Carbondale, stood out in the rain and cold weather, both day and night, to help out these disaster stricken victims of the ravishing floods. This was particularly true on Kaskaskia Island, Ill., and the counties along the Mississippi River from McClure to Cairo, Ill.

I know all of my colleagues will join me in saluting these young Americans as well as the St. Louis, Mo., and Memphis, Tenn., district offices of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Coast Guard, civil defense units, Gov. Dan Walker, who personally toured the flooded areas, and his entire State administration. A job well done.

THE ATLANTIC UNION

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following: As the House considers what I believe to be an ill conceived piece of legislation, the Atlantic Union Resolution, I want to bring to the attention of the Members a resolution of the Young Americans for Freedom which points out many of the problems with this legislation:

A RESOLUTION REGARDING THE ATLANTIC UNION

The following resolution was passed unanimously by the National Board of Directors of Young Americans for Freedom meeting in New York City's Summit Hotel on February 23, 24, 25, 1973. Introduced by the YAF National Director from New York, Richard A. Deigaudis.

Whereas, the United States recognizes the necessity of close economic and political relationships with our European allies in the face of the communist threat and for the mutual benefit of all states concerned; and

Whereas, the concept of the Atlantic Union is entirely alien to the founding principles of Young Americans for Freedom as outlined in the Sharon Statement; more specifically it is in conflict with the clause which states "We will be free only so long as the national sovereignty of the United States is secure," and also that part of the Sharon Statement which states "American foreign policy must be judged by this criterion: does it serve the just interests of the United States;" and

Whereas, the Atlantic Union represents the first step toward World Government and threatens the survival of the United States as a free and independent Republic; and

Whereas, the implied premise in the Atlantic Union proposition, that the bigger and

further away government gets from the people the more efficient it becomes is totally false; and

Whereas, the convention to be established by the Atlantic Union would explore the possibility of transforming NATO into a federal union, of setting up a timetable for such a goal and creating a commission to hasten the integration process; now, therefore be it hereby

Resolved, by the National Board of Directors of Young Americans for Freedom that we are unalterably opposed to any efforts by the United States to develop an Atlantic Federal Union either within or without the framework of the United Nations.

BEEF BOYCOTT MISDIRECTED

HON. WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, last week's meat boycott was aimed at the wrong target. It is not the cattlemen who are to blame for rising prices in this country. It is the big spenders in Congress who have created the inflationary spiral that results in soaring prices of beef and everything else we consumers buy.

So it really is not fair to single out beef as the focal point for fighting inflation. And the effort to do so is likely to backfire.

Of course meat prices have gone up. But meat and other food prices have fallen far short of increases in consumer prices, wholesale prices, personal, and national income and other comparisons.

Despite some recent fluctuations over the last 20 years, beef prices have hardly changed. For example, in 1952—the last year when cattle prices approached 1972 levels—the average beef price was \$29.69 per hundredweight. At that time, disposable personal income per capita was \$1,468.

By the end of 1972 the average cattle price per hundredweight was \$33.40 or about 13 percent above the 1952 price. In the same period, disposable income per capita almost tripled: from \$1,468 to \$3,954, an increase of 169 percent.

The long term trend in other products is even more discouraging to producers. Some commodities are at virtually the same price as 60 years ago, in the 1910-14 period. But, since then the Consumer Price Index has risen 400 percent.

Ranchers and farmers are caught in the middle. Their costs have increased dramatically—feed, tractors, implements, automobiles, consumer goods and especially taxes are going up steadily. So every year it becomes harder to make ends meet. More and more farmers and ranchers, particularly young people, are leaving the field to enter other, more profitable lines of work.

This is sad; all of us who admire the self-reliance and strength of our friends in rural America hate to see these people lose out. They deserve a fair share of our country's prosperity.

But the critical policy issue goes far beyond fair play for agriculture. Artificial

restraints on food prices may temporarily win approval of the Nation's housewives but in the long run, if prices do not afford sufficient economic incentive to food producers, the result will be a decline in supply—shortages—ultimately rationing and a decline in our standard of living.

The price of agricultural products must therefore be permitted to follow the general trend of other commodities in order to assure an adequate supply.

However, this does not mean the situation is hopeless.

There is a way to control price increases and stabilize our national economy. But it requires action which many Congressmen are loathe to consider: controlling runaway Federal spending.

We have been warned repeatedly that inflation is certain to result from excessive Government spending and deficit financing. But Congressmen have been playing Santa Claus with Federal spending for a long, long time. Year after year, they dole out money for Federal projects and programs. Much of this spending is for worthwhile purposes, but year after year the outgo is larger than the income.

There has not been a balanced Federal funds budget in this country since 1960. We have run up \$162 billion in new deficits in the last 10 years alone. And next year's Federal funds budget will be nearly \$30 billion in the red, even after cuts recommended by President Nixon. Is it any wonder we have inflation?

So I say to housewives: You are boycotting the wrong people. It is not the farmers and ranchers who have caused the problem, in fact, they have suffered more from inflation than any consumer group.

I think it is time for the housewives of the country to join with the farmers and ranchers, and the businessman, and the working people, and the old people and others on fixed income and all of the people of this country who have been hurt by inflation and say to the politicians: "Stop spending. It's time to balance the budget."

Until then, inflation will get worse. No product boycott; no system of government price and wage controls will be effective unless and until we come to grips with the basic problem—excessive Government spending.

DAV HONORS VA EMPLOYEES

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Disabled American Veterans—DAV—honored five Veterans' Administration employees for service in the Republic of South Vietnam at the annual DAV Mid-Winters Conference held on March 19, 1973, at the Washington Hilton Hotel in Washington, D.C. The national commander's citation was presented by the DAV's national commander, Mr. Jack O. Hicks, to Mr. Myron N. Arata and Mr. Vincent J. Cos-

tanzo, both from the Veterans' Administration regional office, Newark, N.J.; Mr. Daniel P. McCann from the Veterans' Administration Center, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mr. Ronald L. Dykes from the Veterans' Benefits Office, Washington, D.C.; and Mr. Philip R. Strange from the Veterans' Administration regional office, Roanoke, Va.

The overseas program was begun in an effort to insure that U.S. servicemen and women were aware of the benefits available to them from their Government prior to their separation from active duty. The Veterans' Administration, in conjunction with the Department of Defense, military agencies, and other civilian agencies, drafted to assign selected volunteers to serve in the Republic of South Vietnam. During the 5-year period from December 1967 to December 1972, nearly 100 Veterans' Administration employees participated in this program. Of the 2.3 million service personnel who have served in Southeast Asia, 1.9 million were briefed on Veterans' Administration benefits while stationed there. Providing this service to military personnel stationed in a combat zone was a first for the Veterans' Administration and represents the furthest limits of the Veterans' Administration's outreach program.

Since its inception, the program has been expanded to include the stationing of representatives in Germany, Korea, Japan, Okinawa, and Thailand.

The dedication of those employees, who volunteered for this program to the mission of the Veterans' Administration and to our veterans, is to be commended.

THE FREEDOM OF VOLUNTARY PRAYER

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, we are again being plagued with Mrs. Madalyn O'Hair's efforts to restrict citizens in this country from having voluntary prayer.

Her last attack was against the school system and her suit resulted in the practice of prayer being abandoned in our schools. Her latest assault is to block prayers or readings from the Bible in the White House and the Capitol.

No doubt Mrs. O'Hair resented the many prisoners of war who gave thanks to God upon reaching the United States. Mentioning the Deity on the airwaves or in the news media could be her next objection. There appears to be no end to the actions some people will resort to in this country to prohibit voluntary participation in religious affairs.

Just where does our freedom lie? In being able to give thanks to God—in public or in private—whenever we feel the need? Or is our freedom a restraint on our desire to worship God when and where we like?

Mr. Speaker, I hope we have a large outpouring of public sentiment by our people on their views about freedom to pray. There is a great resurgence of

religion in this country. I hope all America will rise to see that no restriction is put on voluntary religious activity.

OEO FUNDS AND THEIR USE

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress are continuing to seek and share information to indicate the best course of action to follow with regard to OEO operations and programs.

My colleagues will find the following three newspaper items useful. They appeared in the March 1, 20, and 22 issues of the Detroit News and its Sunday edition, the Sunday News.

The article of the 18th, documents how OEO funds financed the Wounded Knee takeover, mostly by Indians with criminal records from outside the area—intruders who are opposed by the Oglala Sioux tribal council on the local reservation. The News editorial of the 20th discusses AIM, the Indian group responsible for the Wounded Knee confrontation, and its record of destruction and waste of OEO grants. And the editorial of March 22 indicated why Congress should probe past OEO activities and audit how OEO grant money has been utilized.

The articles follow:

HOW GOVERNMENT GRANTS TO INDIANS FINANCED WOUNDED KNEE TAKEOVER

(By John E. Peterson)

MINNEAPOLIS.—The Indian occupation of Wounded Knee, S.D., has been financed almost exclusively by federal money.

The Indians who took over the small reservation town have depicted themselves as an oppressed minority group seeking to focus national attention on a long list of grievances.

In point of fact, however, their actions appear to be the latest act in a play staged by a handful of militants and paid for by public money.

A two-week investigation by The Detroit News—starting in Washington and culminating in Minnesota—has unearthed these facts:

More than half of the 258 American Indian Movement (AIM) members and sympathizers holding Wounded Knee (as of Saturday) are employees of social welfare agencies financed primarily by federal grants.

AIM, far from being repressed by the government, has been granted directly and indirectly more than \$400,000 in federal funds since its founding in 1968. The bulk of that money, federal investigators say, has been used in efforts to radicalize the American Indian—not improve his lot. AIM leaders, federal investigations reveal, spent huge amounts of federal funds to stage the takeover of the Bureau of Indian Affairs last fall and the current confrontation at Wounded Knee.

The leaders of AIM almost to a man, had lengthy histories of convictions for such crimes as burglary, strong-arm robberies and assaults long before they organized the militant organization.

Less than 20 of the Indians now at Wounded Knee are Oglala Sioux, the tribe on whose reservation the confrontation is taking place, government investigators say. And the duly elected Oglala Sioux tribal council—by 14-2 votes—repeatedly has asked the fed-

eral government to evict the AIM group from its reservation.

"When AIM took over Wounded Knee three weeks ago (Feb. 27), the Justice Department was all set to move in and make arrests," a highly placed federal official said last week.

"But then AIM leaders threatened to call a press conference and disclose exactly how much financing they've had from the federal government in recent months. That's when the Justice Department, backed off and tried to play for a standoff, hoping AIM would tire and leave of its own volition.

"What's happened is that AIM leaders have just dusted off and updated the old Black Panther tactic of intimidating government officials until they come through with grants," he said. "And so far, it's worked like a charm."

AIM, which began as an off-shoot of a Minneapolis anti-poverty program in 1968, was especially successful in procuring federal grants during the last year.

Last June 21, for instance, government files show that AIM received a \$113,000 grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO).

Of that amount, \$60,000 was for "survival" schools in Minneapolis, St. Paul and Milwaukee to "instill American Indian culture" in Indian children of grade school age. The other \$53,000 was for an Indian community center in Milwaukee.

Early last fall, OEO investigators were dispatched to probe numerous complaints about the "survival" schools from local education officials in all three cities.

What was found was "an almost total absence of any academic standards" and "a sustained effort to brainwash the students into hating all non-Indian Americans, black as well as white," investigators said.

AIM leaders, the report noted, refused to provide any audit information on how the \$113,000 had been spent.

AIM leaders also received \$66,000 in "transportation" money from the OEO as inducement to leave the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), which their followers had systematically vandalized and pillaged during a six-day take-over last fall.

"That was about six times the amount required to buy them all bus tickets back home," said an OEO official who vehemently disagreed with the decision at the time. "They were just handed the money in cash and no accounting was required."

An OEO grant for an additional \$67,000—approved before the BIA take-over—was ordered frozen in a Minneapolis bank before AIM leaders arrived back from Washington.

But AIM leaders Clyde Bellecourt and Dennis J. Banks, both Chippewas, used the announcement of that grant's approval to persuade the Upper Midwest American Indian Center (UMAIC) in Minneapolis to lend them nearly \$30,000.

"We loaned them the money only because they offered the \$27,000 grant as collateral, and we assumed they had it in their pockets," said Mrs. Emily Peake, UMAIC's director, a Chippewa and a spokeswoman for most of the 22,000 American Indians living in the Twin Cities area.

"Of all the money AIM has conned out of the federal government, I'd be surprised if even a minute fraction ever trickled down to our people who really need it," she said.

"When they first started AIM, Clyde and Dennis were going around making statements about how it was going to be the Indian's Black Panthers," she said. "They've done a pretty good job in that respect, anyway."

Another person who agrees with Mrs. Peake's assessment is Richard Wilson, head of the Oglala Sioux tribal council.

Wilson said AIM has made a "half dozen threats on my life since I began speaking out AIM's wrath."

"Their lawlessness and violence give the rest of us (American Indians) a bad name. If the television boys would bother to look up their prison records, they wouldn't come in here glorifying them like they have."

"Banks and Bellecourt bear about as much resemblance to Sitting Bull as Al Capone did to George Washington," he added.

Bill Cuny, an Oglala Sioux who teaches elementary school in Rapid City, echoes Wilson:

"The Bellecourt brothers, Russell Means and Banks are urban Indians, bandits with braids. They can't speak for reservation Indians." The criminal records of AIM's national leaders curiously have been ignored by both the local and national press in recent months although they are a matter of public record in Minnesota's Hennepin County District Court.

Banks, Clyde Bellecourt and his brother, Vernon, all have served sentences in Minnesota penitentiaries for a variety of felony offenses, including burglary, aggravated assault and armed robbery.

A Minneapolis police official said Banks, 35, has been convicted 15 times on charges including assault and battery and burglary.

Clyde Bellecourt, 36, the official said, has an arrest record dating back to age 11. He was found guilty of armed robbery in 1954 and was sentenced to serve two to 15 years in prison. After parole, he was convicted of burglary in 1958, sentenced to five years in prison, paroled again and then was convicted of burglary once more in 1960 and paroled in 1964.

Banks is national field director of AIM and lives in Minneapolis; Clyde Bellecourt, also from Minneapolis, is executive director of the local chapter, one of the largest with more than 100 members. His brother, Vernon, also with a police record, is national co-director of AIM and also runs the Denver chapter.

AIM currently claims a membership of about 4,500 in 67 chapters in the United States and two in Canada.

Banks and Clyde Bellecourt had managed to stay out of trouble for several years when they joined the staff of the Citizen's Community Centers (CCC's) a Minneapolis and anti-poverty program in 1967.

Although Banks and Bellecourt claim to be co-founders of AIM, people close to the group, said the real impetus was provided by Douglas Hall, an attorney and former board chairman of the CCC's and Matthew Eubanks, self-proclaimed leader of the Minnesota Black Panthers and one-time CCC executive director. Hall and Eubanks were cited by OEO investigators as having stacked the CCC's board illegally in order to force out William White, a moderate black man as director and replace him with Eubanks in December, 1968.

The CCC's received about \$1,400,000 a year in OEO money over a seven-year period. OEO investigators have never been able to determine how much actually went into services for Minneapolis' poor because no accurate bookkeeping was done.

... But local government officials say CCC's services to the poor stopped completely in January, 1969, when Eubanks replaced White as executive director.

"Eubanks got his position by packing a board meeting with local Panthers—some of them armed—and forcing the board, which included former Mayor Arthur Naftalin, to remain in session until they fired White," said Mrs. Peake.

Eubanks' own version of what happened agrees with Mrs. Peake's, and a number of other informed sources say that story is correct.

A reporter for the Minneapolis Tribune who covered the CCC's meeting in those days, however, said he wasn't sure what happened "because they locked the press out. I do know

that no one came out of the meeting until 5:30 the next morning," he said.

Whatever, Eubanks promptly shifted the focus of the CCC's from helping the poor to "politicizing" black students in elementary and high schools in the city's one small ghetto area.

CCC's staff members were cited for disrupting classes on so many occasions that the city's school board finally sought a restraining order against Eubanks.

Eubanks then organized a campaign, as he put it at the time, to "harass the police at every turn, break down their police-community relations program and make them targets of hate in the black community."

It was at about that time that Eubanks and Douglas Hall decided to organize a militant Indian group within the CCC's structure and chose Dennis Banks and Clyde Bellecourt to head it.

Eubanks unwittingly named the new group the Concerned Indian Americans, a name that was abandoned after several weeks when Hall returned from an out-of-town trip and pointed out that the group's acronym, CIA, might be confused with "the hated Central Intelligence Agency and turn off a lot of people."

Banks and Clyde Bellecourt then changed the name to the American Indian Movement and hired a six-member staff to begin recruiting the OTO money that had been earmarked for a Head Start program for preschool Indian children.

OEO began phasing out Minneapolis anti-poverty program as early as 1970 because of its dissatisfaction with the lack of accountability, misappropriation of funds and the bad press militants like Eubanks, Hall and the AIM leaders were getting.

"There was a colossal amount of waste in most of the big city anti-poverty programs," an OEO official said last week, "but Minneapolis is probably the ultimate example."

"Here in one of the most affluent cities in the United States the federal government squandered nearly \$25 million in seven years," he said.

"Only one-ninth of the Minneapolis population whose income places them below the poverty cut-off is black or Indian," he said.

"Yet the 90 percent of that money was earmarked for services for minority citizens and eight-years later we end up with 25 percent more minority poor than when we started the program."

Despite the phasing out of the anti-poverty program, OEO, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) and the Department of Labor continued to fund AIM.

"We kept sending them funds for community actions programs," an OEO official said, sarcastically "and they kept giving us community action."

In 1970, AIM members took over the former prison island of Alcatraz in San Francisco Bay, blocked entrances to the Bureau of Indian Affairs and disrupted a conference of the National Congress of Indian Organizations sponsored by the OEO—which incidentally, paid for \$30,000 worth of vandalism damage caused by AIM.

AIM was relatively dormant in 1971, but when Raymond Yellow Thunder, an Oglala Sioux was shot and killed in Gordon, Neb., in early 1972 AIM members moved in and demanded that local police turn over a white man accused of the crime for trial by an Indian jury.

After they tied up the town for more than a week with picketing and several violent confrontations, AIM members moved a few miles north to the Oglala Sioux reservation town of Pine Ridge, S.D., and did \$50,000 worth of damage to the Crazy Horse Museum.

The reason for that destruction, Belle-

court said, was that the owner, even though he was married to an Oglala Sioux, was white.

In the fall, AIM took over a peaceful lobbying effort called "The Trail of Broken Treaties" from more moderate Indians and used it as a vehicle to occupy the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Washington.

When AIM members left with \$66,000 in OEO money after six days they had destroyed or looted an estimated \$3 million worth of the BIA's furnishings—including many irreplaceable Indian artifacts and paintings.

Earlier this year, AIM members staged mini disturbances in Rapid City and Custer, S.D., before moving into Wounded Knee in late February.

AIM's present tactics have been disavowed by almost every recognized American Indian leader outside that organization in Minnesota and the Dakotas—another fact that had gone virtually unreported by the media.

"What AIM is trying to do is to move onto the reservation of a tribe that has given it little support and force the ouster of the tribal chairman," said Roger Buffalohead, acting chairman of the Department of American Indian Studies at the University of Minnesota.

"If AIM wins this confrontation and forces Wilson to resign," said Mrs. Peake, "they'll be able to gain control of every reservation in the country. The majority of the 800,000 or so American Indians will think AIM has government sanction."

"When you look at the federal money they've been able to get and practically burn up, it's not hard to believe that Indians believe that right now," she concluded.

INDIAN MILITANTS FUNDED—AN OEO SCANDAL

When the Office of Economic Opportunity expires next month, they ought to bury its heart at Wounded Knee.

The story of how OEO funds—your taxes—financed a militant Indian crusade, culminating in the occupation of Wounded Knee, S.D., vividly illustrates why the OEO experiment failed and must be dismantled.

An investigation by The Detroit News has revealed that most of the members of the so-called American Indian Movement and their sympathizers at Wounded Knee work for social welfare agencies financed by federal grants.

Since its founding in 1968, AIM has obtained more than \$400,000 in federal funds and has used most of the money to promote Indian militancy rather than to improve the lot of American Indians. AIM leaders, many of them ex-convicts, used federal funds to finance their take-over of the Bureau of Indian Affairs last year. The OEO gave them \$66,000 for "transportation" purposes following their vandalizing and pillaging of the bureau. Last June, OEO granted the group \$113,000; AIM refused to provide an audit showing how the money was spent.

"Of all the money AIM has conned out of the federal government," observes a spokesman for Indians in the Minneapolis area, "I'd be surprised if even a minute fraction ever trickled down to our people who really need it."

Responsible Indian officials, including the elected Oglala Sioux tribal council, on whose reservation the Wounded Knee confrontation has taken place, oppose the tactics of the militants. Indeed, the record shows that the only substantial support for the radical Indian movement has come from the U.S. government, which the radicals depict as the hated enemy.

The AIM episode is the sort of thing never mentioned, of course, by critics of the Nixon administration's decision to terminate the OEO. As they see it, OEO is being dismantled because Mr. Nixon cares nothing about the poor.

The hard fact is that OEO was a noble experiment that went awry. Its community

action programs proved disastrous. Millions of dollars went into projects which lined the pockets of a few and did little, if anything, for those who needed help most.

As the Nixon administration recognizes, many of the OEO programs are worthy ones. Those programs will not die but will be transferred to existing federal agencies. But the OEO bureaucracy, a miserable failure, will disappear. There is small reason for American taxpayers to mourn its passing.

CONGRESS AND THE OEO—PROBE IS IN ORDER

Odd, isn't it, how politics can blunt a politician's sense of smell?

The slightest whiff of impropriety on the President's staff sets congressional bloodhounds to baying. Yet, as the stench of scandal in the handling of Office of Economic Opportunity funds grows stronger, we hear no call in Congress for an investigation. Instead, congressional crusaders keep right on fighting President Nixon's effort to dismantle OEO. They don't want to be on the wrong side of the war on poverty.

Unfortunately, as a weapon against poverty, OEO proved not just weak but disastrous. As current revelations in The News make clear, the dismal failure of OEO to end poverty has been matched only by the government's incredible failure to require an accounting from those who got money, ostensibly to help the poor.

The Economic Opportunity Commission of Nassau County (EOCNC), Long Island, N.Y., receives \$1.5 million a year from OEO. Federal authorities now suspect that about \$50,000 of that money was recently used to help sponsor Washington rallies protesting cutbacks in anti-poverty programs.

Investigators believe that middle level bureaucrats in "anti-poverty" agencies may have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars, public money earmarked for helping poor people, in a lobbying effort to preserve their own jobs.

OEO investigators know for a fact that the Nassau County agency, headed by John Kearse, transferred money from its operating account to a private slush fund just a few days before the first of a series of protest rallies in Washington. They also know that OEO agency employees went to Washington on chartered buses and had money for living expenses while there. And that nine EOCNC employees who refused to make the trip were fired two days later.

When OEO investigators began looking into all this, they encountered astonishing defiance from Kearse, who said the firings were "no one's business but our own" and refused to open the agency's books for an audit. Kearse was getting \$1.5 million a year in government funds but refused to let the government see how he was spending it! Only a threat to cut off funds finally opened the books, whereupon OEO investigators found the agency's accounting controls "practically nonexistent."

Such is the dismal aftermath of the great war on poverty, started with fanfare and good intentions and money by the ton. There was great faith, apparently, that the money would be spent well and honestly, that no questions need be asked.

Some of the money, we agree, has been well spent. We are thinking, for example, of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, which has helped put idle Detroit youths to work. But billions have gone down the drain in various projects for which the government has nothing to show but empty pockets and shattered dreams.

The least the public can expect is that the government has learned some lessons. By deciding to dismantle OEO and give some of its programs to other agencies, President Nixon shows he has learned something after futile attempts to make OEO work. Congress,

it seems, is slower on the uptake—or less considerate of the public purse.

HOPE, INC., STAFFER RECOGNIZED

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the March 1973, issue of Tuesday at Home recently paid tribute to a young woman, Ms. Sheila O'Brien, who has made a remarkable contribution to the city of Cleveland. Ms. O'Brien, or "Paddy" as she is known, has been working for an organization called Housing Our People Economically—Hope, Inc.—for a year and a half as a Vista volunteer. In that short timespan, Ms. O'Brien set up a communications network which has enabled Hope, Inc., to maintain contact with the residents of Hough in Cleveland. As the organization's executive director, Mr. Vernon R. Thornton told me recently:

I think this exemplifies the cooperation that HOPE works under and is a small example to the rest of the country of the many resources that are needed to orchestrate a successful organization.

I am confident that my colleagues will enjoy reading about Ms. O'Brien's outstanding effort. The Tuesday article follows:

GOOD WORKS KEYNOTE CAREERS

(By Cynthia DeWitt)

When Helen King started writing children's books, she had no idea that it would lead to her own publishing firm. "It's sort of incredible for me since all I've ever wanted to do was write," said the president of Let's Save the Children, Inc., a new children's book publishing company based in Chicago. "Actually, it was the failure of other publishing houses to distribute children's books relating to the Black experience which led me into the business," the former elementary school teacher and author of two children's books—"Willy" and "The Soul of Christmas"—explained. "I always felt that there was a need for children's books about Black lifestyle and culture," Mrs. King added, "but I couldn't convince other publishers that they were profitable."

Her firm, established last year, now has 13 staff members and has released eight titles on well-known personalities such as Nikki Giovanni, Isaac Hayes and Marvin Gaye for elementary school children. Written in what Mrs. King calls "soul rhythm," a teacher's guide and instructional booklets accompany each title. The books are now marketed to 15 school systems around the country.

Mrs. King chose well-known personalities as subject matter, she said, because the material was already familiar to the children and would increase their desire to read. However, the firm will not always publish books on popular figures, and is currently planning a book on the Black family.

The purpose of the books, Mrs. King said, is to teach about goals, values and life realistically.

"For so long educators and book publishers have force-fed a value system to children that doesn't exist," she said, "therefore we try to supply material that children of today, who are more sophisticated, can relate to. Most children are aware of the serious social problems in the U.S., but book publishers have not accommodated this awareness." Her books are written for both Black and

White children because, "Black children have had to learn about Hansel and Gretel, and White children need to know about people like Marvin Gaye so that they can grow to understand the Black lifestyle," said Mrs. King, whose two children, Chad, 9, and Penote, 7, she calls her best critics. Asked why she named the firm "Let's Save the Children, Inc.," she replied, "because that's exactly what I mean. More than anything, I want to do a service for children." Most of the profits from the company, she said, will go toward establishing mobile health units, research centers, and summer camps for disadvantaged children.

Like Mrs. King, 23-year-old Sheila O'Brien is not out to conquer the world, but is making an effort to heal some of the country's social ills. For the past year and a half Miss O'Brien has worked as a VISTA (Volunteers in Service of America) volunteer in inner-city Cleveland with H.O.P.E., Inc. (Housing Our People Economically), an organization devoted to improving housing in Cleveland's blighted Hough district.

One of the first goals of the organization was to develop an ongoing communications department to let its clients and public know what H.O.P.E. is doing, and executive director Vernon Thornton said, "It was Sheila's ingenuity that put the program together."

As communications officer of H.O.P.E., Miss O'Brien has contact with city officials as well as residents of the Hough area. Although her term with VISTA expired last month, she is continuing her work with H.O.P.E. as a staff member. Miss O'Brien, who joined VISTA after graduating from Pitzer College in Claremont, Calif. said, "When I first got into the program, I put all my text books aside. I was afraid to pick up a sociology book for fear that it would confuse me, but most of all I wanted to test book learning with reality." She considers VISTA a program that can promote change, but feels "VISTA is only as good as its volunteers." She added, "Working at H.O.P.E. is no glamor job, but it's challenging and a tremendous learning experience."

ENERGY CRISIS

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Stanley A. Blumberg of Baltimore, Md., has written a thoughtful and informative article about the energy crisis facing our country and his proposal for creating a Federal corporation to prospect and drill for oil and gas on federally owned lands.

I am sure that many of my colleagues are interested, as I am, in receiving suggestions on how to alleviate our energy shortage. The Baltimore Evening Sun printed Mr. Blumberg's article, and I should like to insert it at this point in the RECORD:

YES, THERE REALLY IS A WAY TO END THE GOUGING OF THE PUBLIC AND RESOLVE THE ENERGY CRISIS

(By Stanley A. Blumberg)

Before the American consumer accepts at face value the solution advocated by the oil and gas companies for the energy crisis—namely higher prices—he should weigh some solutions that are more in his own interest.

Certainly the public interest can generally be served by permitting an adequate return on invested capital for companies engaged in the business of finding and marketing fossil

fuels. No investor will provide equity or debt capital unless he is assured of a return on his investment, and without funds, exploration and distribution of oil and gas will grind to a halt.

This does not mean, however, that the oil and gas companies should be permitted to use the alleged energy crisis as an excuse to gouge the public. There is little doubt that this is exactly what they are doing and apparently intend to continue to do, if they can get away with it.

For the past year these companies have engaged in a nearly unparalleled advertising campaign designed to convince the reader that current costs are too low and because of shortages and inflation he will be forced to pay more for their product if he expects to heat his home and drive his car. They have been unwittingly aided in this psychological conditioning by members of the media who too often accept the word of "experts" without informed questions.

According to the gas companies, since the Federal Power Commission has set an unrealistically low figure at which gas must be sold at the wellhead, there is no incentive for speculative drilling. The message is clear: Unless wellhead prices are increased, new wells will not be drilled and the shortage of natural gas will continue and intensify. Under this pressure the FPC is now letting prices rise, although in the opinion of the industry not fast enough. The gas lobbies are pressuring Congress to amend the Natural Gas Act to eliminate the control of the FPC on wellhead prices.

Before this is done Congress should consider other methods to provide the gas companies with incentives for drilling that would, at the same time, give the consumer some protection against price gouging. One method, and we will deal with another in our discussion of oil, would be to treat drilling companies as public utilities. The prices that public utilities charge for their product are controlled by regulatory agencies. Their dual aim is to insure the corporation a fair return on invested capital and to protect the public from excessive rates.

In order for this concept to be effective, the operating company and the drilling should be a single entity. If a drilling company operating independently does not find gas there are no gas sales to regulate. If, however, prospecting and marketing are joint functions of a single company, drilling losses would be reflected in higher gas prices but success in drilling would produce profits, thus resulting in lower gas prices. In either event, as a regulated company, it should be able to attract capital at reasonable rates, and the public would have a degree of price protection.

The growing dependency of the United States on imported oil and gas is fraught with monetary and political dangers. At the present time, we are importing 26 per cent of our crude oil requirements. John G. McLean, chairman of Continental Oil Co., estimates that by 1965 we would be obtaining 40 to 55 per cent of our oil from foreign sources. He projects a large and growing deficit in the United States balance of trade in fuels. From a current yearly deficit of \$3 billion he foresees a deficit in the \$20 to \$30 billion range during the early 1980's. Recognizing the political hazards of depending on an unstable Middle East as a prime source for U.S. fuel, he "suggests that we will need to take a new look at all our foreign policies with respect to the Middle East—".

Fortunately, the current and future energy needs of the United States can and therefore should be met from domestic sources.

According to Dr. Edward Teller, the U.S. has within its boundaries more hydrocarbons than exist in the form of oil in the Middle East. Oil, gas coal and oil shale are all hydrocarbons. Dr. Teller believes that technology can be developed economically to extract oil

and gas from coal and oil shale. An example of this procedure is an economical method of extracting oil from shale, that was discussed on this page in December, 1972.

These approaches will probably take several years to implement. In the meantime, what can be done to increase supplies of domestic crude?

The President's Office Of Science and Technology is studying and preparing a report on the national energy problem. The agency expects to issue the report prior to June 30, 1973, when its existence will be terminated by executive order. Until then it is not clear if the study will provide a focus for an effective national energy policy.

It is reported, however, that the administration will recommend the leasing, on a competitive bid basis, of federally owned lands to private companies for oil and gas exploration and production.

The rationale for this proposal is convincing. First, the U.S. would be less dependent on unstable foreign sources of fuel. Second, the United States would enjoy a better trade balance.

All this is fine, but if the administration is also concerned with the price of fuel to the consumer, perhaps the plan should be modified.

The prospecting companies argue, with a great deal of logic, that since they are in a very risky and speculative business, they must receive a "fair" price for their product. For the sake of argument, let us assume that the "explorers" are right, forgetting momentarily the federal tax advantages that they enjoy.

There is a method that would insure private marketing and distribution of any gas or oil discovered on publicly owned land, without involving private risk capital. Since these lands, including all subsurface deposits, are the property of all the people a federally-owned corporation should assume and discharge the obligation of exclusive prospecting and drilling.

Such a federal corporation would be charged with exploration and test drilling for the purpose of establishing and controlling what reserves are available on public lands for our current and future national energy needs. It would have the responsibility of selling established proven reserves for ultimate distribution to private companies.

A national board representing industry and consumers, to be appointed by the President and confirmed by Congress, should have the power and responsibility of determining what price oil and gas, when discovered on public lands, should command in the market.

It has been estimated that at least one third of the United States' oil and gas deposits lie beneath federally owned land. If this is so, rational decisions as to the degree that domestic reserves should be released or hoarded in favor of more imports can be arrived at without undue pressure from political influences.

If this type of plan is implemented, the consumer as an underlying "land-owner" will expect, and rightfully so, that since it is "his" oil and gas that is being "resold" to him by the distributing companies, the cost will be a fair one.

UNIFORM TIRE GRADING STANDARDS FOR PASSENGER CAR TIRES

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1973, the Department of Trans-

portation printed at page 6194 of the Federal Register, a set of proposed uniform tire grading standards for passenger car tires—Docket 25; Notice 4. DOT has asked for all interested parties to comment upon these proposed standards by June 4, 1973.

At first glance, the proposed standards appear to be an answer to the consumer's long unheard cries in the night for an understandable method of grading and labeling all new tires. The new standards go a long way toward aiding the hapless consumer in deciding what is the best tire for the price, and what kind of safety standards the tire will meet.

Though these proposed rules are long overdue, I welcome them. However, I must object the seeming timidity of DOT to give the American consumer the "whole truth" about the tires he or she is buying.

Why, for example, are retreaded tires—potentially the most dangerous tires sold today—not included in these new standards?

How does DOT plan to set up its proposed 16,000-mile, over-the-road tire tests? There is no mention about this very important aspect of the program in the proposed rule. Will climate, road types, speed, and other important tire-wear factors be taken into consideration?

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration—NHTSA—has requested all interested parties, laymen and professionals alike, to comment upon the proposed rule by June 4, 1973. I encourage all those interested in bettering consumer information and auto safety to do so.

Mr. Dan Fisher wrote an articulate article in the March 18, 1973, issue of the Los Angeles Times raising a number of important questions with regard to these proposed standards.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks at this point Mr. Fisher's article entitled, "U.S. Grading System To End Tire Mystery May Get an 'F'":

U.S. GRADING SYSTEM TO END TIRE MYSTERY MAY GET AN "F"
(By Dan Fisher)

Those much ballyhooed new government tire grading standards—proposed a couple of weeks ago to help you make a wise purchase—may "help" you to buy a 30,000-mile tire instead of a 50,000-mile tire without even knowing the difference.

At least, that's the problem noted by some critics who have had a chance to study the fine technical details of the oft-delayed U.S. Department of Transportation proposal.

Under the plan, which was originally due in 1968, tire buyers beginning in September, 1974, will be able to compare various brands and types based on federally devised performance codes stamped on the sidewalls.

The codes will indicate performance in three areas—tread wear, high speed capability and traction.

Currently, there are no uniform tire grades. Manufacturers can designate a tire "premium," "first line," "100 level," or anything else at their whim, and what one company calls a "premium" tire is not necessarily "premium" to another firm.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), the DOT unit which drafted the grade labeling proposal, says its plan will end much of the consumer confusion resulting from the current setup.

Everybody seems to agree it's a step in the right direction, but a few experts contend it

will keep many buyers in the dark—especially those willing to fork over a bit more money in exchange for a longer wearing tire. And before the NHTSA plan is finalized in June, there may be a major battle over what these experts see as the culprit—something NHTSA calls its "control tire."

Two of the performance grades NHTSA proposes would be based on a tire whose specifications would be dictated by the agency—the control tire.

There would be, for example, six tread wear categories. A tire's mileage potential would be indicated on its side by a number comparing it with the control tire on a percentage basis. The lowest category would exhibit "less than 60%" of the tread life of the control tire. The top grade would be "200," identifying a tire that should last at least twice as long as the control tire. In between would be grades of 60, 85, 100 and 150.

LOW GRADE TIRE

But critics point out that the control tire proposed by NHTSA is such a low-grade type that most production tires will get high tread wear marks, and many will just go off the top of the rating scale—so the system leaves unwitting buyers in the dark.

If the control tire gets 15,000 miles of tread life, for example, a 30,000-mile tire would get the top "200" grade. But so would a 40,000-mile tire, or a 50,000-mile product. "The consumer won't have any comparative information at all" on these longer-life tires, points out D. McCarty Thornton, an attorney specializing in tires for the Federal Trade Commission.

REASONABLE RELATIONSHIP

"There has to be a very reasonable relationship between the control tire and the solid middle of the industry's quality range or the whole thing becomes farcical," adds Rep. John E. Moss (D-Calif.).

Edward Wallace, chief of NHTSA's tire division, concedes that "a tire that's worse than the control tire would be pretty bad." The low standard was chosen, he says, because it has been used as a basis for standards set by the Society of Automotive Engineers for new cars and because it is readily available in the designs and sizes covered by the proposed standard.

The debate over what should constitute a control tire "is crucial because more and more quality and safety-conscious consumers are opting for new types of tires that promise much longer mileage."

Better tires have resulted from sweeping changes in tire building technology over a relatively short period of time.

About 25 years ago, recalls Fred Kovac, manager of tire reinforcing systems for Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio, a Goodyear salesman called on an Army quartermaster touting a new product.

"Hey," he asked. "I want you to take a look at these new nylon tires we've got."

"I don't know," frowned the skeptical procurement officer, "we've been doing pretty good with these rubber ones."

The Army and other major tire industry customers have undoubtedly become more sophisticated since then, but the average consumer, if anything, seems to have become more confused in the face of a seemingly endless stream of new types of tires.

That old "rubber" tire the Army quartermaster defended probably had a rayon carcass (fabric) beneath its rubber tread to give it strength. Rayon was the favored carcass material in those days, but in the late 1950s, it lost out to nylon, which in turn seems now to be losing ground to polyester.

Also, the Army's old tire was undoubtedly of "bias ply" construction, featuring two layers of rayon cord arranged at an angle (or bias) to the tread it supported. Since then, tire construction methods have changed considerably, and today the "glamor" tire is a radial, in which the cord runs at

a right angle to the tread and is supplemented by belts of fabric between it and the tread.

BETTER MILEAGE

As a result of changes in carcass materials and construction methods, today's best tires get at least twice the mileage of the old bias ply versions. At least, that's what the tire companies' commercials say.

This year, more than half the 200 million new automobile tires sold in the United States are expected to be either radials or belted bias ply tires—a third tire construction category that also promises much longer life than the plain bias ply tire.

Detroit shifted in the late 1960s to bias belted tires for its new models, and now Ford Motor Co., says that 75% of its 1974 models will be equipped with the even higher mileage radials when they come off the assembly line.

Despite all that, NHTSA's proposed control tire is a two-ply, rayon job—the Army quartermaster's old "rubber" tire. And only two of the six tread-wear grades it suggests would apply to longer-life tires.

B. F. Goodrich, the nation's fourth largest tire company, doesn't even make a two-ply rayon tire any more, a company spokesman says.

FTC's Thornton suggests that NHTSA could help today's tire buyer more by either upgrading its control tire or adjusting its grade categories so there were more over "100" and, possibly, higher grades than "200."

FEARS EXAGGERATED

"I think the industry will have a lot to say about that" as comments on the proposal flow in prior to next June, says NHTSA's Wallace. He thinks the fears of Thornton and others are exaggerated, but promises "if it becomes a necessity, then, we'll amend the proposal."

Most people involved with the grade labeling proposal apparently agree with Wallace, although some were unaware of the control tire specified by NHTSA until it was brought to their attention by The Times.

Sen. Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.), author of tire quality grading legislation in 1966, says the proposal "appears to be workable and comprehensible," though he calls it long overdue.

Art Delibert, an engineer with the Ralph Nader affiliated Center for Auto Safety, adds: "Overall, we're very pleased." He notes that the latest NHTSA effort is much simpler than a two-year-old proposal which would have included a confusing array of grades covering a half-dozen areas of tire performance.

The Nader lieutenant and others object to the lack of a minimum tire traction standard, as well. The latest NHTSA proposal would include four traction grades, indicated by one, two, or three stars, or a dash.

A one star tire would offer 90% of the road-holding ability of the control tire; two stars would mean the tire was at least as good; and three stars would identify it as having at least 10% better traction than the control. A dash would mean the tire has less than 90% of the road holding ability of NHTSA's base tire.

Edward Wallace says that about the same time the grade labeling standard becomes effective, NHTSA will also complete a minimum traction standard that would outlaw anything below a one-star tire.

HIGH PERFORMANCE

High performance grades under the latest NHTSA proposal would be indicated by the letters A, B, or C. A "C" graded tire would offer the minimum high speed capability allowed under federal safety standards. A "B" tire would have passed additional tests at sustained speeds of up to 95 miles per hour, while the top, "A" tire would have been tested at up to 105 miles per hour.

Tire manufacturers have generally been

mum on the latest grade labeling proposal. Russel deYoung, Goodyear chairman, claims the whole concept "will cause more confusion."

"Tires are like gasoline," he says. "If you drive a car fast, you use more gasoline than if you drive it slow. It's the same with tires. A new concrete road wears tires three times as fast as a three-year-old road."

He contends that it's not just tire buying that confuses consumers these days, "it's a whole merchandising system."

If so, the tire business has one of the wildest versions. Its distribution system resembles an explosion in a spaghetti factory.

Thirteen U.S. companies make automobile tires, but they're sold under 157 different brand names. A Firestone plant, for example, may turn out Atlas, Shell, Union 76, Mobil, Phillips 66, or any one of a dozen other brands of tires, as well as Firestones.

Firestone subsidiaries—Dayton Tire & Rubber Co. and Seiberling Tire & Rubber Co.—turn out a like number of different brands.

One wit, noting that there are now more than 1,600 brand and model names for passenger car tires alone, once suggested that the industry needs a "tire birth control pill."

At the retail level, tires are sold through independent dealers, manufacturer-owned outlets, gasoline stations, department stores, automobile dealerships, and auto supply houses, among others.

And "the pricing structure in this business is predicated on the number of tires a retailer can buy."

As a result of all this, tires made in the same plant and virtually identical in performance may sell at retail under several different names and at many different prices.

PRIVATE BRAND ALSO

Generally, "private brand" tires such as All-state, distributed by Sears Roebuck & Co., have taken an increasing share of the replacement tires market in recent years at the expense of the "major," or manufacturer brands. Sears, for example, sold 8.5% of all replacement auto tires purchased last year, estimates "Modern Tire Dealer," a trade magazine. That made Sears the third best selling tire brand, behind Firestone (9.5%) and Goodyear (13%).

One reason for the rise of private brands is price. But one effect of government grade labeling standards will be to close that gap, contend many industry analysts.

"We left the price of the major get too far out of sight of the private branders," admits Edward Carter, executive vice president of Firestone.

Lately, however, the major manufacturers have been reducing prices on their own brands. One reason might be their fear that government grading standards will reveal the cheaper, private brands to be equal in performance to their own lines of tires.

Despite such reductions, however, the price of the average tire sold is going up, as consumers opt for higher cost radials, or bias belted tires. "Modern Tire Dealer" says the median tire bought last year cost about \$32, up from \$25 five years ago.

THE LOOMING GASOLINE CRISIS

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I note with great interest reports in the Oil Daily of the low level of gasoline stocks on hand

for the up-coming spring and summer season. These projections of shortages in gasoline fall quickly on the heels of the fuel oil crisis we weathered this winter. Mismanagement is the common denominator to these shortages. To remedy this situation, I have offered the following legislation, which I would like to submit to the RECORD:

H.R. 6194

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that—

- (1) the lack of coherent planning among the various agencies engaged in energy policy formulation has accentuated shortages in petroleum supplies and electrical energy;
- (2) a comprehensive national energy policy, encompassing energy research and development, and the efficient use of the Nation's energy resources, is essential to the improving of the general welfare of the Nation; and
- (3) it is a primary responsibility of the Federal Government to provide essential leadership in advancing a program of efficient development, supply, utilization, and conservation of energy resources.

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress declares that it is the purpose of this Act to protect and improve the general welfare of the people of the United States by promoting a national energy policy through the establishment of an Energy Development and Supply Trust Fund, which shall be used to promote the comprehensive collection of energy data and statistics, the wise management and conservation of energy resources, and the development of environmentally sound sources of energy.

ENERGY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPLY COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established a Commission to be known as the Energy Development and Supply Commission, hereinafter referred to as the "Commission".

(b) (1) The Commission shall consist of five members appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(2) No individual shall be selected to serve on the Commission if such individual at any time has been affiliated with or has held any direct or indirect pecuniary interest in any electrical power, natural gas, petroleum, or other energy production or distribution industry.

(3) Except as provided in paragraph (2), members of the Commission shall be selected from among those individuals who have experience and competence regarding the environment and its protection, consumer protection, and energy-related research and development.

(4) Not more than three members appointed under this subsection shall be of the same political party.

(c) (1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), members shall be appointed for terms of five years.

(2) of the Members first appointed—
(A) one shall be appointed for a term of one year;

(B) one shall be appointed for a term of two years;

(C) one shall be appointed for a term of three years;

(D) one shall be appointed for a term of four years; and

(E) one shall be appointed for a term of five years;

as designated by the President at the time of appointment.

(3) Any vacancy in the Commission shall

not affect the powers of the Commission, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term.

(4) A member may serve after the expiration of his term until his successor has taken office, except that no member shall serve beyond the expiration of the next session of the Congress beginning after the expiration of his term of office.

(d) During the period any individual serves as a member he shall not engage in any other employment, business, or vocation, or have any direct or indirect pecuniary interest in any electrical power, natural gas, petroleum, or other energy production or distribution industry.

(e) Three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(f) A Chairman shall be selected from among the members by the President. The Commission annually shall elect a Vice Chairman to act in case of the absence or disability of the Chairman, or in case of a vacancy in the office of the Chairman.

(g) The Chairman shall be compensated at the rate provided by level II of the Executive Salary Schedule under section 5313 of title 5, United States Code. Other members shall be compensated at the rate provided by level III of the Executive Salary Schedule under section 5314 of such title.

(h) The Commission may appoint a Director and such staff personnel as it deems desirable. The Director and staff of the Commission shall be appointed subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(i) The Commission shall have an official seal, of which judicial notice shall be taken.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) In order to carry out the purpose of this Act, the Commission may—

(1) make such expenditures and enter into such contracts as it deems necessary;

(2) promulgate regulations to carry out its functions;

(3) subject to subsection (b), procure the services of experts and consultants to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 (b) of title 5, United States Code;

(4) subject to subsection (b), utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel who may be allowed transportation expenses, including per diem expenses, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for individuals serving without pay;

(5) purchase lands or interests therein;

(6) purchase, rent, or lease office space; and

(7) make grants with respect to any research program established or maintained under section 5.

(b) In obtaining the services of individuals under subsection (a) (3) or (a) (4), the Commission shall seek such individuals from all segments of electrical power, natural gas, petroleum, or other energy production or distribution industries from State and municipal governmental units, environmentalist groups, consumer groups, institutions of higher education, and Federal executive agencies. Upon request of the Commission, the head of any Federal executive agency is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel or such agency to the Commission to assist it in carrying out the purpose of this Act.

(c) The Commission shall, for the purpose of examination and audit, require that any

person receiving a grant under subsection (a) (7) shall maintain such records as the Commission shall prescribe, including—

(1) the amount and disposition by such person of funds received under such grant;

(2) the total cost of the project in connection with which such funds were given or used;

(3) the amount and nature of the portion of the cost of the project supplied by any other source; and

(4) any other record which the Commission deems necessary.

(d) The Commission and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any authorized representative thereof, shall have access, for the purpose of examination or audit, to any record of any person receiving a grant under subsection (a) (7) which is maintained pursuant to requirements prescribed by the Commission under subsection (c).

RESEARCH PROGRAMS

SEC. 5. (a) The Commission shall establish and maintain research, development, testing, and evaluation programs which shall seek to—

(1) develop low-cost, environmentally sound energy sources and energy generation, transmission, and distribution processes for transportation, industrial, and residential use, and other areas, with primary emphasis on the development of all aspects of solar energy sources and new sources of energy for self-propelled vehicles;

(2) develop processes and techniques of energy conservation for use in construction, transportation, and in the manufacture of consumer and capital goods;

(3) eliminate the adverse environmental impact of energy generation, transmission, and distribution processes, especially the present fission technology of civilian nuclear programs;

(4) increase the efficient generation, transmission, and distribution of energy; and

(5) explore other areas related to energy generation, transmission, and distribution.

(b) The Commission shall publish and distribute, at such times and in such manner as it deems appropriate, any information, discovery, development, or related matter produced by any program established and maintained under subsection (a).

PETROLEUM RESERVES

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission, in order to safeguard national security, shall establish and maintain national defense petroleum reserves on public lands of the United States which shall have a petroleum-producing capacity sufficient to protect the United States against a continuous one-year interruption of importation of petroleum from all foreign countries (except those contiguous to the United States), which the Commission determined to be an insecure source of petroleum.

(b) The Commission, to any extent it deems necessary or appropriate, may treat existing petroleum reserves (established under chapter 641 of title 10, United States Code) as part of the national defense petroleum reserves, and for this purpose the Commission may purchase lands or interests in areas adjacent to such existing reserves and may enter into contracts which protect or increase the capacity of such existing reserves.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to require or authorize—

(1) the cancellation or termination of any existing lease; or

(2) the taking or use of any lands which are, on the date of the enactment of this Act, within the national parks system or which are, on such date, parts of national forests, national seashores, game refuges, or any other lands which have been otherwise

set aside by the United States, any State, or any local government for purposes of recreation, conservation, or public use.

MINERAL DEPOSIT INVENTORY

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission shall prepare annually an inventory of mineral deposits in the Nation and shall submit such inventory to the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Power Commission, and the Secretary of the Interior in order to promote coordination among them regarding energy planning. The first such inventory shall be completed on or before June 30 of the second calendar year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) Any prospector, mine operator, or well operator who makes any discovery of any substantial mineral deposit (as determined by the Commission) after the date of the enactment of this Act shall, no later than 30 days after such discovery, file a report with the Commission, in such form as the Commission may prescribe, setting forth the following information regarding such discovery—

(1) the type of mineral, the estimated volume of the deposit, and the estimated quality of the unprocessed mineral;

(2) the location of the deposit; and

(3) the name and address of—

(A) any owner of the deposit; and

(B) the person filing the report.

(c) Any prospector, mine operator, or well operator who owns or has legal authority, by lease, license, or otherwise, to exploit any substantial mineral deposit (as determined by the Commission) discovered before the date of the enactment of this Act shall file a report within one year after such date of enactment setting forth the information described in paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (b).

(d) Any member of the Commission, or any duly authorized representative of the Commission, may enter during business hours the site of any substantial mineral deposit for the purpose of conducting independent tests to determine the accuracy of the reported quality, volume, and location of the deposit.

(e) Any member of the Commission, or any duly authorized representative of the Commission, may inspect or examine any record or document relating to the estimated quality, volume, and location of the deposit.

(f) Any person who willfully fails to file any report required under subsection (b) or (c), or files any report under subsection (b) or (c) with the knowledge that such report is erroneous in any material respect, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION

SEC. 8. (a) Any information received by the Commission under section 4(d), 7(b), 7(c), 7(d), or 7(e) may be published or otherwise disclosed by the Commission, except that no information may be disclosed (except as provided by subsection (b)) if—

(1) the disclosure of such information, in the opinion of the Commission, would be adverse to the public interest;

(2) such information contains or relates to any trade secret or other matter referred to in section 1905 of title 18, United States Code; or

(3) the Commission determines that such disclosure of such information would give an unfair competitive advantage to any person.

(b) The Commission may disclose any information received by it under section 4(d), 7(b), 7(c), 7(d), or 12(e) to—

(1) other Federal officers or employees concerned with carrying out the purposes of this Act; and

(2) the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate, for the purpose of ascertaining the accuracy of any Federal tax return.

Any information falling within subsection (a) (1), (a) (2), or (a) (3) shall not be published or disclosed by any person receiving such information under this subsection.

COOPERATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES

SEC. 9. The Commission, in carrying out the purpose of this Act, shall coordinate its activities, in order to avoid any duplication in policy planning, with the Departments of the Interior, Commerce, Agriculture, Defense, and Transportation, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Federal Power Commission.

COMMISSION REPORTS

SEC. 10. (a) The Commission shall prepare—

(1) a report of the petroleum-producing capacity in reserves maintained under section 6 during each calendar quarter after the date of the enactment of this Act, to be submitted to the Joint Committee on Defense Production within 30 days after the close of each such quarter;

(2) a report, from time to time for submission to the Attorney General of the United States, recommending action to preserve competition among businesses engaged in the production of coal, oil, natural gas, or uranium;

(3) a report, to be submitted annually to the Congress, setting forth information regarding the supply of mineral deposits discovered during the preceding calendar year, and the estimate of the Commission of the total remaining mineral reserves of the Nation by categories; and

(4) a comprehensive report, to be submitted to the President who shall transmit such report to the Congress * * *

**RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE:
DOMESTIC PROGRAMS CUT, TO
PROVIDE AID TO NORTH VIETNAM**

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, today I reported to my people on the inconsistencies in Federal spending priorities. I insert the text of that report:

REPORT

Over the years I have supported the President when I thought he was right, and opposed him when I considered his proposals not to be in the best interest of the country or the people of the Sixth District. Most often in the past, I have sided with the President. My agreement with him particularly has been in the area of reducing inflation and preventing tax increases. I have long supported Mr. Nixon in his avowed goal to reduce and control inflationary federal spending.

But I have witnessed a noticeable difference between what the President says about reducing inflation, and what the results of his actions actually are. Mr. Nixon's March 29th address to the country, the one where he clamped a price ceiling on meat prices, was a fine example of the maneuvering that earned the President recognition as a "master politician."

The thrust of the President's message would lead the public to believe that Congress is to blame for the runaway spending that has brought about the inflationary trend in this country. He admitted to submitting the largest budget in the history of the country—268 billion dollars—but added that some members of Congress believe that domestic spending should be even more. Mr. Nixon

went on to estimate that if he approved the increases that Congress had attached to the budget, "it would mean a 15 percent increase in your taxes, or an increase in prices..."

And for this reason, the President said he would veto the bills that would "break the federal budget." He added: "If I did not veto these bills, increased prices or taxes would break the family budget of millions of Americans..."

If this were the actual case, I certainly would support the President and vote to sustain his vetoes.

My voting record over the seven years I have been in Congress should prove I am not a big spender. I am a fiscal conservative. In fact I have voted to go along with the President in each of his vetoes with the exception of one.

But a look at the record of fiscal responsibility, gives the President's anti-inflation proclamation a completely different tone.

Mr. Nixon continues to veto domestic programs that would use tax money to aid Americans. We are told that such programs are "inflationary" and would only increase federal spending to dangerous levels. But the President's adamant refusal to even reconsider his so-called "commitment" to provide aid and assistance to North Vietnam, destroys any logic or credibility his anti-inflation posture may have.

Something that I cannot understand is why it is inflationary to spend money for domestic use here at home, but spending tax money to rebuild the war machine of Communist North Vietnam or for that matter the Soviet Union and Red China is a non-inflationary "investment in peace". The people I have talked to in Baton Rouge, Hammond, Denham Springs, in fact all over the district, cannot understand cutting off money to worthwhile domestic federal programs in this country, just to turn around and give the money to North Vietnam (or any other foreign country for that matter).

But that's what the President has proposed. The most often quoted figure for North Vietnam is \$2.5 billion. If spending that amount of taxpayer's money, without returning one cent of benefits to the people who gave the government the tax money in the first place, isn't inflationary and fiscal irresponsible—then I don't know the meaning of the words.

If continuing to spend our tax dollars overseas doesn't also constitute a potential threat of new taxes, then I don't understand deficit spending.

But I do know what irresponsible and inflationary means, and so do the people of this country. That's the reason that in every national opinion poll recently, the people of the United States have solidly opposed aid to North Vietnam. Yet the President continues to attempt to ram this "commitment" past Congress. This determination to give away tax money to North Vietnam is hardly in line with what the president told us to be the "goal of the new prosperity"—which is to "hold down the federal budget."

I am certainly not trying to say that the President is fully responsible for reckless federal spending. The Congress must accept its share of blame for putting this nation on the inflationary treadmill. Congress has tried to buy the vote of every pressure group in the country by giving away huge sums of money in the form of aid, grants, and loans. In many instances this is irresponsible spending. But at least in the case of domestic programs, some of the money is returned to the taxpayers. How many U.S. taxpayers will benefit from the money the President is reported to want to send to North Vietnam?

Let's look for a few minutes at some of the programs the Congress has appropriated money for, and the President has seen fit to impound the funds or veto completely.

Damage done to property in Louisiana, or any other state, by the flooding Mississippi

River or by hurricane is no longer covered by the Emergency Disaster Loan Program. The money was voted by Congress. It was in the budget. But the President impounded the funds. He said that his action was in line with sound fiscal policy. But that argument doesn't hold water. While he was cutting disaster protection loans for Americans, he was freely spending our tax money to aid disaster victims all over the world. Louisiana and Mississippi people cannot get help to pay for the damage done by flooding, but last year the President succeeded in giving away \$31 million in disaster handouts round the world. More than half a million was used to provide relief for victims of floods in Haiti, Panama, Peru and Botswana (wherever that may be). Our people cannot get assistance for flood damage, but you better believe the people of Botswana can get U.S. help when they need it. While flood funds at home were cut, an increase of almost \$4 million was requested for flood control in Mexico.

I am unimpressed with the Administration's urging for fiscal responsibility when the President's international friends keep giving away your tax money with both hands. During 1971, almost \$300 million was given to build roads, bridges, power plants, canals, and schools—not in the U.S., but in Bangladesh. And Congress was asked for another \$300 million to give the Bangladesh last year and this year.

These are just a few examples of Administration programs that have denied benefits from tax money to Americans, while lavishing them on foreigners. But these examples are part of a trend in Administration spending over the past few years. The President's so-called "new prosperity" doctrine has not changed his spending patterns.

Just this past week Congress was called on to vote whether to override or sustain the President's veto of yet another domestic program. In January, Mr. Nixon impounded funds appropriated by Congress to assist rural communities with problems of water treatment and sewage disposal. Clean water should not be denied any American, and without proper sewage treatment in many rural areas, water pollution will become more serious. This was the reasoning we members of Congress used when we passed an act that would restore the funds and help our rural citizens. The President vetoed the measure. In his veto message he bases his action on a need for sound fiscal policy, the fear of inflation, and the threat of higher taxes.

If Mr. Nixon backed up this wonderful sounding rhetoric with responsible actions that reduced wasteful spending, I would be the first to cast our vote to sustain his veto. But budget controls of the Administration carry a double standard.

Let's look at the record. The President has denied water and sewage grants to rural Americans program costing about \$120 million. Yet at the same time he would deny help for clean water and pollution control to Americans, \$20 million was authorized for a water treatment and a prototype desalting plant in rural Israel. Apparently, the President thinks that country folks in Israel are more deserving of clean, pure drinking water than country folks in Livingston Parish, St. Helena, Tangipahoa or any other area of America. This is a double standard, and the rankest form of discrimination when Americans come last with their own money.

At a time when the federal public debt exceeds \$430 billion, and deficit spending by the Administration is at a historic high, the President continues to insist that more tax money be given to assist foreign countries around the world. It is anticipated that during 1973 alone, 102 countries and territories will receive U.S. tax money from various foreign aid programs. And if the President has his way, this number would include North Vietnam.

The President has raised the debt ceiling

more times than any other single president in the Country's history—an increase of \$100 billion since he took office. He now has the authority to operate this country \$465 billion in the red. Our national debt exceeds the combined public debt of every other nation in the world. Yet the President asks that Americans tighten their belt. When budgets must be cut and programs eliminated; it is always the American people who are asked to tighten their belts—to make the necessary sacrifices.

Until the President abandons his so-called "commitment" to aid North Vietnam, and until he starts impounding or cutting funds for foreign-aid giveaways, I intend to cast your vote on the side of true fiscal responsibility and against the waste of the American people's money by scattering it to the four winds.

It just doesn't make sense to cut off money to American programs, only to give it to foreigners.

THE REALITY OF ADDICTION

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, we who are in the business of dealing with our Nation's problems are often well advised to "step back" for a moment and contemplate the nature of these problems and what can be done about them.

Addiction to alcohol and drugs is a widespread dilemma facing our country. I suggest that my colleagues take a "step back" by considering William Raspberry's column in March 21 Washington Post entitled "Deciding Against Addiction."

The article follows:

"DECIDING" AGAINST ADDICTION

(By William Raspberry)

You're old enough to be wary of easy solutions to difficult problems. So be apprised from the beginning that Dr. Thomas Szasz isn't really offering a solution to the narcotics problem at all. He's simply describing the nature of the disease, and of the cure.

Szasz is a professor of psychiatry at the State University of New York, a cofounder and chairman of the American Association for the Abolition of Involuntary Mental Hospitalization and author of the soon-to-be published "The Second Sin" (Doubleday & Co.) from which the following is quoted:

"Powerful 'addictions'—whether to smoking cigarettes or injecting heroin—are actually both very difficult and very easy to overcome. Some people struggle vainly against such a habit for decades; others 'decide' to stop and are done with it; and sometimes those who have long struggled in vain manage suddenly to rid themselves of the habit.

"How can we account for this? Not only is the pharmacology of the so-called addictive substance irrelevant to this riddle, but so is the personality of the so-called addict.

"What is relevant is whether the 'addiction'—smoking, drinking, shooting heroin—is or is not a part of an internally significant dramatic production in which the 'patient-victim' is the star.

"So long as it is (and if it is, the struggle to combat the addiction is only a part of the play), the person will find it difficult or impossible to give up his habit; whereas once he has decided to close down this play and leave the stage, he will find the grip of the habit broken and will 'cure' himself of the 'addiction' with surprising ease."

Whether the Szasz analysis is profound

or merely frustrating depends almost totally on what you're looking for.

If you're trying to understand the nature of addiction (including addiction to alcohol, to gambling, and to overeating) it may furnish you with some helpful insights.

If you're an "addict" of one sort or another, it may be of enormous help to learn what it means to "decide" to give up a habit.

But if you're running a drug-treatment program, or trying to devise an approach to drug-treatment that has some hope of working, on a large scale, the Szasz insight may strike you as virtually paralyzing.

In some ways, it is. His analysis is very much like Dr. Eric Berne's analysis of alcoholism in "Games People Play" (Grove Press, New York).

Berne acknowledges that there may or may not be biochemical or physiological abnormalities involved in excessive drinking, but that such abnormalities have nothing to do with the Alcoholic game.

What Berne sees at work is a full-fledged game, with the Alcoholic in the central role. Others necessary to the game are the Persecutor (to give him hell) and the Rescuer (to save him from his disease). There may be other roles—the Patsy, who extends credit, the Connection, who is the point of supply—but these are the vital ones.

Berne's point is that the Alcoholic sees himself as the star of a drama, and that sincere and strenuous efforts to break the alcoholism are an essential part of the play.

The suggestion is that it may be helpful for the supporting players to stop playing their parts; but 'cure' is possible only when the Alcoholic himself decides to give up the game.

It is worth noting that both Szasz and Berne are psychiatrists, which puts them in a milieu where one-to-one is the norm.

The problem is that public officials who see narcotics addiction and the crime it generates as massive social problems have neither the time, the resources nor the inclination to deal one-to-one with addicts.

Szasz and Berne are saying that "addiction" is a game which the "addict" can give up virtually any time he decides to give it up, but that only he can make the decision. The public programs are based on that notion that addiction is a real disease, as subject to mass (and even mildly coercive) treatment as, say tuberculosis.

Maybe the public addiction-treaters have to feel that way. Admit that no one else can cure an addict but the addict himself, admit that the cure cannot be forced or accelerated or mass produced, and you're very close to admitting that the drug-treatment center is a farce.

You're also very close to saying something that hardly any "professional" would even dream of saying: Yes, there is a problem, and a massive one at that. But since we haven't the foggiest notion of what to do about it—since we're not sure that it's possible to do anything about it—we might as well stop pretending.

MINNESOTA NEWSPAPER NOTES STAKES IN SPENDING BATTLE

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. NELSEN, Mr. Speaker, considering the great pressure all of us are under with regard to Federal spending issues, it is encouraging to find voices in the press who recognize that the financial integrity of the United States must be protected. One such voice is the Shakopee Valley News of Shakopee, Minn., in my congressional district.

I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent editorial which appeared in the Shakopee paper, and which helps to outline the importance of controlling Federal spending. The article follows:

A BALANCED BUDGET MUST COME . . .

Some economists are afraid that the budget of the federal government is out of control. This is like saying inflation is inevitable, the dollar is doomed and national bankruptcy a foregone conclusion. Just the fact that the question of controllability of government spending has arisen could exert almost irresistible pressure against stabilization efforts.

To find out how one top authority views the problem of government spending, the editors of U.S. News & World Report interviewed by Mr. Caspar W. Weinberger, Director, Office of Management and Budget. The first question that was asked by U.S. News editors was whether there is any chance of getting a balanced federal budget in the next few years. Mr. Weinberger replied that he felt there was— "... if people want it badly enough."

All through the interview, he repeatedly stressed his belief that cuts in government spending and reduction of inflationary federal deficits depend upon the people. One reason pressure to cut federal spending must come from the people is that real budget trimming has become a long-range statutory question. Laws must be changed to curb the proliferation of open-ended spending programs wholly beyond the control of any president or administration. As Mr. Weinberger put it: "All told, about 71 percent of total budget expenditures are for things over which we have no control." These include programs like medicare, medicaid, veterans' compensation, welfare and unemployment insurance, to say nothing of the interest on the national debt. The recent 20 percent boost in social security will add heavily to the 1973 deficit. This is but a sample of the kind of congressional action that encourages talk of an "uncontrollable" federal budget.

Mr. Weinberger is against increasing taxes to achieve a balanced budget. He reports, "We are spending a little more than one-third of our total gross national product—the value of all the goods and services produced per year—and the proportion keeps moving higher." He points out that experts have determined that if we move to a point where, say, 40 percent of total output goes for taxes, it will be impossible to maintain a free enterprise, capitalist, incentive-oriented economy. "So", in his words, "the stakes in the budgeting process are far greater than worrying about whether we'll have higher taxes. The stakes, ultimately, are whether we can keep the kind of system we have—on under which we've made greater progress than any other country in the modern world."

One area in which the Director of the Office of Management and Budget believes cuts should be approached with caution is defense. He thinks cuts of \$30 to \$35 billion would be disastrous. With such cuts in defense spending, he says, "... you're either going to have a great many empty bases and rusting airplanes and tanks with nobody to man or maintain them, or you're going to have people standing around with no equipment to use." He observes that in nearly every other field—education, health, welfare, etc.—what the federal government doesn't do, local government or the private sector will attempt to do. But only the federal government pays for defense. What the federal government fails to do toward defense of the nation does not get done, and unless there is adequate defense, all other programs are meaningless.

Mr. Weinberger reinforced his plea for grassroots support of cutbacks in non-essential government spending programs by noting that, "A lot of people think that a balanced budget means a sterile, unimaginative, noncreative government. I don't think it means anything of the kind. It means that you have to be imaginative and ingenious, and that you have to try something new, rather than just piling new spending programs on top of old ones." To the final question of, "Do you have a new formula to try out?", he concluded: "No. The only new formula is the willingness to act responsibly—something that too few people have been willing to do in the past."

Speaking as the man who knows as much as anyone about the finances of the federal government, Mr. Weinberger clearly was addressing his last remark to Congress and to all citizens on whose shoulders rests the fate of the financial integrity of the United States.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA BUSINESS IN SUPPORT OF MASS TRANSIT

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, some of us who have been working to open the highway trust fund to provide revenue for rapid mass transit sometimes forget the large and still growing amount of support for our actions.

The Southern California Business newspaper produced by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce recently printed an editorial which is an excellent reminder of the Los Angeles area's support for increased Federal mass transit funding.

Their editorial is a well-written one with several salient points. Because of its merit, I am providing my colleagues with an opportunity to read Southern California Business' editorial in support of opening the highway trust fund for mass transit revenue:

HIGHWAY FUNDS FOR MASS TRANSIT

Mass transit, recognized as desperately needed years ago by this Chamber's leadership, is finally receiving the same support from both Federal and State governments. We applaud recent moves aimed at opening up both Federal and State highway gas tax funds for use in developing mass transit facilities.

Increasingly, motorists who have paid for our highway network have come to realize that total dependence on a single mode of transportation cannot meet our optimum needs for mobility. Pollution, congestion, energy demands and the cost of operating the automobile will force drastic changes in our life style, as recently dramatized by the Environmental Protection Agency's gas rationing proposal, unless immediate steps are taken to provide an attractive, efficient transportation alternative.

Of course it will take money to build a mass transit system and the highway trust fund is the most logical, appropriate source available. The fund was established to develop a highway network to move people efficiently, but that network cannot do it alone. So why not use some of those revenues to provide an integrated transportation system that can accommodate both highways and mass transit. Balanced transportation is our goal, but to accomplish it we must have financial flexibility.

In 1968 the Chamber supported the SCRTD bond issue which unfortunately failed. In 1970 we supported Proposition 18 which would have opened up the State highway trust fund and it came very close to passing. Finally, 1971 gave birth to SB 325, the 5%

sales tax on gasoline which again was backed by a massive campaign effort on the part of the Chamber and it passed. However, SB 325 funds will not afford enough money for mass transit especially since they are currently devoted to improving the bus system.

At long last the climate is changing. Both Federal and State governments are feeling the local ground swell for such legislation as recently passed the U.S. Senate and is currently in the House. Chamber Directors are speaking to this issue in Washington this week in face-to-face talks with our California delegation and Claude S. Brinegar, Secretary for Transportation.

It is the Chamber's objective to deliver a balanced mobility system for the Los Angeles area and it will take the combined action of legislators at all levels of government, the interest and support of business leaders and the voting public, all of whom stand to benefit.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to enter into the RECORD an article written by Mr. Walter H. Shorenstein for the Los Angeles Times on March 25, 1973. I hope that my colleagues will find Mr. Shorenstein's ideas on the direction of the environmental movement both helpful and informative.

THE ENVIRONMENT: CHANGE CAN BE GUIDED
(By Walter H. Shorenstein)

Scarcely a day goes by that we in California do not read of an effort somewhere in our state to stop new construction in the name of preserving the environment.

It may be an initiative to limit the height of all buildings in San Francisco. It may be a drive to halt a freeway connection in Los Angeles.

It may be an effort to halt resort development in a mountain area. Whatever the merits of the various causes, there is in all of them the general assumption that man-made structures are automatically inimical to the environment.

Obviously this is a dangerous oversimplification created out of the rising concern over the quality of the environment coupled with a lack of knowledge of some facts of demography.

We cannot—any more than King Canute—halt the tides of growth and change by refusing to acknowledge their existence. We can best enjoy their benefits and best remove or limit unpleasant side effects by directing growth and change in wisely controlled courses.

The demographic facts should demonstrate why absolute no-growth policies are bound to fail in urban areas. Our rising national population alone points to the need for more

housing, more office space, more schools and factories. Americans are not only becoming more numerous, they are moving west in large numbers. And, they are moving to cities.

At the beginning of the 19th century, only 55% of our national population lived in urban areas; today it is more than 75%. By the year 2000, most demographers agree, nine out of 10 Americans will be city dwellers. An inexorable tide of urban population growth is coming our way. We must be prepared for it.

At home or at work, these people must have shelter. They can be accommodated horizontally in endless chains of suburbs, with consequent sacrifice of open space and the necessity to commute great distances, or they can be accommodated vertically in high-rise towers. From an environmental point of view, the choice would seem obvious.

The modern high-rise building is one of the great engineering miracles of our age, ranking in its time with the pyramids of ancient Egypt and the Gothic cathedrals of the Middle Ages. It is an extraordinarily efficient means of comfortably housing a maximum number of human beings on a minimum of precious ground. High-rise buildings conserve rather than consume open space.

It must be remembered too that the urban real estate developer has a strong interest in improving the quality of the urban environment. His edifice represents a large and long-term personal investment.

Urban blight brings him rising costs and declining income. So for economic as well as civic-minded motives, the developer has a vested interest in the future preservation and growth of his city.

For perhaps different reasons, the average citizen also has a strong motive for encouraging planned improvement and growth of his urban environment.

If he works in the city, he will prefer a modern, centrally located high-rise office building because it is convenient, comfortable and close to transportation. And, of the monthly rent his company pays to occupy this building more than 20% of it is returned to the community in the form of taxes which pay for schools and hospitals and fire departments.

MAJOR INVESTMENT

Another 30% of the rent is returned to the community in wages and fees for building services. The building itself represents a major investment in local economy. About 35% of the construction cost of a modern office building, for example, goes into wages and fees. High-rise buildings provide the best means, from both the economic and the environmental standpoints, of sheltering the increases in the working population.

Let us have the courage to accept as given facts that our cities will grow and change. Let us also be resolved to allocate sufficient resources to keep our cities compatible with the environment.

High-rise buildings in themselves are not enough to do this. We must look to solutions for our urban problems that go beyond sim-

ply improving designs for roads and buildings within the old pattern of local planning.

We must have better planning, planning not on a patchwork block-by-block basis, but on a wide regional level, predicated less on institutionalizing the errors of yesterday, but instead on anticipating the much more challenging problems of tomorrow.

GREATER TRUST NEEDED

Secondly, we must have closer coordination and greater mutual understanding and trust between the private sector and government, so that the efforts of both can be directed toward the common goal of improving the urban environment, rather than dissipating energy in struggles for power leading to decisions dictated by political expediency.

We must, seriously and at once, address ourselves to the urgent problems created by the automobile in our cities. Today, more than half of the typical downtown area—in Los Angeles it's almost two-thirds—is dedicated to the automobile in the form of streets, parking lots and garages. The automotive by-products of pollution and traffic congestion long ago reached unacceptable levels.

Some cities have attempted to deal with the problem of banning automobiles from certain areas, only to find increased congestion in surrounding sections. Others, like Minneapolis and Houston, have experimented with utilizing air-rights over existing streets to provide car-free pedestrian spaces. Still others, with San Francisco as a current example, have invested heavily in mass transit.

Whatever the best solution, or combination of solutions, proves to be, it is evident that finding a means of breaking the stranglehold of the automobile on our cities is a project of utmost priority.

Finally, there is the problem created by our increasing need for electrical energy and fuel for energy production, both in absolute terms and on a per capita basis. As the population continues to concentrate in urban centers, the need for new power facilities near the centers of population becomes an ever greater economic and planning problem.

Although both face serious problems, Los Angeles and San Francisco are cities with bright futures, perhaps the brightest of any two cities in the United States.

Complementary rather than competitive, each offering different advantages, opportunities, and life styles, they stand in supremely strategic market positions as America again faces west, toward Asia and the entire Pacific Basin with their rapidly growing new markets for U.S. goods and services. If we in California are to realize the promise of growth without unpleasant and even dangerous side effects, we must face our problems realistically.

It will take effort to fully recognize our problems and place them in a logical scheme of priorities. It will take imagination to find the best solutions. It will take great energy and resources to implement these solutions.

But these solutions will never be imagined, the resources never assembled, the solutions never implemented, if we sit by the sea and order the tide to come no closer.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, April 11, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O taste and see that the Lord is good; blessed is the man that trusteth in Him.—Psalm 34: 8.

Eternal God of all the ages, whose glory the heavens declare and whose handiwork the planets reveal, we come to

Thee in this splendid season of spring when Thy life-giving spirit stirs the quiet Earth and our slumbering world is born anew with the rising splendor of fragrant flowers, budding trees, and growing grass.

Help us, we pray Thee, to find a rebirth of hope and a renewal of love in our own hearts this season, that life for us may be born again and our flowering

faith make us more than a match for the mood and movements of our modern world.

Grant, O God, that we may work to preserve our American way of life and reap the rich rewards of those who serve Thee and our fellow creatures in honesty and truth, with friendliness and good will.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.