

H.R. 9126. A bill to amend the Public Health Services Act to provide for the protection of the public health from unnecessary medical exposure to ionizing radiation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself and Mr. BURTON):

H.R. 9127. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to the waiver of certain grounds for exclusion and deportation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 9128. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to contract for hospital care and medical services for veterans with service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARAZITI:

H.R. 9129. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide penalties for the murder, manslaughter, or attempted murder or manslaughter of Federal law enforcement officers, members of federally assisted law enforcement agencies and Federal employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MELCHER (for himself, Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. TOWELL of Nevada, Mr. CAMP, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. KETCHUM, and Mr. CRONIN):

H.R. 9130. A bill to amend section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, and to authorize a trans-Alaska oil and gas pipeline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 9131. A bill to provide for the conservation protection and propagation of species or subspecies of fish and wildlife that are threatened with extinction or likely within the foreseeable future to become threatened with extinction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'NEILL (for himself, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. CRONIN, Ms. GRASSO, Mr. COTTER, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. KYROS, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONTE, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Ms. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. STEELE, Mr. MACDONALD, and Mr. STUDDS):

H.R. 9132. A bill to create a Marine Resources Conservation and Development Fund, to provide for the distribution of

revenues from outer Continental Shelf lands; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKLE (for himself, Mr. BELL, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. ROE, Mr. THORNTON, and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 9133. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to designate certain institutions of higher education as national energy research centers; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 9134. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H.R. 9135. A bill to provide for the regulation of surface coal mining for the conservation, acquisition, and reclamation of surface areas affected by the coal mining activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. KYROS, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mrs. GRASSO, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. LENT):

H.R. 9136. A bill to extend on an interim basis the jurisdiction of the United States over certain ocean areas and fish in order to protect the domestic fishing industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself, Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MACDONALD, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. REES, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROSE, Mr. STARK, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 9137. A bill to extend on an interim basis the jurisdiction of the United States over certain ocean areas and fish in order to protect the domestic fishing industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina:

H.R. 9138. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for emergency allotment lease and transfer of certain tobacco allotments or quotas in disaster areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 9139. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to restore the survivor annuities of certain remarried spouses whose remarriages have terminated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 9140. A bill to divorce the businesses of production, refining, and transporting of petroleum products from that of marketing petroleum products; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 9141. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe regulations governing the humane treatment of animals transported in air commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHOUP:

H.R. 9142. A bill to restore, support, and maintain modern, efficient, rail service in the Northeast region of the United States, to designate a system of essential rail lines in the Northeast region, to provide financial assistance to rail carriers in the Northeast region, to improve competitive equity among surface transportation modes, to improve the process of Government regulation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.J. Res. 649. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of Guglielmo Marconi; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DRINAN (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. POWELL, Mr. RIEGLE, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. YOUNG of Georgia and Mr. KASTENMEIER):

H.J. Res. 650. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States lowering the age requirements for membership in the Houses of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.J. Res. 651. Joint resolution relating to the taking of the 1974 Census of Agriculture; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEATING:

H.J. Res. 652. Joint resolution designating certain election days as legal public holidays, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPIN:

H. Con. Res. 261. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a moratorium be declared on any further abandonment of rail services or facilities within the rural nonmetropolitan regions of the United States until such time that appropriate investigations can be conducted to determine what might be done to continue such service where it is determined to be essential to the continued growth and development of communities and industries located within such regions. This moratorium shall remain in effect until at least June 30, 1974; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FRANK KELLOGG RECEIVES AWARD

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, recently the Honorable Francis L. Kellogg, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Refugee and Migration Affairs, was

awarded the medallion of the Hebrew University.

This presentation was made in recognition of his work in helping Russian Jews during their trip from the Soviet Union to Israel.

I also believe that Frank Kellogg deserves recognition for the help he gave me in getting the funds appropriated by Congress to help resettle Russian Jews in Israel released and turned over to the agencies which work with the emigrants.

At this time I enter into the RECORD Mr. Kellogg's acceptance speech:

REMARKS MADE BY THE HONORABLE FRANCIS L. KELLOGG

Excellencies, President Harman, Distinguished Faculty and Staff, Friends new and old: I am pleased and honored to accept this award, the Medallion of the Hebrew University.

But, Mr. President, in accepting it, I receive it not for myself but for the American people. Our nation, like yours, has a time-honored tradition of concern for immigrants and refugees. Since our earliest history refugees

and migrants have been welcomed to our shores, as Thomas Jefferson said, "to enjoy the blessings of liberty."

The American people respond to humanitarian causes quickly and compassionately. Annually they give over \$600,000,000 to the voluntary agencies of their choice for good works overseas—more than two dollars for every one dollar of additional help provided refugees by our Government.

Mr. President, I accept this award, too, on behalf of the United States Congress and in particular of Senator Javits and Muskie and Congressmen Bingham and Halpern, for they led the way in providing the material assistance that represents the will and the desire of the people of America to help in the task of giving Soviet refugees a new life in a new country.

And finally, Mr. President, I accept the Medallion on behalf of Secretary of State William P. Rogers, who so often has expressed his concern for the plight of refugees wherever they may be and his belief, the belief of free people throughout the world, that no man should be born without the right of freedom of movement.

May I also mention the members of my own staff at the Department of State, who labor long and diligently in the interest of refugees.

While we recognize the importance of feeding and clothing the hungry—providing medicine and shelter to the needy—these I might add are not the accomplishments of my office of which I am proud. Significant and measurable progress has been made during my years of tenure with regard to:

The principle of freedom of movement.

The inalienable rights of refugees as expressed in the Protocol and Convention on the Status of Refugees.

The right of asylum—what the French call nonrefoulement—assurance that a refugee will not be forced to return to his country at the risk of his life.

And the Travel Document which assures a refugee safe travel abroad and a safe return to his new country.

These are the milestones of which I personally am most proud.

And now I have a confession and a pledge to make to you. On the morning after my arrival in your country I was interviewed on your radio and under the pressure of time—as the hands of the studio clock moved inexorably onwards—and with so much to say, I spoke of your country as "small."

Size as measured by metes and bounds, by square meters, by acres or miles is but one measure of the scope of a country. In the days that followed by arrival here I have seen more significant dimensions:

The concern and compassion with which your people receive the many newcomers from overseas;

The warmth and welcome you offer them;

The respect they are given;

And many other things.

Last night still another dimension—your great Philharmonic Orchestra with its talent equal to any, and with musicians from Russia playing alongside their new countrymen.

And the breathtaking Weizmann Institute with its research laboratories and library.

And now this great and justly famed institution of learning, the Hebrew University, and its coveted Medallion.

And so I pledge I shall never again refer to your country as "small."

FRANK BATTAGLIA

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1973

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is a little hard to comprehend that within a few

days the House of Representatives will find itself without the valuable services of Frank Battaglia who, for 30 years, has served the House so faithfully as an Official Reporter.

Frank now is dean of the Official Reporters corps. It is through his efforts and the efforts of his colleagues that the amazing job of preparing transcripts for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is carried out with such speed and accuracy. I question that any of us adequately appreciates the truly excellent work which this dedicated group accomplishes for the Congress. Over the years, I have marveled again and again at the manner in which they manage to record verbatim the words uttered in the often confusing atmosphere of this Chamber.

Frank Battaglia came to us well prepared for his work. He studied shorthand at DeWitt Clinton High School in his native New York City. He later used his skill in several positions while attending night school. Working his way through City College of New York and Fordham Law School, he then worked as a freelance shorthand reporter in almost every court in New York City.

Arriving in Washington where he had heard there was an acute shortage of shorthand reporters, he worked for various Federal agencies and later became a specialist at reporting committee hearings.

Named an Official Reporter of Debates in 1943, Frank came to us through recognition of his capabilities by Speaker Sam Rayburn and he has been here ever since.

Now he is retiring after 30 years and he will be missed. All of us who have known and admired him over the years wish him good luck and good health in his retirement and we take solace in the fact that those Official Reporters who remain with us have had Frank Battaglia as their mentor, teacher, and example.

LETTER TO BE READ ON CAPITOL STEPS

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I received a letter from the Honorable D. B. Xuan Minh, first vice president of the House of Representatives in South Vietnam. I feel my response is self-explanatory.

Today I submitted this same letter to the Woman's International League for Peace and Freedom to be read at their rally held this noon on the steps of the Capitol. I wish to submit it to the RECORD now:

The Honorable D. B. Xuan Minh: I regret that I cannot accept the spirit or substance of your recent letter. You speak of "freedom" when your country has been a stage for the world showing kidnapping, imprisonment, and torture. The leaders of the opposition parties are nowhere visible. Your "democracy" seems to have no more credibility than its paper claims of civil rights and liberties for all.

Can you dispute that in January 1973,

Deputy Ho Ngoc Nhuan of your National Assembly disclosed a new version of what we knew previously as Operation Phoenix? Is it not true that under this plan anyone with allegiances to the opposition is subject to arrest and indefinite imprisonment?

There is widespread belief in this country that our own civilian advisors are now serving as counsel to the National Police Special Branch in Saigon, or to the Provincial Interrogation Centers. Can you deny the truth of this rumor?

This prevailing philosophy which denies all civil liberties is only one aspect of your government that I distrust. Far more serious, I believe, is your utter disregard for the humane priorities of all other "free societies." War orphans in South Vietnam number in the hundreds of thousands, possibly millions, and adequate care is visibly lacking. Much of your population is now one of refugees and yet no viable planning has been developed for their support.

The vast amount of American foreign aid you receive does not go to the support of these people so critically in need of assistance. We subsidize, instead, your military needs and the social habits of your government officials. Such a blatant disregard for basic humanitarianism is totally unacceptable.

You may be certain that I will do all within my power to see that all future American aid to your country is suspended. I cannot, under any circumstances, see the justification for such misuse of desperately needed dollars. This money must be used for the support of those oppressed people in our own country and in Vietnam, who must depend on their fellow man for assistance. You do not provide this assistance.

Any American dollars spent abroad must be spent for the good of people most sorely in need. I believe that many thousands of the people of your country fit this category. Until all the world can witness that they are truly being rehabilitated you should not be permitted the luxury of misappropriating and abusing our aid.

REBORN TAVERN

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the 20th century has been a period of advancement and progress in nearly all phases of life, however, we have sometimes neglected to preserve many of our historical structures. Mr. John Giannetti of Bladensburg, Md., is one person who has shown the insight in preserving our link to the past.

The following article gives a brief account of the Indian Queen Tavern, which Mr. Giannetti has bought and is planning to restore to its original state. This inn has had such famous people as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, and many others, pass through its doors.

I am pleased to hear that the Indian Queen Tavern will once again stand in its old style and I recommend the following article to all of my colleagues and others interested in the preservation of the past:

REBORN TAVERN
(By Rosemary Donihi)

For a sad some of us girls, once the sleigh ride's started, it's downhill all the way! So it seemed for the "Indian Queen" until a tall,

dark and adequately handsome young man stepped in to save her.

Now the ancient inn popularly called the George Washington House on old Route One in historic Bladensburg is being readied for a brilliant new future and John Giannetti, the architectural sculptor who snatched her from imminent demolition by a fast-beef franchiser, finds his off-time divided between boning up on the anatomy of an authentic restoration and trying to find the money to pay for it. He didn't offer as much as the franchiser, but Florence Morgan, whose family had owned the tavern for 27 years, accepted his bid anyway. Giannetti is instigator, author and now chairman of the Prince Georges Jaycees' Indian Queen Tavern Project to make it a county historical museum.

The Indian Queen was not just another hostelry and John Giannetti is not just another likely young man. He is the descendant of generations of Florentine craftsmen whose regard for tradition is bred in the bone.

"In our business, we use the same kinds of tools, the same materials, the same fixtivities that my father's father and his forefathers used two, three or more hundreds of years ago." (A friend insists that the weathered legend "Giannetti" is etched just beneath the magic name of Michelangelo on a statue in Florence.)

As for the Indian Queen, she's what remains of the Favorite of the Famous; she was the finest tavern in town in what was then the second biggest, boomingest commercial center on the whole Eastern seaboard.

Annapolis was the political capital of the Maryland province and Upper Marlborough with its fine legitimate theater, race track and polite society was the social and cultural center but Bladensburg, at the time of the American Revolution, handled in its 40-foot harbor a larger ocean tonnage than any other port in the colonies with the sole exception of Yorktown, Va. Great English and Scotch factors maintained their own local representatives; shipyards and "rope walks" clustered docksides.

The Indian Queen, established c. 1760 (the 1732 on her chimney is suspect) by an immigrant Swiss hotelier, and set advantageously just up from the town's Publik Landing where a monumental Peace Cross now stands, was smack-dab on the main north-south post road from Alexandria to Baltimore and Philadelphia. The Inn, more spacious than most in the period, became as the stage lines flourished the Bladensburg coaching house and relay station of distinction.

In 1774 George Washington, Patrick Henry and other delegates found lodgings here en route to the first Continental Congress, and Washington stopped again in 1790 "breaking the journey that was to end in agreement on a National Capital." Thomas Jefferson, Henry Clay, Daniel Webster and John C. Calhoun were other ranking guests.

As the Anacostia River silted in, the great days of Bladensburg shipping ended but the important people kept coming to the now rather raffish town on the outskirts of the new Federal City. They utilized its slave market, its race track, its dueling ground and its foremost inn.

After the Battle of Yorktown, Rochambeau and his men, en route to Boston, had tarried two days to enjoy the pleasures of Bladensburg. In the War of 1812, British troops, caught in the Battle of Bladensburg, en route to fire the White House, found it comfortable to set up gun emplacements almost immediately behind the Indian Queen.

Naval hero, Stephen Decatur, came there to rest the night before he arose to be run through at the next day's dawning by Commodore James Barron on what the natives called "the dark and bloody ground."

In 1894, Jacob Coxey's dusty "army" of

federal jobseekers, on being routed out of Washington, were tented in at the rear of the tavern. The "general" charged curiosity-seekers one dollar admittance.

The river rose, the army scattered, the stage lines were long halted and the town and the tavern went into a decline which lasted more than a century. In 1940, the Bladensburg population was less than 400 persons. The Indian Queen was growing older and apparently infirm.

Yet John Giannetti admired her from afar. "When I was a little boy and wanted to go bicycling, my mother told me to notice the tavern—that George Washington, the father of our country, had stopped there. So I'd go out of my way just to look at it. I'd think about how it used to be and that I'd do something about fixing it up if I ever got the chance."

When Giannetti was elected president of the Prince Georges Jaycees for 1971-72, he seized the opportunity. "I decided I would if I could, make the Indian Queen Tavern my project; developers wanted to demolish her to make way for a roast beef sandwich shop. I wanted us to buy it and fix it up and make it a kind of present to the county. I also wanted the people to know the accurate story about the Battle of Bladensburg which some people like to call the 'Bladensburg Races.' A lot of brave men died that day. I determined that while I was in office I would see what I could do."

The second generation American, who attributes his passion for American history to the dual influences of Verne E. Chatelain, history professor emeritus at the University of Maryland (from which Giannetti graduated on a football scholarship) and a former Marine Corps C.O. who required that his young officers read and report history, did very well.

After a year of ways and means meetings, his fellow Jaycees voted the night before Giannetti went out of office, to buy the tavern, make him chairman of the Indian Queen Tavern Project and also president of the greater Prince Georges County Council of Jaycees. It's working fine. Giannetti is widely attending preservation meetings, giving speeches, encouraging other groups to enter into the project which the Jaycees envisions as a museum to house memorabilia of history-rich Prince Georges County and also as a meeting place of their own.

Architects are drawing plans, archeologists from the University of Maryland are sifting through shard and volunteers, old and young are variously banding together to raise money for the restoration. Special benefactors have been the Southern Maryland Antique Arts Association and the Topping Castle Chapter, DAR.

Vandals last spring broke all remnants of the inn's old glass but the original plaster construction is so sturdy that a fire last spring was contained within the rooms where it was started. Architects report it is still structurally "sound."

Truth to tell, the Indian Queen looks every one of her checkered years. Her steps are sagging, some portions of her faithful plaster finally are falling; a shiny grass-green Victorian "mantle" masking the fireplace in her right public room is a horror and her front porch is plumb stove in. But the best chamber upstairs where Washington bedded, still boasts its own fireplace and at dusk, in the shadows, the ghosts of Washington and Patrick Henry and Thomas Jefferson are imaginable in her halls. She is expected to be restored to her blooming best by bi-centennial time.

As for the Giannettis—the next generation of craftsmen is rallying 'round. For the last several Saturdays, John's two sons, John Jr., 8, and Gregory, 4, have come to the studio to work with their father, their uncle, and 76-year-old Gregory, their grandfather.

"They're getting," says their father, "the feeling of the plaster and I can tell you that after you once get your hands into it, it's very hard to ever really get them out."

PEABODY, KANS., GAZETTE-HERALD OBSERVES 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the weekly newspaper in America is a unique and important institution serving communities, large and small. One of the outstanding weekly newspapers in Kansas is the Peabody, Kans., Gazette-Herald which is published by Mr. and Mrs. W. V. Krause.

The Gazette-Herald has just observed its 100th birthday, and it is a privilege for me to take note of this anniversary and to congratulate the editors and the paper for their long record of community service.

Bill Krause is one of the outstanding editorial writers of Kansas. He provides his readers with a candid, humorous, and intelligent approach to local, State, and national issues. At the same time the news columns of the paper provide a wide range of information which is helpful to all who subscribe.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the 100th anniversary issue of the Gazette-Herald:

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO US

This week the Gazette-Herald is celebrating its 100th Anniversary. What can you say on such an important occasion.

People who live to be 100 are supposed to have some words of wisdom for the young folks on how to live a long life and enjoy it. Not too many newspapers care to get advice on how to grow old gracefully from other newspapers, however.

Actually, the Gazette-Herald has probably never been younger than it is today. As we begin our second century, the old Gazette-Herald is in fine fettle, thank you, and raring to keep right on going for at least another 100 years.

The Gazette-Herald has published about 5200 issues—actually quite a few more, since once there were two papers instead of only one. It has printed about one-hundred million words of news and information about Peabody and the surrounding area. We have recorded thousands of births and deaths, marriages and engagements, businesses starting and dying, people coming, going, colliding, helping each other, fighting with each other. The Gazette-Herald has recorded celebrations and disasters, floods and train wrecks. Put all of the information of that 100 years in book form and it would fill a very large library.

We sort of kept this anniversary a bit of a secret until this week. We were afraid that someone would get up a testimonial dinner for the publisher and embarrass him, or maybe folks would be hauling in cakes covered with rich frosting and candles, or maybe Jack Whisler would even organize a parade in our honor. Not feeling deserving of such notice, we just quietly got this edition ready and here it is.

Seriously, it has been something of a pleasure to serve the community in publishing this newspaper for nearly a fifth of the years of its existence. If the Lord wills it, and the federal government doesn't succeed in their efforts to run us out of business, we'll be here for a few more years.

Wonder what Messrs. Church and Morgan would think if they could see us today. Hope they would be proud.

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT NIXON

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a copy of a most moving open letter from the California Association of Retired Persons, to President Nixon. Although it was written in February, it has proved to be prophetic. At the White House it received as little attention as the needs of older people usually receive from this administration. But it is worth sharing, in the hope that senior groups everywhere will continue to speak out as as strongly as this concerned organization:

PALM SPRINGS, CALIF.

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT NIXON

The membership of our California Association of Retired Persons feels that it is representative of the vast majority of Senior Citizens that helped put you in office and backed the policies of your Administration. We, unquestionably, gave you credit for having some inner knowledge or power that was always working to make everything right for the best interests of the general public. Now, since your election, we are beginning to have second thoughts and wonder about a lot of things.

We have weathered the shame of being a part of the awesome, inhumane Christmas bombing of Vietnam that only served to degrade our Nation further in the eyes of the world. We rejoiced in your visit to China and Russia and, particularly, in your peace treaty that now appears to be mostly meaningless. Why? On the one hand, we court the Communists, on the other hand, we say we are still fighting them. Give us both sides of the story, Mr. President. What real justification is there now in continuing to fight on and on? France suffered no humiliation in completely pulling out of Indo-China, and went on to greater heights in the eyes of the world than ever before. Surely we could do no less than follow their commendable example. Why stay on?

We ask you to stop being a "Phantom President" and hold formal or informal news conferences to answer pertinent questions and better justify issues of major concern. Surely you have nothing to hide! And isn't that a part of the job of being a good leader? Or don't you believe that the public has the intelligence to properly evaluate and interpret the news and issues involving its interests? Why not work more closely with the Congress and the public on major issues rather than act solely in consultation with a few of your close associates?

We wonder, Sir, why you are permitting the slow but obvious erosion of the rights of the news media to investigate and report the news of interest to the public. We like various interpretations of what is going on. Like all industry, the news media is far from

perfect, but it is the best in the world—and it is subject to prosecution under the law. We think the news media is doing a good job. Let it report! Let us decide!

We wonder, also, about your past glowing promises to the elderly, in view of your reluctance to sign the recent Social Security legislation into law. And, why was much favorable legislation to help the needy elderly vetoed at the close of the 92nd Congress? Remember that it is the *needy elderly* we are concerned about. The elderly don't want charity but yearn to continue being a useful, viable part of every day life rather than being considered discards of society. Their talents and usefulness should be encouraged and exploited since most of this fast-growing segment of our population do not fall into the category of the senile, the handicapped or the sick.

We wonder, Mr. President, about how you will be remembered when your term of office is ended. Will you be remembered as a mediocre president that provided well for himself, his friends and certain special interest groups? Will you wind up being despised? Or, will you be remembered as being an understanding, beloved president that worked to overcome man's inhumanity to man; who helped to overcome the evils of greed that only sickens and frustrates the country? Please expand good, peaceful relationships with all countries of the world. Help enact meaningful, fair tax equalization laws, and push for laws that will put teeth in consumer protection. And, of course, there is the matter of national health, etc.

And wouldn't it be wonderful if you would work to eliminate the crushing agony and fear everyone faces worrying about security during their declining years? That is so very important to all but the wealthy. Help pass laws that would assure that all *needy elderly* over sixty-five years old could live out their lives *above*, repeat *above*, the ever-changing poverty level with some measure of dignity and honor regardless of the emergent situation they encounter. How great such legislation would be for the future elderly. What frustrations it would help dispel. Surely, after 65 years of contributing to society they deserve no less—if they need it!! After all, the cost would be negligible compared to fighting wars, defense costs or even special interest legislation enacted into law.

Finally, Mr. President, may God grant that our growing concern about the course of your leadership is groundless and that your future goals are in keeping with your position of trust. Your great powers can work wonders for your people. Use it well. You still have our trust—but we'll be watching with hope and concern. Keep us advised.

Presented as a unanimous expression of concern by the board of directors of the California Association of Retired Persons and by its membership at an open, regular meeting held in Palm Springs, California, February 1, 1973.

Attest:

MAYBELLE BIRCH,
Secretary.
CHARLES D. VINSON,
President.

APPROVING OMB DIRECTOR

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Congress on May 1 showed overwhelmingly that it feels the positions of director and deputy director of the Office

of Management and Budget—OMB—hold such powers that appointees to the posts should receive the scrutiny of the legislative branch.

The bill that was passed, however, included a provision that the two men presently holding those offices would also be required to be confirmed by the Senate. That legislation was retroactive and therefore invited a veto.

In the aftermath of this action, I joined a number of other Congressmen in introducing legislation requiring future appointees to those positions to be approved by the Senate. That bill, we felt, cured the defects many Members saw in the plan vetoed by the President while providing for approval by the legislative branch.

An editorial in the June 22, 1973 *Sheboygan, Wis., Press* offers an excellent discussion of why this legislation is needed. The editorial follows:

APPROVING OMB DIRECTOR

Apparently cooler heads are prevailing in Congress relative to the matter of senatorial confirmation of the director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

A new bill to replace one President Nixon vetoed is under consideration. This bill would simply require that in the future the man appointed by a president to direct OMB be approved by the Senate.

The earlier measure was more of an attempt at skulduggery. It abolished the office and created a new, very similar post. The result would have been that the present director, Roy Ash, would have been required to appear before the Senate for questioning. The procedure would have been unprecedented. Mr. Ash was legally appointed and properly held his position. The attempt by Congress appeared to be more a show of muscle than profoundly considered legislation.

The new measure, though, is proper and desirable. It will not become effective until the end of Mr. Ash's tenure. Thereafter all directors of OMB will be required to earn Senate approval.

The position is of equal importance to many cabinet posts. The man who drafts the national budget has influence, for example, on decisions of the secretary of defense. He is in a position to intervene with the president if in his judgment the defense budget is out of line, as he is with other specified budgetary matters.

It was not proper for Congress to change the rules in midterm of a president nor during the tenure of an OMB director. It is desirable though that in the future men of such power and influence be approved by the Senate.

TRIBUTE TO MR. O. HENRY, JR.

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, July 10 marks the retirement dinner of one of the San Fernando Valley's most distinguished citizens and civic-minded business leaders, Mr. O. Henry, Jr.

For three decades, Mr. Henry, vice president and manager of Western Federal Savings & Loan, has demonstrated his dedication to his community through active participation in a number of or-

ganizations. These include the North Hollywood Realty Board, where Mr. Henry served as vice president, and the California Real Estate Board, with Mr. Henry serving as State director from 1946 to 1952. He has been a leader in the area chambers of commerce of Toluca Lake, North Hollywood, and Panorama City, with service as president or director of each.

For 62 years, Mr. Henry has been a vigorous member of the Boy Scouts of America, including a term from 1945 to 1970 as National Boy Scout Council representative. A Mason and a Shriner, he has also been deeply involved in the Toluca Lake Rotary Club, the North Hollywood Optimist Club, the YMCA, Red Cross, Cancer, and United Way drives.

Recently, Mr. Henry was elected president of Associated Brokers, and in 1968 received a Meritorious Service Award from the city of Los Angeles for outstanding citizenship and activities enhancing community betterment. It is an understatement to say that the citizens of the San Fernando Valley and all of Los Angeles have certainly benefited a great deal from the dedication of Mr. O. Henry.

THE ENERGY CRISIS: WHO'S IN CHARGE?

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues this excellent article by Hobart Rowen in the Washington Post of June 28, 1973, which points out the great need for some kind of policymaker in the field of energy. His article deals with a problem to which I have addressed my bill, House Resolution 439, a resolution to establish a standing House Committee on Energy, which would be responsible for developing and maintaining a coordinated energy policy for the United States. The following is Mr. Rowen's article:

THE ENERGY CRISIS: WHO'S IN CHARGE?

(By Hobart Rowen)

Officials here keep talking about the energy crisis, but it's hard to find out who's making policy—if anybody—and what's being done about it.

So far as I can tell, no one in authority has yet faced, in a comprehensive way, any of at least three serious consequences of the crisis:

There will be some shortages of gasoline this summer and, perhaps, some pinch on the supply of home heating oil by next winter. But within a year or 18 months, we could be confronted with coupon-rationing.

The only possible way of coping with the short and medium-term shortage prospect (the next 5 to 10 years) is by some cooperative arrangement with the other big countries in Europe and Asia who are also dependent on the Mideast for oil.

The dependence of the United States and the other countries on Mideast oil will pile up enormous wealth in the hands of a few Arab sheikhs, even if they decide, as a matter of self-interest, to restrict their production. And as the United States is forced to shell out more dollars for off-shore oil, the balance of payments deficit will grow, possibly forcing

one or more additional devaluations of U.S. currency.

The shortage problem will impose a discipline in the use of energy that will test the American character. As a people, we will need to pursue the kind of conservation of petroleum products and electrical energy that has been demanded of us heretofore only in wartime.

We will be forced to give up the "gas-guzzlers" that the automotive industry has produced for an all too eager public, relying instead on small cars of a more economical design. Detroit's half-hearted steps along these lines, prodded by imports, should be hastened by punitive tax penalties on the high-horsepower monsters that produce only 6 to 9 miles to the gallon.

In the last couple of days, both William J. Casey, under secretary of state for economic affairs, and Sen. Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.) have made speeches urging the Western consuming countries to coordinate their energy policies.

Casey told the Center for the Study of the Presidency that "we favor participation by all parties in some sort of emergency-sharing scheme based on oil imports carried over in international waters."

It's easier said than done. Merely pooling imported supplies is hardly likely to appeal to other nations who depend almost wholly or entirely on imports. A true sharing of the problem would also throw into the pot American oil (which still accounts for most of what we use), assuming that we follow much stricter conservation rules.

The difficulty in getting any deal may be seen from a simple fact that is currently embarrassing the Common Market: because of a French veto opposing the other eight EEC nations, Commission Vice President Henri Simonet was not even allowed to discuss common energy problems on a recent official visit here. The excuse: the EEC has not yet worked out its own joint approach to energy.

Clearly, the nexus of the American problem is the relationship to the handful of Arab countries in the Mideast who own 70 per cent of the world's oil reserves. The President's International Economic Report in March 1973 observed that the oil-producing countries "are no longer content merely with rising revenues from petroleum resources developed and managed by foreigners."

The White House thus has correctly identified the problem, but so far has failed to evolve a policy, national and international, to deal with it.

Treasury Secretary George Shultz, for example, who keeps emphasizing to every possible audience the gravity of the energy problem, nonetheless in a recent speech debunked the "spectre" of "billions of short-term oil dollars sloshing about in the market" as the Arab nations rake in money for oil. He may be right for the wrong reason.

The Arab nations, Shultz assured the International Monetary Conference in Paris, would have an overriding interest in "stable, secure and profitable investment opportunities."

But that's a big assumption. Sheikh Zaki Yamani, petroleum minister of Saudi Arabia (which alone has 25 per cent of the world's oil reserves), recently told Washington Post reporters that his country might keep its oil in the ground, rather than expand production to meet U.S. needs, unless the United States modifies its stance in support of Israel in the Mideast.

The Arab countries, in any event knowing that their resources, while precious, are also finite, want Western help in building up their own economies rather than depreciated paper money, in exchange for the oil. The importance of what Sheikh Yamani says is that the Arabs want to develop their productive potential, rather than live off dividends from foreign investment.

Thus, the energy question, as Peter Peter-

son has just reported to the President, cuts across all other problems—security, the dollar, trade, everything. We need a sophisticated policy that will enforce conservation and deal with new Arab ambitions, without making Israel a scapegoat. There probably is no knottier dilemma on the horizon, but in Watergated Washington it's not getting the attention it needs.

THE PRESIDENT MUST MEET THE PRESS AND THE NATION

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, it has become increasingly evident that the response of the White House to the series of charges being leveled against the President will continue to be silence. The President has not appeared to answer any questions, by either the press or the Congress, since the present round of Watergate disclosures began several months ago. The White House has argued that for the President to do so would be "constitutionally inappropriate." In light of the serious accusations made this week by Mr. John W. Dean, the President can no longer duck behind his constitutional interpretations, for his own good and the good of the Nation.

Two respected columnists, David Broder and James Reston, have written articles this week stressing the necessity for an immediate President news conference. I am inserting both articles in the Record, with the hope that their logic will be understood by White House spokesmen who find it "appropriate" to keep the American people in the dark.

The text of the articles follows:

[From the Boston Sunday Globe, June 24, 1973]

NIXON HAS LOST EXCUSES TO SNUB PRESS (By David S. Broder)

WASHINGTON.—There is no constitutional or legal requirement that a President of the United States ever hold a press conference, but there is now an overriding necessity for Mr. Nixon to meet with reporters. His ability to function as head of government and, in some senses his right to hold the office, depend directly on his willingness to accept this responsibility.

The President has not held a press conference since March 15. The enormity of the changes in his world and ours since then is indicated by the fact that the first question he was asked that day concerned his allowing John W. Dean 3d to testify in the hearings on L. Patrick Gray's nomination to be director of the FBI.

"Mr. Dean is counsel to the White House," Mr. Nixon replied. "I am not going to have the counsel to the President testify."

Well, neither of those statements is "operative" any longer, but they still constitute the President's last word on the subject. In the interim since his last press conference, Brezhnev and Connally have both come and gone, Phase 3 has been terminated and a price freeze reimposed, and a second Indochina cease-fire has been signed and violated. Mr. Nixon has not been asked about his feelings on the prospective return of baseball to the capital—a subject on which, one feels sure, he has strong views.

So long an interval between press conferences is, unfortunately, not unprecedented

for Mr. Nixon, who has the habit of withdrawing when things are not going well. In 1970, when the economy went into a tailspin, he went almost six months without accepting questions.

"President Nixon has all but killed off the press conference," Courtney R. Sheldon, the respected Washington Bureau chief of the Christian Science Monitor, said the other day. "His record is abysmal compared to that of every modern-day President," said Shelton, the chairman of the Freedom of Information Committee of the professional journalism fraternity, Sigma Delta Chi.

What makes the present lapse far more damaging than the previous ones is that now the President's credibility has become an overriding national concern.

Mr. Nixon has gone to the country twice on television since his last press conference—once to explain his role in the Watergate case, on the night that four of his senior aides resigned, and once to explain his new economic policy. In neither case was he convincing. Rather than rallying public support for himself and his policies, the stock market averages and the polls show a picture of declining confidence.

We have now reached the point that the impairment of the President's credibility must be dealt with before any of the other serious issues facing the country can be addressed. Either he must answer the multitude of questions about what happened in his Administration and his re-election campaign or he ought, in respect for his office and the national interest, to acknowledge that he cannot answer them and step aside in favor of the Vice President.

The overriding national interest in his scheduling such a press conference now—without any further delay—is evident to every politician, including the staunchest Administration loyalists in the GOP. Senate minority whip Bob Griffin and Virginia Gov. Linwood Holton have said publicly what everyone knows: Only the President can clear the paralyzing national doubt, and the way for him to do it is not through artful 4000-word lawyers' briefs, but by answering questions until there are no more questions left to answer.

Mr. Nixon's stated doctrine has been that he would hold a news conference when it was "useful" to the country. Today it is not only useful but urgently required. He has run out of excuses to avoid his duty; for the moment, the big international policy decisions are behind him.

The only current White House alibi for delaying a press conference is the supposed fear that reporters' frustration with incessant Administration runarounds would be expressed in personal hostility to the President.

That is nonsense. The appropriate comment came from Dwight D. Eisenhower, who was asked at his last press conference in office if he felt that "the reporters had been fair to you in their questions" over the years.

"Well, when you come down to it," Eisenhower shot back, "I don't see that a reporter could do much to a President, do you?"

Eisenhower said that at the close of his 193d press conference. So far, Mr. Nixon has found time to meet with reporters 31 times.

To come close to matching Eisenhower's eight-year total, Mr. Nixon would have to schedule a press conference almost every week from now on. His willingness to do that ought to be accepted as a condition of his remaining in office. No. 32 should be this week, and No. 33 next week. The obligation is clear.

WHO AFTER MR. DEAN?

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, June 26.—How the Senate Watergate committee handles its investigation in the coming days—particularly who

it calls to the witness stand immediately after it finishes with John Dean—can be of critical importance to the opinion of the nation and the reputation of the President.

Mr. Dean has made more serious charges against Mr. Nixon than any official has brought against any President in this century. Anticipating this, the White House has been urging that the Senate committee now call witnesses who are in a position to challenge Mr. Dean's testimony—and call them before the July Fourth recess—rather than summoning other witnesses who are likely to follow Dean with confirmation of his charges.

This is a reasonable request. Without passing judgment on Mr. Dean's recollection of the events, and without trying to discredit his testimony or impugn his character—as the White House has been doing for days and weeks—the fact is that the selection of witnesses and the timing of their appearance before the national television audience can make a great deal of difference.

For example, if the Ervin committee were to call another witness after Mr. Dean who also incriminated President Nixon in covering up the scandals and obstructing justice, or even if it didn't call any other witness before the long July Fourth holiday, Mr. Dean's testimony would tend to dominate public opinion well into July, by which time the vacation season would be on us and the rebuttals heard by a smaller audience.

Mr. Dean has been an effective witness. He makes one wonder how such an intelligent and composed young man could have been so stupid, timid or weak during the cover-up. But in the Senate box, he has had total control of his brief, he has put down a foundation for his case that is an explosive mine field for the President, and he has been responsive to the questions of the Senators.

By a torrent of details and almost total recall of meetings and dates—without keeping either a diary or even a calendar, he said—he led the doubts of the television audience right to the President's door, and was even bold enough to plead that the President should be "forgiven"—a startling word Mr. Nixon denied to those who had defied his policy on Vietnam.

No wonder then that the President's lawyers want his testimony to be followed by witnesses like John Ehrlichman or Bob Haldeman, whom Mr. Dean has incriminated, so that Dean's story can be challenged.

Still, there is a flaw in the White House argument, reasonable as it is. The White House, in order to get a fair hearing, does not have to rely on the good judgment of the Senate committee, and nobody has yet questioned the good faith of Senator Sam Ervin.

The President is not exactly an innocent bystander in this controversy, and he is not without power. He doesn't have to leave the important question of the next witness and the doubts of the American people to the Senate committee. He can command the stage and overwhelm the committee anytime he likes.

He knows all the options. The press is outside his gate at San Clemente, watching Mr. Dean on TV cutting him up and being told the President will have nothing to say. He can call a press conference and command the headlines before the next witness.

He has told several stories about the espionage and the sabotage and the cover-up, all of which have now been denied by John Dean and others who have questioned his control of his staff, his judgment and even, by inference, his integrity.

This is not the sort of thing that can go out over national television and be dealt with effectively by silence, or by picking the next witness before the Senate committee. Especially by an Administration that has paid so much attention to public relations and public opinion.

If the President is so sure that he is innocent, that he is being misrepresented by John Dean, and vilified by a hostile press and television, he has an obvious remedy. He can come forward himself and offer voluntarily to give a deposition to the Watergate special prosecutor. Or if he is really sure of his case and concerned about the reaction of the television audience, and wants to be bold and command public opinion, he can volunteer to be the next witness himself before the Ervin committee and the American people.

The chances are that he will do none of these things. But even so the calling of the next witness is important.

John Dean has not knocked the President out, but he has hurt him badly. He has talked for hundreds of pages, and incriminated the President and many of the President's closest associates before one of the largest audiences in the history of television.

Accordingly, whatever the President does or refuses to do, the fair thing is to maintain some kind of continuity in the search for the facts. And this surely means calling Ehrlichman and Haldeman as soon as possible to answer Dean's charges before the July Fourth recess, and before nobody remembers anything except what Dean had to say incriminating the President.

CONGRESSMAN HOSMER'S STATEMENT TO SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE RELATING TO PLACING OF CERTAIN NAVAL NUCLEAR SURFACE VESSELS IN HARM'S WAY

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there follows my testimony given this day to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, together with an imaginary scenario timed in the year 1978 conceived to dramatize the point made in the testimony:

LONG BEACH BASE CLOSURE

(Statement before the Subcommittee on Military Construction Authorization of the Senate Armed Services Committee by Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, June 28, 1973)

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for this opportunity to appear before you. I am here on behalf of the citizens of California I am honored to represent. I believe you may also agree that I appear on behalf of the national security interests of our country.

Now as to the base closures: obviously they had to follow the recent major reductions in fleet units. I am not here to argue about them.

Even though the closures struck with major impact in my own Congressional District, I am not making a plea to keep the Long Beach Naval Station open or to rescind the closure of the Long Beach Naval Base or change the planned reduction or elimination of shoreside facilities at Long Beach, elsewhere in California or wherever in the nation.

This is not because I believe each and every one of these plans constitutes the essence of infallibility. It is simply because, from what happened last week when the East Coast people were before this Committee, I know I would be beating my head against a wall.

The civilian heads of the Navy Department seem to have taken an oath in blood to keep their closure package intact for fear

even the slightest change to correct even the most glaring defeat in it will cause the scheme to collapse like a house of cards.

So be it. Their strategy with the Congress is their business.

But the consequences of what they do with United States Naval Ships is the public's business. If, by their actions, they place any of those ships in harm's way, then these people ought to order those ships back to safe havens. If they do not, then this Committee should require them to do so.

With that in mind I will now speak specifically about the U.S.S. *Truxton*, U.S.S. *Long Beach* and U.S.S. *Bainbridge*. The total cost of these three ships exceeds half-a-billion dollars.

Since early in their careers these three nuclear powered surface ships have been homeported in Long Beach, California, where they have gotten along very well, indeed. From their base at Long Beach they have been able to conduct their crew training in excellent fashion. They have Naval housing for their sailors and uncrowded schools for dependents' children. They have the finest medical support. They have had and they can continue to have all of these things at Long Beach for the indefinite future—without change in Secretary Warner's and Under Secretary Sanders' base closure package, and without sacrificing any significant dollar savings they claim to be making.

Moreover, they can have all these things at Long Beach while at the same time having these incredibly valuable ships kept where they have almost instant access to the safety of the open seas in the event of surprise attack, attempted sabotage or earthquakes or tidal waves or fallen bridges or other hazards.

Logistics support available at Long Beach Naval Shipyard, which remains open and is being expanded by almost 1/2, will be more than adequate to support *Truxton*, *Long Beach* and *Bainbridge*. In fact, it will be inherently adequate to handle many more ships that could also be left homeported at Long Beach as a free bonus instead of being jammed into San Diego Bay.

It will cost next to nothing to leave these ships at Long Beach. The expense of shifting them to San Diego will be saved. The front end costs of moving these ships to San Diego have as yet not been disclosed for public scrutiny. They have to be phenomenal, and I doubt that the Navy or Federal Government for that matter has adequately taken that into account.

Although some argument is made that the ships cannot train at Long Beach, the fact is that they have trained there for years and trained there well. This cannot be denied and it is a situation unaffected by the base closures.

Insofar as command and control is concerned, that is not exercised in a harbor, but at sea and any time you help rather than hinder a ship equipped with the Navy Tactical Data System, as these are, to get quickly and safely to sea, you rack up a plus for command and control.

Despite all this the closure package needlessly sends *Long Beach*, *Truxton* and *Bainbridge*, whose replacement costs total at least \$1 million, to homeport in San Diego. The situation would be laughable if it were not so deadly dangerous. At San Diego these ships would be jam packed 1/2 miles inside the Bay behind a bridge which cannot easily be navigated at higher tides and which would trap and immobilize them if it is dropped by earthquake, sabotage or enemy attack.

Must we learn the lessons of Pearl Harbor once again?

Will we so ineptly deploy our forces and so totally ignore the value of dispersal that

we convinced our potential enemies we are no longer competent to defend ourselves?

Will we be so weakened by our own strategic and tactical blunders that we no longer pose a credible deterrent retaliatory threat?

Mr. Chairman, I hope you will and that Mr. Warner and Mr. Sanders will review the 4 July 1978 scenario or self-defeat that is attached. Its clear message is that moving these ships to San Diego is a major blunder. It is a needless defect ancillary to the closure package that should be eliminated right now, before it does irreparable damage.

Lest you believe my testimony today is based on parochial considerations let me describe my credentials. I wore the Naval uniform on December 1941. The lesson of Pearl Harbor I learned I shall never forget.

Since that time I have been a constant student of naval affairs. I won second honorable mention in this year's Naval Institute Prize Essay Contest which I entered anonymously. The essay is to be published in the Institute's August proceedings. Its ultimate point is that in periods of low international threat and uncertain Congressional support for defense expenditures, vast damage can be done to the nation's defenses.

That is exactly the situation here. That is why I warn so unequivocally that these splendid ships must not needlessly be placed in harm's way.

[Item from Pravda for July 4, 1978]

HOW WE DEFEATED THE AMERICANS—U.S. NAVY FORGOT PEARL HARBOR SAYS ADMIRAL PRIBILOFF

LENINGRAD (Tass).—Admiral Serge Pribiloff, Chief of Soviet Naval Operations, revealed today that "America's failure to remember the lessons of Pearl Harbor" set the stage for United States defeat and surrender in the recent war.

Pribiloff recalled that Kremlin strategists became convinced of "American naval incredulity" when U.S. Pacific Fleet forces were crowded into San Diego Bay and a few similar landlocked ports during defense cutbacks ordered in 1973.

"From that moment we could confidently plan victory, secure in the knowledge that even America's deadly nuclear surface ships were no longer immune from surprise attack and destruction."

"Dropping the bay bridges at San Diego and San Francisco to immobilize the fleet became the key element of the war plan which forged our victory in the six-day war," he said.

Pribiloff spoke at the commencement of War Crime trials of the American aggressors.

"Obviously we are not bringing to trial the foolish American naval authorities whose penury and short memories made our glorious victory possible," Pribiloff laughed.

THE ENERGY CHALLENGE IS UPON US

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, this week I am sending to my congressional district, an accounting of the energy situation—the "energy challenge" as I prefer to refer to it. I rise at this time to bring

* NOTE: This reference is to the former U.S.S. *Truxton*, *Long Beach* and *Bainbridge* which previously had been homeported at Long Beach where immediate escape to open seas was possible.

to the attention of my colleagues, not only the newsletter which I am submitting, but the overall problem we face due to our historical lack of planning to prepare for this challenge.

During these past several days, we have approved substantial funding for development of new energy sources. I spoke about some of those efforts yesterday in support of our Interior appropriations legislation.

Following is the text of my energy message to my constituents. I believe it is imperative that the facts of the energy situation be brought to the attention of every legislative body and every opinion molding force in this country.

ENERGY—WHAT IS HAPPENING?

The "energy crisis", predicted for a decade, has suddenly stunned the nation:

Entire neighborhoods on the East Coast have been "blackout" by electricity failures in summer and frozen by heating oil shortages in winter.

In California, farmers are urged to produce more food and fiber, while their supply of gasoline and diesel fuel is cut.

Gas rationing is discussed for Los Angeles, and prices soar as stations go on restricted schedules.

Natural gas is restricted for industrial uses to eke out the supplies for high priority domestic needs.

Is there an answer that we can live with? I think so, but it's going to be tough on some of our indulgent habits.

First, let's call the situation an "energy challenge" rather than a crisis. Our course of action must be directed toward marshaling our technology and our resources to meet the challenge rather than waiting and hoping for the "crisis" to pass. It's a challenge to us now; it will be a real crisis when the lights go off!

HOW DID IT HAPPEN?

We are doubling our national demand for energy every sixteen years. At the same time, we are discouraging the development of new supplies and new sources of energy.

Today everything we do is mechanized. We have electric hairbrushes and toothbrushes . . . electric shoe-shiners and carving knives. We have air conditioners in our homes and our cars. With more leisure time, we are using more energy to travel and to enjoy ourselves than ever before.

Put another way, we are suddenly consuming a far greater percentage of our energy supplies in non-productive, leisure and comfort-oriented uses. Since 1960 the trend to greater efficiency in energy used per dollar of gross national product has reversed sharply.

On the other hand, our monumental and highly justified concern over the environment has severely strapped our search for energy supplies.

Our environmental push has sharply curbed such sources of energy as off-shore oil deposits and surface coal supplies, while it has stymied efforts to develop new sources such as nuclear and geothermal energy.

Changes in life style have caused us to use more fuel for larger cars, automatic transmissions, smog control devices, and air conditioning.

In aggregate we have increased our use of energy, shifted the load to oil and gas, and have not developed other sources. This leaves us overly dependent on an uncertain foreign oil and gas supply and facing the likelihood of a trade deficit for some years to come.

WHAT CAN WE DO?

With today's technology, and today's consumption rate, science estimates that we have a 300-year supply of coal underground. We need an immediate federal effort to move us from oil and gas to coal in a way consistent with environmental concerns.

The North Slope oil supplies in Alaska alone offer many years of petroleum supplies. The Alaska pipeline should be completed without further delay to make this supply available.

At the same time, we must encourage new development of domestic oil and gas supplies, and remove some of the stringent barriers which we have placed on imported oil supplies. Tar sands and oil shale are two abundant but unused sources of oil.

Finally, we must set for ourselves, a sophisticated, well reasoned long-range course. Nuclear energy has barely been touched. Yet, it has the long-term potential to supply our major needs.

And geothermal energy (steam or heat from within the ground) may be the most important of all to us in Southern California. Science estimates that our supplies of geothermal energy in the 43rd Congressional District alone could light and heat the entire Southwestern United States for generations. Being relatively pollution-free, geothermal has a distinct advantage over most other energy sources.

We must also move to increase the efficiency of our energy use and to avoid waste. Currently more than 80% of the energy burned in an automobile blows out of the tailpipe. Pilot lights on gas stoves burn continuously. Neon lights advertise all night long through city streets from coast to coast. And a million cars carry a million commuters to work every day in Los Angeles, when 20,000 buses could do the job. Poorly insulated buildings and excessive use of glass add 40% to heating and cooling loads.

On another front, recycling offers a real energy saving bonus to its environmental advantages. For example, it takes thirty times as much energy to produce aluminum cans from scratch, as it does to produce them from recycled aluminum.

We face difficult times in meeting the energy challenge. And the most important aspect is our national attitude. Government, industry, environmental groups, special interests, and the public in general must coordinate goals and priorities. Only then can we hope to meet this challenge in a way compatible with our way of life.

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE
STATEMENT

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, last year at this time, as a candidate for election to the House of Representatives, I made public a statement of my personal and political finances. At that time I pledged that, if elected, I would continue to release such a statement each year. I support legislation to require this disclosure by Members of Congress, Federal judges, and public officials of the executive branch, and deeply regret that such a requirement is not already written into law.

CXIX—1415—Part 17

My statement follows:

ASSETS	
Item and current value	
1. Home at 485 H Street, Salt Lake City, Utah	\$29,025.00
2. Home at 3243 Highland Lane, Fairfax, Va.	66,600.00
3. One-eighth interest in old family home, Panguitch, Utah (owned with seven brothers and sisters)	1,100.00
4. Four shares stock—Canadian Homestead Oil	24.00
5. 5,000 shares stock—Cameo Minerals	400.00
6. 1973 Ford Capri	2,700.00
7. 1969 Oldsmobile Vista Cruiser	1,700.00
8. Home furnishings and personal belongings	4,000.00
9. Library	1,000.00
10. Whole life insurance, cash value	2,900.05
11. Unpaid insurance dividends	97.80
12. Cash value of civil service retirement	1,586.58
13. Notes receivable (Owens Newsletter and office account committee)	5,000.00
14. Cash in savings and checking account	1,242.70
Total assets	117,376.13

All property is held in joint tenancy by my wife, Marlene Wessel Owens, and me. This year's statement attempts to show the increased value, since purchase, of our two homes, which last year's statement carried at acquisition cost. This accounts for virtually all of the increase in net worth since last year.

LIABILITIES	
1. Mortgage on Home at 485 H Street, Salt Lake City, Utah (Prudential Federal Savings, Salt Lake City, Utah)	\$16,516.75
2. Mortgage on Home at 3243 Highland Lane, Fairfax, Va. (Riggs National Bank, Washington, D.C.)	36,063.74
3. Unpaid real property tax (Virginia)	402.00
4. Note payable (Tracy Collins Bank)	5,000.00
5. Note payable (New York Life Insurance Co.)	1,450.00
6. Note payable to purchase automobile (Riggs National Bank, Washington, D.C.)	2,544.10
Total liabilities	61,976.59
Net worth	55,399.54

Our joint adjusted gross income for the calendar year 1972 was \$9,499.57. Present income is totally derived from my salary as a Member of Congress which is \$42,500 per year, plus \$1,200 rent per year from a basement apartment in our Salt Lake City home.

POLITICAL FUNDS
The total political funds of all campaign contributions received during the year 1972 were reported and are on public record with the State Auditor, State Capitol, Salt Lake City, Utah and with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. All political funds have now been disbursed and all political bank accounts closed.

OFFICIAL EXPENSES
Costs required to carry out my official business as a Member of Congress exceed, by nearly \$1,000 per month, the amount of expense reimbursement by the House of Representatives. These expenses primarily accrue for costs of paper and printing to send out

newsletters and town meeting notices and for the costs of maintaining three state offices, including telephones. I have borrowed \$5,000 to cover costs to date and have formed a committee of three, known as the Owens Newsletter and Office Account Committee, which will host a fund raising affair in September to pay back the \$5,000 I have borrowed and to pay prospective costs for the following 12 months.

THE IRISH CRISIS

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Fred Burns O'Brien has compiled a group of materials proposing a solution to the present situation in Northern Ireland which merits consideration. As a frequent visitor to the North, and a student of the political and social developments which has created the crisis in Northern Ireland, Mr. O'Brien speaks with considerable knowledge of the subject. I am placing in the record a collection of pieces, edited with an introduction by Mr. O'Brien, which outline at least one approach to resolving the tragic crisis which has been plaguing Northern Ireland for many years:

REGIONALISM: A SOLUTION TO
THE IRISH CRISIS

(Edited by Fred Burns O'Brien)

INTRODUCTION

The events in Northeast Ireland over the past four years have been particularly tragic in Ireland's incessant struggle to attain self-determination for her people. The present conflict could best be curtailed with the implementation of a system of government for the entire island that would be conducive to the interests of the various Irish communities that will be vying for power. A system must be created that would cater to the loyalists that predominate in the Six Counties known to the world as Northern Ireland as well as the aspirations of nationalists who are in the minority.

Such a system does exist and has been given scrutiny by politicians in the North who are diversely opposed on most issues. This system is based on a federal approach similar to that of the United States and it will provide for a gracious amount of autonomy for the four historic regions of Ireland. Loyalist John Taylor, a former minister in the Northern Government would accept a form of "regionalism", but would prefer it to be for an independent Ulster state with special relationships to the remainder of Ireland and Britain. On the other side of the political coin Frank McManus, M.P., who is one of the representatives for Northern Ireland in the British House of Commons, has done extensive research on "regionalism" in an all Ireland context that would include all of the island in one nation. Realizing the frugality of his logic, the utmost consideration must be given to Mr. McManus' efforts.

In his book "Ulster," Mr. McManus calls for a new consciousness for Ulster, retaining its regional identity in a federal Ireland. His proposals have been well received by the many U.S. legislators who have had the opportunity to discuss an Irish solution with

Mr. McManus. American concern over the North is essential to the Irish people as so many have been historically exiled to the United States. (Today there are approximately 25 million people of Irish extraction in the United States.) Also, the American social conscience and a basic belief in freedom is welcomed by the Irish nation. The American and Irish traditions have been parallel and they have fought the same enemy for the same principles as they both sought freedom and national self-determination according to the tenets of international law.

Mr. Harold Wilson, Opposition Leader of the British Government has alluded to the reunification of Ireland in a fifteen point peace plan; all he lacked was a means of implementation which is provided by regionalism, that guarantees the present Province of Northern Ireland a continued status within a united Ireland. It is certain that both the National Coalition now governing Ireland and the Fianna Fail Opposition in the Irish Republic would be amenable to a conducive plan for the reunification of their country. To date Regionalism is the only detailed plan of government that has been offered for the reunification of Ireland and is well worth careful deliberation as to its merits. It allows rival Northern politicians room for effective compromise and should be acceptable to both Ireland and Britain who have an interest.

In February, 1973, Mr. Frank McManus spoke before fifty members of Congress at which time he expressed his overwhelming desire for a just peace in Ireland. He stated "There is a future for Ulster. The future will be shaped and determined by Ulstermen themselves. The future depends on understanding, on co-operation, on co-existence, on the agreement to live and work together for the good of the whole community. Co-operation must be the new name for peace in Ulster. But only a new constitutional arrangement, a new political settlement, can provide the basis for co-operation. Only a change of heart can secure reconciliation." With this plea for reason in mind, the structure of "Regionalism" is presented for consideration.

THE FEDERAL SOLUTION (By Emmett O'Connell)

In any proposed new structure of administration for Ireland a high priority must be given to breaking-out of the strait-jacket mentality of two-state planning that has existed since partition. The suggested creation of a new provincial parliament—Dail Uladh—taking in between seven (Donegal plus the Six), and ten-and-a-half counties (the Six plus Donegal, Cavan, Monaghan, Leitrim and the northern part of Louth) is certainly one such way to achieve this aim.

There is, however, one major problem to be faced if the area defined is too large, and that is the political problem of assuring the national minority of Unionists that what is being proposed is not a new version of gerrymandering, whereby the localized majority the Unionists now enjoy is diluted by the inclusion of sufficient Nationalist areas.

POLITICAL CONTROL AND PARTICIPATION

In terms of population, the Unionists would still have control, albeit, at a slightly reduced margin than that which they had under Stormont. On a nine county basis the non-Nationalist population would total approximately 1,000,000 as against approximately 750,000 Nationalists. The Nationalists would, however, be within reach of power—something which they have always been denied. For an effective democracy to exist, a strong opposition capable of achieving power is necessary. Further, given the checks and balances of a Federal system with community administration at local level, provincial government at provincial level, and Federal gov-

ernment at national level, it would not be possible for the localized majority—the Unionists—to abuse the instruments of power as they have been accustomed to doing in the past.

It should be seen then that what is being offered to the northern Unionists, is not a role of second class citizenship, such as they now have in a U.K. context, but rather an enhanced stature of first class citizenship in a united, but federally administered, Ireland. In addition to their enhanced citizenship they would also have control of one of the provincial parliaments—Dail Uladh, which would contain some 40% of the island's population, guaranteeing them a large voice in the federal government. At a lower level, they would have community control of local services, and at a higher level they would have equal representation with other provincial parliaments in the Federal Government.

BRITISH INTERESTS

The extent of British financial subventions to the Six County area is a much discussed topic and estimates vary, largely in relationship to the political prejudices of the reviewer. Most of this transfer of wealth returns again to Britain, since a vast proportion of that area's trade is with the "mainland", as Unionists fondly refer to Britain. The financial arrangements are therefore, mutually beneficial. Purchasing power and a tied market are assured for British industry, and Unionists at least, are assured of a British standard of living.

Now, if the social services and similar benefits available in the North were extended to cover the new area of administration of a nine county Ulster the cost to Britain would only be increased by 20 million pounds a year. When it is considered that conservative estimates of current defence costs in the North are running at a rate of 50 million pounds a year and rising, then the extension of British subvention to Donegal, Cavan and Monaghan, in return for a true and lasting solution to the "Irish problem" can be seen to be a very good proposition for British interests.

The query is likely to be put, "Why should Britain continue to aid any part of Ulster once it is no longer an integral part of the United Kingdom?" The most immediate response which springs to mind is the fact that Britain created the problem, and the financial cost of solving it must remain in large part her responsibility. Further, there would, of course, be a large element of war reparations included in such British payments. Just as the war reparations of the defeated German aggressors played a large part in financing the new state of Israel, similar reparations should be extracted from Britain for her war crimes in Ireland. Finally, Britain could be expected to pay because it would be in British interests to do so. Some 85% of the Six County trade is done with Britain. The inclusion of the additional three counties would scarcely alter that to any meaningful degree. As Britain's home market will be coming under intense pressure from Common Market imports, and as the traditional Commonwealth markets will be disappearing, it will be essential for British industry to secure those markets which remain open. As the Twenty-Six County State is Britain's third best customer in the world, and the Thirty-two Counties her best customer, it is clearly in British interests to co-operate in securing a prosperous Ireland.

IRISH INTERESTS

The advantages accruing to the remaining Twenty-Three Counties from a Dail Uladh settlement of the Northern problem are obvious enough and no great detail is required. Suffice to say that the present bureaucratic and centralized Twenty-Six County State has little enough to offer Donegal, Cavan and Monaghan.

Since 1926 these three counties have lost fully one-third of their people, while County Leitrim has lost no less than fifty per cent of her people. Little as it is, the cessation of such aid by the Dublin government would mean that much more for, say, the development of Connacht. In addition, the combination of peace and prosperity in an area containing nearly 40% of the island's population, could not but be beneficial to the other areas of the country. In a federal type government administration, it would not be a necessity for social services in all provinces to be at the same level at the same time. Such is not the case with Federal administrations in countries like Canada and the United States, where the benefits and costs of social services vary from Province to Province and from State to State. There is no reason other than that of a blinkered mind to conclude as the Fine Gael paper does that the only alternative is British Standards for the whole island. But even when it comes to that, Fine Gael of all parties should be well aware that it is the expressed policy of the EEC to level up social services throughout the Community by 1980. So while that part of Ireland outside Dail Uladh would initially have a lower level of social welfare benefits—and costs—they could look forward to catching up within a relatively short period of time.

EEC INTERESTS

It would be reasonable to assume that if the North entered the EEC as part of a Federal Ireland, the special protocol negotiations on behalf of the Twenty-Six Counties would be extended to include the remaining Six. The exemptions from Common Market restrictions on industrial inducements, tax-free remission of profits and longer transitional periods for vulnerable industries, would be of considerable benefit to Six County industry, and would not be available to them within the United Kingdom.

In addition, with two full members, Britain and Ireland, pushing for development funds for the same area, Dail Uladh should be well placed to obtain sufficient funds for a massive building programme for the infrastructure.

Here again, British industry will have much to gain. The vast majority of EEC funds spent developing the Dail Uladh area will be spent on British imports. Without having a prime development region such as Uladh, lesser amounts of EEC funds would end up chasing British goods.

As it is, the EEC is certain to want the "Irish" problem solved before both Ireland and Britain become full members. Urban guerrilla warfare is very exportable, and it is one import the EEC will be most anxious to do without.

CONCLUSION

It should be seen therefore, that the concept of Dail Uladh within a Federal Structure of national government, is by far the most realistic and promising proposal yet put forward for a just and lasting settlement of the Northern problem. It contains real and *renumerative* advantages for all parties concerned: The Nationalists, the non-Nationalists, the British government, the Dublin government, and the EEC. It penalizes no one, and it removes only one thing from Irish soil—the British Army, and the corruption and abuse of power that has gone with it always and everywhere.

THE REGIONAL STRUCTURE (By Ruairi O'Bradaigh)

The object of the Republican movement is to establish a new society in Ireland—EIRE NUA. To achieve that aim, the existing system of undemocratic Partition rule must be abolished and replaced with an entirely new system based upon the unity and sovereignty of the Irish people.

A NEW CONSTITUTION

The New Constitution would provide:

- (a) A charter of rights which would incorporate the principle of securing to the individual protective control of his conditions of living subject to the common good.
- (b) A structure of government which would apply this principle by providing for the maximum distribution of authority at provincial and subsidiary level.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

1. The Federal Parliament, Dail Eireann, would be a single chamber of approximately 150 deputies elected as follows:

- (a) fifty per cent by direct universal suffrage on the Proportional Representation system

(b) fifty per cent in equal numbers from each provincial parliament

2. The Federal Parliament would control all powers and functions essential to the good of the whole nation.

3. The Federal Parliament would elect a President who would be both Prime Minister and Head of State.

4. The President would nominate a Government consisting of a limited number of ministers for election by the Federal Parliament.

5. Members elected to the Government would relinquish their seats in the Federal Parliament. There would be a provision for electing a restricted proportion of the Government from outside Dail Eireann.

6. The independence of the Supreme Court and judicial system, as the guardian of the Constitution would be secured.

7. National legislation would be initiated by any of the following agencies:

- (a) Federal Parliament deputies
 - (b) The Central Government
 - (c) A Provincial Parliament
 - (d) Referendum
8. National legislation would be adopted by:

- (a) Federal Parliament
- (b) Referendum in specified cases

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT

Four democratically elected Provincial Parliaments (Dail Uladh, Dail Laighean, Dail Chonnacht and Dail na Mumhan) based on the four historic provinces of Ireland—Ulster, Leinster, Connacht, and Munster—would deal with their respective areas.

The establishment of Dail Uladh would be the first step towards the creation of this new government structure for the whole island. By thus creating a Provincial Parliament for the nine counties of Ulster within a New Ireland, the partition system would be disestablished and the problem of the border removed. Dail Uladh would be representative of Catholic and Protestant, Orange and Green, Left and Right. It would be an Ulster Parliament for the Ulster people. The Unionist-oriented people of Ulster would have a working majority within the Province and would therefore have considerable control over their own affairs. That power would be the surest guarantee of their civil and religious liberties within a New Ireland.

REGIONAL GOVERNMENT (ADMINISTRATION)

Regional Development Councils would be established to promote and co-ordinate the economic, social and cultural affairs of clearly defined economic regions. For example, East Ulster and West Ulster, having different economic problems, would require separate Regional Development Councils.

The Regional Development Council would be a single chamber consisting of:

- (a) Representatives of Community Councils within the region concerned
- (b) A commission of experts appointed by the Provincial Government

COMMUNITY GOVERNMENT (LOCAL)

A system of Community Government would replace the existing local government authorities North and South. It would consist of Community Councils democratically elected by the people on a Proportional Representation basis. A Council would govern an area which has physical and social unity, and on the basis of justice and efficiency would take and implement decisions appropriate to its area, with the minimum control by Central Government, in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity of function. In brief, a Community Council would be a local people's assembly. Councils would vary in size and area of jurisdiction. In determining a Council area of jurisdiction, physical and social unity would be the principal factors along with the wishes of the local inhabitants.

The above proposals for a government structure are put forward as a realistic basis for discussion and are not to be deemed either definitive or exclusive of alternative proposals. Further details on Regionalism may be found in *Ulster—The Future*, by The Honorable Frank McManus, M.P., available in the United States from Mr. John McBride, 110 Bosley Avenue, Cockeysville, Maryland 21030.

"LUNG" ASSOCIATIONS

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the Christmas Seal Association, formerly known as the Tuberculosis-Respiratory Disease Association of the counties of Frederick-Howard and Montgomery in Maryland, has changed its name to "Lung Association of Mid-Maryland."

This change, which was voted May 24 at the association's annual meeting, is part of a nationwide name-changing program on the part of lung disease associations. The national Tuberculosis-Respiratory Disease organization is now American Lung Association; the Maryland State group is now American Lung Association of Maryland.

All local Tuberculosis-Respiratory Disease Associations are changing to names which incorporate the word "lung." It is believed that the new, shorter names using the word "lung" will more aptly reflect the central purpose of these independent health agencies, which is "to prevent and control lung disease." Moreover, it is thought that the new names will make it easier for the public to recognize, remember and seek help from these lung associations when they have problems from respiratory disease, air pollution or smoking.

Tuberculosis was once a terrifying and widespread disease. Today, better public health efforts and improved treatments have reduced its impact, but such weakening conditions as emphysema and other smoking and pollution-related ailments have risen in importance. The new name of the association reflects these changes.

DEBATING—A PATMAN TRADITION

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, Austin is proud of our girls' debate team from Stephen F. Austin High School which recently captured the Texas Interscholastic League debate championship, and I feel sure that my colleagues will be interested to know that one-half of that winning team, Miss Carrin Foreman Patman, is the granddaughter of the dean of the House, WRIGHT PATMAN. Carrin and her partner, Sarah Jeannette Goodfriend, not only won the State debate competition, but they won by a unanimous vote. It should come as no surprise that a Patman would have a knack for public speaking—Members know of Dean PATMAN's ability as an orator; WRIGHT's son, State Senator William N. "Bill" Patman, is a distinguished and highly respected member of the Texas Legislature; and Bill's wife, Mrs. Carrin Patman, is our former Texas Democratic national committee-woman. It seems only natural that 17-year-old Miss Carrin Patman should carry on the family tradition of eloquent and persuasive public speaking.

The Texas State Senate has adopted a resolution commending Carrin and Sarah for their victory, and I include the text of the resolution at the conclusion of these remarks. In addition, I want to extend my personal congratulations to the girls and to Mrs. Georgiana Sims who so successfully coached this talented debate team. Finally, I want to congratulate one of the proudest grandfathers in the Congress, Dean WRIGHT PATMAN.

The resolution follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION

Whereas, it is a special privilege for the Senate of Texas to pay tribute to young people of this state who have gained recognition for outstanding achievement; and

Whereas, two young ladies who qualify highly for this honor are Carrin Foreman Patman, the daughter of our distinguished colleague, Senator William N. Patman and Mrs. Patman; and Sarah Jeannette Goodfriend, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Irving Goodfriend; and

Whereas, on May 5, 1973, they won the final round in the 1973 University of Texas Interscholastic League State competition in Girls' Debate, by a 5 to 0 decision of the judges; this established them as first place winners and state champions in the AAAA division; they had previously won first place in the District 26 AAAA contest on April 5 in Austin and the Region 4 competition on April 14 in Corpus Christi, which qualified them for the state finals; and

Whereas these two 17-year-old students are juniors at Stephen F. Austin High School in Austin; they are members of the National Honor Society and both serve on the Student Council; Sarah serves as president and Carrin is vice-president of the Austin High School Debate Squad; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the 63rd Legislature of the State of Texas congratulate Carrin Foreman Patman and Sarah

Jeannette Goodfriend on winning first place in the 1973 University of Texas Inter-scholastic League state competition in Girls' Debate in the AAAA division; and commend their debate coach, Mrs. Georgiana K. Sims, on her guidance and training which contributed greatly to the success of this debate team; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be prepared for Carrin and Sarah and for Mrs. Sims, under the seal of the Senate of Texas, as a memento of this occasion, and as an expression of our deep sense of pride in the accomplishments of these two outstanding young Texans.

REACTION TO WATERGATE CORRUPT, TOO

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following article for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend it to my colleagues.

The article entitled "Reaction to Watergate Corrupt, Too" appeared in a recent issue of the Lafayette, Ind. Journal-Courier. It was authored by Paul Miller, chairman, chief executive, Gannett Co., Inc.:

REACTION TO WATERGATE CORRUPT, TOO (By Paul Miller)

Partisanship began to show in the Watergate hearings this past week. It will be surprising to many if it doesn't increase.

Readers and viewers are drawing sharper lines in their reactions.

Polarization is setting in.

For the first time—during questioning of former Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans—Republican committee members spoke out against Chairman Sam J. Ervin Jr. The North Carolina Democrat with the good-old-southern-country-boy manner had bored in on Stans. He repeated the same question insistently, or forcefully. He put words in the witness' mouth.

In the end, Republican Sen. Howard Baker Jr. of Tennessee suggested that with the Ervin questioning taking the turn it had, the committee might now go into Democrat party campaign details.

GOP Sen. Edward J. Gurney of Florida accused Senator Sam of "Harassment."

Eyebrows working up and down in mannerism long familiar to North Carolina constituents and to fellow senators, Ervin seemed to misunderstand.

So Gurney spelled it out—the word, he said, was "h-a-r-a-s-s-m-e-n-t."

Actually, although it has seldom shown in the hearings, there was sharp partisan conflict in the setting up of the Ervin committee at the start.

Republicans had asked that the Committee go into 1964 and 1968, as well as 1972. They also tried to get an even break on committee representation. They contended that otherwise the hearings would become a Democrat partisan witch hunt. The Democrat majority in the Senate rebuffed them on both counts.

Thus the Democrats got control they sought, and which Republicans undoubtedly would have assumed had Republicans enjoyed the Senate majority.

All this had disadvantages as well as advantages for the Democrats. The disadvantages are, among others, that no matter

where the hearings now go, the minority may be able to contend that the hearings were not fairly conducted.

Newspaper readers and television viewers are, like the senators, split. Once more, it seems that it's in "the eye of the beholder."

A Gallup Poll reported that 44 per cent of Americans questioned said they're getting too much Watergate from the press and on the air, contrasted with 38 per cent who saw the coverage as "about right," and 11 per cent who wanted even more.

Chairman Ervin was a mite more conciliatory with witnesses after the protests from Baker and Gurney. But there was no apparent letup in his moralizing and tossing about of quotations long familiar to those who hear him regularly.

It could become boring. But meantime there are those who have been collecting Ervinisms. Some are horrible, some pointless or patronizing; some are good, for example the one used in an interview before the hearings began. Ervin said:

"As the mamma whale said to the little whale, 'It's only when you're blowing that you get harpooned.'"

The whole committee, looking sharp and being sharp in the national exposure, could well contemplate that. As could we all.

Newspapers which strive to "present both sides," and that includes most, missed a prime opportunity if they overlooked or did not have available a Commencement speech by Chancellor W. Allen Wallis of the University of Rochester.

Editors who know his credentials listen with interest even when they disagree.

He wasted no time in going to the heart of his subject. He said:

"All commencement speakers are discussing Watergate. Yours is no exception. What I have to say about it will, I venture to boast, not resemble what other commencement speakers are saying about it, except in one fundamental point: I agree, of course, that Watergate is deplorable, disgraceful, immoral, shocking, inexcusable, alarming, reprehensible, and quite a few other things besides, none of them nice."

"But," Chancellor Wallis went on, "the saddest thing about Watergate is that in important respects it is far from unique or even unusual."

"It is another of those many instances in which the end is regarded as justifying the means. One thing different about Watergate, however, is that the end is not acceptable to the academic-journalistic complex, as were the ends pursued by Daniel Ellsberg, the Berrigan brothers, the anti-war rioters, the Black Panthers, and innumerable others stretching back to the sit-in strikers of the 1930s . . ."

"By 'Watergate,' I refer not just to the intrusions on the Democratic National Committee in 1972 and activities related to that. I refer also to the reaction by journalists and politicians to the Watergate break-in, which . . . has been morally even more corrupt than the Watergate activities themselves."

"I refer still more broadly to a pattern in American public affairs which has been growing since the Second World War—the McCarthy craze, income-tax corruption in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the Department of Justice, and the White House staff during the Truman administration; eavesdropping by government prosecutors on conferences between defenders and their lawyers; military conscription in peacetime; the biased perspective of the press and television; the politics of expectation and the exploitation of subsequent disappointment; the litigation explosion; restrictions on freedom that are regarded erroneously as necessary or even desirable in a modern, complex, urban, technological society; the raise of

self-selected, self-righteous groups contemporary counterparts of the Ku Klux Klan responsible to no one and successful in influencing public policy, sometimes through intimidation, obstruction, suppression, assault, arson, bombing, maiming and killing . . ."

After discussing the increasing American public reliance on government, Chancellor Wallis made mention of President Nixon. Wallis said:

"Until the Watergate affair shackled him at least temporarily, President Nixon appeared well launched on a movement of heroic proportions to reverse the trend towards over-government . . ."

"The President attacked special privilege on a breathtakingly broad front . . ."

"The President's own unparalleled abilities augmented by the superb and dedicated service of Messrs. Haldeman and Ehrlichman, were achieving amazing progress. Totaling, which is a good index of the degree to which a government is encompassing the totality of society, was coming under control. Obsolete programs, ranging from 40 years old down to five or six years and which—whatever may once have been the case—are at best sheer waste and often worse were being stopped . . ."

"There is in fact no doubt in my mind that the persistence and ferocity with which the Watergate affair has been pursued is related to the President's domestic reforms."

So spoke Chancellor W. Allen Wallis this past week in what may be unique among commencement speaker comment in this or any other year.

PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RIGHT TO STRIKE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, an issue which we have repeatedly faced in this body is the right of public employees to strike. Although the Congress has never recognized this right by passing appropriate legislation, there are many among us who feel strongly about this issue, and I am sure that it will come up again.

So that we will be better prepared to deal with this subject the next time that it does come up, I would like to share with you and our colleagues some remarks made by Mr. Gordon Bittle, president of the California Teachers Association. Mr. Bittle's comments, broadcast over Los Angeles television station KNBC on June 14 were in response to an editorial which that station had aired opposing the right of public employees to strike. The original editorial was stimulated by a measure currently before the California State Legislature which would affirm that right.

At this point I would like to read Mr. Bittle's remarks.

KNBC EDITORIAL

KNBC's editorial displayed a common misunderstanding of collective bargaining for public employees. Two basic assumptions were made. Neither was correct.

One was that the right to strike in collective bargaining for public employees is a license to strike. The other was that public employees don't need collective bargaining,

because they have tenure and civil service protection.

Of the collective bargaining bills now before the legislature, only one, AB 1243, authorizes the strike or lockout, and in a limited way. The aim is to stimulate good faith negotiations on both sides due to the uncertainty the threat of strike or lockout creates. If the parties then come to loggerheads, the law sets up impasse procedures of mediation and fact-finding, plus a cooling-off period. Following that, if no agreement has been reached, the parties can announce they will then strike or lockout.

But any citizen can move to stop this by going into court. If the judge then finds either the strike or lockout to be detrimental to public health and safety, he must stop it.

This is much better than our present non-method, which did not prevent some 30 so-called illegal strikes of public employees last year in California.

KNBC's other idea, mixing tenure and civil service protection with collective bargaining, is like trying to mix oil and water. Collective bargaining is an employee-related protection. Tenure and civil service are public protections. They safeguard the children and the public from political pressures in the schools and in government jobs.

Freedom to teach the truth is essential to a free society. Without it, schools become propaganda agencies for those in power.

The California Teachers Association believes that it will not only be more fair if public employees are given the same collective rights as those in private industry, but it also will improve the quality of public service.

I would like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, the generally unrecognized fact which Mr. Bittle referred to at the end of his brief statement. In the present atmosphere of Washington, with Senator ERVIN's committee bringing forth new information about illegal actions by political appointees every day, I believe we can all see the value in those measures which have been developed to prevent such abuses of power from being more widespread. Protections such as tenure and civil service procedures are important to the people of the United States if we are to avoid additional Watergates by Government employees loyal only to their superiors, instead of to the public interest. We must not confuse these important public safeguards with employee rights.

FISCAL YEAR 1974 CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

HON. JOEL PRITCHARD

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 26, the House considered an amendment to the fiscal year 1974 continuing appropriations, House Joint Resolution 636, that prohibited the use of funds to support military activities by U.S. forces in, over, or off the shores of North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos without the consent of Congress.

I opposed Mr. MAHON's substitute amendment to the previous amendment offered by Mr. ADDABO that allowed a 60-day grace period after which no

funds appropriated under the resolution could be used for combat activities in Cambodia or Laos, and voted against it. However, through some error I found that I was recorded as voting for Mr. MAHON's substitute amendment.

Whether the error was mechanical or human, Mr. Speaker, I would like the permanent RECORD to show that I opposed the amendment allowing a 60-day grace period.

RESPONSIBILITY TRANSFORMS FORMER TROUBLEMAKERS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, Navy men in San Diego are volunteering their free time to help the young people of the community. I enjoyed reading an article which appeared in the June 17 issue of the San Diego Union regarding the Naval personnel who are devoting their off-hours as tutors, playground supervisors, and just good friends to the students at Kennedy Elementary School, located in southeast San Diego, and would like to share this report with my House colleagues:

HELP RUN SCHOOL—RESPONSIBILITY TRANSFORMS FORMER TROUBLEMAKERS

(By Diane Clark)

A Kennedy Elementary second grader named Larry goes to his principals' office daily to report how his class has improved.

"My class came in quieter today, Mr. Weintraub."

"There were no fights today, Mr. Weintraub."

"The grounds are cleaner today, Mr. Weintraub."

Only five months ago, Larry's visits to the principal's office were probably for disciplinary action but today he goes of his own volition.

ON "COMMITTEE"

That's because Larry was a member of the Committee."

The committee's formal name is "Student Committee to Improve Kennedy's School." It is comprised of 23 students (one from each class) who meet with the principal each Thursday morning to tackle what the students decide is the biggest problem that week.

The committee members, selected each week, are not the highest achievers or goodie-goodies but those whom Jerome Weintraub says know what the problems are. Like Larry, all have been to the principal's office before for less desirable reasons.

"They develop a strong desire to see things improve," says Weintraub.

At least four teachers have asked Weintraub after committee meetings, "What did you do to them?"

"They come back smiling, anxious to work and anxious to help others improve," teachers have told him.

Before February when the committee was formed, students at the Southeast San Diego school were not allowed to walk unsupervised through the halls but marched as a class.

Now they are being sent to the library with passes, reports Weintraub.

SCORES IMPROVE

He says students are developing more positive attitudes toward their classmates and

teachers. Weintraub attributes a marked increase in the school's math and reading scores to the improvement program.

"In the state testing program in reading, Kennedy jumped from sixth from the bottom last year to 47th from the bottom this year," said the principal.

Among problems the children concern themselves with is discipline. Committee members, instead of making trouble, are urged to watch for troublemakers and tell them to straighten up.

But there are other problems, such as the trampled grass and littered campus to be solved and assembly programs to be selected.

The committee reseeded a portion of lawn, but only after each class voted to replant grass.

It was the litter problem that prompted a third grader to say, "My daddy's in the Navy and the Navy doesn't have papers around." Thus, the students decided they could learn some lessons from the military and asked for its help.

What resulted is incorporation of the Navy into the Kennedy school program. About 68 military volunteers from various commands each week spend free time at Kennedy supervising on the playground, tutoring students, helping in the classroom, devising games, telling classes about their jobs or just rapping.

ADDED BENEFIT

Weintraub says many of the students have no father, thus a masculine figure is provided.

Besides the school activity, the men take students aboard their ships and to their duty stations. They have toured the Imperial Beach Naval Air Station, Miramar Naval Air Station, fleet tug Ute and the destroyer H. W. Tucker. The Tucker has about 20 men in the project.

"The men have been very pleased with the program," said the Navy project coordinator.

KILLING OF BABY CHICKS

HON. JERRY LITTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. LITTON. Mr. Speaker, recent developments including the killing of baby chicks, the closing of packing plants, the shortages of certain foods and feed-grains and the increasing food crisis are the result of too much interference from a Government more interested in political expediency than economic reality. For months I have been predicting the breakdown in our food production process if the Government did not leave it alone. I have been predicting food shortages if changes were not made.

An America which has seldom been without in recent times finds it hard to believe that we will be without anything whether it be gas or food. Some have said that my statements were designed only to aid the farmer, but I have often said that it was the consumer who was being used by a Democratically controlled Congress and a Republican administration, and it would be the consumer who would ultimately suffer the most, economically. The killing of baby chicks and the embargo on soybean exports make it very clear to the American people just exactly how serious the situation really is.

On March 15 of this year, President Nixon said rigid price controls on meat

would not work. He said such a freeze would discourage supply and lead to black market and rationing. A few days later Secretary of Agriculture Butz said anyone who favored such a freeze on food would be a damn fool. On March 23 at the first meeting of my Sixth District Congressional Club in St. Joseph, I agreed with both President Nixon and Secretary Butz. On March 29 the President imposed a meat price freeze. What I had predicted and what the Agriculture Secretary, as well as what the President himself only 2 weeks earlier had predicted—came true. Increased production was discouraged. Farmers who had been holding back heifer and cow replacements in anticipation of higher meat prices started selling. Feedlot operators who found selling prices bumping against the ceiling and production costs increasing, soon found they were losing money for each pound put on each animal. When they realized this they started selling their cattle at 900 instead of 1,100 pounds. Each time they sold such an animal, it meant 200 pounds of beef that would never see the light of day.

The new freeze reached all food products. To say the freeze was only at the retail level and, therefore, did not affect the farmer is phoney. Retail prices set farm prices. If retail prices cannot go up to reflect increased demand or lowering supplies neither can farm prices. The freeze instead of lowering food prices will result eventually in higher food prices. If you do not believe me just look at the percentage of sows included in the weekly hog kill or the number of cows included in the weekly cattle kill. The unusually high percentage of pregnant sows going to market means tens of thousands of pigs that will never be produced. The hundreds of thousands of baby chicks being killed and the even larger number of eggs not being hatched will show up in greatly reduced broiler numbers in September. Reduced pork supplies will not show up for several months and reduced beef supplies will not hit the consumer for another 2 years when the calves, which would have gone to market from the cows being shipped, do not appear.

The bipartisan political game of words and deeds in Washington by people more interested in the short-range voting power than the long-range buying power of the consumer, is hurting the consumer more than the product. It is true many producers are being run out of business. But many are simply cutting back breeding numbers in their herds, refraining from making usual long-range production investments, selling livestock at lighter weights and taking other such steps which are designed to save them from anticipated financial losses. The big loser is the consumer who must have food and will pay almost anything to get it no matter how scarce the item, which means this slight decrease in food supply will be reflected in sharp increases in price. The voting consumer as well as the policymaking politician needs to better understand the way in which the inelastic demand for food works and the factors that go together to encourage or discourage food production.

The decision by the administration to place an export embargo on soybeans, cottonseeds, and their byproducts is a prime example of how one interference by the Government in the food production process must be followed by another to offset the first. Had a ceiling not being placed on meat, the increased cost of feed could have been passed on and there would have been no killing of baby chicks, heavy slaughter of pregnant sows or other such actions which will eventually lead to either food shortages or higher food prices.

When President Nixon threatened to stop exports of farm commodities, he, by this action alone, created more of a food shortage in this country. Farmers considering long-range investments in machinery and other inputs which would eventually lead to increased food supply backed off after the President's statement. Instead of looking ahead to higher farm prices, these farmers could see the Government was prepared to step in and shut off exports any time it appeared food prices were higher than it wanted. I am sure the President's statement obviously designed to soothe the consumer, only served to further aggravate the consumer's food budget problems. The most recent action to halt exports, while providing short term relief for the problems imposed by all the ill-advised meat freeze, will serve to further discourage producers of all farm commodities from making longrange investments by showing clearly that the Government will step in and halt the export of their product if prices get high enough to create undue public pressure. In the past farmers were able to study long-range crop forecasts both at home and abroad, and based on these forecasts, crop conditions, food supplies, and so forth, make production decisions and longrange investments. Now this most recent action by the administration adds an unknown as well as depressing factor. If the price outlook is too good, it might result in governmental action such as the recent export embargo. This then results in discouraging producers at the very time when they need to be encouraged the most—when shortages at home might be on their way. The recent embargo on soybeans will hurt farmers in my State who have soybeans planted, but it will help those who feed livestock. Soybeans represent the No. 1 cash crop in Missouri, but livestock represents the No. 1 industry in my State. It is unfortunate that one segment of agriculture must suffer in order to bail out the other, especially when the bailout was needed only because of an ill-advised economic move by the Government in the first place. This is especially the case when one realizes that the move made by the Government, was known to be a bad move at the time it was made. This is documented by the statements of both President Nixon and Secretary Butz. They both said it would not work only days before they imposed the ceilings.

I think it is time we stopped playing political games at the expense of both the consumer and the producer as well as our overall economy. We know we are going to import large quantities of oil, which will further aggravate our balance-

of-trade deficit. We know that the last 3 years are the first since 1893 that this great productive America has bought more goods than it sold. We know that we must rely on farm products to offset this trade deficit if we are to stabilize the American dollar and reverse the balance-of-payments situation so weakening to our economy. Now we find that our economically unwise moves, designed to help the consumer, are not only hurting both consumer and producer, but our economic position abroad as well. If we shut off exports of key cash crops to compensate for our unworkable ceilings on products that respond best to a supply and demand situation without governmental intervention, where are we going to go for products to sell abroad to reverse our balance-of-trade deficit? I would hope that both the Congress and the administration would carefully study the economic position our country finds itself in, and come up with solutions which are based on sound long-range economics instead of short-range self-serving politics and quit taking advantage of an unsuspecting consumer who does not understand that many Government actions which appear designed to lower her food costs are only driving them further by discouraging production.

ALASKAN OIL

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during the course of debate on the delivery of Alaskan oil, it has been consistently assumed that opinion within the State of Alaska was virtually unanimous in support of the proposed trans-Alaska pipeline/tanker system. However, in recent days it has been eloquently demonstrated to me that such is not the case.

There is substantial opposition to the Alyeska pipeline in Alaska. This opposition does not arise solely from a small band of environmentalists bent on preserving the fragile Alaskan ecology, but from all sectors of the Alaskan populace. The following letters, received by my office, represent the unspoken for citizenry of Alaska:

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA,
June 18, 1973.

Representative JOHN B. ANDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: I sincerely regret that I must write to you rather than to our Alaska representatives, but unfortunately our elected representatives have been caught up in such a pipeline mania that one wonders who they really do represent. They certainly do not represent a great number of us who make Alaska our home and plan to make it the home for our children.

It is for this reason that I write to you and urge you with utmost concern that every attempt be made to have Alaska's North Slope oil be transported from Alaska via Canada, either following the military pipeline from Fairbanks down the Alaska highway into the Yukon Territory, thence to Edmonton, Alberta or else over the Mackenzie River route.

We have seen our forests, our salmon and our Cook Inlet Oil all disposed without great benefit to the vast majority of the people of Alaska. Now we are told that Alaska faces bankruptcy. It appears that it is the stick being used for keeping Alaskans in line. Still our per capita wealth and our growth in the last few years have reached new highs—though unfortunately this has all been in the Anchorage and Fairbanks areas and not in our bush villages.

I enclose a leaflet that has been given to each and every state employee—and we paid for this so called committee from our taxes. "Government", as you probably know is the largest single employer in the state.

I particularly call your attention to the spills we have had already—almost every 6 months—on the North Slope and the spill this spring at Cold Bay which clearly showed that it is impossible to prevent or control such spills in our turbulent and often fog bound waters.

We do not want more than one pipeline except where existing land transportation systems are utilized. There is a great deal of support for your stand here in Alaska, particularly among the rural people. Thank you for your efforts in our behalf.

Sincerely yours,

LEWELLYN R. JOHNSON.

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, June 15, 1973.

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ANDERSON: I am writing to you as a concerned citizen of Alaska and the United States on the matter of the construction of the trans-Alaska pipeline. At present there is a massive campaign of advertisement in favor of the pipeline being made by many Alaskan citizens, politicians, businessmen and others who stand to profit by the construction of this pipeline. I would like to go on record as one of many Alaskans who maintain the opposite point of view.

There are many of us who feel the trans-Alaska pipeline may not be the full answer to the problem of transporting North Slope oil to market.

I, for one, have great concern over the environmental problem to be encountered, both in construction and possible pipeline spillage and oil tanker spillage. The matter of where the best market for the oil is is open to question. The midwest and points east seem to be in more critical need. More thought and study need to be given to the Canadian route of a pipeline. I don't believe the Canadian government's point of view on this matter has been fully discussed or aired. And lastly, is there really an energy crisis big enough to justify a rush job of the Alaska pipeline, or is it a myth being perpetrated by oil companies and some people in Washington?

In summation, there are many Alaskans who feel their voices in opposition to the present pipeline plan need to be heard. I know that you and others are interested in seeing more study done on the proposed Canadian pipeline route. Be it known that there are those of us in Alaska who support your efforts.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

LUCINDA NEWMAN.

JUNE 19, 1973.

Representative JOHN B. ANDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ANDERSON: You have our support for your Alaska pipeline proposals. The Alaska press and official state government attempts to make it appear that all Alaskans are behind the Valdez route is so much wishful thinking.

We have had enough oil spills in Cook Inlet as well as arrogance from the oil companies there to know what to expect. Prince William Sound is far more turbulent than Cook Inlet. It is also one of the few salmon fisheries left where the stock has not been greatly depleted. Most of us support the fishermen who are suing to prevent the Valdez route.

We want but one pipeline corridor for oil and gas, if we need any at all. It should follow the old military line from Fairbanks down to the Yukon Territory, or else go over to the MacKenzie where an existing transportation system exists from which to build a pipeline. The proposed "haul road" to build the pipeline is going to have a more adverse effect on our North country than the pipeline. Why must we be the victims for shortsighted, selfish businessmen and politicians? This is our home.

Sincerely yours,

CAROL T. JOHNSON.

JUNE 18, 1973.

Representative JOHN B. ANDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ANDERSON: I am writing to you about an issue that is of great concern to me and to many Alaskans, the Trans Alaska Pipeline System (TAPS). I am very skeptical about the barrage of propaganda that is being presented to Alaskans and the nation by state and federal officials about the virtues of TAPS. I feel, as do many Alaskans, that the pipeline as presently proposed would be an environmental disaster while having only a temporary effect on our "energy crisis". The present "railroad" atmosphere that pervades in Alaska government as well as in the U.S. Congress is most disheartening. If ever there was a time for careful deliberation and consideration of all the alternatives, now is the time.

I strongly urge you to make every effort to see that this issue is thoroughly and completely discussed in House chambers and that full consideration be given to the Trans Canadian route. I appeal to you because Alaska's elected officials' minds are closed to all rational alternatives to TAPS.

Thank you for your time and effort.

Sincerely,

DAVID T. STONINGTON, M.D.

FAIRBANKS, ALASKA,

June 12, 1973.

Representative JOHN B. ANDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ANDERSON: It is my impression that you are being misled into believing all Alaskans want the pipeline as now planned. I write to you to tell you that this isn't true, and that many Alaskans support your amendment to study a trans Canadian alternative route.

My main concern is the marine tanker route and the great danger Alaskan oil sent in tankers poses on our fisheries resource. We have no way to deal with grounded tankers which spill oil in our turbulent waters. There is no technique available to stop such spills, and the trans Alaska pipelines tankers will go through tremendously treacherous and extremely high waters. I think you should make a better argument out of this great threat. Alaska's commercial fishermen oppose this route.

I also wish to tell you I believe the pipeline is poorly planned. An engineer from Anchorage who knows this has sued Alyeska Pipeline Service Company for \$501 million. The great Caribou herds of the Arctic have been shown NOT to cross the test lines, contrary to the lies published to the contrary in *Popular Science* January 1973, and in other publications.

I believe Alaskan oil will be sold to Japan. Alaska's Cook Inlet oil is already sold to

Japan at the rate of 19,000 barrels per day! Natural gas produced there is liquified and sold to Tokyo Power and Light Company.

I warn you of this Japanese market. The Valdez route is just an excuse to sell at great and quick profit.

Many Alaskans, demoralized and nearly hopeless, consider this pipeline a fiasco of the first order. Your efforts to redirect its course have our heartfelt support and thanks.

Sincerely,

SUZANNE M. MUNCHOFF.

COLLEGE, ALASKA,

June 14, 1973.

Representative JOHN B. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ANDERSON: I am an Alaskan resident, taxpayer, homeowner with wife and three children. We have a lot at stake in Alaska, and are terribly concerned that our political leaders are taking upon themselves to speak for all Alaskans as supporting the Trans-Alaska Pipeline. As you know, there is a tremendous amount of pressure by the oil companies, the State of Alaska and business leaders to ram this project through.

Many of us in Alaska are particularly concerned about the changes which go with oil development. We have the highest cost of living in the nation already, which will certainly not be eased by a boom and bust economy. This is a historic fact in the Kenai Oil developments.

The road which will accompany the proposed Trans-Alaska Pipeline is not desirable. The problems of marine tanker transshipping is understudied and a mind-boggling concept. We were to understand that the Environmental Protection Act required that alternate proposals be made, such as a Canadian route. This has not been done.

The influx of the workers from the outside will place insurmountable burdens on our schools, services, housing (and zoning) and contribute to an air pollution problem in Fairbanks which is already seemingly unsolvable.

The changes in the lifestyles of our native and white population may not be worth a hasty and ill-conceived pipeline project.

I just wanted you to know that by no means all Alaskans support the Trans-Alaska Pipeline project as proposed.

Sincerely,

GORDON B. WRIGHT.

PS: I am particularly offended by our Governor authorizing \$100,000.00 from taxpayers money to pay for a group of businessmen and politicians to travel around boosting this project.

ALASKA ADJUSTERS, INC.,

Fairbanks, Alaska, June 13, 1973.

Re Trans Alaska Pipeline.

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: I am a businessman in Alaska. I am president of Alaska Adjusters, Inc. The company has offices in Fairbanks and Kodiak. I first came to Alaska in 1955 and have owned and operated my own business since 1969.

The discovery at Prudhoe in 1968 ushered in a great deal of excitement in Alaska and reawakened old dreams of resource development here.

The trouble with such old dreams and the sudden awakening here is that Alaskans seem hell bent on doing it over again just as it was done in the "lower 48." I am not at all satisfied that such methods of development and the reasoning behind such desires for development (the need for more gadgets and more energy, etc.) are any longer valid.

Many of us who are Alaskans, and many

of us who moved to Alaska, had this realization early and came here to escape the mechanization and madness which exists in the "lower 48."

Therefore, there are many of us who believe the trans Alaska pipeline is an anachronism and a tragic error across the face of Alaska. No matter how thin Lt. Governor Red Boucher says the line will be in comparison to the width of the State of Alaska, it is still a dangerous seed and a desecration.

In addition it has engineering defects which have never been adequately answered and risks which can never be accurately measured. I believe, as an Alaskan businessman, that if Alaskan oil must be taken from the ground and if it must be transported that the Canadian route is preferable.

The trans Alaska pipeline route is not only inherently dangerous and environmentally destructive over its near 900 mile path, but also the marine transport section has been frighteningly underestimated as to dangers and seems to have been accepted as plausible without proper investigation.

Do not be misled by the State funded Alaska Pipeline Education Committee which is a group of Chamber of Commerce empty heads running around the lower 48 like little wind-up men shouting how much Alaska wants and needs the pipeline. This is horse manure. A large number of Alaskans, including professionals, working men, liberals, conservatives, outdoorsmen, salesmen, and many types abhor the thought of the development which the pipeline will bring to this country.

They may agree the oil needs to come out and that energy needs to be consumed. There are certainly varying degrees of thoughts on that matter, but they are universally agreed that the pipeline will change the "Alaskan way of life" and they do not like to see this happen.

I realize this seems to be a manner of burying one's head, but nonetheless it is true that not all Alaskans are for the pipeline.

An Alaskan against the pipeline

Yours truly,

J. A. "JIM" HUNTER,
President.

JUNEAU, ALASKA, June 20, 1973.

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: I wish to extend my support to you and your efforts in Congress to amend pending legislation to remove legal barriers to construction of the Trans Alaska Pipeline System. It is imperative that a careful thorough investigation of alternatives be made for the following reasons:

TAPS involves a short pipeline and a long oil tanker route; incoming tankers in ballast and outgoing under load will traverse treacherous waters among the most turbulent in the world, which also happens to be located in one of Alaska's richest fisheries.

Tanker spills in these turbulent waters would be impossible to prevent, and impossible to control—as evidenced by the 200,000 gallon spill in March, 1973, in Cold Bay of the grounded Hillyer Brown.

Alaska Cordova District Fisheries Union and the United Fishermen of Alaska oppose this plan.

All overland pipeline alternative routes avoid all marine tanker traffic and the threat TAPS poses, and deserve official, top level investigation before a decision is made to go on oil delivery.

Cordova District Fisheries Union is in court to prevent the tanker route.

An Anchorage arctic soils engineer has sued Alyeska Pipeline Service Company for \$501,000,000 to force them to reveal how decisions were made to go on the current design

he says is faulty due to soil mechanics mistakes.

The Secretary of the Interior has failed to give thorough study to existing alternatives from the very beginning.

Alyeska has failed to design its North Slope pipeline and feeder lines so migrating caribou will overcome these obstacles and cross them; refuses to make public its study; and refuses to fund proper crossing designs.

Alyeska and British Petroleum have already had chronic oil spills on the North Slope tundra at construction camps even before a construction permit is granted and they appear unable to control these accidents.

A Canadian gas consortium already plans to request a permit to construct and operate a 48-inch gas line from Prudhoe Bay to the Midwest via Canada.

Interior admits savings would accrue from a single, joint gas and oil pipeline corridor.

Some evidence exists that Valdez is a short cut from Prudhoe Bay to Tokyo.

Cook Inlet oil is already sold at the rate of 19,000 barrels daily to Japanese interests.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD K. FREEDMAN, M.D.

CALL ME COUNSELOR

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

MS. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, in a profession that purports to place justice high in its scheme of values, women have traditionally played an insignificant role. The 1973 Economic Report of the President states that the percentage of women lawyers and judges is only 4.9. In 1950, the ratio of practicing female and male attorneys was 1 to 28; today, the ratio is approximately 1 to 40.

I am pleased to note that this trend is reversing itself. This past winter, two new all-women law firms opened their doors in New York City, Bellamy, Goodman, Kelly, Ross & Stanley, and Lefcourt, Kraft & Libow.

At the conclusion of these remarks, I am reprinting an article from today's Daily News, which I hope will serve as an impetus to all women considering a career in the legal profession:

THEY MAKE A GOOD CASE FOR WOMEN LAWYERS
(By Beth Fallon)

Mudge, Gudge, Sludge and Curmudgeon can just move over, along with Wily, Sneakee and Drone. There are two new law firms in town, and all the partners are women—a first here, as far as they know.

Both firms are dedicated to the law not only as a tool for securing women's rights, but also as a business in which women can be self-employed, successful and self-sustaining.

Lefcourt, Kraft and Libow opened Feb. 1 with attorneys Carol Lefcourt, Veronika Kraft and Carol Libow.

On March 1, Bellamy, Goodman, Kelly, Ross and Stanley set up for business, with State Sen. Carol Bellamy (D-Brooklyn), Jan Goodman, Mary Kelly, Susan Ross and Nancy Stanley as senior partners.

While women have practiced law for the government, as seldom-seen Wall St. adjuncts and as loners until the last few years, the emergence of young, tough, capable female lawyers in the civil rights movement and women's movement—who have argued

and won some revolutionary cases—led them to growing awareness of their own skill.

SPECIAL NEEDS FILLED

It also led to the conclusion that women increasingly need lawyers for marital problems, for business, for general civil cases, discrimination and criminal matters—needs that the male legal establishment seldom filled, they say.

"The legal profession," says Mary Kelly, "wasn't set up to look after the rights of women."

And the pressure on women lawyers to be twice as good in order to win, to move up in law firms, to even get a judge to call them "counselor" instead of "young lady"—"Well, you have to be very strong to overcome all that, and that's another reason for a women's firm," adds Nancy Stanley.

Both firms are set up for general civil practice, including wills, business law, mortgages, etc. They have interests in women's rights cases and in certain criminal matters which especially relate to women, such as prostitution. Both firms have been surprised a bit by the volume of work they've gotten, mostly from women clients.

"We expected to starve the first quarter," Jan Goodman grins, "an there are over 100 cases in the house. There certainly must be a need for our kind of service."

The two outfits have somewhat different styles. Bellamy, et al is in the Bar Building on 44th St. after a polite struggle with the management, who initially told them no space was available, when it was. The partners, some of whom came from Wall St. firms or from arguing women's rights cases for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in Washington, are all feminists whose ideology does not prevent them from enjoying bright modern offices in the staid old building.

Down at Broadway and Bleeker, Lefcourt et al work in the brick-walled radical charm of the old New York law Commune offices. Two of the partners, Carol Lefcourt and Veronika Kraft, helped win acquittal for the Panther 21 in 1971, before the commune broke up. "We wanted to change the world," says Ms. Kraft, with a sigh. "Now, if we can at least get justice for some individuals, we'll be pleased."

"Also, we are making a statement, that as a group we can support each other and make a go of it," she continues.

As to the discrimination against women attorneys, all the new partners say it lessens as big cases are won.

"While it makes it tougher for the lawyer, I don't believe the client's interest suffers from it, since women lawyers argue harder and longer, as they had to all through school. The biggest problem for women lawyers is probably being overprepared, just to be SURE," Ms. Kraft says.

"We're discovering that we can do it, and we've all had experience," notes Carol Libow, who spent a total of four years with Legal Aid; Legal Services in Harlem; and at a private firm. "We don't need some senior male partner to lean on."

BIG MONEY NOT GOAL

At both offices, the attorneys noted that big money wasn't their goal, but a good living, and working for the cause of women's justice was. Their experience, in the downtown firm with the Panthers and suits against the FBI; in the uptown group with suits against WABC-TV, EEOC cases ("I wondered once how Susan knew so much about certain EEOC regulations," Carol Bellamy laughs. "It turned out she wrote them") gives them some clout with other lawyers.

"Men lawyers sometimes are nice, because they expect to push us around. When the iron fist comes out of our velvet glove, they get furious. It really helps of course," she chuckles, "if they lose their tempers. It's easier for us to win."

"When Mary gets finished with some lawyers," Mrs. Bellamy laughs, "we send in somebody with band-aids. It's doing a good job that counts. That's the bottom line."

DELAWARE AIR SERVICE

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. du PONT. Mr. Speaker, Delaware is faced with the possibility that our air service will be permanently discontinued. We are of course working as hard as we can to see that this does not happen. It is imperative to Delaware that we succeed.

Recently the Delaware General Assembly passed Senate Joint Resolution No. 19, voicing the opposition of the people of Delaware to the termination of this service. I ask that the resolution be included in the RECORD:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 19

(Voicing the opposition of the 127th General Assembly of the State of Delaware and the citizens of Delaware to the termination of certificated air service in the State of Delaware by the Civil Aeronautics Board)

Whereas, there is presently pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board in Washington a proceeding captioned "Wilmington Service Investigation", initiated by the Board which has as its stated purpose the elimination of all certificated air service into and out of the State of Delaware which will make Delaware the only state in the fifty states without such service; and

Whereas, for nearly thirty years the Civil Aeronautics Board affirmatively acknowledged Delaware's need for more and better commercial air service and repeatedly denied petitions by airlines to terminate services, the most recent denial of which was 1970; and

Whereas, the airlines presently obligated to service Delaware have unilaterally discontinued certain service in violation of orders of the Civil Aeronautics Board and purposefully downgraded and rendered inadequate service and now use those created conditions in the attempt to justify an economic need to terminate all service; and

Whereas, in the face of a gasoline energy crisis, with our highways already overburdened with traffic, with the attempt of the bankrupt railroads to discontinue rail service in the entire Northeast, it is imperative to Delaware's economy, future development and the welfare of her people that she retain and upgrade commercial airline service; and

Whereas, the Governor of Delaware has ordered that the State of Delaware be added as a party to and join in the proceedings before the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the 127th General Assembly of the State of Delaware, the House of Representatives concurring therein, that the Delaware Congressional delegation be advised of the opposition of the members of the Delaware General Assembly and the citizens of Delaware to the proposed elimination of commercial air service in this State.

Be it further resolved, that the 127th General Assembly of the State of Delaware go on record as vigorously opposing the cessation of commercial air service and recommend and request that the Civil Aeronautics Board consider the public need and not merely acquiesce to the airline lobby.

Be it further resolved, that the text of this resolution be spread upon the Journals of

the Delaware Senate and House of Representatives, and copies of this resolution be forwarded to all members of the Delaware Congressional delegation, U.S. Senator William V. Roth, Jr., U.S. Senator Joseph R. Biden, Jr., and U.S. Representative Pierre S. du Pont IV, with the request that it be incorporated into the Congressional Record.

ELINOR M. GLENN

Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Ms. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, Elinor M. Glenn has been general manager of the Los Angeles County Employees Union, local 434 for the past 6 years, and has been affiliated with the Service Employees International Union, AFL-CIO, and the Los Angeles County Employees Union, local 434, for the past 20 years. She is one of the few women in labor to achieve such leadership. Elinor is one of the first two women elected to the international executive board of the SEIU in May 1972. Elinor was selected by her peers to preside as president of the Public Workers Committee of the Western Conference of SEIU.

The executive board of the California State Council of SEIU is another board on which she serves. Elinor is also a trustee of joint council No. 8 covering southern California SEIU.

During the past 20 years, Elinor Glenn has organized and fought for the low paid Los Angeles County hospital workers. Elinor was head of an independent unaffiliated union when she met George Hardy, the west coast director of SEIU to discuss affiliation. A merger resulted immediately.

It was largely through her leadership efforts that social security benefits were won for Los Angeles County employees.

Elinor's dedication to the working poor resulted in organizing the unorganized public hospital workers when most of the public sector was either hostile or pathetic to the need for unionization to solve their miserable working conditions and low pay. The dressing rooms and rest rooms, in the heat of the laundries, kitchens, on the wards and in the labs, was where Elinor signed up the workers to become active union members.

Elinor was physically removed from the premises of the county hospital 1 day and was right back the next day signing up the working poor. The wages in those days was \$103 per month. Many of these people had to go on welfare to supplement their earnings. Under her leadership, these workers have made substantial gains in wages and working conditions, upgrading, promotions, and upward mobility.

She led the fight by thousands of the hospital workers against demotions and downgrading, and won.

Elinor's determination to build the union, to mobilize the public workers and to win dignity for themselves as first class citizens led to the first major collective bargaining ordinances in the State of California for public employees.

Under Elinor's leadership the union built close ties with the community, in the political, religious, human rights, civil rights, social and child welfare, and in the women's rights fields not only in Los Angeles, but up and down the State of California.

The Union broke through and won acceptance of the County of Los Angeles to seek funding for child care for children of hospital employees.

Elinor is a leader in the first against discrimination and for the right of minorities not only to be recruited, but to be in policymaking positions; for fair testing and equal opportunity.

Elinor has worked closely with trade union education programs and set up stewards classes. She has brought close ties between Local 434 and the Institute of Industrial Relations of UCLA. Local 434 has provided scholarships to their members to attend classes at UCLA in collective bargaining and negotiations in the public sector. Women's rights has become one of Elinor's contributions in seminars at universities and in the agencies of the Federal Government.

Elinor served on the Steering Committee at UCLA to find and select applicants, mainly women and minorities to train to become future mediators, arbitrators, and factfinders in the public sector. This training program was sponsored by the Federal Government Department of Labor.

Elinor's background in New York City is varied and rich. After he graduated from New York University she became a teacher of the underprivileged, an actress and worked as an economist here in Los Angeles. When she went on a job she either joined the existing union or organized one where none existed.

This marks her 20th year in the Service Employees International Union, Local 434, which she helped build from 700 to its present over 6,000 members. Her motto of "An injury to one is an injury to all" has stood her and the union in good stead over the years.

ELECTION DAY IMPROVEMENT

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the election of 1972 has demonstrated the need for serious reform of our electoral process. It was the most expensive campaign in our history, and resulted in a voter turnout of only 55 percent. There can be no doubt that changes are necessary.

The bill that I am introducing makes some basic changes that would give renewed voter interest and confidence in the electoral process.

My bill does four things. First it makes election day a national holiday. Second, it establishes a fixed period when House and Senate primaries can be held. Third, it fixes the month of September as the time when Presidential nominating conventions are held. Fourth, the bill pro-

vides for simultaneous voting hours across the continental United States in Presidential elections.

The first section, to designate election day as a national holiday is designed to increase voter participation. This will enable more people to vote and also make it possible for more people to work for the candidate of their choice on election day.

The second provision would establish a definite period for House and Senate primaries. At the present time the primaries start in March and go through September. If the actual time of the campaign can be reduced then these goals can be reached.

Shorter campaigns will obviously cost less. Now it is necessary to conduct campaigns for several months, under my proposals the primaries could not be held before August 1st and must be over by the end of September.

Long campaigns bore the general public. One election seems to flow into the next. By making the campaign period more compact citizens might well take a greater interest in the candidates and the issues. Our campaigns are too long. Many of the problems of 1972 would have been eliminated in a short campaign.

The third section of the bill stipulates that any party may nominate a candidate for President during the month of September. This would also have the same effect of cutting down on the length of the campaign.

In the past, before mass communications, perhaps there was a need for a longer campaign period to get a message to the American people. But now with television and radio advertising it is possible to run a national campaign in 5 or 6 weeks.

These proposals would make the incumbent Congressman or Senator a better representative of the people. He will be able to devote more time to the legislative process during the first 6 months of the session when the budgets are being prepared; knowing that the primary can be no earlier than the first of August.

Section 4 of the bill would establish simultaneous voting hours in Presidential elections. In this age of instant predictions of election outcomes, there is a very real problem of election results on the east coast affecting the voter attitude on the west coast. Some voters may feel that the outcome is obvious and stay at home. While their main interest may have been the Presidential election by staying home, they will not be voting for the other offices on the ballot.

While it is really impossible to gage the impact of this problem in a close election, California, with its large number of electoral votes, could have a real impact on the final winner.

If election day is a national holiday, the 12-hour period provided should allow everyone to vote.

The hours in the bill range from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m. on the east coast to 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. on the west coast. This would mean that all polls in the continental United States would open and close at the same time.

This bill, in and of itself, will not restore the confidence in our political system. It will not insure record voter turnout. However, these are significant steps that will modernize our electoral process and be a positive step in this direction.

RUNAWAY YOUTH ACT

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, ever since the days of Charles Dickens' "Oliver Twist," society has been aware that children who have no homes have been mistreated, abused, and neglected. We have surely come a long way in protecting children from the exploitive behavior of characters like Dickens' Fagin, with the enactment of legislation to protect orphans and other homeless children. But there is one group which has not been adequately cared for: those who have run away from home.

The phenomenon of the runaway has increased dramatically over the past several years. Some have linked it with a decline in American family life. Others have suggested that runaways are a product of a modern, and loosely structured society. Whatever the cause, youths are leaving home at an estimated rate of 1 million per year. A recent study by the Massachusetts committee on children and youth calculated that over 200,000 youths under age 18 run away from home every year in that State.

The Massachusetts study found that over 50 percent of the youths left home because of a family argument; in fact, there seems to be a direct correlation between the runaway's relationship with the adults with whom he or she lives and the circumstances that lead to the runaway act. The underlying causes are strikingly similar to the immediate reason for departure.

It is clearly beyond our power to reach into the family to help solve the emotional or familial problems that cause children to run away from home. But large numbers of runaways create a social problem with which we must deal. Runaways who flock to the central cities, with no shelter or means of support, cannot merely be abandoned to whatever Fagin might be lurking in the streets.

Fortunately, a wide variety of private, nonprofit agencies have acted to assist runaways in need of temporary shelter and support. Many of them, operating on minuscule budgets, have succeeded in providing professional medical, counseling, and legal advice to runaways. But the vast majority of these programs do not have the resources to give those youths more than a roof over their heads and the kind of personal understanding and attention that was lacking at home and precipitated the runaway.

The Senate has already passed legislation to provide Federal grants to these

agencies, and today I have joined Representative WILLIAM D. FORD in introducing this legislation in the House. The bill would not deeply involve the Federal Government in the care of runaway children. Nor would it create a new bureaucracy to deal with the problem. It would simply direct the Government to pay 90 percent of the cost, for up to \$10 million annually, of providing shelter, counseling, and medical services to runaway children in established community runaway houses.

This approach recognizes the ability and concern which many of those manning these houses have shown. Since runaways generally remain close to home, support of local agencies would facilitate the reestablishment of contact with their parents.

In addition, emphasizing treatment by such agencies removes the runaway from the pressures of the legal system's adversary proceedings. The personal problems of these children require professional attention and help that can best be provided in the cooperative atmosphere of the community runaway house, and not in the juvenile courtroom.

Specific safeguards against the unwarranted disclosure of records dealing with runaways are included in the bill, to protect these children from embarrassing disclosures that would only add to their difficulties.

Unless Congress acts to financially assist community shelters, runaway youths must depend on the beneficence and dedication of those few who have concerned themselves with their plight. Both they, and the runaways, deserve the financial support and recognition contained in the Runaway Youth Act, so that no youth who temporarily leaves home is deprived of shelter, medical attention, counseling, and a chance to return home safely.

CONGRESSMAN PATMAN'S GRAND-DAUGHTER WINS TEXAS DEBATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. JOHN YOUNG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of my friend and colleague, Mr. PICKLE, relative to the forensic accomplishments of Miss Carrin Foreman Patman, who has participated on the debate team that has won the State debate championship. Miss Patman is a granddaughter of our dean of the House and a constituent of mine of whom I am very proud. She is the daughter of Senator and Mrs. William (Bill) Patman, who are distinguished friends and exceptionally respected constituents. Her forensic abilities come from a long heritage and she is truly to be commended and congratulated. Speaking for myself and all south Texas we are indeed proud of Miss Carrin Foreman Patman.

THE CACHE RIVER PROJECT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the necessity of a number of stream channelization projects has been questioned by conservationists, farmers, and hunters alike. The feasibility and success of these proposed projects are in doubt.

One of these is the Cache River channelization project in Arkansas. On the Cache River and the Bayou DeView in eastern Arkansas, a total of 232 miles of scenic river would be straightened and dredged by Army Engineers. The purpose is to put more land into soybean production.

However, the area is the most important wintering area for mallard ducks on the North American continent. The transformation of the river, woodland and marshes into a series of water-filled ditches will be seriously detrimental to the preservation of the mallard's life cycle, not to mention the aesthetic beauty of the river.

Also, development of this \$72 million drainage project would destroy some of the last hardwood forest and scenic bottomlands in Arkansas.

I would like to share with my colleagues the following friend of the court brief filed on behalf of Minnesota citizens in support of the Arkansas environmentalists' suit against the Army Corps of Engineers Cache River project: [U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas, Western Division, No. LR-71-C-199]

PETITION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAR AS AMICUS CURIAE

(Environmental Defense Fund, Inc., Arkansas Wildlife Federation, Arkansas Ecology Center, Ellis Throckmorton, Pratt Remmel, Jr., and Mrs. Gale Eddins, Plaintiffs, vs. Robert F. Froehike, Secretary of the Army, General Frederick B. Clarke, Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, Cache River-Bayou DeView Improvement District, Defendants).

(Arkansas Game and Fish Commission, Plaintiff, vs. John Getson, S. L. Simpson, Anderson Wells, F. D. Munger, Owen Burton, John Conner, Donald Cain and Raymond Carloch, Defendants).

Comes now the State of Minnesota by Warren Spannaus, its Attorney General, Petitioner herein, and respectfully prays leave of the Court to file a Brief as amicus curiae in the above-entitled causes and to otherwise appear in said causes, and as reasons therefor states:

1. The State of Minnesota annually spends in excess of \$250,000 in producing mallard ducks and other forms of waterfowl for the benefit of the citizens of the State of Minnesota and of other states along the Mississippi Valley Flyway, which include parts of all of the States of Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, Ohio, Indiana, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, Louisiana and Alabama.

2. The citizens of the State of Minnesota annually spend in excess of three million dollars per year in harvesting mallard ducks in the State of Minnesota. Approximately 175,000 Minnesotans annually engage in waterfowl hunting.

3. A substantial portion of the ducks which are produced in the State of Minnesota depend for winter habitat on marsh areas of Arkansas. One of the major areas of winter habitat of the State of Arkansas is situated in the area of the Cache River-Bayou DeView project.

4. The construction of the Cache River-Bayou DeView project would materially and adversely affect the interests of the State of Minnesota in the population of waterfowl which the State of Minnesota produces and manages for the benefit of its citizens and of the citizens of the states comprising the Mississippi Valley Flyway.

Wherefore, Petitioner respectfully prays this Court that it be allowed to file said Brief as amicus curiae in said causes and to otherwise appear relative to whether the construction of the proposed Cache River-Bayou DeView project is in conformity with federal law.

VETO OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today, in one of his most arrogant and irresponsible acts since taking office, Mr. Nixon vetoed the Supplemental Appropriations Act which contained funds necessary for the Federal Government to continue operating through the conclusion of the fiscal year which ends in just 3 more days.

As his reason for doing so, he cited the fact that the act contains language to prohibit the use of funds appropriated under this or any other act to support U.S. combat operations in, over, or off the shores of Cambodia or in or over Laos. Mr. Nixon says that this language would "cripple or destroy" the chances for an effective negotiated peace settlement in Cambodia.

Mr. Speaker, just what is Mr. Nixon doing negotiating a peace settlement in Cambodia now? What are his legal justifications for carrying on hostile activities in that area of the world in the first place? We are not at war. To the contrary, Mr. Nixon ran his 1972 campaign on the assurance that "peace is at hand." We have received continued assurances ever since then that everything was under control over in Southeast Asia. If this is the case, then why does the President of the United States insist on vetoing a vitally important bill simply because it includes language which prohibits him from doing something he has no legal authority to do to begin with?

The Supplemental Appropriations Act Mr. Nixon so arrogantly vetoed today was approved by an overwhelming majority of the elected representatives of the people in both Houses of Congress. It was approved by a vote of 240 to 172 in this body and by a vote of 81 to 11 in the other body, and I submit that it is time that Mr. Nixon started listening to the elected Representatives of the people and not his own little clique of White House advisers.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Congress of the United States to stand up to the President—to serve notice upon him that we intend to reassert ourselves in the decisionmaking process of this country—and to remind him that the executive branch, in spite of what he may wish, is only one of three coequal branches of our Government. War making, however carried on, must be at the will of the people, expressed through their elected representatives, not at the whim of the generals, the colonels or the President.

Mr. Speaker, you may recall that when this body passed the Long and Addabbo amendments last month which contained language similar to the language in the act now before us, then Secretary of Defense Elliot Richardson announced that the Nixon administration would simply use other funds to continue the bombing of Cambodia. This is just one example of what I mean when I refer to the Nixon administration's arrogant and contemptful attitude.

In voting to override the veto of the Supplemental Appropriations Act now before us, we can send Mr. Nixon a message. We can serve him notice that the Congress and the people of the United States are no longer willing to put up with his arrogance—and we can force him to discontinue once and for all the waste of the taxpayers' money and senseless bombing, destruction and killing which continues to take place in the name of our country over in Southeast Asia.

In refusing to accept the veto of this act, we may also assure that our Government will continue to function for the remainder of the week, that our Federal employees will receive their paychecks at the end of this month, and that the flow of social security benefits to some 25 million American people will not be disrupted.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to vote to override this veto so that the Supplemental Appropriations Act may become law.

JOHN D. MACARTHUR—FLORIDA'S ACCESSIBLE BILLIONAIRE

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent New York Times article, Jon Nordheimer writes of the life of one of the great builders of the State of Florida, John D. MacArthur. Since moving to Florida in the 1920's, John MacArthur has been instrumental in the State's tremendous growth, and has pursued the development of the area through many a battle and controversy. I insert in the RECORD at this point Mr. Nordheimer's account of a fascinating interview with a fascinating man:

FLORIDA'S ACCESSIBLE BILLIONAIRE
(By Jon Nordheimer)

SINGER ISLAND, FLA.—Surrounded by the clatter of dishes and the cluck of conver-

sation, John D. MacArthur, quite possibly the nation's most accessible billionaire, runs his real estate and insurance empire from a corner table in the coffee shop of the Colonades Hotel here.

Women in straw hats and bathing suits trot by his table on the way to the beach, passing a steady stream of petitioners and hucksters who line up each day to curry favor from Mr. MacArthur, who sits stone-faced and skeptical between a Sillex coffee pot and a telephone.

"This is the greatest racket," he later confided to a visitor, allowing a smile to crack his granite face.

"If I look these guys up to my office [in the hotel penthouse] I'd have to be courteous to them. Here I can just get up and walk off into the kitchen and hide."

Recently, Mr. MacArthur threatened to take a longer walk. He complained bitterly that conservationists and "other obstructionists" were forcing him out of Florida, where in the last 18 years he has built a real estate fortune almost equal to his immense holdings in the Bankers Life and Casualty Corporation, the Chicago-based insurance company he built from scratch during the Depression.

His ire had been aroused by a number of legal citations that halted work on his developments in Florida, where he is the single largest private landowner, holding thousands of acres of choice real estate.

Speaking like a character in "The Front Page," the play about Chicago journalism written by his brother, the late Chares MacArthur, and Ben Hecht, he bluntly lays his trouble at the door of "bearded jerks and little old ladies who call me a despoiler of the environment."

He snorts with derision during an interview and pours himself a fresh cup of black coffee from the handy Sillex pot, one of the 20 cups or more he gulps in a day. Some people have been saying nasty things like that about John MacArthur for most of his 76 years and throughout his life he has savored the joy of besting his detractors.

Using language that is often unprintable, he attacks his collective foes, chuckling like a man who fought hard and well against the odds and emerged from the scraps with hard-boiled humor and a mountain of money.

This combativeness can be traced to his family background. He was the youngest of four sons born to a dirt farmer who had turned evangelist and settled in Chicago. The father instilled in his sons a Calvinist regard for money that was respected by all the sons except Charlie, a two-fisted drinker and bon vivant.

"My father said 'If you own a cow don't buy milk,'" Mr. MacArthur recalled. It was an adage he applied as a poor man starting in the insurance business in Chicago nearly a half century ago when he lived out of the office he worked in. It still is evident today in his decision to reside in a hotel he owns.

With the help of an older brother he acquired the small Marquette Life Insurance Company for \$7,500 in 1928 and kept it afloat through the rock-bottom years of the Depression because he says he was too stubborn to let it go under.

"I had shot my mouth off to my brothers about making a big success, so I couldn't throw in the sponge when things got tough after '29. Insurance companies were going out all around me like lights on a Christmas tree, but I was afraid to admit failure," he said.

"I was in a somewhat better position than the bigger established firms because I had just made a fresh start and didn't have too many dead horses to bury. I didn't have any assets, but I didn't have any liabilities either, and the liabilities were destroying the big firms."

He also had flexibility. The big companies,

which had expensive overhead, couldn't afford to collect premiums of less than \$5. Mr. MacArthur, living off the sales commissions he earned himself, was hawking term policies on the streets of Chicago for almost any amount he could get, even a client's lunch money.

"If he had \$2 in his pocket, I sold him a policy for that and told him to mail in a dollar or two each month," he said.

In 1935 he acquired Bankers Life, then a tiny bankrupt concern, for the \$2,500 impairment against it. The new investment almost forced Mr. MacArthur out of business when he was hit by four death claims in the first month he owned the company. At one point his assets shrunk to less than \$100.

But the Depression eventually proved a bonanza as Bankers Life began gobbling up a large share of the market relinquished by the faltering major companies.

"My competitors saw me as a little whippersnapper coming up that they had to stop," Mr. MacArthur recalled, relishing the memory across the decades from his Florida penthouse.

"They got together and tried to put the screws to me. They had the I.R.S. on my tail and the Post Office was crawling all over me looking for violations."

"And the insurance commissioners ganged up on me and tried to put me out of business in every state where we had an office, saying we weren't paying off on claims and I wasn't paying my agents properly. But I won all those fights because I wasn't guilty."

By the mid-fifties, Mr. MacArthur had reached the pantheon of success in America. Fortune magazine named him as one of the country's richest men.

"The big boys took me into the club then," he said with a laugh. "They say good morning to me now. They told me they tried to catch me with my foot off first base, but I was down to second by the time they threw the ball."

Then he laughed some more, a deep, gravelly roar that seemed to contain more mischief than merriment.

His Florida venture, like most of the things that have enriched him, grew out of someone else's calamity.

"I am not a bulldozer," he likes to say, "I'm a savior. When someone gets caught in a wringer they call me to get out."

A mortgage failure "dropped a chunk of Florida property in my lap about 18 years ago." The "chunk" was more than 6,000 acres of valuable real estate in Palm Beach County.

Mr. MacArthur had the capital and the desire to wheel and deal in the Florida land boom, which started in the fifties, grew in the sixties and is still increasing today.

The linchpin of his fortune, which helped him profit from his real estate holdings, is Bankers Life. The insurance company, of which he is owner as well as chairman and president, has assets today of more than \$838-million. Among his other important holdings are controlling interests in the Union Bankers Life Insurance Company of Dallas and the Certified Life Insurance Company of Sherman Oaks, Calif.

His Florida companies—Royal American Industries, Inc., and the Southern Realty and Utility Company—own huge tracts of land and power and sewerage plants on both the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts. He has more than 25,000 acres in Palm Beach County alone, including almost all of the undeveloped acreage adjoining the Florida Turnpike.

A decade ago, after developing Palm Beach Gardens, a residential community of 8,500 residents, Mr. MacArthur was angered when the state refused to build a turnpike exit to the town, so he paid the cost—\$450,000—out of his own pocket, thereby enhancing the value of his other property in the vicinity by many millions.

At first he attracted attention in Florida for his efforts to protect the environment,

spending thousands of dollars to replant trees and reroute roads around esthetic sites while other developers were bulldozing the land into subtropical ghettos.

"But now the pendulum has swung the other way and the obstructionists have gone overboard," he said, explaining why he has threatened to pull out of Florida if he can figure a way to do so without losing money on his investments. However, this position seems to imply that Mr. MacArthur is not going anywhere soon.

"The conservationists are well-meaning people who simply just don't know what the hell they are talking about," he said. "Right now they're on a wetlands binge. You can't drain your property, they tell you. It might hurt the alligators."

The gruff sarcasm colors his voice as he unwraps his third pack of cigarettes for the day.

"Has anyone ever justified the existence of an alligator?" he went on. "They eat cattle and dogs. When they start eating kids the public is going to feel different about them. Let's stuff a few and put them in a museum and get rid of the rest."

His critics have responded with the charge that a conservationist by 1960 standards could be a menace to the environment today.

"It's true that when Mr. MacArthur created some land developments he went to some expense to spare some trees," remarked Dr. Dwight Goforth, regional biologist for the Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission.

"But he also owns utility and sewerage plants on these properties that pump waste into canals that kill fish and make the water unsafe for human contact. The habitat simply can't survive under such conditions."

Mr. MacArthur scoffs at the dictum that "puts the needs of fish before the needs of man." Furthermore, he is incensed at what he feels are arbitrary laws that have created a plethora of regulatory agencies that inhibit development without consideration of the rights of ownership.

"Hell, I was born in the last century when private property was respected," he said.

"Now we have a new philosophy that says a man can't fully use his investment. Unfortunately, the obstructionists have a very bad example in what's happened to Miami. Miami is New York with sunshine, and Fort Lauderdale is moving fast in the same direction."

"I'm for correcting every valid thing that we are presently doing wrong, but I want someone more than a schoolboy or a housewife to prove to me it's wrong."

Mr. MacArthur's paper assets have grown to the point where he can probably call himself a billionaire and go unchallenged.

"Some people say I'm worth umpteem jillions," he remarked, "but I feel like H. L. Hunt when he says that you're not very rich if you're able to count all your money."

Still, Mr. MacArthur leads a relatively frugal—some say parsimonious—existence with no retinue of servants, chauffeurs or public relations men.

He drives a dusty four-year-old Cadillac with more than 50,000 miles on it; flies tourist on commercial flights to his Chicago, Dallas and Los Angeles offices ("My tail fits very nicely in a tourist seat"), and spends a considerable amount of time running around his Florida hotel on errands for his guests.

Speaking of the hotel on this 2½-mile-long island about 10 miles north of Palm Beach, he said:

"I bought this hotel because domestic help was hard to get and I figured if I had my own hotel I'd just ring for room service when I needed something. Now I have to worry about everyone else's maid."

"Every once in a while some guest confuses me with the maintenance manager. I suppose I'm lucky they don't think I'm the

janitor. I go ahead and do the repairs. I can fix everything but a politician. I never had any luck with them."

There have been times, though, when Mr. MacArthur played the role of a millionaire to the hilt. In the fifties he produced plays on Broadway and was editor and publisher of Theatre Arts magazine.

In 1965, he paid \$25,000 to ransom the DeLong star ruby, which had been stolen from the American Museum of Natural History in New York.

He brushed this adventure off, however, by noting: "I've played hands of poker for more than that."

Three years ago he suffered a serious illness and said he underwent surgery for cancer of the stomach. But since then he has come back with a bounce and even resumed the presidency of Bankers Life when the man he had named to replace him 10 years ago retired.

"This is my last year in that job, though. I'm going to find a new man for the job from inside the organization," he said.

Mr. MacArthur has one son and a number of grandchildren, but the bulk of his wealth has been earmarked for a foundation that is still without special plans or purpose in the dispersment of his fortune.

He says he does not want to administer the estate from the grave, but so far he has failed to find a lasting monument for a long career.

"I don't have many friends," he remarked the other day, and it was difficult to judge from his voice if it was said with regret. "They're either jealous or read something about me in the newspapers that's not quite true."

His voice fell for a moment from the gleeful range of wisecracking that had preceded this fugitive comment.

"Money's the name of the game," he said. "If I played poker for matches I'd want all the matches. I want to win. I'm a stinkin' loser."

A GREAT AMERICAN SUCCESS STORY: HON. WILLIAM M. BATTAGLIESE—PATERSON PACKING CO., INC.

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, the pleasure of great personal dedication and always working to the peak of one's ability with sincerity of purpose and determination to fulfill a life's dream—that is the success of the opportunity of America—and the mark of distinction in our society of "the self-made man."

Do you and our colleagues remember the last time you heard that expression: "the self-made man." It was most refreshing to read, and I wanted to share with you and our colleagues here in the House my warm feelings, of good will in the substance of, a recent news article that appeared in one of New Jersey's most prestigious newspapers, The Paterson News, extolling the life's pursuits and expressing the vigorous efforts, and happiness derived therefrom, of a most distinguished citizen and his good family of my Eighth Congressional District, State of New Jersey, close friend and great American—the Honorable William M. Battagliese—whose aspirations and

success in the mainstream of America's business enterprises does indeed portray a great American success story.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to insert here in our historic journal of Congress a copy of this news report which so eloquently unfolds the real heartbeat and pulse of America—the businessman and his family—and the dream and achievements of Bill Battagliese who climbed the ladder of success in the great American way in a tradition that serves as a shining, example to all of us—and particularly the youth of America—with the warmth of inspiration and hope that is ever present in our land of opportunity. It was indeed my great privilege to officiate at the dedication celebrating the opening of his latest, most modern food handling facility in Paterson, N.J., last year and as Bill Battagliese and his family celebrate the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Paterson Packing Co., Inc., their family business of great distinction in our community, I ask my colleagues here in the Congress to join with me in national recognition of his lifetime of devotion to serving the needs of our people with his outstanding business enterprises and many years of dedicated civic leadership throughout our district, State and Nation. A copy of the Paterson News feature story of a great American, Bill Battagliese, and the 20th anniversary celebration of the Paterson Packing Co., Inc. is as follows:

PATERSON PACKING CO. INC. CELEBRATES ITS 20TH ANNIVERSARY IN BUSINESS

Friends and business associates throughout the State are offering hearty congratulations today to a self-made man whose courage, faith and hard work make it possible for him to observe the 20th anniversary of the founding of a successful meat processing and packaging business. The man is William M. Battagliese, a native of Paterson and resident of Fair Lawn, and his company is the Paterson Packing Co., Inc. of 220 Sixth Ave., Hawthorne. Battagliese says that his first interest in the meat processing and packing business goes back as far as his days as a junior at Eastside High School in Paterson. One day, in the hope of making him sick, two of his friends took him to visit the Fair Lawn Slaughter House. It turned out that it was his friends who became ill. He was so fascinated by the meat processing he saw there that he decided he must somehow become involved in this business. He says, "It was then that I knew what I would like to do in the future, but at this stage it was just a dream."

"I still had a year and a half to finish in high school. Then I would need the money to venture into a business I knew almost nothing about." In 1935, he graduated from high school after which he worked at several jobs in an effort to save money so he might start his own business. "All the time," he says, "I kept dreaming of that day at the slaughter house."

In 1937, he met Elizabeth Tumminello of Paterson, the daughter of a butcher and in 1939 they were married. He is quick to express his gratitude for his wife's encouragement and work in finally realizing his dream of starting his own business. Two years later, he took a job as a truck driver for Armour and Co. in Paterson, and after three and a half years was promoted to the receiving and shipping department. During one and a half years in charge of the department he made it his business to become acquainted with the procedures of all their other company departments. In particular, he says, this gave

him a good opportunity to learn the fundamentals of salesmanship. In 1946, he was again promoted, this time to route salesman, a job which he held for the next two years.

Then in 1948, a totally unexpected offer of a loan from an aunt put Battagliese one step closer to his dream. He accepted the offer gratefully and quit his job with Armour, again grateful for the knowledge he had acquired while employed by the company. With the loan from his aunt, he bought a used ice-refrigerated truck, loaded it with a variety of meat products and began knocking on the doors of butchers, restaurants and diners. "It was not as easy as I thought, and there were many discouraging days and sleepless nights," he says. But he was optimistic and persistent and had the constant encouragement of his wife.

Battagliese worked diligently for the next five years as a wholesale jobber. In spite of the fact that there were many difficulties and obstacles, each year was marked by some progress and business began to improve.

Finally in 1953, Battagliese joined a partnership of three other men in the establishment of the Paterson Packing Co., Inc. The company began operations at 118 River St. in Paterson in a building which was originally occupied by Henry Muhs and Co., a meat packing business which has started in the city about forty years before this. The partnership, however, failed to work out and after several years was dissolved when Battagliese bought out the interests of his associates and became the sole owner of the company. He determined then to make the company a family owned and operated enterprise.

In June, 1966, his son, William J., a graduate of Fairleigh Dickinson University, joined the company as its manager. His college studies and training in business administration "brought new life to the company," says Battagliese.

Two years later, his son, Joseph, entered the company as production manager. According to his father, "he had filled this position splendidly."

Battagliese's daughter, Maryann, has also devoted her talents and energies to help in bringing the company to its current state of success. As a high school student attending St. Luke's High School in Ho-Ho-Kus, she served as an assistant bookkeeper for the company during vacations and her spare hours. Following her graduation, while studying at the Berkeley Secretarial School in East Orange she continued to serve the company during her spare hours.

With his wife, Elizabeth, serving as treasurer of the company, Battagliese remarks, "My firm has become a close knit family organization. This close knit unit could spell only success."

On March 6 of this year, the company observed the first anniversary of the move from Paterson, where it had done business for 19 years, to its new, larger headquarters building in Hawthorne.

The new building is a modern, single-story brick and cement block structure built according to specifications prepared by Battagliese himself. After years in the business he knew precisely what he wanted. The building contains 19,275 square feet and was designed to allow for the continued growth of the company. Battagliese is particularly proud of his private office which he refers to as "my home away from home." In addition to a large, attractively furnished and appointed working office, it also features a fully equipped kitchen and bath. Although Battagliese is now semi-retired, he still spends enough hours at his plant to warrant these private facilities. Outside his own office is another large office area for a clerical staff. Beyond that are special refrigerated rooms and areas designed for meat storage and processing.

The weekly business routine of the Pater-son Packing Company, as described by Battagliese, is a relatively simple matter. Each week, seven trailer truck loads of beef, each weighing 35,000 pounds and coming mainly from the American Beef Packers in Omaha, Nebraska, are delivered to the company. A small part of this delivery, which comes as sides and hind quarters of beef, are "fabricated" or broken down into smaller cuts such as sirloin or potterhouse steaks. The company also makes up 100 per cent pure beef hamburger patties. These fabricated meats are for delivery to hotels, restaurants and diners. However, the bulk of the uncut beef is delivered to supermarket clients and retail butchers who fabricate it into the sizes and cuts they want. Battagliese also said that part of the company's business is to serve freezer supply houses which sell meats to consumers who purchase to stock their own freezers. The company currently operates a fleet of trucks which deliver meats to clients all over the state. The company also makes local purchases of lamb, veal, pork and poultry which it distributes to its customers.

Battagliese explained that all meat processing equipment and storage rooms must be scrubbed down daily for a rigid inspection by state inspectors for whom offices are maintained on the premises at 220 6th Avenue, Hawthorne which must be properly heated in winter and air conditioned in summer and be equipped with a bathroom according to state and federal regulations.

Quality meat, says Battagliese, refers to the overall palatability of the edible portion of the carcass. Among the quality grades established by the U.S. Department of Agriculture are prime, choice, good, standard and commercial. The grades are determined simply by evaluating visually certain carcass characteristics such as maturity, marbling and also the texture, color and firmness of the lean part of the carcass. This evaluation process is something that Battagliese has been doing for years.

Many of Battagliese's friends tell him that after all these years spent in building up his business, he ought to relax by taking a trip around the world or engage in some other ambitious leisure-time project. But such activities have no appeal to him. Having worked hard to establish and build his company, he still takes deep pleasure in being involved in it on a more or less daily basis. He also prefers to be close to his children and grandchildren. His two sons and daughter are married and he has four grandchildren. He also maintains an active interest in his memberships which include the Rotary Club of Hawthorne, Lodge 60 of the Paterson Elks, the Fideles of America and the Holy Name Society of St. Catherine's Church in Glen Rock of which he and his wife are parishioners. In a minor concession to semiretirement activity, he revealed that he and his wife had joined a Fred Astaire Dancing Studio. This, he figures, will offer ample opportunity for fun and relaxing.

Mr. Speaker, I share the pride of the people of our congressional district and the State of New Jersey in the accomplishments of Bill Battagliese and ask you to join with me in a national salute to this all-American family: Bill, his good wife Elizabeth, and his sons William J. and Joseph, and his daughter Maryann and their families for their continued success and happiness—and in grateful appreciation for the contribution they have made to the image and stature of the American family way of life which has truly enriched our community, State, and Nation.

THE CHICKEN AND THE EGG

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the administration finds itself with egg on its face because it has failed to put a lid on the sizzling increase in the price of farm feeds. It has concocted a new version of the fairy tale dealing with the goose and the golden egg. Today, the goose of old is the present day chicken and, if things continue as they are, our breakfast omlet will be the golden egg.

On June 6, I wrote the Department of Agriculture and urged it to press for an administration freeze on the price of farm feeds and a temporary halt to the exportation of vitally needed food grains. I knew if the situation which existed then continued unchecked, American poultry, dairy and livestock farmers would be forced to cut production because of soaring costs. Inevitably, this would mean the consumer would shell out more for meat and eggs because of the shortage of supply.

The administration did not meet the challenge. It only scrambled the problem. It froze retail prices on food but failed to put out the fire under the soaring costs of farm feeds. It did nothing about stopping the exportation of food grains abroad, which would have helped ease the shortage here at home.

Consequently, it should come as no surprise to learn that chicken farmers now are slaughtering hundreds of thousands of chicks because it is cheaper to kill them than to buy feed for them. Producers say the cutback will be felt at the retail level in 8 to 10 weeks. Furthermore, it is predicted that unless the administration trims the exportation of corn and soybeans, the supply of broilers by November will be down 10 percent from last year.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the RECORD at this point an article from the June 25 issue of The Wall Street Journal. It may not answer the question which disappears first from the family table, the chicken or the egg, but it does give a bird's eye view of what is in store, but not in our stores, in weeks to come.

POULTRY RAISERS KILL CHICKS, DESTROY EGGS AS PRICE FREEZE AND COSTS INSURE LOSSES

Texas chicken producer Madison Clement bought 42,000 day-old chicks from hatcheries last Tuesday. On Saturday he drowned them all in large vats of water. This, he said sadly, was cheaper than feeding them for the two months or so it would take for them to grow into broilers and fryers.

Mr. Clement, managing partner in Clement Grain Co. in Waco, Texas, is among a growing number of chicken processors in the South and Southwest caught in the squeeze between soaring feed prices and retail prices held down by the government's 60-day price freeze.

"Don't feel sorry for me," said Mr. Clement. "I'm killing my chickens. Some other producers are going to try to feed theirs." He estimates he would lose 20 cents to 30 cents on each chicken when they were broilers.

Mr. Clement, who usually produces 80,000 to 90,000 broilers each week, said: "Unless

the situation changes, I'll be out of the chicken business in 12 weeks, when the chicks I started last week are finally sold."

OTHER PRODUCERS

Meanwhile, other producers in Texas and in the South also have begun killing young chicks and destroying fertilized eggs. For the most part, however, chicken growers at this point are simply cutting back on broiler output and, to a man, damming the freeze on prices while costs rise unchecked.

Most producers forecast a shortage of chickens at the retail level in eight to 10 weeks. And any recovery from a shortage may take awhile because producers are selling off their breeder chickens. It takes about six months to grow a chick into a hatching breeder, they say.

If the chicken producers are irked at the freeze itself, they are doubly incensed over its timing. They say the retail price level for chickens was at its lowest level in 90 days in the week ended June 8, the base period for the freeze.

At the same time, according to Lonnie Pilgrim, president of Pilgrim Industries Inc., the second biggest Texas processor, the price of soybean meal feed shot up to about \$450 a ton from about \$150 a year earlier. The Pittsburg, Texas, company said it has cut back broiler production to 450,000 a week from 550,000 so that its supply of feed will last longer.

FREEZE BADLY TIMED

Gene Biddle, president of Rite-Care Corp., a subsidiary of Stratford of Texas Inc., said Rite-Care has cut back incubation of chickens about 10%. He said the freeze was badly timed because wholesalers usually are glutted with chickens at the end of a month and therefore sell at very low prices. As a result, retail prices are lower and during the base period of the freeze chicken price at retail were three cents a pound lower than during the prior week or the week after.

"I keep hoping for a miracle," said Mr. Biddle, "but last week we had to start diverting eggs from the hatchery."

Walter Sheffield owns an integrated poultry company in Smiley, Texas, with breeding, hatching, milling and farming operations. At capacity, his complex hatches about 40,000 to 45,000 baby chicks each week. But he's cutting that back to about 20,000 chicks weekly because of price conditions.

Last week, Mr. Sheffield destroyed about 8,000 chicks and 12,000 eggs, and he says he expects to dump more eggs this week. He's also selling 5,000 of his 18,000 breeder hens, and they'll be delivered for processing this week.

POTENTIAL IMPACT

Mr. Sheffield said the sale of his breeders is especially important because, in terms of the chicks they would have produced, he is keeping about one million pounds of broilers out of supermarkets.

Mr. Sheffield, who mills his own feed, said there isn't any question that rising grain and soybean costs are to blame.

"Our normal soybean cost is about \$110 to \$115 a ton. Now I'm paying more than \$500 a ton," he said. His cost of grain is twice what it was a year ago, he added.

Mr. Sheffield says it costs 27 to 28 cents a pound to produce broilers at current prices. But he says he can receive only about 23 cents a pound for them.

One analyst estimates that, based on current feed costs, wholesale prices of 60 cents a dozen for large white eggs at New York and 44 cents a pound for broilers at Chicago would be needed for farmers to break even. But with the New York large eggs quoted as low as 55 cents a dozen and Chicago broilers as low as 39 cents a pound, farmers who have to buy feed ingredients at current market prices are losing as much as five cents a dozen on eggs and as much as five cents a pound on broilers.

FEED-GRAIN EXPORTS

In Chattanooga, George Allen, operational vice president of Loret Farms Inc., said the problem was simply that "our input cost wasn't frozen but our selling price was frozen."

He said, the only thing that will solve the problem of food shortage in this country is an immediate curtailment of food-grain exports for at least 45 days or until we have a new-crop production of protein."

This is the only answer, he added, "and I think I have a 12-year-old son who could have figured it out."

Mr. Allen, who expressed some concern over getting into trouble with the Humane Society in disposing of chickens, said he will be drowning some chicks this week, but didn't disclose how many.

Industry analysts agree on the export problem. One predicted that unless the government acts to trim exports of corn and soybeans sharply the supply of broilers by November could be down 10% from year-earlier levels.

EGG FARMERS

Meanwhile, egg farmers also are taking steps to cut operating costs, including culling their flocks and moving older, less productive hens to slaughtering plants much sooner than usual.

Don Turnbull, vice president of the Poultry and Egg Institute of America, said: "If farmers could see any hope that the price ceilings would be lifted and that a profit could be made when new-crop feed becomes available, then they would expand production. But nobody sees that happening at the moment."

In Washington, Agriculture Department officials hadn't any comment on the killing of chicks and destruction of eggs. However, the department's latest summary of the poultry and egg situation, released on Friday, said broiler, turkey and egg output this summer will lag behind year-earlier levels while prices will continue well above those of recent years." In addition it said, spiraling feed costs in recent weeks may keep output reduced next fall."

Without the June 13 price-freeze order, broiler, egg and turkey prices "would have advanced further during the summer," the summary said. It reported egg production for the year through May 31 at 6% below the like 1972 period. Broiler marketings were down 2% in the period.

HAPPY 300TH ANNIVERSARY
TO DEERFIELD, MASS.

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as we approach our national bicentennial, there are certain places that give us insight into the past and refuge from the present. One of these is Deerfield, a town of 3,800 citizens, located in my First Congressional District of Massachusetts.

To me, Deerfield is the jewel of the remaining small New England communities. Nestled in the valley of the Connecticut River in the heart of Franklin County, it is both a typical and an atypical representative of the species known as the New England town.

It is steeped in the history of courage and independence that made this Nation great. In that, it is typical of many of our fine New England communities.

It may draw its atypical attributes

from its soil—uncommonly rich for that area, an area whose foundation is best known for the rocks and boulders that make for fine walls, but not-so-fine farming. It is unique in its deep and long running interest in its own physical preservation.

As two of its many biographers, Samuel Chamberlain and Henry N. Flynt, wrote:

Deerfield is a treasure that has come down through generations and which in our time is more priceless than ever.

This year marks the tricentennial of Deerfield. Beginning Sunday, and for 7 days thereafter, the town will officially mark its 300th birthday in earnest.

An ecumenical church service is planned for Sunday.

Monday has been dubbed "Homecoming Day" and to climax that day, the tricentennial play—an original work, "Today's Sun, Tomorrow's Moon," written for the occasion by James Percival—will open for a 4-day run.

On Tuesday, a promenade, fashion show and strawberry festival will keep the townspeople well occupied.

On Wednesday, the citizenry has been called to turn out for an all-day old-fashioned "beef barbecue" with the main course comprising beef raised expressly for the meal on Deerfield farms.

Two days of historic home tours are planned for Thursday and Friday.

Saturday will be known as 300-year day and a memorial plaque will be dedicated in official ceremonies.

The week-long festivities will build to a crescendo on Sunday, July 8 with a gala parade and anniversary finale.

Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, I intend to be on hand to join in the good times. I wish that many of my colleagues could join me in Deerfield next week to participate in the multitude of activities or merely to visit this lovely spot. If you did, I have no doubt you would quickly endorse my opinion that nowhere may be found more perfect testimony to the beauty and strength of New England.

The township of Deerfield is divided into distinct areas; one is the section known as south Deerfield, a growing commercial and residential area, the other is the Village of Old Deerfield, a national historic landmark. Every home in this section tempts the visitor to linger and imagine the life in the early days of New England. There is value to these musings, for they encourage one to keep the past, present, and future in perspective.

There is one house in Old Deerfield Village that particularly enchants me. I can look at this house and better understand the determination and independence of those early American settlers.

This home belonged to John Sheldon in the early 1700's. Today, a replica stands as a memorial to the noble defense many early settlers put up against the ordeals of frontier living.

Visitors today can see a hole in the original door of this large and impressive house. This hole is a dramatic reminder of an Indian raid that left nearly 50 villagers dead and over 100 captive.

At daybreak on February 29, 1704, a horde of Indians and Frenchmen crept into Deerfield, undetected by the watch-

man who had fallen asleep at his post. The interlopers encountered no difficulty entering the village and burst upon the sleeping villagers.

Since the Sheldon home had been heavily fortified against attacks, many villagers took refuge here. The house was so sturdy and the front door so massive, the Indians attempted to pierce the door with their hatchets to reach the villagers inside.

But the stout timber prevailed, and according to accounts of that fateful day, the attacking force gained entry by a back passage which had been left open by a fleeing citizen.

Today, the "Indian Door" stands as a mute relic of that raid, now known as the Deerfield Massacre.

Once before, on September 18, 1675, just 2 years after its incorporation by the general court, Deerfield bore the brunt of a "massacre."

On that day, a train of ox-carts, filled with needed supplies, fell prey to a large force of hostile Indians as the caravan attempted to ford a tributary of the Connecticut.

The toll that day, also, was a frightful one—64 men killed. The stream now bears the name "Bloody Brook" in commemoration of the battle and the blood that colored those waters that day.

More than 50 old buildings in Old Deerfield Village have been preserved in their original state, most on their original sites. Many are now provided with tender loving care by three organizations, Historic Deerfield, Inc., the Pocumtuck Valley Memorial Association, and Indian House Memorial, Inc.

Preservation, rather than restoration has been the hallmark of the efforts in Deerfield, home of the first attempt at historic preservation in the United States.

Within Old Deerfield Village is located one of the Nation's finest preparatory schools. The tradition of quality that is found in the houses of Old Deerfield endures also in the fine education offered at Deerfield Academy.

Many generations of school boys have been enriched by their stays at Deerfield since the founding of the academy in 1797.

I do not think that any alumnus would disagree with me that if the late Frank Boyden had not arrived at Deerfield Academy in 1902, education would not be the life of Deerfield as it is today.

In his more than 60 years as headmaster, he, along with the able help of his wife, Helen, made Deerfield Academy one of the most highly respected preparatory schools in the United States.

Frank Boyden came to Deerfield with many new and invigorating ideas and in carrying them out, gave the town of Deerfield its 20th-century fame.

But Deerfield is not the only fine school in the community. The superb Eaglebrook School for Boys from grades six through nine and the excellent coeducational Bement School for children ages 5 through 14 are also located within the township. This is in addition to a fine public school system with both grammar schools and a regional high school.

While the Village of Old Deerfield has

preserved the era of the 17th and 18th centuries, the history of south Deerfield typifies the activity in many parts of the East in the 19th and early 20th centuries. That period, of course, saw a great influx of immigrants to our shores. Attracted to Deerfield by its uncharacteristically rich, fertile farmland were many former residents of Europe, predominantly Eastern Europe.

These new citizens rejuvenated the town of Deerfield; infused it with new blood.

They came to farm, and still today many of their children, and grandchildren till the Deerfield soil, producing lush crops. In addition, the University of Massachusetts sows its experimental crops in south Deerfield soil.

South Deerfield is not without its own scenic beauty. Mount Sugarloaf, the highest peak in the Pocumtuck Range, offers a panoramic view of neighboring towns.

Progress has not passed Deerfield by—rather it has treated it more kindly than most communities.

Currently the town is experiencing a period of rapid population growth. Those who work at the nearby great educational institutions, the University of Massachusetts, Amherst College, Hampshire College, and Smith College, are in increasing numbers calling Deerfield "home."

All this tricentennial year a torch will burn in Deerfield. The flame was brought to Deerfield by Andrew T. Delisle, president of the Indians of Quebec. The torch was ignited on February 16 for a "common purpose, that of responsibility, understanding, reflecting the dignity and worth of all mankind."

A famous Massachusetts native son and our sixth President, John Quincy Adams, once wrote that Deerfield was "not excelled by anything I have seen." I am sure you could apply his words to that great demonstration of brotherhood, as symbolized by the torch of peace and friendship, in Deerfield today.

Mr. Speaker, I now enthusiastically ask my colleagues to join with me in wishing the town of Deerfield, Mass., a very happy 300th anniversary.

LETTERS FROM PARENTS OF AUTISTIC CHILDREN

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, previously, during my daily inserts during National Autistic Children's Week, I have spoken of the emotional burdens the parents of autistic children must face. An additional burden to which I have alluded very briefly is the cost of caring for an autistic child. This additional financial burden is a constant drain on the income of the family.

Two years ago when I testified before the House Ways and Means Committee on national health insurance, I included

letters from parents of autistic children. Today, and for the further information of my colleagues, I would like to reprint some of those letters, particularly those which deal with the high costs of the autistic child remaining at home. The costs incurred by these parents, even for dental care for their children, are exorbitant. There is no way that a family can meet these costs and still have enough left over to provide adequately for the rest of the family.

The letters follow:

OCTOBER 22, 1971.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HARRINGTON: I am writing to you in regard to the great need of a National Health Insurance for mentally ill children.

As the mother of an autistic boy, I am finding it very difficult to pay for his medical and dental care without aid. My son is non-verbal. Because of this handicap when he is ill, I have no way of knowing what or where he is having pain. I cannot afford to guess. This always results in a visit to the hospital.

With normal children an accident requiring stitches can be done quite quickly and simply. The mentally ill child needs to be asleep; therefore, there is the added expense of operating room, anesthesia, and an overnight stay in the hospital.

Recently we had a dentist bill of eight hundred dollars (\$800.00) due to hospitalization. We are struggling to hold on to our home and keep up with all the other financial obligations.

Your kind interests in this vital matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

OCTOBER 28, 1971.

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I am the parent of a severely emotionally disturbed fifteen year old daughter. Her conditions has also been described at various times as autistic, both terms being a form of mental illness. She has been so afflicted since birth.

The Association for Mentally Ill Children (AMIC) has informed me that you are sponsoring a national health insurance plan and that you would be interested in knowing of the needs of these children and their parents in connection therewith.

As you may know, these have been the "forgotten children" of America. Their parents have struggled almost alone in attempting to better their lot in life. Although not counting the cost, in an effort to aid them we have found that like most unfortunate, the attempted cure has been expensive, very often to the detriment of the remaining children. I believe that these expenses should be included in a bill such as yours. It would seem that such a bill is justified only if costs such as these are reimbursed.

The following are several examples of what I mean. She was unable to attend public school and our only choice was to keep her at home or send her to an institutional school out of state. We felt she was an integral part of our family and only we could offer her a chance at a normal life. We prevailed on a nursery school-kindergarten in Roxbury to accept her at age 6 and allow her to spend the day with normal children and develop as much as possible. This went on for only six years at a cost of approximately \$1,000.00 per year. She was on expensive medication during this time (and since) which could be tallied, I suppose, into the thousand(s) dollars bracket. We have been able to find only one dentist who will treat her but this requires an anesthetist and other attendants leading to a bill of \$200.00 or \$300.00 each

time she requires work. I could go on with other examples but I think enough is included to show that in addition to unmeasurable heartbreak, a great financial burden is imposed on the patients.

I appreciate this opportunity to communicate with you and thank you for your kind consideration.

Very truly yours,

OCTOBER 26, 1971.

MICHAEL HARRINGTON,
Representative, State House,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. HARRINGTON: We are the parents of a four-year-old daughter, who has been diagnosed encephalographic, autistic, mentally retarded, and emotionally disturbed.

Our trips to the neurologist and pediatrician are quite frequent, and at one time she was taking four prescriptions a day.

We were also sent to the Putnam Children's Center for psychiatric evaluation, and our insurance company paid a grand total of \$10.00 on a \$350.00 bill.

We are also forced to send her for nursery and therapy at the Cerebral Palsy Center in Lawrence (they are also equipped to handle other handicapped children) because there isn't a state program for her at present. Without assistance, we are paying approximately \$130.00 per month for this education. We feel this is necessary until another appropriate program is available. She had been refused at the state program at the Fernald School.

We are also having to send her to a special dentist dealing with children who do not communicate. I do not have facts regarding this expense whereas she is having her first appointment on Nov. 4. But, I know that our insurance company, which is Washington National, will not cover such dentistry.

As you can see, the expense of having a handicapped child is great, and the insurance program we have does not help us with this special type of coverage. We are beginning to feel the pressures of financial burden, and we wish you much success in obtaining insurance coverage for children with such special needs.

Sincerely,

OCTOBER 25, 1971.

GENTLEMAN: I am writing in regards to Health Insurance for Emotionally Disturbed Children. Children of this nature involve quite an extensive medical and dental expense. A regular dentist will not take him so I have to take him to the Children's Hospital Dental Clinic which charges more per visit. When he had to have fillings he had to go to the hospital and stay two days.

He has more white corpuscles than red so he has to get blood tests every year. He also has to have evaluation tests, E.E.G.'s and attend Seizure Clinic.

As you can see Health Insurance would alleviate this financial burden.

Yours truly,

OPEN STATEMENT TO THE SPONSORS OF FEDERAL
LEGISLATION PROVIDING FOR NATIONAL HEALTH
INSURANCE

SEPTEMBER 1971.

GENTLEMEN: It has come to my attention that the proposed federal legislation providing for a National Health Insurance Plan does not, at present, include full coverage for treatment of mental illness. This is, in my view, a serious flaw that will only serve to compound the most grievous failure in the present practice of American medicine. Anyone familiar with the National Health Programs of European countries (Sweden, Denmark, Germany, for instance), can surely attest to you from experience that financial

coverage for mental illness is of critical social and medical importance.

The fact of mental illness alone has a destructive effect upon the family unit. The prognosis is usually uncertain and with it comes the kind of despair that drains confidence and hope and makes one fear the future. And it is at that time of distress, when one is least able to cope with it, that our system places on the family a huge and almost intolerable burden of expenses. The emotional shock, in other words, is compounded by a prolonged threat to the material resources of the family. I cannot imagine that this is medically defensible and the social destruction caused by this depressing burden is, as you must be aware, very severe.

You may perhaps have sensed that I am speaking here from personal and very painful experience. Because of unsuspected and undetected injuries at birth (we could not afford private medical care at that time), both of our boys are afflicted by severe emotional and speech impairments resulting from brain damage. They cannot live in a regular social setting and need special schooling. When they were less than three years old we began to seek treatment for them. The costs of private therapy, extending over a period of years, were so great that I could not even begin to defray them from my salary. My wife was thus compelled to work full-time, even at highly irregular hours, in order to pay the bills from clinics and psychiatrists. And she had to do this at a time when she herself was suffering from serious fits of depression and needed medical attention and therapy. We spent well over ten thousand dollars on psychiatric therapy alone.

After waiting for many years, we were finally fortunate enough to find a residential children's clinic that would accept our boys and offer them treatment and schooling during the week. But with this the financial problems did not end, of course. The State of Massachusetts bills us for \$80 a day for these services. Since my daily income is less than \$40, I cannot possibly hope to meet these expenses. My debts to the state are rising steadily and must by now amount to \$60,000. Fortunately, the Department of Mental Health has charity enough not to enforce payment. But the laws clearly state it could do so and could thus lay claim to whatever assets I have or may have in the future. This, gentlemen, is a miserable way to live, especially when one is used to paying one's bills and feels guilty when one cannot. And when and where will it end? I may still have to provide for these children twenty or thirty years from now unless they do recover.

I therefore urge you to include the coverage for treatment of mental illness—diagnosed as such by a certified medical board—in your projected health plan. What a relief it would be to pay a premium of let us say, \$150 a month and then feel entitled to medical care without incurring a burden of financial guilt. And as far as potential abuse is concerned (upper-class couch psychiatry, for instance), I am sure that any competent physician can tell genuine mental malfunction apart from social or emotional affectation.

I beg you earnestly to consider my plea.
Sincerely yours,

This last letter is perhaps the most moving, especially in the fourth paragraph when the author—apparently of two autistic children—writes that he is now \$60,000 in debt and can see no end in sight.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that this body act to help alleviate this situation, not only for this gentleman, but for all Americans who are parents of autistic children.

XCIX—1416—Part 17

It is absurd to demand that these families continue to bear the costs at a risk of financial bankruptcy. Congress as a body can enact national health insurance legislation that will help absorb these costs and insure that the children receive adequate and proper care when they need it, not when they can afford it.

The Kennedy-Griffiths bill, of which I am a cosponsor, would go far in assisting these families and providing the autistic children with the treatment that they need. This Congress can go even farther and provide mental health coverage to all Americans so that this Nation will be both mentally and physically sound. My proposal, H.R. 6152, the Mental Health Act of 1973, would assure the quality of mental health in this country.

I urge my colleagues to support these proposals which create a rational system of health care.

LEE HAMILTON'S JUNE 27 WASHINGTON REPORT, ENTITLED "BREZHNEV'S VISIT"

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following: my June 27, 1973, Washington report, entitled "Brezhnev's Visit."

The report follows:

BREZHNEV'S VISIT

Few foreign visitors to Washington have captivated this city like Soviet Communist Party General Secretary Leonid I. Brezhnev, the son of a steelmaker, lifelong Communist Party official, and now at age 67, even though he holds no government office, the preeminent leader of 250 million Soviet citizens by virtue of his Communist Party office.

At an assemblage of Washington's elite, President Nixon admiringly called him "the best politician in the room." His burly, bushy-browed figure has dominated the newspapers and the TV screen. His four-hour performance before Congressional leaders drew high praise even from those seasoned public men, and in every public appearance he has shown himself confident, affable and cooperative. Meeting him in person or on the TV screen, Americans have had to remind themselves that he has been a ruthless and crafty practitioner of power politics in the Kremlin.

His visit symbolizes a change in the direction and mood of Soviet-American relations. Fourteen years ago, when Nikita Krushchev was here, tension and distrust characterized the visit, and despite lofty rhetoric and "the Spirit of Camp David," no agreement was reached on an arms limitation, trade was non-existent, and whatever progress was made in easing tensions evaporated the next year with the U-2 spy plane downing over the Soviet Union. Krushchev talked about burying the U.S., competition was fierce, and actual conflict never far from the surface.

Brezhnev comes preaching, not conflict, but cooperation and interdependence. Each country, knowing that it cannot destroy the other without being devastated itself, emphasizes cooperation over conflict. In 1972, more American-Soviet agreements were signed than in all the years since diplomatic negotiations began. Six or seven more will be

signed while Brezhnev is here. More important than any one agreement is the developing relationship between the two nations, and the hope is that the momentum will continue, producing additional agreements and strengthening cooperation. Military confrontation is not ruled out, and the guard must be maintained, but with each new area of cooperation, confrontation becomes less likely.

Brezhnev speaks for a country remarkable for its mixture of strengths and weaknesses. The military power of the Soviet Union is comparable to that of the U.S. Its economy has been capable of great achievements, like Sputnik, the first manned space flight, and 1,500 mph jet aircraft. But development has been lopsided, with housing desperately short (the average Soviet citizen lives in about one-fourth the space of the average American), agricultural production faltering, consumer goods often shoddy and hard to get, and a top-heavy bureaucracy unable to generate enough good technology to propel the Soviet economy forward. Under Brezhnev there has been a steady erosion of personal and intellectual freedom, not like the days of Stalin, but stifling enough.

Brezhnev's Russia is powerful but insecure, proud of its accomplishments but wanting badly the technology of the West. Its leaders want to preserve the political system while importing and adopting the latest technology to encourage economic growth. They have decided that the best way to achieve this is by moving toward relaxation of tensions with the U.S., and they are willing to make concessions to get it, e.g. by allowing more Jews to emigrate and welcoming President Nixon to Moscow right after he ordered the mining of the Haiphong harbor.

I watched Brezhnev this week with strongly mixed emotions. He occupies Czechoslovakia, suppresses freedom of thought, undermines American political positions, and causes us enormous expenditures of resources. At the same time he is also reaching for some kind of accommodation, and his attitudes and the agreements he has approved are hard evidence that the times have changed from the Cold-War days of implacable hostility.

These contradictions cannot be fully resolved. The American-Soviet relationship will continue to be tense, competitive, and unstable. There will be some cooperation, some conflict. Our defense effort will have to continue even as we reach out for more dialogue and expanding cooperative ventures.

RECORD OF LIBERALISM

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, John P. Roche has some interesting comments on the record of liberalism during the past 30 years in his column which appeared in the AFL-CIO News of June 23. It follows:

A WORD EDGEWISE: 30 YEARS OF LIBERAL EFFORTS PRODUCE SIGNIFICANT PROGRESS

(By John P. Roche)

In a weak moment five months ago, I agreed to give the commencement address at a nearby college. June seemed remote and the task manageable. However, at the moment I am neurotic and depressed: June is here, D-Day and H-Hour are almost upon me. I am contemplating fleeing the country.

You see, I have two major difficulties. First, for more than 20 years now I have sat with the faculty and listened to commencement

speeches. By and large, they have been awful; the amount of drivel I have heard (or tuned out) defies description. For the students and their families it doesn't make much difference—they are just waiting to get those diplomas.

For them it is a one-shot affair, but the faculty is condemned to the cruel and unusual punishment of returning to the torture chamber year after year. As one who has taken this beating, I am already empathizing with the faculty that must listen to me.

My second problem is that my topic is so obvious. All over the nation commencement speakers have been exploring the moral meaning of Watergate and calling for a revival of civic virtue, a renaissance of American values, and similar high-minded objectives. But where I come from whenever anyone, except a man of the cloth, starts talking about "virtue," we lock up the silver. It's like talking about how "tough" you are—one of President Nixon's less attractive topics. The most virtuous people I have known were incapable of self-advertisement just as the toughest would have considered it demeaning to boast about the "blade tempered by the heat."

So Watergate and virtue are out. What then am I going to talk about? Well, at the risk of sneers from the intelligentsia, I am going to compare the United States of my childhood and adolescence with the country today. Thirty years ago this month I graduated from college—in absentia. I was marching through the dust and mud of Virginia with a rifle on my shoulder.

In the subsequent 30 years, I submit, the United States has undergone one of the most fantastic transformations in the history of any nation.

The world I grew up in was unashamedly racist. I didn't know the word Negro existed until I was about 15 (which may explain why I have some problems with "black," which is currently the chic designation). Negroes, however, were not alone: the polite words Jew, Italian, Pole were equally unfamiliar. (As I mentioned here a while ago, I don't think Archie Bunker is funny; he is a throwback to an America that is best forgotten.)

In 1940, Margaret Truman tells us, her father's opposition in Missouri started a story that his middle name was Solomon, that he was a quarter Jewish. And, of course, stories about Franklin D. "Rosenfeld" were legion.

I went to war in a Jim Crow army. With a few token exceptions, the Negroes were put in labor battalions, invariably in my experience officered by southern whites. They might as well have served on the chain gang.

The nation of my childhood rejected the principle of community, the view that Americans had obligations to their less fortunate neighbors. There was no unemployment compensation, no legitimization of trade unions, no social security, no minimum wage, no child labor law governing the whole country (a few states had adopted reforms). At the risk of sounding like a candidate for Congress, I would continue the list: no Medicare, Medicaid, federal aid to education, civil rights acts, voting rights acts.

In the view of the Uriah Heeps in the Nixon Administration all these measures represented a federal intrusion on the rights of state and local governments. (However, I doubt if we will hear much more of this: they are currently discussing other kinds of intrusions with the federal grand jury.)

The proposition, however, is historically preposterous: the national government assumed jurisdiction because in the view of the people it was the only level on which liberal principles of justice, equality, freedom, and simple decency could be implemented.

In short, I'm not ashamed of the liberal record, and I hope that the young people whom I am commencing can look back when they are 50 and see a comparable record of accomplishment.

PERSECUTION OF JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES IN MALAWI

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, a four part article printed in "Awake," March 8, 1973, should be noted by all who deplore violations of individual rights. The case in point involves the rights of members of a minority religious group, the Jehovah's Witnesses, who were living in the African country Malawi.

Members of the Jehovah's Witnesses believe that it is improper for them to participate in the political process. The Malawi Congress Party is the only political party in Malawi—if indeed it can be called a political party when one considers that there are no other parties. The party passed a resolution forcing the Witnesses to join the party or be driven from the villages. The choice the Witnesses made was to exercise their inalienable right to refuse to participate in politics. This brought about the outbreak of persecution against them—not the first; only the latest. Murder, beating, and looting characterized the process.

A comparison can be made between the Malawi incident and the case of the Amish in America. The Amish also wish to remain apart from the political process. In our relatively free country, they are generally allowed to abstain.

I hope the following article will be read by my colleagues:

WHAT IS HAPPENING

In recent months the world press has repeatedly called attention to the persecution of Christians in Malawi. These Christians, Jehovah's witnesses, have been the victims of what London's *Sunday Telegram* of January 14, 1973, called "one of the most vicious religious persecutions in Africa's turbulent history."

Regular readers of *Awake!* magazine are familiar with many of the details of this persecution, which broke out most recently in the latter half of 1972. The December 8 issue of *Awake!* carried a full report on this, entitled "Christians Flee Cruel Persecution in Malawi."

That report covered the events that had taken place up to a few months ago. But what has happened since then? Where does the situation now stand for these Malawian Christians?

Before we bring events up-to-date, a brief summary of what has taken place in Malawi may help readers who are not familiar with the situation.

WAVES OF INTENSE PERSECUTION

Intense persecution of Jehovah's witnesses on a national scale began in Malawi in 1967. Then many Witnesses were savagely beaten and some were murdered. Hundreds of their women were raped, some repeatedly. Thousands of their homes, stores and places of worship were looted and destroyed. Their Christian activity, including their peaceful meeting to study the Bible, was banned, as was all their literature.

Last year, 1972, another wave of persecution broke out. This time it was even more severe than the one in 1967. The beatings, burnings, lootings, rapings and murders were on a much larger scale. The Witnesses were deprived of their livelihood and fired from their jobs. Indeed, a countrywide effort was made to destroy the some 23,000 of Jehovah's

witnesses in Malawi. So they were forced to flee for their lives.

All of this came about as the direct result of official actions taken by Malawi's one-party government. Matthew White, a correspondent for the London *Financial Times*, was in Malawi at the time. Writing from Blantyre, he said the following, which was published in the *Financial Times* on October 31:

"The purge of Jehovah's witnesses . . . has unsettled the country more than any other post-independence event. Action against the Christian sectarians . . . followed a resolution passed at the annual convention of the Malawi Congress Party to deprive Witnesses of their livelihood and have them 'chased away' from their villages unless they joined the party."

Those resolutions were endorsed by the president of Malawi, Dr. H. Kamuzu Banda, in a rally at the city of Zomba on September 17. With what result? Correspondent White reports:

"Seeing this speech as the green light, squads from the party's League of Malawi Youth and the Young Pioneers started house-to-house searches, evicting and sometimes assaulting Africans who could not produce or refused to buy party membership cards. It is difficult, perhaps impossible, to gauge the full extent of this violence . . .

"What astonishes many people here—including some members of the M[alawi] C[ongress] P[arty]—is that President Banda should allow the hostility to get so completely out of hand."

The savagery of the attacks caused a wave of revulsion on the part of many people throughout the world. The press of many nations reacted similarly. Typical of many press reports was this comment by the London *Times* of December 15, 1972:

"Hitler put them in concentration camps, they have been persecuted behind the iron curtain, and they have been persecuted in African one-party states. Dr. Banda of Malawi banned the sect in 1967, and this year the savage attacks of his Young Pioneers—the Kamuzu's party watchdogs—have driven thousands of them into neighbouring countries."

Appeals were made to stop the persecution. But these did not prevail. So, as the *Times* noted, Jehovah's witnesses were forced to flee Malawi for their lives.

THE ISSUE

In an editorial on October 17, the San Francisco *Examiner* said of Jehovah's witnesses: "You might regard them as model citizens. They pay taxes diligently, tend the sick, battle illiteracy. But they refuse, on religious principle, to buy membership cards in Malawi's single political party."

Thus, the immediate cause of this persecution is the refusal of these Christians to join the political party that controls Malawi, the Malawi Congress Party. They will not purchase the party cards, as is demanded of them. This is because of their Bible-based neutral stand on politics.

In this regard, they do just as Jesus Christ and the first-century Christians did. Ask yourself: What political faction, whether Roman or Jewish, did Jesus join? What political faction did the apostles join? The Bible is clear on this point. They did not join any of them. They remained neutral, peacefully carrying on their Christian activity as decent, law-abiding citizens.

To try to explain such matters to the authorities, every effort was made by Jehovah's witnesses. Cables, letters, phone calls and interviews were used. The Governing Body of Jehovah's witnesses in Brooklyn, New York, cabled a request to Dr. Banda asking him to have a meeting with representatives of the Governing Body of Jehovah's witnesses. But the Malawi government simply answered that any information should be sent through the Malawi delegate to the United Nations.

This was done. A thirteen-page memoran-

dum was sent to this U.N. representative. It explained the position of Jehovah's witnesses, and why no government should fear them. In a section of this letter under the subheading "Why Jehovah's Witnesses Refuse to Buy Party Cards," the following was stated:

"The position of Jehovah's witnesses in this matter is based on Biblical teaching and their conscience. Jehovah's witnesses take a neutral position in all countries of the world, not taking sides or participating in any political activities, thus better to serve impartially as ministers of good news representing the heavenly kingdom of Jehovah God."

Commenting on the matter of political involvement that would result from buying party cards, this section also noted:

"Jehovah's witnesses respect and observe the laws of each country in which they reside as long as these laws are not contrary to the divine law. However, in the matter of political involvement, which includes the purchase of political party membership cards, they conscientiously feel that this would be contrary to the words of our Lord Jesus concerning his true followers: 'They are no part of the world, just as I am no part of the world.' (John 17:16) Also, Christ said, as recorded at John 18:36: 'My kingdom is no part of this world. If my kingdom were part of this world, my attendants would have fought.'"

In addition, the Governing Body's letter to the representative of Malawi in the United Nations said this:

"Jehovah's witnesses take the same position as early Christians. The book 'Christianity and the Roman Government' states: 'The Christians were strangers and pilgrims in the world around them; their citizenship was in heaven; the kingdom to which they looked was not of this world. The consequent want of interest in public affairs came thus from the outset to be a noticeable feature in Christianity.'"

"Permit it to be said, however, that Jehovah's witnesses have no intention or desire to interfere with what others do about participation in politics. They are not working against the Government of Malawi or against the political party. They themselves decline to participate in political matters or to purchase political party cards, even though it has brought great suffering upon them, because to Jehovah's witnesses it is a matter of Bible-based belief and conscience."

However, to this time, no reply has been forthcoming from the government of Malawi. No delegation has been allowed to represent Jehovah's witnesses to the president or to other officials of that land.

Well over 20,000 of Jehovah's witnesses were forced to flee Malawi. Most of them fled to neighboring Zambia. Several thousand fled to Mozambique.

THE REFUGEE CAMP AT SINDA MISALE

Those of Jehovah's witnesses who fled from Malawi to Zambia were gathered into a refugee camp near the border of the two countries. This camp was called Sinda Misale. Several reports, including one by Zambia's Rural Development Minister, Mr. Reuben Kamanga, indicated that about 19,000 of Jehovah's witnesses were refugees there.

Since Zambia had not invited the Witnesses into their country, they were treated as unwanted visitors. The camp was isolated by security forces so that there would be no free access to it.

... officials from Malawi and Zambia determined that Jehovah's witnesses at Sinda Misale would be sent back to Malawi. Arrangements were made to do that, unknown to the Witnesses at the camp.

THE TRANSFER—A DECEPTION

In December, Jehovah's witnesses at the camp were told by officials that they were going to be moved, but to another place in

Zambia. Such a move was not objectionable to them. But they were not told the truth. The actual destination was Malawi.

That the Witnesses were deceived as to the destination is clearly documented. Over one hundred interviews with Jehovah's witnesses who were actually involved have proved this conclusively. According to London's *Sunday Telegraph*, they had been told that their destination was another camp in Zambia:

"On December 20, 21 and 22, a fleet of 52 lorries and 13 buses driven by Zambians arrived at Sinda Misale. According to an African journalist who visited the camp . . . Jehovah's Witnesses were told to board transport for another camp in Zambia."

The United Nations representatives did nothing to thwart the deception. In fact, they became a party to it. The *Times of Zambia* stated on December 23:

"The 19,000 Watchtower refugees who have just been repatriated to Malawi 'were happy to return to their country.' This was stated yesterday by UN High Commissioner for Refugees, Dr. Hugo Idoyaga. . . ."

Dr. Idoyaga said he and a director of the UNHCR from Geneva, Mr. Skodjoe Dazie, had helped supervise the voluntary repatriation."

About two weeks later, the *Times of January 6* said: "The United Nations high commissioner for refugees in Zambia, Dr. Hugo Idoyaga, said the refugees had been happy to go back."

But that was untrue. The Witnesses did not want to go back under the conditions that then prevailed in Malawi. Indeed, had they not been forced to flee for their very lives, they would not have gone to Zambia in the first place. That is why the *Times of Zambia* had correctly reported earlier, on December 18, that Jehovah's witnesses "prefer to remain in Zambia." Also, the London *Sunday Telegraph* said: "Despite the official assurances, the Jehovah's Witnesses did not go back willingly."

Scores of interviews with the Witnesses who were involved in the transfer verify this. Following is a summary of the situation told by these Witnesses:

"First of all, these brothers [that is, Jehovah's witnesses] explained that it is not true that the brothers who were at Sinda Misale happily agreed to return to Malawi. The police and other government officials who supervised the move cheated the brothers by telling them that they were moving them to a new site in the Petauke area."

"The officials waited until all the leading brothers and others boarded the buses which were guarded by police, and then they told the brothers that they were being taken to Malawi."

The Witnesses from Sinda Misale were to be taken to a camp in Malawi at Lilongwe. There, at an old airfield, Malawian officials and hundreds of Malawian security forces waited for them.

How many of Jehovah's witnesses actually arrived there? This cannot be determined accurately at the present time. Eyewitness reports are incomplete.

One report by the *Sunday Telegraph* of London does say this: "On the 60-mile journey from Sinda Misale to Lilongwe . . . thousands abandoned the buses and lorries and fled back into the bush." The newspaper also states that an "African journalist travelled all the way to Lilongwe on the last convoy, which had set off with 3,000 refugees from Sinda Misale. Eight buses arrived and only 29 Witnesses disembarked." However, such reports have not been confirmed as yet.

But what can be confirmed is what happened to those who did return.

BRUTAL PERSECUTION BREAKS OUT AGAIN

The reluctance of Jehovah's witnesses to return to Malawi was well founded. This became evident when we learn what happened to those who were taken back.

What awaited them was another reign of terror. Nothing had changed. The vicious attitude against them still prevailed. Malawi's government had taken no steps to alleviate the situation.

RETURN TO MALAWI

When the Witnesses arrived at Lilongwe Airport in Malawi, those who were known to be leading overseers were arrested and put in jail. Among these were John Chiwele, who had been supervisor of the camp at Sinda Misale, and Lazarus Chirwa, who was his assistant.

At the airport, the Witnesses were addressed by Malawi government officials. One of these was Mr. Kumbweza Banda, minister for the Central region. Another was Mr. Quansio Chibambo, minister for the Northern region. The Witnesses were told that they had left Malawi of their own will, which was untrue; and that they had returned to Malawi of their own will, which was equally untrue.

The officials next said that the Witnesses would have to go back to their respective villages and buy party cards. When one of the Witnesses tried to say a word to the officials, he was told to shut up. Policemen and Young Pioneers, the militant youth group of the Malawi Congress party, were then instructed to search all the Witnesses. They confiscated Bibles, Bible literature, passports and all other documents. The Witnesses were then told to walk to their villages. Those who lived very far away were taken in lorries to a place near their area and then told to walk the rest of the way.

When the Witnesses reached their villages, a few who had relatives were provided with sleeping accommodations. But the majority stayed out in the open and slept there, some under trees, along with their children. But a worse fate awaited them, and it became evident very quickly. An example is noted in the London *Sunday Telegraph* of January 14, which reported on a speech that President Banda made over the radio at the beginning of the new year. The report states:

"Banda said the Jehovah's Witnesses . . . had been deceived by their own kind, he said, into believing that 'someone called Armageddon would destroy Malawi on November 15 and would build them a new city at Lilongwe.'"

"Even as he was speaking, Mr. and Mrs. Gorson Kamanga, middle-aged members of the sect who had been repatriated to their home at Nkhata Bay on the Lake, were being stripped naked and paraded through the streets as, once again, they had refused to buy party cards."

"And, at a village near Lilongwe, another five 'repatriated' Witnesses had their arms and legs broken in a vicious beating at the hands of Young Pioneers. One man had nails driven through his hands. At Lilongwe Hospital they were refused treatment because they had no party cards."

Anyone familiar with the teachings of Jehovah's witnesses will, of course, know that never have they believed or taught that Armageddon is a person. Nor have they ever taught that Malawi would be destroyed on November 15, or that a new city would be built for them there.

But such hostility against them fanned the flames of persecution. And the issue of party cards was once again thrust at the Witnesses. When they refused to buy them because of their neutrality in political affairs, vicious attacks began on these Witnesses who had been 'repatriated.'

EYEWITNESS ACCOUNTS

The evidence of this comes not just from foreign newspapers. It comes from Jehovah's witnesses themselves who were the victims. Many interviews were held with those "repatriates" who had been again engulfed in a wave of terror.

These eyewitness reports show that when

the refugees went back to their respective villages, the chiefs, village headmen, party officials, as well as government officials, demanded that they buy the party cards. Typical are the following examples:

One of Jehovah's witnesses, Gilbert July of Chimongo village, reported: "On January 3, 1973, a meeting was convened for all village headmen in Mchinji district, presided over by Mr. Cheuche, M.P. for Mchinji region. At this meeting it was resolved that if the Witnesses from Sinda Misale would still refuse to buy party cards, then they should be dealt with ruthlessly. After this meeting the Witness brothers and sisters of Kandama congregation situated at Chimongo village (whose chief is Duwa) were all chased away from their village because they refused to buy the party cards. The brothers and sisters left for the bush."

Witness Rightwell Moses is from Kachijere village, the chief of which is Mbelwa. Moses reported that as soon as the Witnesses had returned to the village they were savagely beaten by the youths because they refused to buy party cards. Hastings Mzamo, the presiding overseer of the local congregation there, was so badly beaten he can no longer hear well.

Rightwell adds these details to his report: "Two days after we arrived home, Mr. Mahara Banda, M.P., came to the village and warned the people at a meeting that nobody without a party card should be allowed to stay in the village. Then on January 1, 1973, Mr. Mahara Banda brought two youths with him in his car. Their last names are Jere and Tembo. He parked his car outside the village and waited there while the youths entered the village. When the youths entered the village they approached my daughter Jolcy and also Sister Oliva and demanded party cards from them. The sisters, of course, could not produce any, and so the youths began hitting them with fists. The young sisters were forcibly stripped of their clothes and then the youths began beating them with sticks in their naked state. They got hold of the brothers and began beating them up also. When they got tired they left for their car, shouting as they were going away that they would return to beat up the brothers and sisters again. As soon as they left, the brothers and sisters fled from the village into the bush and then left Malawi."

Another Witness woman, Likeness Kamanga, was sent back to her village of Vit-hando, whose chief is Chindi. She reports the following: "Upon arrival at our village we were invited to a meeting at Bulale. The meeting was addressed by Adamson Dindi, district chairman of the Malawi Congress Party. This was on January 4, 1973. Twelve Witnesses, including myself, were at this meeting. We were all ordered to buy party cards. But we explained that we would not buy any. Mr. Dindi and the others became so enraged that they ordered us to leave Malawi immediately, right then and there. We were not allowed to take anything with us. We all left for the bush in small groups. The next day, as I was in flight, I was told by my relatives that one of the Witnesses who was at the meeting with us the previous day had been killed."

Geleson Esaya, a Witness from Mwelekela village, relates: "On January 2, 1973, we were invited to a meeting to be held in Mwelekela village. Village headman Lombwa was to preside. We were twenty Witnesses all together. While at the meeting we were ordered to buy Malawi Congress Party cards or else face death. We explained that we would not buy a card. Then he ordered us to leave the village immediately. We kindly but firmly explained that we wanted a letter from him explaining the reasons for expelling us from the village. He refused. We then decided to go to the Mchinji police station. But instead of listening to us, the officer in charge there ordered us to return to the village. We therefore had no alternative but to leave Malawi."

Scores of other eyewitness accounts testify to the same brutal treatment. Every one of the more than one hundred Witnesses interviewed confirmed that absolutely nothing had been done by the government to stop the persecution. They all expressed fears that the situation would get worse. As a result, many of them have fled into the bush and out of Malawi once more.

JUNE OPINION POLL

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1973

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, herewith is my June opinion poll:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 1973.

DEAR FRIENDS: As Congress heads into the second half of the First Session, we are faced with a heavy work load of critical issues. It is important that your voice be heard to enable me to give our 23rd Congressional District truly representative service in determining national policies.

The best way I have found to encourage a wide-spread, indicative response is through the Minshall Opinion Poll. Combined with first-hand information gained in committee hearings, official briefings and House debates, the consensus obtained from these questionnaires helps me to reach legislative decisions.

As in the past, a copy of this poll is being sent to every home in the District. If you wish additional copies, please call my Cleveland office, 2951 New Federal Office Building, telephone 522-4382.

Returns run into the tens of thousands so you can understand why it is not possible for me to answer each one individually. Should you have any specific question or problem requiring my help, I would appreciate your sending it separately from the poll to avoid delay in giving your request top-priority attention.

No envelope is needed for the attached self-mailer. Simply cut along the dotted line, fold with return address outside, stamp, and mail. *Please do not staple or tape together as this slows the tabulating process.* All polls will be carefully tabulated and results made known in a future "Washington Report" newsletter.

Thank you for working with me to make yours a strong voice in Washington.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
Member of Congress.

MINSHALL OPINION POLL

(NOTE.—Each question has yes, no, undecided choices.)

1. Do you believe:
 - (a) The President had prior knowledge of the Watergate break-in?
 - (b) The President knew of or participated in the cover-up?
2. Do you think the President has done a good job in foreign affairs?
3. Has he done a good job handling domestic affairs?
4. Should Congress further curtail spending to slow inflation?
5. If Congress does not keep within the budget ceiling, should the President refuse to spend the funds?
6. Phase 4 economic controls, due in August, are under study by the Administration. Do you favor controls on:
 - (a) Food prices.
 - (b) Rent.
 - (c) Wearing apparel.
 - (d) Petroleum products.
 - (e) Home appliances.
 - (f) Interest rates.
 - (g) Corporate profits.
 - (h) Wages.
7. If both sides honor the peace agreement, do you approve of U.S. aid to Indochina, including North Vietnam, for reconstruction purposes?
8. What is the most important issue facing the Nation today?

- Age:
Sex:
Occupation:

POWER MAN CAN LIVE WITH

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 29, 1973

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, it is now evident in America that we must develop alternatives and supplements to fossil fuels and nuclear energy. One such source is the sun. A second basic energy source is the wind. A third potential energy source is solid waste. Another energy source which needs more emphasis and the one I wish to discuss today is water—hydropower.

Specifically, today I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a French achievement in the use of tidal power on the Rance River near the channel Port of St. Malo in Brittany. The story appears in the June 11, 1973 issue of *The Nation*. As its author Karl Keyerleber writes:

The basic idea is old. For centuries tidal mills have ground corn and done other chores, but as a source of energy they ranked somewhere behind windmills. Thoughtful planners in many countries have dreamed of putting oceans to work on a big scale. The French did it, developing a sophisticated generating plant that began operating in 1967 and last year added 560 million kilowatt-hours to the national grid.

The performance of this St. Malo plant has met all expectations. I hope that this achievement will encourage us to initiate similar projects on this side of the Atlantic, possibly at Passamaquoddy. We must also attempt greater efforts to make the most of other available hydropower sources, such as those of the Missouri Basin.

From the environmental standpoint, from the operations cost viewpoint, and from the standpoint of energy suppliers who need instantaneous peaking power, hydropower is attractive. In terms of economics it compares favorably also with costs of nuclear power, and does not present the problems of nuclear contamination. As Mr. Keyerleber points out at the end of his article on the St. Malo tidal power facility:

The one clear conclusion we could reach was that the structure in which we stood is something man can live with.

Mr. President, so that my colleagues and others may see the full text of this article by Karl Keyerleber, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWER WITHOUT POLLUTION: THE TIDAL
DAM AT ST. MALO
(By Karl Keyerleber)

ST. MALO, FRANCE.—This ancient fortified town, fought over in wars from Caesar's time to Hitler's, has often seemed to have its eyes more on the past than the future. But today it can boast of one of the most forward-looking engineering feats of our time—the harnessing of the ocean tides to produce power without pollution.

I came to this underdeveloped region of Brittany for a first-hand look at the result of French pioneering because reports had indicated that it was an unusual example of man's wise use of natural resources while protecting his environment. I was drawn to the plant astride the River Rance, first of its kind, in part because of a strong belief that my own country has made a mistake by not acting on a similar plan which would have tamed the towering tides in the Bay of Fundy to furnish energy for the East Coast. (See "Passamaquoddy: A Good Idea Is Hard to Kill," *The Nation*, February 26, 1973 and "Reviving Passamaquoddy," *The Nation*, July 13, 1964.)

The basic idea is old. For centuries tidal mills have ground corn and done other chores, but as a source of energy they ranked somewhere behind windmills. Thoughtful planners in many countries have dreamed of putting the oceans to work on a big scale. The French did it, developing a sophisticated generating plant that began operating in 1967 and last year added 560 million kilowatt-hours to the national grid.

I reached St. Malo, about 200 miles west of Paris, after a five-hour ride through rain-washed country with a change at Rennes from the Paris Express. Although three-fourths of St. Malo's buildings were destroyed by a German bombing attack and subsequent week-long fire in 1944, the town retains much of its picturesque 13th-century appearance. The reason is interesting. Instead of replacing demolished buildings with gleaming, modern structures of glass and steel, the tradition-loving residents rebuilt many areas just as they had been, even using original plans of many of the buildings.

Conveniently across the street from the railroad station is the old Hotel des Voyageurs where, as in the custom of French innkeepers, they insisted that I eat all my meals in the hotel's dining room and charged me 6 francs for a bath. On Saturday morning a twelve-minute bus ride brought me to the Rance site, where I was met by Jacques Feuillebois, a former captain in the French merchant marine now doing public relations for Electricité de France, the government utility that built and operates the plant. Accompanying us on a tour of inspection were four engineers and a newspaperman from West Germany.

At first sight the dam appears surprisingly small. It doesn't soar skyward 600 or 700 feet like Western dams in the United States. Slowly one becomes aware of a more significant difference. There is no huge acreage under water—no Lake Mead or Lake Roosevelt reservoir. At its highest, the water in the basin behind the dam is only a few feet above its level before the dam was built. That increase, explained our guide, is the result of pumping at off-peak hours, which overfills the basin and adds to generating capacity on ebb tide.

Built into the concrete structure is a relatively small lock. Since the plant is upstream from St. Malo and its docks, it was not necessary to provide for ocean-going vessels. Fishing, pleasure and other small craft are locked through. Besides the lock, there are gates for controlling the flow of water, the power station itself, and a fixed dike that closes

off the rest of the river's width. Most of the structure, like an iceberg, is under water.

Central feature of the power station is a concrete-walled chamber 43.5 feet from floor to ceiling and more than 1,000 feet long, like half a dozen great concert halls set end to end. The floor, we were told, is at the lowest water level when the tide is out, the ceiling at about the highest level when the basin is full. Twenty-four open bays in this long hall contain the turbines that make it all function. The turbines are of ingenious design, developed especially for this use. Whereas turbines with which we have been familiar operate when driven in only one direction, these are reversible, enabling the generation of electricity when the tide comes in as well as when it ebbs. Each turbine is encased in a bulb-shaped steel shell that looks not unlike a small two-man submarine. The generator is inside the shell and the whole unit remains under water, another departure from usual practice which places generators above the water level. Besides their two-way power production, these versatile turbines also act as pumps for the overflowing task. Each has four propeller-like blades, about 5 feet wide, of variable pitch design so that they can be set for varying conditions of tide and river current. In this first installation of its kind half the blades are of stainless steel and half of a copper-aluminum alloy. Both metals have proved highly resistant to corrosion, according to M. Feuillebois, with the stainless set standing up slightly better.

Operations are programmed daily by a computer, which takes into account variations in the tide and river flow at different hours each day and in different seasons. A small staff in a control room just off the large hall throws the switches and monitors the operation with the aid of a closed-circuit television camera. In the spring, the high tide may rise 47 feet, sending sea water surging at 10-knot speed through the rocky banks that pinch the rather broad Rance into a narrower channel as it approaches the gulf.

With the off-peak pumping and using the four tides each day, the French have been able to modify the lunar rhythm that ignores man's need for certain peak-power periods and approach the solar rhythm by which he customarily works. In other words, they can produce power when it is most needed.

Maintenance work is minor and the plant has required no repairs, said M. Feuillebois, which is remarkable in view of the innovative techniques and equipment used. "In more than six years we have had no repairs, not even a turbine blade," he commented. "Both types of blade are as good as new."

So pleased are the French with the new turbines that a program is under way to install similar ones for one-way operation in conventional hydroelectric stations on the Rhine and Rhone Rivers. Some officials have been quoted as saying that the bonus of the more efficient turbines would go far to justify the expenditure for the Rance plant even if it didn't perform as they had hoped. However, performance has met all expectations. Output is higher than the designed 540 million kilowatts per year and operating costs are less than for any other type of power plant in the French system. The Rance facility doesn't pollute the air, foul the water supply, or disfigure the landscape. Far from being an eyesore, it has become a tourist attraction that last year drew about 200,000 visitors, said M. Feuillebois. One small drawback is the fact that navigation is somewhat impeded because small vessels have to be locked through to reach the sea. What is lost in marine activity, however, is made up by improved land traffic, since a new highway using the dam as a roadway over the Rance has lopped 20 miles off the route between St. Malo and points west of the river.

A major negative factor remains and it

leaves one pondering a paradox. Despite the unqualified success of the project, which is described with pride by M. Feuillebois and others at Electricité de France, there are no plans to build more tidal power plants. The reason is that nuclear plants can be built more cheaply, and the government has decided to take that route. Like the electric power industry in the United States, the French seem to be enamored of fission energy and, like the Americans, they shrug off the peril to the environment of its radioactive fuel. To some the performance of the Rance plant is rather an embarrassment.

M. Feuillebois talked about the economics of the situation, though we were handicapped by a language problem that sadly blurred nuances. As I understood him, investment cost for nuclear power in France is about half the 600 million francs, or more than \$122 million in U.S. dollars, that was spent on the Rance project. But he drew attention to the difference in useful life and operating cost. The Rance facility should last fifty years, he indicated, adding that the dam could be amortized over seventy-five years and the turbines over thirty-five years. And there is no cost for fuel or disposal of waste products. A nuclear plant would have only a ten-year amortization in France, according to M. Feuillebois. This seems low and at variance with experience in the United States. In any case, such comparisons of useful life are inconclusive in any language, and only obscure the pervasive issue of safety to the environment and the extent to which expediency may govern the choices made. The one clear conclusion we could reach was that the structure in which we stood is something man can live with.

UNFAIR TO BE LEFT OFF LIST

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague, TOM REES, has written a plaintive condemnation of the recently revealed list of "enemies of the White House." Mr. REES asks, quite properly, what will become of those of us who did not make that list? Obviously we have been jeopardized in our political careers by such omission. Obviously there will be those who will ask whether our opposition to the President has been sincere since it apparently has gone unnoticed by the White House. It is indeed embarrassing to many of us and TOM REES expresses our vexation and uneasiness quite well. I include his remarks to be included with my own:

WHITE HOUSE POLITICAL ENEMIES LIST UNFAIR

(By Congressman THOMAS M. REES)

John Dean's presentation of the White House's "Opponents List and Political Enemies Project" at the Watergate hearings has hit congressional Democrats like a bombshell. Many of us who assumed that we would be certified "political enemies" of the White House, who had done everything possible to be considered as such, did not make the list.

Nothing more damaging to Democrats has yet been presented at the hearings—how can we run for re-election as Democrats when we're not official enemies of the White House? What will happen to us in our party primary elections if our opponents are certified political enemies who have been investigated and harassed by the FBI and the IRS?

Apparently the White House is trying to destroy the vast majority of the Democratic congressmen by not putting us on its political enemies list. And the list is grossly unfair. It is discriminatory and probably in violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It certainly does not come near to following the delegate selection guidelines adopted by the Democratic Party for their 1972 convention. For example, the list only contains six white congressmen out of the over 400 white members of Congress—but all the black congressmen are listed. If this isn't reverse discrimination, what is?

Eleven senators and three other politicians are listed. But the political enemies list really goes overboard on media people, academics, and businessmen. Columns and columns of them are listed in the newspaper report.

So what's going to happen?

What's going to happen is that every certified "political enemy," especially those in the media and academia because there are more of them, will be running against the poor non-certified Democrat congressmen in the Democratic primaries. This is how President Nixon is going to get even with all of us Democratic congressmen who have been voting against him for the last four and a half years.

To make this whole process of designating political enemies fairer, the President should establish a bipartisan commission and at least have an informal set of ground rules listing the criteria for choosing political opponents. There should also be an appeal process so that those of us who were left off the list could come before the commission and make our case by clearly showing that we meet the criteria of a certified political enemy.

ADDRESS BY HON. SPRUILLE
BRADEN

HON. JESSE A. HELMS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 29, 1973

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, there has recently come to my hand the text of an address to the New York State Society of the Cincinnati made by the Honorable Spruille Braden on February 20, 1973. The intervening months have not invalidated a single line or a single phrase. It is a speech full of permanent wisdom, and worthy of being taken to heart by every American. Ambassador Braden has been one of the outstanding diplomats in the history of the Foreign Service, and the rich reservoir of his experience has cast up truths which ought to guide our future actions as a nation. I commend it to my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this speech by Spruille Braden be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS TO THE NEW YORK STATE SOCIETY OF THE CINCINNATI BY THE HONORABLE SPRUILLE BRADEN, FEBRUARY 20, 1973

To address this patriotic and aristocratic society for a second time makes me proud indeed. With such a well informed and intelligent audience, I shall speak frankly, hoping thus to win your individual and collective support for some of my ideas on the inter-dependent subjects of defense and foreign policy.

A fully adequate defense will support and strengthen a sound foreign policy; and an

effective foreign policy will render our defense more potent.

An adequate defense must be genuinely and knowledgeably desired and supported by a substantial majority of the American people.

But how many of us know what an adequate defense really involves?

Let me catalogue a few of the apparently extraneous but nonetheless pertinent, although malevolent influences which presently are undermining our national defense:

How can the average citizen be informed accurately on defense by a media biased in favor of the left; an educational system largely controlled by radicals; by sex and vulgarity, both profane and filthy, permeating the theater, movies and much so-called literature; by "lib", racial and other movements and demonstrations propagating heretofore unmentionable and even unbelievable objectives of all varieties.

How can our citizenry concentrate their minds on defense or foreign policy when so much of our press and TV—sometimes reluctantly, too often clamorously—belch forth vivid pictures and accounts of each day's muggings and murders, kidnappings and sky-jackings, as crime and narcotics each intimately related to the other have spread and become both a way of life and a reign of terror.

How can the honest citizen give thought to defense and foreign relations, when he is beleaguered by wide-spread corruption and incompetence at all levels of government—just take a look at "fun city".

Simultaneously our people have become indifferent to the very real threat to this nation of communism. Witness, how that diabolical ideology has instigated and supported brush-fire wars all over the globe, as in Korea and Vietnam, where we spend our strength and the Soviets, at almost no cost in lives or wounded, have a testing laboratory for their arms while we suffer ghastly casualties and mortalities.

Finally, how can any one of us contribute to building an adequate defense in the face of an ever-expanding inflation, resulting from 40 years of governmental extravagance and welfare-statism?

One of the major and least productive extravagances, foreign aid, amounting to astronomical billions of dollars, has injured the recipient peoples as much or more than it has the American taxpayer.

On March 15, 1972, Secretary of the Treasury Connally said: "The United States is broke". The dollar, once the backbone and sturdiest of all currencies now is floundering in a slough not of despond but of devaluations, and is shunned by many countries.

In 1953, when addressing the foreign policy association I blasted the Bretton Woods conference sponsored by our Government, I said it was "A conglomerate of Keynesians, communists, some fellow-travellers and other misguided or ignorant souls" who agreed "To put good U.S. dollars into a pot with a miscellany of other currencies. They flaunted a fundamental economic principle, that bad money always drives out good. All we humble citizens can do is to cry: 'Look out!'"

Most of you are too young to remember that a convertible gold standard, although not a cure-all, as crises approach sounds an alarm and acts as a safety valve. Over several decades before 1929, when coupled with sound monetary and fiscal policies it brought us a fair degree of security.

Instead our citizens today are befuddled by our modernistic-art-nouveau-currencies, and chatter about "paper gold", a self-contradictory name for special drawing rights. We do know positively that the dollar we now earn will buy little more than one third of what it did in 1939. Inflation inevitably will continue until our politicians abandon the inebriating habit of unbalanced budgets and deficit financing.

Only with a reasonably sound and stable dollar can we buy essential materials for defense, such as copper, iron, petroleum and many other things. Already we are confronted with national energy shortages. Without copper from Chile and oil from Venezuela, the U.S.A. and its allies could not have won World War II. I submit our defense is threatened on this count alone.

Leaving aside such menaces as race riots, actual mutiny, on some of our carriers, the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Zumwalt recently declared that we have lost control of the Atlantic and Mediterranean, and only by some sort of legerdemain can we hope to control far eastern waters for as long as another five years.

Presently we are out-submerged and out-cruised by the Soviets, who now also are building aircraft carriers.

Starting in 1959 we permitted the Soviets to gain control over Cuba, only 90 miles off our shores. King Philip II of Spain, President Jefferson, Admiral Mahan, the greatest strategist this country ever had, all have said the nation which controls the Caribbean and Cuba will dominate the Western Hemisphere. Such an enemy could land on our gulf coast and proceed up the Mississippi Valley with ease.

The Communists headed by the Soviets, with some Chinese and Ghanians, and their satrap Castro rule Cuba with over 12,000 Russian troops. They have built two-lane highways through the huge caves underlying the island. Over these roads they have conveyed and installed medium and long range missiles which can hit any city in the United States. Also on the north coast submarines can enter underground pens without surfacing at all outside.

These threats to the defense of our land result from President Kennedy's mishandling of the Bay of Pigs and the missile crises; plus his agreement with Khrushchev guaranteeing that neither would the U.S.A. invade Cuba nor permit it to be invaded by anyone else. This last-mentioned iniquitous deal tore in shreds the cornerstone of our foreign policy, the Monroe Doctrine—the most brilliant diplomatic and security measure ever taken by any nation, anywhere, at any time.

Due to our frequently pusillanimous defense and foreign policies during the sixteen years following President Truman's retirement we find Chile gone Communist and stealing billions of dollars of our fellow citizens' properties; Peru acting in the same fashion, and all Latin America excepting Brazil, Paraguay, the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua, gradually aligning themselves against us.

The U.N. Security Council is encouraging these animosities by planning from March 15 to 21 to convene in Panama. The Communist and so-called developing countries then will viciously attack our country as an imperialistic aggressor.

Already the Israeli foreign minister declared publicly just a few weeks ago that the United States had sunk to the status of a second or third rate power.

I have presented the foregoing in summary fashion, but must add that while President Nixon wants and is trying to build an adequate defense he is blocked by congressional, press and other doves in general along with an assortment of misguided idealists, leftists, fellow-travellers and communists. Your help is essential if he is to obtain the requisite finances and authority, wherewith to increase both manpower and all varieties of armament up to secure levels.

The armed forces must replace permissiveness with an esprit de corps, discipline, courage, and the same military bearing our POWs demonstrated when they landed at Clark Air Base.

The Department of State also must return to its old disciplines, authority and procedures, quickly stopping those who are attempting to destroy professional proficiency

by converting the foreign service association into a labor union.

When these returns to sanity have been accomplished the United States again will occupy the unquestioned status of a first rate power, and so with eternal vigilance, be ready and able to repulse attacks of any kind from any source.

Defense and foreign policy must be based on a renewed popular morality, willingness to work and pride of craftsmanship by employers and employees alike—i.e., the work ethic as expounded by President Nixon. All of us must stop trying to get something for nothing, and put an end to repeated strikes, slowdowns and sit-ins so fundamentally injurious to our nation, and, therefore, our defense.

For many years I have emphasized at every opportunity that the gravest issue facing humanity—with all the other evils I have listed and which extend throughout the world—is not nuclear warfare. It is the breakdown in morality everywhere. I further hold that the worst of all immoralities is communism, which only respects physical force greater than its own.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have drawn a gloomy, even a pessimistic picture. Yet, in the words of the South Pacific song, I remain a "cockeyed optimist," provided the U.S.A. returns to and stands firmly on the principles of our Christian faith. In this belief, implemented by a long diplomatic experience, I submit the following conclusions on what should be the conduct of our relations vis-a-vis other nations:

Foreign policy necessarily may be altered according to circumstances, time and place, but there are certain immutable principles which always must outweigh policy. These principles are:

I. Respect is the *sine qua non* of all foreign relations. Irrespective of every other consideration and under all conditions, the U.S.A. must demand and get respect. To do so we must first have self-respect and exact from our own and other governments respect for their obligations and the sanctity of agreements.

II. The sole reason for being of the state department and foreign service is to protect and advance the legitimate interests of the U.S.A. If ever they should become illegitimate, then they are unworthy of this great nation and should not be supported.

III. Every policy and action must be moral. Leaving ethics to one side, only in this way will we win and hold the confidence and respect from other countries which are so essential for a solid and enduring amity between peoples.

IV. While never attempting to impose on other nations our way of life or form of government, our ideas or even our moral standards, we should ourselves stand unswervingly for and practice the system of republican, constitutional, representative government laid down by the Founding Fathers in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

We can adhere to these principles and help save our civilization by following the precepts set forth by this society's first president general, George Washington, still the greatest President this Nation has had. In his farewell address he laid down the most moral and cogent statement ever made on both domestic and foreign policy. If with moral fiber we will dedicate ourselves to doing these things then, with God's help, the U.S.A. will defeat communism along with many other malignant forces. We will preserve our freedoms and insure peace for our children and grandchildren in, if not the best of all worlds, at least in a much better one than the present.

My confidence in this Nation is further augmented because, as I said to begin with, I am convinced the society of the Cincinnati can and will play an important, constructive and patriotic role in bringing the

U.S.A. back to adequate defense and effective foreign policies.

Finally my faith in our country is fortified by the words and spirit of Navy Captain Jeremiah Denton, Jr. Speaking for his fellow POW's as he led them aground at Clark Air Base. I conclude as he did: God bless America!

NUCLEAR SUB

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1973

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, the newest in a long line of nuclear attack submarines is now under construction at the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. in my home city of Newport News, Va. When christened it will bear the proud name, *Memphis* in honor of that great city in Tennessee.

We were honored last Saturday when the distinguished senior Senator from the great State of Tennessee, the Honorable HOWARD H. BAKER was on hand to offer dedicatory remarks at a most impressive ceremony when his charming wife donned the gloves and mask of a shipyard welder to implant her initials on the keel of the submarine thus authenticating the keel laying.

In the great tradition which Tennesseans have carried so proudly since the days when the first migration westward began Senator BAKER presented a message of great national pride. I am pleased to offer his remarks for inclusion in the RECORD so that they might receive proper recognition:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS OF SENATOR HOWARD H. BAKER

Today we observe with symbolic ceremony the completion of another important step in the construction of the *Memphis*, America's newest nuclear attack submarine.

This is a proud occasion for all Tennesseans, and especially all Memphians. Mrs. Baker and I are deeply honored to have this opportunity to participate in the keel laying of this, the latest addition to our nation's nuclear Navy.

It is, I believe, altogether appropriate that SSN 691 will bear the name *Memphis*. On the bluffs rising above the Mississippi, *Memphis* stands out as the largest city in Tennessee and, indeed, in the entire Southeast. It is a dynamic and diverse city with a way of life which lives up to its ancient name, "the place of good abode."

When the *Memphis* is launched, she will be heir to the legacy of both the city for which she was named and her five proud predecessors of the Fleet.

The first *Memphis*, a wooden five-gun steamer, was built in 1849. Originally a merchant ship, she became the *Memphis* when chartered by the Navy for an expedition to Paraguay.

The second ship to bear the name *Memphis* was a Scottish ship captured with a cargo of cotton while running the blockade of Charleston, South Carolina, in 1862. Commandeered into service as a seven-gun steamer, she saw action as a Union blockade ship in the very waters in which she was captured.

The third *Memphis* was an armored cruiser originally named the *Tennessee*. She was commissioned in 1906 and renamed the *Memphis* only three months before she was lost in a tidal wave off Santo Domingo in 1916.

The fourth *Memphis*, a cruiser launched

in 1924, served with distinction as the flagship of the Navy in Europe. She carried Col. Charles A. Lindbergh and his plane the "Spirit of St. Louis" back to the United States after his triumphant solo flight across the Atlantic. In World War II, she served as the flagship for President Franklin D. Roosevelt during the Casablanca Conference.

An oil company built the fifth *Memphis* in 1944 and she was acquired by the Navy twelve years later. This fleet tanker carried oil to help maintain American DEW Line bases in the Arctic in 1957. Converted into a floating powerplant, she served in the harbors of South Vietnam in 1968.

Though she is not the first ship to bear the name *Memphis*, perhaps SSN 691 is charged with the most important mission of all. The *Memphis*, with her high speed capability, great powers of endurance, and sophisticated navigation and weapons systems, will be a powerful guardian against enemy submarines and surface ships.

In the paradoxical world of the nuclear age, the *Memphis* is designed to be a fighting ship without peer, part of a deterrent force built with the hope that it is never called upon to perform those ultimate tasks of which it is capable.

From the earliest days of our republic, geography and our national interests have called for America to play a prominent role as a maritime power. Admiral Rickover deserves great credit for his foresight and persistence in championing the cause of nuclear propulsion, insuring that the Navy will continue as our far ranging front line of national defense.

This sound and flexible national defense system is essential to preserve the freedom of our citizens, to deter potential adversaries, to reassure our allies, and to provide the bargaining power necessary for crucial negotiations.

All of us, certainly, owe a debt of gratitude to President Nixon for his remarkable diplomatic achievements built on a sure foundation of national strength and mutual respect among the world's great powers. The agreements signed this week represent another significant step toward a more stable structure of peace.

While we must not be lulled into a false sense of security, I believe it is realistic to acknowledge the hopeful new forces at work in a world that can afford to spend less of its limited resources on war.

Because we have maintained sufficient strength to see us through a time of testing, we are now able to look forward to the benefits of an era of detente. Perhaps the most dramatic evidence can be seen in the allocation of the federal budget.

Four years ago, 44 cents of each federal dollar was spent on defense and 34.4 cents went to meet human needs. This year 30.2 cents is being spent on defense and 47 cents is going for human needs spending.

Another dramatic change is evidenced in the phasing out of the peacetime draft and the creation of our nation's all-volunteer armed forces. The Navy under Admiral Zumwalt has taken the lead in humanizing military life, encouraging more young men and women to freely choose military careers.

President Nixon has rightly said that we must remain as strong as we need to be for as long as we need to be. To do so demands a continuing evaluation of our defense needs.

We must never be so distracted by the supposed attractiveness of worthwhile objectives of any program, military or civilian, that we do not notice the actuality of its performance.

At the same time, we must not neglect the real need for maintaining our military defenses at a level needed to carry out our national policy of peace through strength.

A nineteenth century diplomat once remarked that his nation had no permanent allies, only permanent interests. I think it might well be said that America today seeks no permanent adversaries, rather only a permanent interest in world peace.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE JOHN BRADEMÁS AT THE DEDICATION OF THE ETHEL PERCY ANDRUS GERONTOLOGY CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES, FEBRUARY 14, 1973

HON. THOMAS F. EAGLETON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, June 29, 1973

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I want to share with my colleagues an address delivered by the Honorable JOHN BRADEMÁS, the distinguished chairman of the House Select Subcommittee on Education, at the dedication ceremonies of the Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center on February 14.

Mr. Brademas' remarks, delivered during the time he was sponsoring the Comprehensive Older Americans Services amendments in the House, constitute a thoughtful analysis of the problems facing older Americans, as well as a comprehensive program for attacking those problems in the next several decades.

I think, Mr. President, that my colleagues will be interested in the call of the gentleman from Indiana for the development of a coordinated national policy for the elderly.

Says Mr. BRADEMÁS:

Surely, if we do not have a national policy on aging in 1973, it is imperative that by the Year 2000 we fashion a framework within which we can consider the questions of income, health, housing, transportation, nutrition, and the other needs of the 29 million Americans aged 65 and over who will be living at the turn of the century.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print Congressman BRADEMÁS' remarks in the RECORD.

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

AGING IN THE YEAR 2000

(By Congressman JOHN BRADEMÁS)

I am honored to have been invited to participate in these ceremonies marking the dedication of the Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center at the University of Southern California.

As I rise to speak, I recall what George Bernard Shaw once said to his British publisher to indicate his displeasure with its printing of one of his plays. Shaw sent a copy of the American edition, which he liked, to the British firm with a note that read: "As the rooster said to the hen as he placed an ostrich egg before her, 'I am not disparaging, I am not criticizing. I merely want to bring to your attention what has been done by others.'"

I am pleased to add my own to the many tributes that are being paid to what has been done by the many others who have made this extraordinary Center possible.

I think of the thousands of members of the National Retired Teachers Association and the American Association of Retired Persons; of my good friend, Leonard Davis; of Dr. James Birren and his devoted staff; and of course of Dr. Andrus herself, to whose spirit this pioneering enterprise in human inquiry is a living memorial.

I am delighted to be with you for a number of reasons.

First, I count it a privilege to share the platform with two such distinguished thinkers as Buckminster Fuller and Bernice Neu-

garten. I have looked forward with enthusiasm, as I know you have, to hearing what they have to say.

Second, I rejoice at the opportunity to talk to you because of the concern that brings us all together—our common desire to lift the level of life of the twenty millions of our fellow citizens aged 65 and over.

And third, I am pleased at the chance to speak to you as a Member of Congress with a particular responsibility for legislation that affects older persons.

I want to argue that the time has come for us to develop a national policy for the aging. I want to speak to you of the response of the Executive Branch to Congressional initiatives in aging policy, and finally, I want to suggest that gerontologists and other experts on the problems of the aging can play a more effective role in developing legislation that affects older Americans.

AGE-CENTERED MORALITY

I have said that we need to develop a national policy for the aging.

A few days ago, I read some portions of an unpublished manuscript on aging written by Harvey Wheeler of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions at Santa Barbara, and it occurred to me that some of Mr. Wheeler's suggestions help explain why we need to think ahead about the situation of the elderly in the American society. Mr. Wheeler predicts, for example, that 25 years hence, largely as a result of a declining birthrate, over 50% of the people in the United States will be middle-aged or older, with perhaps 30% of them 65 or over.

Mr. Wheeler concludes that "although the United States is now a youth-centered society with youth-centered mores, the future promises . . . a reversal of these values. Maturity will assume the role youth has held previously with an age-centered morality beginning to appear before the end of the 20th century."

I shall not here enumerate some of the challenges this demographic development raises for national policy; others here are far more qualified than I to do that, but if there is any validity to the proposition that older persons will represent an increasingly large proportion of our population, we must, if we are to be both sensible and humane, reflect upon the kinds of policies we require for such an era.

And surely if we do not have a national policy on aging in 1973, it is imperative that by the Year 2000 we fashion a framework within which we can consider the questions of income, health, housing, transportation, nutrition, and the other needs of the 29 million Americans aged 65 and over who will be living at the turn of the century.

And by the way, I am not without support in my contention that we should take a more comprehensive look at problems of the elderly. Hear these words: "For too long we have lacked a national policy and commitment to provide adequate services and opportunities for older people."

Those of course are the words of President Richard Nixon, spoken in April 1970, in proclaiming Senior Citizens Month.

A NATIONAL POLICY FOR THE AGING

What are likely to be the dimensions of the national policy for the aging we must have by the Year 2000?

In commenting on this question, I remind you that I shall do so from the perspective of a legislator, and that I shall speak with particular reference to the efforts of the 92nd Congress on legislation affecting older Americans.

RETIREMENT INCOME

Such a policy should undoubtedly include provision for adequate retirement income.

That is why the 92nd Congress raised Social Security benefits by 30%, the largest increase ever voted by a single Congress, and why we also approved a cost-of-living escala-

tor to help make Social Security benefits inflation-proof in the years ahead.

And that is why, in the Social Security Amendments of 1972, we provided widows with 100% of their spouses' benefits and strengthened state public assistance programs for the aged, blind, and disabled.

Despite these actions, nearly 5 million older Americans, according to a recent Senate report, remain today below the official level of poverty. So adequate income for the aging also remains a problem we cannot avoid.

HEALTH CARE

A national policy for older Americans must provide as well for the health care of the elderly.

The 92nd Congress included protection against retroactive denial of payments under Medicare, coverage of kidney transplantation and dialysis, as well as authorization for Medicare patients to enroll in prepaid group health plans.

But we have a long way to go before older persons—indeed, before Americans of every age—can feel able to obtain decent health care at prices they can afford.

USE OF LEISURE

Yet another requirement of a sound aging policy will be to help make possible leisure time activities for the millions of men and women who will be retiring at 60—and at earlier ages—over the next three decades.

A case can be made for readily accessible senior citizens centers where elderly people can receive services they need and enjoy the companionship of others who share their interests and experience.

I speak too of the need for special programs in the arts, of libraries, of special educational programs for older persons.

In Denver last week, meeting with the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, of which I am a member, I sought to impress upon the other members of the Commission the implications of financing postsecondary education in an era when lifelong learning will be more than an educator's phrase but a reality.

For we hear a great deal today of open universities, computerized instruction, and cable television. Let us make sure that these new developments provide opportunities for learning and pleasure to the millions of older citizens who will be alive in the Year 2000.

SYNERGISTIC APPROACH

We must as well consider shaping new patterns of housing and transportation for older citizens and pre-retirement training and counseling for the men and women who will be retiring earlier than any generation in our history. And we should also look to ways of providing job training and employment opportunities for those who want them.

These are only some of the problems that concern those of us in Washington who believe we must think ahead about the problems of the elderly in American life.

And as we look down the road toward what we can expect in the Year 2000, we must surely be aware of the inadequacies of our current piecemeal approach policy for the aging.

I believe most of you will agree that a generation from now, if not today, we are going to require a synergistic approach to the problems of older Americans, a broader view of the challenges we are likely to encounter as well as of the resources we shall need effectively to cope with them.

Indeed, that is why Democrats and Republicans in Congress united last year to support a Comprehensive Older Americans Services Bill that would have been a milestone in establishing the type of national policy for the elderly I have been suggesting here today.

CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT FOR THE ELDERLY

In speaking of the Older Americans Bill, I do so in the context of what, in my view,

threatens to be a crisis in the constitutional relationship between the President and Congress.

The impounding of funds duly appropriated by Congress is perhaps the most dramatic evidence of that looming confrontation for, in asserting his right to impound, the President is arguing not solely that he is the only authority competent to combat inflation—a curious contention in view of his extraordinary record of huge budget deficits—but he goes a giant step down the road of destruction of the fabric of our separation of powers system.

NOVEL AND DANGEROUS DOCTRINE

For the President is now contending that he is free to pick and choose among those programs legislated by Congress, supporting those he approves and killing off those that do not suit his fancy.

In view of the fact that Article I of the Constitution states that "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States", President Nixon's present attempts to arrogate unto himself these powers represents, as the New York Times warned last Sunday, a novel and dangerous doctrine.

It is a doctrine, clearly, which reflects President Nixon's contempt for Congress and for the integrity of the legislative process.

And still further evidence of this President's disdain for the views of the other elected representatives of the people is that last fall President Nixon vetoed three major bills of great importance to older persons, all of which were unanimously passed by Congress.

COMPREHENSIVE OLDER AMERICANS SERVICE BILL

The Comprehensive Older Americans Service Bill, which I sponsored in the House and which Senator Thomas Eagleton managed in the Senate, is one of those bills, a measure that would have provided a variety of services directed to the special needs of the elderly, including low-cost transportation, senior citizens community centers, housing, preretirement training, employment, recreation and nutrition.

Our bill would also have authorized federal funding for new multidisciplinary centers of gerontology of a kind of which the Andrus Center is such an outstanding pioneer.

Not a single Senator or Congressman, Democrat or Republican, voted against this legislation, which had been fashioned in close cooperation with officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Yet in late October, after Congress had adjourned and therefore, could not vote to override, President Nixon shocked Democrats and Republicans alike by vetoing this truly landmark initiative for older Americans.

OTHER VETOS

On the same day, Mr. Nixon vetoed another bill that would have meant much to the development of a national policy for the elderly.

I refer to a bill sponsored by my distinguished colleague, Congressman Paul Rogers of Florida, to create a National Institute of Aging within the National Institutes of Health, to conduct research on the aging process and on the special health problems of the elderly.

And, finally, to complete this tragic list of missed opportunities, President Nixon also vetoed the Rehabilitation Act of 1972, which would have continued the 50-year-old vocational rehabilitation program for the handicapped, many of whom are elderly, and would have provided that, henceforth, priority in services for the handicapped be assigned to the most severely handicapped persons, including those suffering from spinal cord injury, serious kidney disease, and the deaf.

You should know that each of these measures, too, was passed unanimously by both the House and the Senate.

INADEQUATE BUDGET PROPOSALS

Still further indication of the President's determined opposition to the efforts of the men and women elected to Congress, Democrats and Republicans alike, who support adequate services for the elderly, is to be found in his 1974 budget.

He proposes, first, to add \$516 million to the out-of-pocket expenses of the 23 million aged and disabled Medicare beneficiaries, by increasing their costs for both hospital stays and physicians' services, and he would eliminate Federal support for adult dental care under Medicaid.

Then the President asks that we in Congress acquiesce while he takes an axe to the Administration on Aging budget for training. In place of \$8 million dollars this year, he suggests nothing for 1974.

He complements that request by proposing to slice \$1 million from the budget for research and training on aging in the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

And finally, he asks us to phase out both the Mainstream older workers program in the Department of Labor and the Senior Opportunities and Services (SOS) program targeted on the elderly poor within the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Now the election of 1972 is over and I am not, therefore, interested in giving you a campaign speech.

PRESCRIPTION OF NEGLECT

I cite this record of vetoes of measures unanimously passed by Congress and the President's budget for next year only to enable you to understand the terribly important issues at stake when Mr. Nixon claims the sole right to decide the direction of public policy in the United States, and attempts to enforce his will against that of Congress by vetoing major legislative initiatives and impounding duly appropriated funds.

Those of us concerned with sensible and humane policies for the aging ignore this situation at our peril.

For the President's vetoes last year, combined with his recent budget proposals for older Americans, make very clear that Mr. Nixon is telling older Americans exactly what he told the rest of us last month in his inaugural address.

Listen to his words:

"In our own lives, let each of us ask—not just what will government do for me, but what can I do for myself."

This is a prescription, not of self-reliance, but of malign neglect—neglect of older persons, of children, of the handicapped, the poor, indeed, of all Americans whom we may in our modern society call vulnerable.

I am pleased to tell you that many members of Congress of both parties do not share the President's regressive attitude toward his fellow Americans. Over 100 of my colleagues in the House, both Democrats and Republicans, have joined me in co-sponsoring, once again in the 93rd Congress both the Comprehensive Older Americans Services Bill and the Rehabilitation Bill.

And Congressman Rogers, too, has introduced a modified version of his bill to create a National Institute on Aging.

In the Senate, Tom Eagleton is again leading the forces backing the Rogers Bill and the Older Americans measure—which last week was reported out of the full Labor and Public Welfare Committee—while my distinguished colleague, Senator Alan Cranston of California, is once more championing the Rehabilitation Bill.

I am confident that we will shortly see both measures passed by Congress and, if necessary, over the President's veto.

THE SCHOLAR AND SOCIAL POLICY

Before I take my seat, I want to speak to you briefly about one other concern of mine.

I have told you of the opposition, indeed, vigorous hostility, which has greeted our efforts for the elderly in the Executive Branch.

Now, beyond your support for our legislative initiatives, let me tell you one other way in which you can help us in our work.

I refer to what I believe is the need to develop and nurture better linkages between, on the one hand, the thinkers and researchers on aging problems, and on the other decision-makers in government.

More specifically, we in Congress who deal with issues that affect the aging must have more effective access to the best intelligence and information on the subject matter with which we deal.

I shall not bore you with a long list of the demands upon the time and energies of elected officials, but let me say simply that so many forces converge on a modern Congressman that he often finds it enormously difficult to get at the best thinking on the problems on which he must legislate.

I find this troubling, for it is clearly in the national interest to have public policy examined in the most searching way and with the most relevant and accurate data at hand.

I therefore make a plea to you of the gerontological community here today to give us in Congress your best counsel on the problems of the elderly.

I must stress that I am not suggesting another interest group pressing its own projects but rather that I am urging the intellectual community to help us in Washington think intelligently about the concerns of the elderly and to make informed policy judgments.

I invite your reaction to the possibility, for example that my own subcommittee set up an advisory council on the aging, composed of gerontologists and others knowledgeable about the elderly, to advise us, through memoranda and occasional get-togethers.

Such a group could be of significant help to us in Congress in anticipating important problems and developing reasoned alternatives for future action.

Let me summarize what I have tried to say.

I have suggested that the time has come for the richest nation in the world to begin to shape a national policy with respect to older persons.

I have told you of some of the initiatives in Congress on programs that affect the elderly.

And I have reported to you on the opposition of the Nixon Administration to these efforts.

Finally, I have suggested that we ought to find more effective ways to bring together those whose entire lives are given to concern with the elderly and us in Congress who write legislation that affects older persons.

So we have much to do, you, you, and I.

And perhaps some words by the distinguished lady in whose name we are gathered here this week, Ethel Percy Andrus, express for us all what our purpose must be as we fill whatever part of the vineyard is ours.

Said Dr. Andrus:

"Second only to the desire to live is the natural yearning to be wanted and needed, to feel that one's contribution to life is essential. But this yearning challenges the older and impels him to give generously of himself, to circulate among his fellows, to participate actively in the little world about him, and to share whatever he may have of talents, strength, means, wisdom, or skills. This is the basis of his self-respect; in this way he earns his sense of dignity and worth."

Whether we are gerontologists, politicians or citizens of whatever vocation, to help older persons enjoy that sense of dignity and worth and self-respect must be our common calling.

HOUSE FOREIGN AID INITIATIVE WINS PLAUDITS

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1973

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today the Committee on Foreign Affairs finished the task of restructuring and revitalizing the U.S. bilateral foreign assistance program.

In a series of votes on amendments it incorporated into the administration's requested foreign aid proposal the provisions of H.R. 8258. That bill was introduced by me with 25 other members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on May 30.

That measure, which has now been incorporated into the administration's proposal would:

Focus bilateral development assistance on acute problem areas and encourage the developing countries to allow the poorest people to participate more effectively in the development process.

Create a new export credit development fund to expand U.S. exports to the poorest countries with the further aim of providing additional resources to those countries on appropriate terms without increasing U.S. budgetary outlays.

Change the title of the Foreign Assistance Act to "The Mutual Development and Cooperation Act" and the name of the Agency for International Development to the "Mutual Development and Cooperation Agency."

Improve coordination of all U.S. activities that bear on development, including trade, financial policy, and developing aid.

This congressional initiative has been given wide attention in the press and by those interested in international development. At a recent meeting in Washington of former Presidential foreign aid advisers, the new proposal was unanimously endorsed and a press statement released.

Recently too, the Christian Science Monitor featured an article by Prof. Robert R. Bowie, a development specialist, who said that—

If passed by Congress, this proposal would be a positive step in revising U.S. relations with the developing nations.

Because of their timeliness and relevance to today's action by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I insert the press release and Professor Bowie's article in the RECORD at this point:

MEMBERS OF FORMER PRESIDENTIAL ADVISORY GROUPS ENDORSE NEW CONGRESSIONAL INITIATIVE TOWARD DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

WASHINGTON, June 26.—A bipartisan group of former presidential foreign aid advisers meeting in Washington today unanimously endorsed an innovative bilateral development assistance program proposed in both Houses of Congress and endorsed by the Administration. The new program would focus American development assistance on the problems of the poorest majority in the developing countries, and would authorize funding aimed primarily at rural development, food production, population and health, and education and human resource development. The bipartisan bill also would

provide for export credits both to provide American goods of a developmental character for the lowest income countries and to help create more jobs for American workers.

The group is composed of members of President Johnson's General Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance Programs which was headed by James A. Perkins, Chairman of the International Council for Educational Development and formerly President of Cornell University, and President Nixon's Task Force on International Development chaired by Rudolph Peterson, presently Director of the United Nations Development Program and formerly President of the Bank of America. The two groups are the most recent presidential commissions on United States foreign aid programs.

The bipartisan and bicameral Congressional initiative endorsed by the group would restructure and expand United States bilateral policies and programs for working with the poor countries in a manner consistent with President Nixon's State of the World Message on May 3. It would redirect United States bilateral aid to focus on the problems of the poorest majority in the developing countries in areas such as disease control, food production and population planning. The proposed legislation would also establish a new export development credit fund to provide Americans goods and services of a developmental character on terms which the poorest countries could afford.

The group indicated that it would later issue a fuller statement on bilateral and multilateral assistance programs, as well as a trade and monetary policy affecting the developing countries.

In endorsing the Congressional initiative, members of the group pointed out: "While the United States has achieved great improvements in relations with East and West since 1970, no such progress has marked American relationships with Asia, Africa and Latin America. This is despite the fact that we Americans are discovering now that many of our most pressing and international problems no longer can be solved through isolation or solely in cooperation with other rich countries. Secretary Brezhnev's visit reminds us that a nation which is able to achieve imaginative breakthroughs in dealing with the Soviet Union and China should be able to lead the world in achieving similar advances in relationships with the poor countries of the world containing a majority of the earth's people."

In addition to Perkins and Peterson, other members of the group included:

Bell, David E., Vice President, Ford Foundation.

Case, Josephine Young.

Casey, William, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

Cooke, Terrence Cardinal (Represented by James Norris).

Curtis, Thomas B., Vice President & Gen. Counsel, Encyclopedia Britannica.

Foster, Luther H., President, Tuskegee Institute.

Haas, Walter A., Chairman & Chief Exec. Officer, Levi Strauss.

Hesburgh, Theodore, President, University of Notre Dame.

Linowitz, Sol, Coudert Brothers.

Mason, Edward S., Prof. Emeritus, Harvard University.

Perkins, James, Chief Exec. Officer & Chairman of the Board, International Council for Educational Development.

Peterson, Rudolph, Administrator, U.N. Development Program.

Wood, Robert J., General, U.S. Army (Retired).

FORGOTTEN PEOPLE OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

(By Robert R. Bowie)

In recent years, the poorer nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, have become the "forgotten men" of United States foreign

policy. They have little place in the power-balancing and summitry of the White House. And Congress has been no more interested, with some of its members venting their Vietnam frustrations by opposing foreign aid. In consequence the U.S. foreign assistance has dropped to only three-tenths of 1 percent of its GNP, ranking twelfth among the rich nations of this scale.

One reason for the neglect of the developing countries has been confusion about U.S. interests. In a sense, they have been the victims of detente and U.S. retraction. Formerly, relations with these areas were seen as an extension of the cold war, with foreign aid justified, especially to Congress, as a means for combating Soviet expansion. As that appeal has gradually waned, so has concern for the poorer nations. In reality, that disregard is extremely short-sighted. It is not feasible to develop a peaceful order for an interdependent world while ignoring one-half of it. The urgent necessity is to reappraise U.S. interests in the developing nations and its relations with them.

Recently, just such an effort has been launched in Congress. A majority of the House Foreign Affairs Committee have submitted proposals for reform of the bilateral aid program, which have now been endorsed by key senators. Implicitly, these proposals would clarify the bases for concern with the developing nations and reshape the approach to them.

First, they identify three strands of interests in the developing nations: (1) an enlightened interest in international order which must include the majority of mankind living in poverty; (2) a humanitarian concern for these poorer peoples as fellow human beings who more and more become neighbors; (3) a commercial interest in economic relations with the developing countries as markets and as suppliers now and in the future. These are solid reasons for continuing concern by the United States, quite aside from East-West competition.

Second, the proposals would revamp America's approach to the developing nations, with the aim of putting relations on a better footing of mutual respect and cooperation. They recognize that the poorer nations are the ones to define their own goals and their plans for reaching them. U.S. bilateral aid would concentrate on activities directly affecting people—agriculture and nutrition; health and population; education and training. For providing assistance, more use would be made of private agencies, universities, cooperatives, unions, and voluntary agencies, which may often be more acceptable than official missions. Large capital projects would be financed through international agencies like the World Bank. These changes should make possible substantial cuts in U.S. aid staff at home and abroad.

To expand available funds, the measure would create a new fund to finance exports to the poorest countries (primarily under \$200 income per capita) on concessional terms. This fund would have several significant features. The financing would be tied to U.S. exports to these nations and would take the form of loans, at low interest for 30 years, with a 10-year grace period. Such tying, of course, has some drawbacks, but the dollar devaluation should make U.S. products cheaper than heretofore compared to other sources. Moreover, the funding would be derived from borrowing, and the subsidy for the low interest would be provided from current repayments on earlier loans. Thus the proposal would entail no budget costs or annual appropriation. With an initial capital of \$5 billion the fund would make available about \$1 billion a year, initially for five years, but renewable for similar periods.

If passed by Congress, this proposal would be a positive step in revising U.S. relations with the developing nations and in provid-

ing added assistance. It could help get straight the real and enduring U.S. interests in the developing nations. By directing American bilateral assistance to manifest and specific needs of other human beings, it may once more engage the idealism of the American people in providing assistance. At the same time, the measure would link the commercial interests of export firms and labor to a new source of credit for poor nations and focus their attention on the importance of trade with these nations for U.S. jobs and profits. Finally, the measure emphasizes the necessity of taking account of the interests of developing nations in devising and carrying out American policies and actions relating to trade, money, pollution, and other matters affecting the third world.

This proposal is, of course, not a panacea. Even as expanded, the amount of assistance will fall far short of what the U.S. should be doing. No doubt the U.S. has its domestic needs. But with a GNP well over a trillion dollars (over \$5,000 per capita), it is indecent to be providing only about \$3 billion to assist the 1.5 billion poor in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Moreover it remains to be seen whether the U.S. really gives the developing nations a higher priority in the whole range of its policymaking. But if the proposal is only a beginning, it is a very important initiative in the right direction.

A BRIGHT KIND OF MISSIONARY

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 29, 1973

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, over the years there has been a great deal of derogatory talk about the younger generation and its lifestyle, and the unthinking inclination by many people to lump them all together as being "no good." But in Montana there is a young man who refutes such a description.

Garry South of Miles City, Mont., was recently elected student body president at the University of Montana, Missoula. Garry exemplifies the modern student activist, working for change from within the political system. His political know-how and his articulate voice have already won the admiration of "the establishment," as this recent editorial from the Billings Gazette will testify. The piece was written by Duane "Doc" Bowler, editor of the Gazette.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks. There being no objection, it was ordered to be printed as follows:

[From the Billings Gazette, May 20, 1973]

A BRIGHT KIND OF MISSIONARY

(By Duane W. Bowler)

A young man from Miles City who once attended Eastern Montana College may be the best thing that has happened to the University of Montana in quite some time.

You'd like to meet Garry D. South, the new president of the Associated Students of the University of Montana. And he'd like to meet you, too.

South is a clean shaven longhair by crew-cut standards, dresses like a young stockbroker, at least when persuading his elders, and talks straight about the students at the University of Montana.

"I think it is unfair to say students are only here four years and have no stake in

the University and the state of Montana," says South.

"It's not fair to take four years out of my life and say whatever I do is irrelevant and necessarily bad."

Those were the remarks South had for the University of Montana Council of 50 at its spring meeting a week ago. He was telling why the Associated Students had a full-time lobby and plenty of volunteers during the opening session of the 43rd Montana Legislature.

"We got into the real world," South says. And with success. The combined Montana University System student efforts got a voting student on the Board of Regents and 24-hour open dorms, the latter as part of the student's right to privacy.

When South tells you that almost every student on the campus is legally classified as an adult the light gets brighter at the end of the tunnel vision.

His idea is the best way to avert problems is to get students involved in the process, to face the problem head on.

One of them is what to do about the Montana Kaimin, the student newspaper.

"I do not justify everything the Kaimin has printed," says South, "and there is nothing (President Robert) Pantzer and I can do about it."

"It is a student newspaper, paid for by the students and the way the copies disappear each day they like it."

"I do not justify. If I had been editor there are many things I would not have done. But it cannot be a public relations tool for the University. If it tries to, it is not then a student newspaper."

"A newspaper's duty is not to be well liked but well read."

South admits that the Kaimin, with its sometimes offensive language and opinions, does have an effect on the state and there seems to be an attitude against it.

For its critics, in and out of the newspaper fraternity, South advises that the present editor is trying to escape the David Rorvick syndrome.

(Rorvick was Kaimin editor in the middle 1960's who is now a highly successful freelance writer.)

South has no excuses to make for the Kaimin. He asks only that it be accepted for what it is—a newspaper published for and by the students with their own money and reflecting their attitudes.

Were it closed by some cause or other, he feels the underground press would take over with up to five publications springing up which would make the Kaimin seem like nursery fare.

As we said, South doesn't mince his words. Nor does he defiantly antagonize his elders. He tells them, well, like it is.

Student government is no longer a glorified student council. His office administers \$348,000 of student activity fees. He emphasizes that this is student, not state taxpayers', money.

Therefore students have a right to say how it is spent. If they want rock concerts instead of jocks, that's what they'll have.

His current budget allocates \$95,000 to the athletic department. Athletic Director Jack Swarthout got \$105,000 this year and wants \$161,000.

South justifies his proposed budget as allocating money where it will do the most good, that athletics will get twice what any other activity gets. He feels athletics have much too long received a disproportionate share and the arts not enough. He doesn't want to kill varsity athletics. He doesn't want to give them \$161,000.

South draws up the president's budget, there are hearings, it goes before Central Board and the final decisions are made. It sounds just like city council, which it is for the students.

His problem, as well as Central Board's, is how to satisfy the 43 student activity groups with their \$483,000 in budget requests with only \$348,000 available at the rate of \$15 per quarter from each student.

"We do specify that none of our student funds can go for athletic scholarships," says South. "We don't give scholarships in other activities so why do it for athletics?"

As South says, he plans to meet problems head on as student president. His constituency consists primarily of students from the small towns of Montana attending a Montana tax supported institution.

He thinks they both should understand each other better and has charted a course to bring it about.

South isn't a University administration spokesman. But the way this young history major from Miles City goes about his mission is all for the good of the institution and his home state.

TOWARD BETTER PRIVATE PENSION PLANS

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1973

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation aimed at establishing certain minimum standards for employee pension plans and providing incentives for individuals not covered by a pension program to establish their own retirement savings programs.

My bill provides for mandatory vesting of employee pension benefits at a "Rule of 40"—when a person's age plus service equals 40, he becomes 10 percent vested and vests 10 percent more every year until all his accrued benefits are fully guaranteed.

I see this provision as a good compromise between those who would like to see automatic vesting in 10 years and those who push a 20-year service requirement or a "Rule of 50." This approach guarantees that a 40-year-old employee can vest within 10 years, if he starts a new job tomorrow, and that a 60-year-old employee could become vested at two or three places of employment by the time he retires.

Yet, this measure is not so expensive for an employer that he would choose not to establish any kind of pension program for his workers, rather than have to meet a costly Federal standard. Most of this Nation's big companies have very adequate pension programs—many of which vest within 10 years. But the large group of people unprotected by pensions in the work force today work for companies with 25 or fewer employees. These companies generally cannot afford as elaborate a pension program as their larger counterparts, but there is general agreement that their workers should be afforded some minimum protection and should fall under some minimum Federal standards of acceptability. Viewed as a minimum, I believe the Rule of 40 is a very workable requirement for vesting of pension plans which qualify for special tax treatment.

Along with the vesting requirement, my bill requires that a company fund its

pension program properly, on a regular basis, so that even if the company should go out of business or merge with another company, the current and past employees will not lose the pension benefits due them.

As a protection against funds being mismanaged or poorly invested, or a program shut down before becoming properly funded, my bill also contains a requirement that a company reinsure the amount of vested benefits in excess of assets in the fund which could cover those vested benefits. With provisions like these, the Studebaker pension case in Indiana could never have had such disastrous consequences, leaving every one under 60 years of age a minute portion of the benefits they had been promised.

I have also included in my bill the administration's idea of a tax deduction for retirement savings made by an individual either to supplement a low-benefit pension plan or to provide some retirement income for an individual whose company does not offer a qualified pension program.

Under this proposal, individuals can deduct from their gross income, for tax purposes, up to 20 percent of the first \$7,500 of earned income—up to \$1,500. Since employers providing pension funds receive a similar tax deduction on money contributed to an employee pension fund, this measure is only equitable particularly for those people not involved in a pension program. This measure is also desirable in that it will encourage more individuals to plan toward their own retirement, rather than depending on social security benefits to carry them through their retirement years.

Mr. Speaker, a second bill I am introducing today provides for the adoption of detailed fiduciary standards in the administration of pension plans—to better insure against fraud or mismanagement, provide regular reporting regarding compliance with pension laws, and insure better communication between employers and workers as to what the pension program really means to each worker.

The overall goal of the legislation I am introducing today is to lay down some basic guidelines and rules to assure workers they are going to get the kind of pension benefits they had anticipated, without penalizing good employers or discouraging the private pension system.

THE LATE HALE BOGGS

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1973

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, there is widespread agreement among the members of the House of Representatives that Hale Boggs was superbly skilled in

the art of debate and oratory. On one important occasion, upon consideration of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, Hale Boggs took the floor to support an amendment to provide for the recording of teller votes in the Committee of the Whole. The bill was passed, with the addition of the important teller vote provision.

Adoption of the recorded teller vote has had a significant impact on the House of Representatives. Because of the long range significance of the reform, it is fitting to remember Hale Boggs for, amongst his many other honorable positions and great achievements, his active and eloquent support of the amendment. Following is the speech which he made that day:

Mr. Boggs. Mr. Chairman, I might say to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, that the gentleman from California had already had 10 minutes, but I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment this is indeed a historic day. This is a day which will make the House of Representatives truly relevant.

As is the case with so many of the rules of this Chamber, the procedure known as teller voting is deeply rooted in the legislative process. Its origin can be traced centuries ago when the British Parliament devised it as a method of voting the will of the people while escaping the wrath of a powerful and vengeful monarch. One hundred and thirty-eight years ago, when Parliament no longer had reason to fear the Crown, the system was reformed to permit a public record of votes. Unfortunately, with never a King to fear and only the public to serve, this rule has been retained in the House of Representatives. We did so because we said it helped expedite the often slow legislative process. Unfortunately, it has also been used as a shelter from the public eye.

I do not believe representative government can afford the luxury of a shelter from the public eye. The American people are entitled to know the recorded judgment of each Member on the great issues of our time. We cannot ask our people to respect our institutions unless the institutions themselves are self-critical and self-reforming.

As majority whip, it is my responsibility to inform Members of legislation pending on the floor and to encourage their attendance whenever votes are taken. In my opinion, teller voting, as it is now conducted, is a hindrance rather than an assistance to the majority whip. Important amendments are often adopted or defeated in the Committee of the Whole House by a small fraction of the total membership of the House. The truth is, the system of teller voting is a major contributor to absenteeism. This proposal to record teller votes would be a major step toward encouraging the full participation by all parties in forging the law of the land. In this respect, this amendment would be a great assistance to the majority and minority whips, and I think to the fair and full operation of the legislative process.

We hear a great deal of talk these days about the unresponsiveness of our institutions. The founders of this country never intended its institutions to be inflexible and set in their ways. The architects of our Government intended its three branches to be capable of growth and continuous self-renewal. This is the real import of this bill and the real significance of this amendment. For these reasons, I support this amendment and I urge all my colleagues to do so also.

This is not a liberal amendment. It is

not a conservative amendment. It is not a Republican amendment. It is not a Democratic amendment. It is an amendment for this House of Representatives.

When the people and the media say that this House has ceased to be relevant, then, Mr. Chairman, if true, American democracy has ceased to be relevant.

When the people assert that the House of Representatives is not representative, then the last best hope of mankind has been lost. Because if we are not representative, then no institution is.

I have given my life to this Chamber. I love it and the Republic for which it stands. Come September 10, I will observe the 30th anniversary of my first election to the House. I came here when I was 26 years of age.

Today I am proud of the fact that I have a son who wants to come here, too. He believes that service here is a high calling. With all due deference to my colleagues on the Republican side, I hope that he is elected. I am doing everything I can to help him. He thinks the House is relevant. I think it is relevant.

But I know that this system of teller votes is not relevant. I have served for 15 years here as whip or as deputy whip, and there have been countless occasions when I have spent hours and days attempting to get members to come here and do their duty and walk through that teller line and vote.

I know this so-called hanky-panky in the cloakrooms. I know how some conservatives say, "Well, we can make a deal with the liberals." And some liberals say, "we can make a deal with the conservatives." And the beat goes on.

Well, we really do not govern that way. Those deals seldom have worked out. The pressures are too great on both sides on major issues.

All we are saying by this amendment is that the archaic system adopted some centuries ago to protect the Members of Parliament from despotic kings should be abolished in the House of Representatives of the United States of America as it was in the House of Commons many years ago.

We are saying, "Let a man stand up and be counted." What is wrong with that? Tell me what is wrong with being counted if one is a Representative. If you do not want to be counted, why did you come here in the first place, and why do most of us seek to return to this historic Chamber?

Finally, one last thought. A story is told in history about one of the great men who helped found this country, Alexander Hamilton.

Hamilton brought a visitor into the gallery of the old House Chamber, now Statuary Hall. The visitor sat with Hamilton and noting the pandemonium on the floor, which you frequently see in this body even as of this day, questioned Mr. Hamilton, "What goes on there? And Hamilton replied, "There, sir—there, sir, the people govern."

Well, here, Mr. Chairman, almost two centuries later, the people must continue to govern. Let us support this amendment.

FARM PRICE ANALYSIS

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1973

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, the following analysis compiled by Prof. Robert E. Olson of South Dakota State University is particularly appropriate at this time in dispelling the myths concerning

the economic situation of our largest industry, agriculture.

Professor Olson would hasten to point out that prices change rapidly and have changed somewhat from the time when the analysis was formulated. As this analysis demonstrates, however, it is the farmer who comes out on the short end of changes in prices.

I would ask that the Members of Congress, as well as all interested readers of the RECORD, pay particular attention to the column of Table 1 which relates

consumer food expenditures as a percentage of income:

FARM PRICE ANALYSIS

THE DATA

All data are annual averages except 1973. The data for 1973 are estimates of annual rates during the first quarter. They are all drawn from official government sources.

BASE PERIOD

Price data expressed as index numbers were computed on a 1950 base, i.e. 1950 equals 100. A common base facilitates comparison

of relative changes in the price of items with considerable different absolute prices. A 1950 base shows at a glance the price current levels and the patterns of change over a long period.

CONSUMERS' INCOME AND EXPENDITURES (TABLE 1)

Disposable personal income per capita (after taxes) reached a record high level during the first quarter of 1973. For the first time the annual rate was over \$4,000 per person. Expenditures for food per capita in 1973 were double the 1950 rate while disposable personal income expanded three fold during the same period.

TABLE 1.—CONSUMERS' PER CAPITA INCOME, EXPENDITURES FOR GOODS AND SERVICES, AND FOOD EXPENDITURES AS A PERCENTAGE OF INCOME

Year	Expenditures			Food expenditures in relation to income (percent)		Year	Expenditures			Food expenditures in relation to income (percent)	
	Disposable personal income (dollars)	For goods and services (dollars)	For food (dollars)	All food	Farm food		Disposable personal income (dollars)	For goods and services (dollars)	For food (dollars)	All food	Farm food
1947	1,178.0	1,153.0	303.0	25.7	24.7	1961	1,984.0	1,825.0	392.0	19.8	18.5
1948	1,290.0	1,184.0	316.0	24.5	23.7	1962	2,066.0	1,903.0	398.0	19.3	18.5
1949	1,264.0	1,185.0	300.0	23.8	23.0	1963	2,138.0	1,981.0	404.0	18.9	18.3
1950	1,364.0	1,259.0	303.0	22.2	21.3	1964	2,284.0	2,091.0	419.0	18.4	17.7
1951	1,468.0	1,337.0	338.0	23.0	21.7	1965	2,437.0	2,228.0	442.0	18.1	17.1
1952	1,518.0	1,381.0	348.0	23.0	21.4	1966	2,605.0	2,372.0	473.0	17.2	16.3
1953	1,582.0	1,441.0	347.0	22.0	20.2	1967	2,751.0	2,476.0	473.0	17.2	16.3
1954	1,585.0	1,456.0	348.0	22.0	19.9	1968	2,946.0	2,671.0	497.0	16.9	15.9
1955	1,666.0	1,539.0	351.0	21.1	19.3	1969	3,130.0	2,859.0	524.0	16.7	15.6
1956	1,743.0	1,585.0	359.0	20.6	18.9	1970	3,358.0	3,010.0	557.0	16.6	15.4
1957	1,801.0	1,643.0	373.0	20.7	18.9	1971	3,595.0	3,211.0	567.0	15.8	14.9
1958	1,831.0	1,666.0	383.0	20.9	19.1	1972	3,807.0	3,453.0	597.0	15.7	0
1959	1,905.0	1,758.0	386.0	20.3	18.9	1973	4,064.0	0	632.0	15.6	0
1960	1,937.0	1,800.0	388.0	20.0	19.1						

Note: Compiled from Federal and State official data.
Source: Economics department, South Dakota State University.

FARMERS', WHOLESALE, AND CONSUMERS' PRICES FOR FOOD (TABLE 2)

During the 1950-1973 period the changes in prices ranked as follows:

[In percent]

Change 1950-73

Prices paid by farmers..... 81.6
Consumers' prices for all goods and services 78.5

Consumer prices for all foods (including imported, sea foods, and meals away from home) 76.0
Farm-Retail Spread (Marketing, transportation, and processing cost between farm and consumer) 72.8
Retail store prices for food produced on U.S. farms 61.0
Wholesale prices for all goods and services 53.7

Prices received by farmers..... 48.4
Price (farm value) of food at the farm..... 48.0

Prices paid by farmers, consumers' prices and the farm-retail spread advanced steadily during the 1950-73 period. Prices received by farmers for all products and for food were nearly stable from 1949 to 1969. Their increase for the entire period has occurred during the last five years.

TABLE 2.—FARMERS', WHOLESALE, AND CONSUMERS' PRICES, 1947-73

[1950=100]

Year	Received by farmers	Paid by farmers	Whole-sale	Con-sumers'	All food	U.S. farm origi-nated food	Farm value of food	Farm-retail spread	Year	Received by farmers	Paid by farmers	Whole-sale	Con-sumers'	All food	U.S. farm origi-nated food	Farm value of food	Farm-retail spread
1947	107.0	93.8	93.9	92.8	54.4	98.9	108.0	90.7	1961	93.0	118.0	115.5	122.7	119.6	113.8	93.0	132.4
1948	111.2	101.6	101.2	100.0	102.8	106.5	114.9	98.9	1962	94.6	119.9	115.9	123.6	120.7	114.9	95.2	132.6
1949	96.9	98.0	96.2	99.0	98.7	89.6	100.7	100.6	1963	121.9	115.9	138.1	122.4	114.7	91.1	135.9	
1950	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	1964	91.9	122.3	115.8	127.6	124.0	114.9	90.8	136.5
1951	117.1	110.2	111.4	107.9	111.1	111.0	114.9	107.6	1965	96.1	125.4	118.1	130.7	126.7	118.1	100.2	134.1
1952	111.6	112.1	108.3	110.3	113.2	112.2	111.6	112.7	1966	103.1	130.5	122.0	134.8	133.0	124.4	107.2	139.7
1953	98.8	108.2	106.8	111.1	111.4	108.9	103.1	114.0	1967	98.4	133.6	122.2	138.7	134.2	123.1	101.0	143.0
1954	95.3	108.6	107.1	111.7	111.1	106.9	97.6	115.3	1968	101.2	138.7	125.3	144.5	139.1	127.6	106.3	146.4
1955	89.9	107.8	107.3	111.2	109.5	105.1	91.3	117.5	1969	108.2	145.7	130.2	152.3	146.2	134.3	115.9	150.8
1956	89.1	108.6	110.9	112.3	110.3	105.5	90.4	119.0	1970	108.5	152.3	135.0	161.3	154.2	139.9	115.2	162.0
1957	91.1	112.1	114.1	115.5	114.0	109.3	93.5	123.5	1971	110.5	137.5	139.2	168.2	158.9	142.4	115.7	166.5
1958	96.9	114.8	115.6	117.1	118.8	115.6	100.7	128.9	1972	123.6	169.1	145.6	173.8	165.8	149.3	125.5	170.4
1959	93.0	116.4	115.9	119.4	116.9	112.9	92.8	130.9	1973	148.4	181.6	153.7	178.5	176.0	161.0	148.0	172.8
1960	92.6	117.2	116.0	121.8	118.1	113.4	94.7	130.2									

Note: Compiled from Federal and State official data.
Source: Economics Department, South Dakota State University.

CHOICE BEEF AND PORK PRICES (TABLES 3 AND 4)

The retail price of beef is a weighted average price of retail cuts from Choice beef carcass. The gross farm value is payment to farmer for quantity of Choice steer equivalent to 1 pound of retail cuts sold to consumers—2.12 pounds in 1949-51, gradually increased to 2.28 pounds from 1962 on. The byproduct allowance is the portion of gross farm value attributed to edible and inedible byproducts.

The retail price of pork is a weighted average price of loin cuts; ham (whole, center

slices, butts, and shank ends); picnics (smoked); butts; spareribs; bacon squares; sausage; neckbones; forefeet; and pig tails. The gross farm value is payment to farmer for quantity of live hog equivalent to 1 pound of pork sold to consumers—2.13 pounds in January-June 1949, gradually decreased to 1.97 pounds in 1969. The byproduct allowance is the portion of gross farm value attributed to lard and other edible and inedible byproducts.

The net farm value is gross farm value minus byproduct allowance.

The rise of 54.6 cents per pound in the re-

tail price of choice beef from 1950 to 1973 is a percentage increase of 73 per cent. This change compares with an increase of 78.5 per cent for all goods and services and an increase of 76 per cent for all food during the same period.

The retail price of pork increased 44.3 cents per pound from 1950 to 1973. This rise in retail pork prices was 82.5 per cent. The percentage change from 1950 to 1973 in the component of the retail price (net farm value) going to the farmer was 58 per cent for choice beef and 85 per cent for pork.

TABLE 3.—CHOICE BEEF: RETAIL PRICE, FARM-RETAIL SPREAD, NET FARM VALUE, BY-PRODUCT ALLOWANCE, GROSS FARM VALUE, AND PRICE RECEIVED BY FARMERS FOR BEEF CATTLE IN SOUTH DAKOTA

[Amounts in cents]							[Amounts in cents]						
Year	Retail price per pound	Farm-retail spread	Choice beef net farm value	By-product allowance	Gross farm value	Prices received by South Dakota farmers for beef cattle	Year	Retail price per pound	Farm-retail spread	Choice beef net farm value	By-product allowance	Gross farm value	Prices received by South Dakota farmers for beef cattle
1949	67.8	18.7	49.1	5.8	54.9	20.0	1962	81.7	26.5	55.2	4.9	60.1	22.4
1950	74.6	19.4	55.2	6.7	61.9	23.9	1963	78.5	30.1	48.4	4.2	52.6	20.8
1951	87.3	20.3	67.0	8.6	75.6	29.7	1964	76.5	30.3	46.2	4.1	50.3	18.7
1952	85.7	22.7	63.0	5.8	68.8	24.9	1965	88.1	28.3	51.8	4.7	56.5	20.5
1953	68.4	23.1	45.3	4.6	49.9	17.0	1966	82.4	30.1	52.3	5.3	57.6	22.8
1954	67.8	21.4	46.4	4.4	50.8	16.9	1967	82.6	29.6	53.0	4.0	57.0	22.7
1955	66.8	22.4	44.4	4.1	48.5	16.1	1968	86.6	29.9	56.7	3.8	60.5	24.0
1956	65.4	23.2	42.2	4.1	46.3	15.2	1969	96.2	34.0	62.2	4.7	66.9	26.5
1957	69.9	24.5	45.4	4.4	49.8	17.4	1970	98.6	37.1	61.5	4.8	66.3	27.2
1958	80.2	26.2	54.0	5.0	59.0	22.4	1971	104.3	36.4	67.9	4.5	72.4	29.3
1959	82.0	27.6	54.4	5.5	59.9	23.0	1972	113.8	41.3	72.5	7.4	79.9	33.8
1960	80.2	28.1	52.1	4.6	56.7	21.1	1973	129.2	41.8	87.4	9.4	96.8	43.2
1961	78.4	29.6	48.8	4.8	53.6	20.9							

Note: Compiled from Federal and State official data.
Source: Economics Department, South Dakota State University.

TABLE 4.—PORK: RETAIL PRICE, FARM-RETAIL SPREAD, NET FARM VALUE, BY-PRODUCT ALLOWANCE, GROSS FARM VALUE, AND PRICE RECEIVED BY FARMERS FOR HOGS IN SOUTH DAKOTA

[Amounts in cents]													
Year	Retail price per pound	Farm-retail spread	Net farm value	Byproduct allowance	Gross farm value	Prices received by South Dakota farmers for hogs	Year	Retail price per pound	Farm-retail spread	Net farm value	Byproduct allowance	Gross farm value	Prices received by South Dakota farmers for hogs
1949	54.5	19.7	34.8	4.3	39.1	17.2	1962	58.8	28.7	30.1	2.6	32.7	15.9
1950	53.8	19.4	34.4	4.6	39.0	17.3	1963	56.6	29.2	27.4	2.5	29.9	14.6
1951	57.8	21.3	36.5	5.8	42.3	19.2	1964	55.9	29.1	26.8	2.5	29.3	14.4
1952	56.2	22.2	34.0	3.8	57.8	17.0	1965	65.8	27.7	38.1	3.5	41.6	20.3
1953	62.1	20.6	41.5	4.5	46.0	20.6	1966	74.0	31.8	42.2	3.7	45.9	22.2
1954	63.4	22.3	41.1	5.1	46.2	20.7	1967	67.2	32.4	34.8	2.5	37.3	18.4
1955	53.6	24.9	28.7	3.1	31.8	14.4	1968	67.4	32.9	34.5	2.2	36.7	18.1
1956	51.4	24.8	26.6	3.1	29.7	13.7	1969	74.3	32.0	42.3	3.2	45.5	21.9
1957	59.4	26.6	32.8	3.7	36.5	17.4	1970	78.0	38.5	39.5	3.4	42.9	21.9
1958	63.8	26.9	37.0	3.9	40.9	19.0	1971	70.3	38.0	32.3	2.7	65.0	17.4
1959	56.3	30.4	25.9	2.4	28.3	13.5	1972	83.2	35.3	47.9	3.5	51.4	24.6
1960	55.9	27.2	28.7	2.7	31.4	14.9	1973	98.1	34.4	63.7	4.9	68.6	38.2
1961	58.4	27.9	30.5	3.0	33.5	16.1							

Note: Compiled from Federal and State official data.
Source: Economics Department, South Dakota State University.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Agriculture industry has continued to provide an abundant supply of food products in the face of increasing expenses over which they have no control. At the same time farmers have had to accept the returns provided by a marketplace over which they also have no control—a market controlled by the most voracious consumers in the world.

American agriculture is a shining testimony to the merits of a relatively free market supplied by the boundless energy of private enterprise, and I have confidence that it will continue to be.

In these times of ever-increasing government involvement in everything, and of unjustified consumer unrest, however, I do not think that it can be too strongly stressed that any government action to control prices of raw agricultural products, directly or indirectly, will in all likelihood lead to the demise of consumer control of the marketplace.

The marketplace which will develop will be characterized by increasing control by those few producers who are able to survive and by shortages of those products which are in greatest demand.

We often fail to realize when we have a good thing until it's gone. Let us not let it be so in the case of American agriculture and the cheap food it can supply in abundant quantity.

THE DANGER OF DOING NOTHING

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, regardless of how much petroleum the U.S. imports, regardless of the improvements we make in our own oil production, it is a fact that the world petroleum supply is inherently limited.

As developing nations begin to industrialize, they will need energy, and the most accessible energy source in today's technology is petroleum. It stands to reason that, in the future, oil supplies will not only diminish, but the demand for oil will increase on a worldwide basis.

These factors point to the fact that the United States must immediately embark upon a research program which will develop practical alternatives to petroleum energy. Our energy-intensive economy demands a constant, high-level energy source, and we cannot wait until oil supplies diminish further to develop a new primary energy technology.

Our distinguished colleague in the Senate, HENRY M. JACKSON, has penned a brief and succinct article in today's New York Times pointing up the need

for energy research and development, and I am pleased to enter it into today's RECORD:

THE DANGER OF DOING NOTHING

(By HENRY M. JACKSON)

WASHINGTON.—With the deepening dependence of the United States on imported petroleum has come an increasing awareness of the risks to our national security and the stability of our national economy. The closing of gas stations around the country, the prospect of severe summer shortages, and the readying of plans to ration gasoline on a nationwide basis have brought home to the American people the sense of a problem without an easy solution.

Therefore, I suppose it was inevitable that we would soon hear the argument that the threat to the continued delivery of Middle Eastern oil arises from American support of Israel. Such an analysis, quite simple-minded in my view, attributes the chronic instability in the Middle East to the Arab-Israeli dispute.

The real situation is quite different. Middle Eastern energy sources would be insecure even if Israel didn't exist. For it is inter-Arab rivalry, and the opportunistic exploitation of it by the Soviet Union, which threatens to disrupt the normal flow of oil. After all, it is not Israel which threatens Kuwait and its substantial oil reserves; rather, recent Iraqi military activity may have as its objective control of that oil-rich sheikdom. It is not Israel which threatens Saudi Arabia—but Yemen to the south, Soviet-supported Iraq and Syria to the north, and Egypt to the west.

Wherever stability exists in the Middle East today, it is, in my view, largely the result of the strength and Western orientation of Israel on the Mediterranean and Iran on the Persian Gulf. These two countries, reliable friends of the United States, together with Saudi Arabia, have helped inhibit those radical Arab elements which pose a grave threat indeed to petroleum sources in the Persian Gulf. It is ironic that Saudi Arabia and the sheikdoms (which, along with Iran, will provide most of our imported oil in the years ahead) depend for regional stability on Israel's capacity to encourage an environment where moderate regimes in Lebanon and Jordan can survive and where Syria can be contained. Iran plays a similar and even more direct role in the Gulf itself.

Last November I traveled to Israel, Iran and Saudi Arabia. I was impressed with the remarkable extent to which their three separate fates are associated—how they constitute a paradoxical bloc of nations whose security, so important to the United States, unites them in a set of common interests. Between Israel and Iran, for example, there exists a quiet tie that reflects a common concern about the forces of instability in the region.

The relationship between Israel and Saudi Arabia is more complex. While neither Israel nor Saudis are in a position to acknowledge common interests, they do share a common perspective on many problems. For instance, the pipeline which carries great quantities of Saudi oil to Western users passes through the Israeli-held Golan Heights and, over that portion of its length, it has functioned without major disruption. Moreover, the Saudis, a tempting target for any number of forces, would not last long without a stable Jordan, a more or less calm Egypt and a contained Syria and Iraq. The Saudis understand this very well.

Important as the Middle East may be to the future of the international energy economy, it is not the whole story. Even if we had assurances that the flow of oil from the Middle East would continue without interruption, we would still have to undertake the development of new sources of energy on an urgent basis. Indeed, I am persuaded that we can no longer temporize and continue to sit idly by as our dependence upon imported oil—whatever its source—continues to grow.

The United States, with 6 per cent of the world's population, presently uses over one-third of the world's energy. Other developed nations also consume disproportionate amounts of energy on a per capita basis. The developing countries will require more energy as they industrialize, and they are certainly entitled to their share of this finite resource. But oil supplies are limited. We cannot downplay energy research and development while the world drains the depletable reserves of the Middle East.

Moreover, alternative energy sources will restrain the cost of Middle East oil. Without alternatives, crude oil prices will certainly rise and, in a short time, gasoline retail prices could reach a dollar per gallon. The dollar holdings of a few Arab states may reach proportions that could enable them to dominate international economic conditions. By failing to act now to develop alternative sources of energy we are prolonging the period during which the supply and price of imported oil can be dictated by whoever might happen to control a handful of Persian Gulf nations.

This is why I have proposed a ten-year, \$20-billion program to translate several promising technological developments into commercially viable sources of energy. We have already waited far too long to increase our options. We must abandon myopic indecision and make a determined start on alleviating this increasingly critical situation.

BILL TO STRENGTHEN GAO

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1973

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill, H.R. 9002, which is designed to strengthen and revise the powers and functions of the General Accounting Office. It is the House companion bill of S. 2049 which was introduced on June 21, 1973, by Senators SAM J. ERVIN, JR., ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, and LEE METCALF on the request of the Comptroller General.

In the past several years we have witnessed a steady decline of the power of Congress in relation to that of the executive branch. One major reason for this decline can be found in the information-gathering process. In a time of ever-growing complexity of Federal programs, the executive branch has become more and more aloof, often frustrating congressional oversight. Far too often we are at the mercy of the executive branch which may choose not to provide Congress with certain facts. If we are going to operate on a par with the Executive, it is necessary to have the information which will allow us to legislate effectively.

In his recent testimony before the House Select Committee on Committees, the Comptroller General stated that—

A primary objective of the GAO in all of our work is to strengthen, wherever it can, the processes through which reliable information can be obtained by Congress in its oversight as well as its authorization and appropriation responsibilities as well as the conclusions and recommendations of the GAO which flow from our audits. To attain this objective, the work of GAO must be relevant and responsive to the changing needs of Congress.

If the GAO, as an agent of Congress, is to attain its broad objective of assisting us in effective legislation, it is imperative that its statutory base now be revised. H.R. 9002 proposes several revisions which would result in a stronger and more efficient General Accounting Office that would be essentially independent of the Executive.

First of all, the bill would give the GAO important enforcement powers, which up to this point it has lacked. It provides that funds be cut off from any Federal agency which illegally withholds information requested by the GAO. In such a case the Comptroller General's right to such information would be reviewed by a three-judge Federal court, and the funds cut off would be subject to disapproval of either House of Congress.

In addition, the bill for the first time would authorize the GAO to sue in Federal court with lawyers of its own choosing. Up to now, when the GAO disagreed with an executive agency, when it believed that an agency was spending funds illegally or erroneously, the Justice Department would serve as counsel to both the GAO and the agency it was investigating. This part of the bill would help the GAO get the independence it needs to enforce the intentions of Congress.

The bill also gives the GAO the power to subpoena records of contractors who are already legally subject to GAO audit. The Comptroller General could invoke the aid of any Federal district court in enforcing the subpoenas. More than 40 U.S. departments and agencies have already been given this kind of authorization, and it is about time this agent of Congress also had it.

Furthermore, the bill would:

Direct the Comptroller General to obtain fiscal, budgetary, and program information to assist congressional control over the Federal budget;

Clarify the right, already existing under law, of the Comptroller General to have access to information from Federal departments and establishments needed for effective auditing of Federal and federally assisted programs; and

Authorize the Comptroller to make selective profit studies of Government contractors whose Government business aggregates \$1 million or more annually.

Other parts of the bill authorize specific changes in GAO's auditing and review procedures, designed to help modernize its operations.

I urge my colleagues to seriously consider this proposal. We must take action to insure that we legislate responsibly and effectively from as informed a viewpoint as possible.

THE EFFECT OF BUREAUCRATIC GOVERNMENT ON SMALL BUSINESS

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1973

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the problem of Government meddling in private business has risen to an all time high. The Federal Government has resorted to the use of wage and price controls, Government installed marketing quotas, and other such methods, in order to try and regulate the business and economics of day to day operations. This action has had a drastic effect on the small businesses of America. Not only do our small business institutions find it hard to exist and operate under such conditions, they also find little incentive to increase production and improve on what they already have.

I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues a statement I have received from one of my constituents, Mr. Jerry Bigalk, who owns a Printing Service Center in Lancaster, Calif. I think it would do us all good to follow his advice:

Federal spending must not be increased; there should be Price Controls on Federal Government spending also! The government should have to practice what laws they pass. It is getting to the point where a businessman doesn't have time to conduct business and devote his full-time to his customers, because he has to spend so much time with endless reports for the government!!! More and more paper work, which takes more and more time to complete and return to the proper bureau, department or office. We businessmen are the Government's bookkeepers. What used to be the "Government for the People" is becoming the "People for the Government".

CAREER MEN SKIPPED

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1973

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most alarming things about the Nixon administration is the politicizing of formerly nonpolitical agencies. Highly specialized agencies like the Park Service, the Internal Revenue Service, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the FBI have been used to handle purely political assignments for the White House and skilled individuals are being phased out of sensitive positions in favor of unqualified political appointees.

Now it appears that the Bureau of Land Management will fall prey to this policy. Curtis J. Berklund, a former lumber corporation executive, is currently slated to head the BLM, replacing the present director, Burton W. Silcock. Berklund's appointment could result in anticonservation management of vital national resources.

Mr. Speaker, I include an article from the June 18 edition of the Salem, Oreg., Statesman dealing with Mr. Berklund in the RECORD:

CAREER MEN SKIPPED IN BLM APPOINTMENT
(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—The Nixon administration is planning to install a former lumber company executive and rancher in charge of the Bureau of Land Management, the Interior Department agency that has jurisdiction over the vast public lands of the West and the valuable commercial O&C forestlands of western Oregon.

Curtis J. Berklund, former president of Berklund International Lumber Co. of St. Maries, Idaho, is slated to replace Burton W. Silcock, who has been director of BLM about two years.

Silcock is scheduled to be transferred to Alaska as federal co-chairman of the Joint Land Use Planning Commission for Alaska. He will replace in that job Jack Horton who was appointed earlier this year assistant secretary of the Interior for land management.

The appointment of Berklund would deviate from past practices of appointing career government foresters or range management experts to run the BLM.

The only other political appointee in BLM history was Edward Woolley, but he had been Idaho's state lands director before taking over at BLM in 1953. Woolley served throughout the eight years of the Eisenhower terms and left as the Kennedy regime began to go to work for then Sen. Len Jordan, R-Ida.

Berklund came to the Interior Department midway through Nixon's first term after disposing of his lumber interests. He served in several minor staff positions until named deputy assistant secretary for land management a year ago.

Berklund, who was politically associated with former GOP Gov. Don Samuelson of Idaho, was vice president of the American River Lumber Co. at Elk City, Idaho, before running his own company from 1964 to 1967.

The only thing holding up the change of command at BLM is White House slowness in formalizing the president's designation of Silcock to the Alaskan post. It has been awaiting White House action for months.

Once that appointment has been announced, Interior Secretary Rogers C. B. Morton will announce his appointment of Berklund, informed sources report. The BLM appointment is automatic, since it does not

require Senate confirmation. The director of BLM serves at the pleasure of the secretary.

Silcock's departure reportedly was by mutual agreement after the firing late last year of Interior's assistant secretary Harrison Loesch. Silcock had become director after serving as BLM's state director for Alaska. He hails from Burley, Idaho, and has been with BLM for over 20 years.

His predecessor was Boyd Rasmussen, who had been a career man with the Forest Service until tapped for BLM director by Stewart Udall.

The designation of Berklund would be the second political appointment to an old line Interior agency, previously headed by career men, since the presidential election of last November.

The first was the appointment of Ronald Walker, a former insurance executive, as head of the National Park Service.

STRIP MINING

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 29, 1973

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, Ralph Nader has written a long and eloquent appeal to the head of a British-owned firm to pursue an enlightened policy with respect to strip mining in Appalachia. The letter serves as the vehicle for describing the historical impact of strip mining generally, as well as the business practices which preceded the mining. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

MAY 16, 1973.

SIR DENYS FLOWERDEW LOWSON,
Chairman, Board of Directors, American
Association, Ltd., London, England.

DEAR SIR DENYS:

O, it is excellent

To have a giant's strength, but it is tyrannous to use it like a giant. (Measure for Measure Act II, Scene 1.)

As a Life Governor of the Royal Shakespeare Theatre, you are no doubt familiar with these lines. The thought has been applied widely—and rightfully—to America's involvement in Vietnam. Yet as that war winds down, another one continues, a quiet, sordid little war in the once-verdant mountains of the states of Kentucky and Tennessee. The victims of this war are the local residents and their land; the aggressors are "strip miners." And the responsibility falls in large part upon the American Associations, Ltd., a British-based landholding and development company of which you are Chairman of the Board.

The American Association, Ltd., control about 65,000 acres—over one hundred square miles—of coal-rich land, in the Appalachian Mountains of Kentucky and Tennessee. This region is famous for a sad paradox: human misery and abject poverty atop and amidst some of the world's most abundant mineral deposits. The explanation is regrettably simple. Appalachia is a colony. The people there do not own the wealth. Large, outside corporations like the American Association do. And the prime, almost exclusive, concern of these corporations has been to exploit the region at the lowest possible cost to themselves.

Most of your company's holdings—about 50,000 acres—lie in the isolated "Clear Fork Valley" in Claiborne, Campbell, and Bell Counties. Clear Fork is one of the most pop-

ulated remaining valleys in the coal areas of Central Appalachia, with about 500-700 households in the communities of Fonde, Pruden, Hamblintown, Clairfield, Buffalo, and Straight Creek. Your company owns perhaps 85 percent of the valley there.

In this remote valley, the American Association has displayed corporate profitseeking at its worst. It has permitted wanton and destructive "strip mining"—mining by blasting and scraping away the surface instead of tunneling into a coal deposit. Once-beautiful mountains are now scarred and gouged; foliage is razed; streams are clogged and filled with acid and filth; the inhabitants are endangered by landslides, floods, and polluted water. The difference between what strip-mining is doing to the land in Appalachia, and what B-52 bombers have done to the land in Southeast Asia, is one of degree, not of kind.

And while carting away over 2.2 million tons of coal per year, leaving the region that much poorer, and in ruin, the American Association and the Companies to which it leases have virtually ignored the needs of the residents there. They have avoided their fair share of the local tax burdens. They have presided over the destruction of job opportunities. They have even blocked the efforts of the local citizens to better their own lot.

Idealism and good intentions—spiced, albeit, with a goodly dose of empire and profits—propelled your firm into Appalachia in the early 1890s. Backed by capital from Britain's Baring Brothers, the American Association founded a town called Middlesboro (after a British counterpart) in the State of Kentucky, and set out to make it the booming iron and coal capitol of the southern United States. The venture was to strike a bold new phase in British enterprise and in Anglo-American relations. "This is but a transfer of British business to American soil," proclaimed American Association founder Alexander Arthur on November 11, 1890, to visiting dignitaries in the newly-resplendent Middlesboro Hall. He went on:

"I would say that America needs this place and our Anglo-American money, experience and push. Our mines, ovens, furnaces and works you have seen; these comprise our plant. We have also the sinews of body and of money and stand ready, clean-cut and vigorous, for a generation of progress and success in manufacture, arts, and sciences. Come and join hands with us in the great enterprise which is worthy of the noblest efforts of us all, native or foreign born though we may be." (emphasis supplied)

But misfortune, greed, and highly questionable dealings soon shipwrecked the hoped-for "noblest efforts." The financial panic of 1893 dried up the venture's British backing; Middlesboro was sold at auction, and 80,000 acres of mountain and valley land were mortgaged to the Central Trust Co. of New York, for \$1,500,000.

Then a strange thing happened. The Central Trust filed to recover on the mortgage in 1894, and one J. H. Bartlett was appointed Special Commissioner to conduct the sale. Mr. Bartlett let the property go for but \$25,000—about thirty cents per acre. The buyer was, of all people, an agent of the American Association, Ltd., a newly-formed corporation with essentially the same membership as the American Association, Inc. Shortly thereafter, Mr. J. H. Bartlett became General Manager of American Association, Inc.

The American Association, Inc. said later that the land had been worth well over one-half million dollars at the time of the sale.

This strange transaction did not go unnoticed. Creditors of the American Association, Ltd. sued the new American Association, Inc. in Claiborne County for "fraud," claiming it had "paid nothing for said property." But the records of this suit went up in flames with the Claiborne County Courthouse. And researchers could find no trace of the suit at the Bell County Courthouse.

The Association had acquired its Appa-

lachian Coal empire through means its founder Mr. Arthur and yourself might not wish to label a "transfer of British business to American soil." Most records of the era are either missing, or else were burned with the County Courthouse. But the region is alive with tales of how American Association agents tricked, threatened, or forced uneducated mountain people into giving up their valuable coal-land for fifty cents to a dollar an acre. Said one mountaineer recently:

"The American Association said the land was worthless and that they would give my daddy a dollar an acre and we could live on the land and pay rent and they would pay the taxes. We didn't know it but we were standing barely 4' from a seam of coal when the American Association was talking to us."

Local residents say that when the property records burned with the Courthouse, the American Association used the chance to claim property that wasn't theirs.

At first, self interest bound the American Association, and the coal operators to which it leases, to a sort of uneasy truce with the people of the region. The companies needed men to dig the coal out of the large deep mines. So they had to provide these men and their families with a place to live and at least a minimal level of human services. Usually this level was indeed minimal. The miners and their families lived often in indecent conditions and worked in hazard-trap mines. And they were virtual serfs to the companies that employed them and owned everything around them—their home, their credit at the company store, health care and recreation in the company town, even "justice" at the company-controlled courthouse. In the 1930s your company, along with others, tried to keep these miners from joining a union that could stand up for their rights. Yet, despite all this, the need for able, willing bodies to mine the coal made the American Association and its cohorts show some concern for the region and its people.

But the chord that had kept this uneasy truce together has broken. Mining coal no longer requires people. In fact, people just get in the way. Your company has expressed the desire to rid the area of residents. It will no longer repair homes, and it plans to tear them down in the near future. Yet there is little other housing or even property on which to build housing. Depopulation has replaced paternalism as official corporate policy.

"The people would be better off, and we would be better off, if they would be off our land," said Mr. Alvarado E. Funk, the American Association's General Manager in Middlesboro, Ky.

It began in the 1950s, when a coal market slump forced many coal operators to close down. Medium sized independent operators, like those that lease much American Association land, were especially affected. Employment in the region dropped sharply. In 1952 there were 1,230 coal mining jobs in Claiborne County; by 1958 there were but 282. Your company made no effort to provide other sources of employment for the men thrown out of work.

Since the 1950s, the market for coal has revived. More than revived. It is positively bullish. But bullish for the American Association and other coal owners and operators, not for the people of the region where you get the coal. Automation and strip mining have cut drastically the need for miners. At the single large deep mine left on your property, that of Consolidation Coal, 350 men with modern machinery turn out about as much coal as 1,500 men produced at nine mines in 1948. And men are even more dispensable in strip mining. In Claiborne County alone, 200 men can now blast and bulldoze out almost as much coal as 1,500 deep-miners could dig in 1948.

Today, the need for local labor gone, a sort of undeclared warfare has broken loose. The companies to whom you lease are making an unchecked assault upon the land, and in consequence, on its people.

Is it hyperbole to compare your company's presence in Appalachia to a war zone? Consider the evidence.

1. ENVIRONMENTAL DESTRUCTION

Irresponsible strip mining on your lands in Tennessee harkens dismally of the laying-waste-to-the-land strategies of bygone generals. As you know, a strip miner literally blasts away the sides or top of a mountain. He then bulldozes the debris over the side, and shovels out the coal. The process is fast, cheap, and destructive in the extreme. Landslides block roads and railways, destroy homes and farmlands, and imperil human beings. The blasting alone has cracked the frames and foundations of homes. Streams, choked with silt and debris, flood at the slightest rainfall, leaving harmful deposits on scarce fertile soils. Acid and mineral substances pollute the water and endanger the area's water supply.

"We are afraid to go to sleep when it rains. We just stay up all night," says one Tennessee resident whose property these floods have ruined. In the Clear Fork Valley, some people must boil their water and add chlorine to it to make it safe to drink. And the Campbell County Highway Department has had to spend thousands of dollars clearing a single road after continual landslides.

Is this the experience of people in peace or in war?

Your company, the American Association, currently hosts more strip mining operations than does any other landowner in Tennessee. On your Claiborne County property alone, strippers laid waste to about 3,000 acres before the State passed a law in 1967 requiring that the land be restored. Since then, 1,400 more acres on your land have been stripped, and the reclamation is questionable at best despite the new law.

2. TAX EVASION

While their mineral wealth is literally carted out from under them, the people of this region pay, in measurable and immeasurable ways, for this destruction. State and local governments have to clear the roads after landslides and both roads and bridges after illegally overweight coal trucks have beaten them apart. The people pay for this through taxes, and through their own efforts to undo the damage to their homes and property. Yet not only do they get little or nothing, not even jobs, in return. Your company even avoids its duty to pay taxes to meet the costs of local government.

In the United States, local governments depend mainly on property taxes. Especially in Appalachia, where coal is the major form of property wealth, owners like the American Association are expected to pay their share. But it hasn't worked out that way in Claiborne County. Your 44,000 coal laden acres there represent 17 percent of the County's land area and perhaps 90 percent of the County's coal reserves. Yet in 1970 your property taxes provided only 3 percent of the County's property tax revenue. That year your company claimed to the State Board of Equalization—the board of appeals—that 40,000 acres of its coal-rich land were worth but five dollars per acre. Yet in that one year alone you garnered more in royalty payments from the mining companies to which you lease.

Complaints by local citizens led the Tennessee Board of Equalization to require that coal properties be assessed more accurately. But the figures your General Manager Mr. Funk then supplied the State were dubious at best. Local citizens charged that Mr. Funk's suspicious figures gave your company an almost one million dollar underassess-

ment. The State Board seems to have borne out these claims when it tripled values Mr. Funk reported for properties now leased to Consolidation Coal.

Still, the strip mines on your land are greatly underassessed and undertaxed. Two companies mining your land, under lease, appear to have escaped taxation altogether, while others seem to have kept all their mining equipment off of the tax rolls. As late as 1972 your coal-rich Claiborne County lands that were not being mined were still assessed at only \$25/acre, less than the least expensive farm land in the county.

3. HOUSING

As the major employer in the Clear Fork Valley, and as owner of most of the land, the American Association once provided most of the housing as well. But now that it no longer needs the people, it seeks to get rid of them. Is it your company's declared policy to tear down its houses in the valley, and not to build new ones. The houses your company still rents, it won't repair. Nor will it compensate tenants who make their own repairs. And the leases it grants are usually but for thirty days, if it grants a lease at all. And they empower you to evict without cause or reason.

"I've seen barns in better shaps . . . Why, I've worked farms where people wouldn't keep their animals in barns the shape of these houses," one tenant said recently.

Meanwhile, strip mining destroys these homes and the land on which they rest. Residents count forty-two houses that have been stripped away in the small Rock Creek Hollow alone.

And your company has turned its back on both the immediate distress and the long-run needs of people whose homes are thus destroyed. In 1955 on American Association property, water broke through an old "slag" pile, surged down and destroyed the Community of Valley Creek. Two children were killed. Your company offered meager compensation. Just last year your company did not take preventive action when a landslide from a strip mine on your land threatened homes and lives in the Community of Buffalo Hollow until after local citizens hired an attorney and Granada Television filmed the slide for broadcast in Britain. Even the belated efforts you have taken—which have had little success—are of small comfort to people who have had to evacuate homes on your property before the invading army of bulldozing strip miners. Or to residents such as Lewis Lowe, who now faces perennial flooding long Clear Fork Creek. Or to the people endangered or blocked in by the landslides on such places as Duff Road.

Your manager, Mr. Funk, stated on the Granada television documentary, "The Stripping of Appalachia," "We're ploughing back our share into the development of Appalachia." Ploughing, indeed, there is aplenty. But apparently the only "development" is on a minor part of your holdings, in Cumberland Gap, across the giant Cumberland Mountain from Clear Fork Valley. Here one finds a new Holiday Inn for tourists, and here a marina and golf course are planned, as your May 19, 1971 Statement to Shareholders puts it, "to attract the wealthier citizens of Pineville and Middlesboro." What of the less wealthy residents of your 50,000 or more acres in the isolated Clear Fork Valley?

They could move elsewhere, one might reply. After all, your Statement to Shareholders the following year applauds your contribution to the local housing supply. "We have continued," it says, "our policy of building houses on plots of land owned by us. . . ." But these too are across the Cumberland Mountains. In the isolated valley, housing is scarce because your company owns most of the land and is tearing down

its houses. There are very few "elsewheres" for people who wish to remain in the land where they and their parents were raised. And jobs and living conditions in the distant cities are very uncertain.

4. PREVENTING LOCAL SELF-HELP

To keep the area under tight control, the American Association has blocked the efforts of local citizens to help themselves, to provide for their own jobs and housing. These people have formed a community development organization, the Model Valley Development Council, to better the lot of the valley and its residents. Several years ago, when the Council approached your company to buy land for a small factory, your company would consent to sell or lease only a single small tract. It was covered with slag and refuse from an old mine, and the Association would let it go only if the local people themselves cleaned up the shameful mess. In 1972 the American Association refused to sell or lease land for the people to build homes. Last autumn, American Association General Manager Funk would not consider making just one-half acre available for the community to build a health clinic. Since then (and after wide showing of the Granada T.V. documentary) Mr. Funk has suggested you might lease—but not sell—some land.

But the people are still waiting. Meanwhile your company won't even let them cut trees for wood to repair their homes.

The mere control of so much of this area's land and wealth sets your company athwart any growth or local self help there. The County government is reluctant to provide services like sewers and roads because the population is sparse—sparse largely due to American Association policy. Lack of these services in turn keeps new builders away. And potential industries shun the almost total dependence on your company that setting-up in the region would involve.

Your company won't help these people. And it won't let them help themselves.

The American Association's seventy year occupation of this forgotten portion of Tennessee has resulted, then, in what? Surveys in the Valley have shown unemployment at about 30 percent. Around 20 percent of the households live on less than \$1,000 per year; another 20 percent make less than \$2,000. (\$9,400 per year was the average family income in this country in 1969.) Homes are being destroyed and land and water are being ruined. Prospects for employment are grim. Prospects generally are grim, with your company looking ahead to 25-30 more years of strip mining, and then timber cutting after that.

Does this picture suggest the presence of a responsible citizen or of a greedy aggressor? And what will the picture be in twenty-five more years?—not in the small portion of your land north of Cumberland Mountain, where you are building playspots for the rich, but in the depressed Clear Creek Valley where most of your holdings lie?

The bloom indeed has faded from the hopes your countrymen held for the American Association venture in Kentucky and Tennessee. How different the response of two English people, viewing the enterprise at the outset and now. Visiting the area of 1891, Sir James Kitson, then-President of the British Iron and Steel Institute, could boast:

"I think we all, as Englishmen, rejoiced to see a town which was being developed with so much sagacity, so much judgment and energy; that was being developed under English auspices and with British capital."

Eighty years later your countrymen were holding their heads a bit lower. After watching the Granada television documentary on your holdings in Clear Fork Valley, a Mid-diesex, England woman felt impelled to write a small local Tennessee newspaper:

"I write to tell you how ashamed I am that an English-owned company can so indis-

criminately cause so much havoc to a small community. . . . My feelings after watching a recent television programme on the subject were ones of total horror.

"You must realize that I am an English woman of absolutely no importance, but nevertheless, would like to use the good offices of your newspaper to apologise for the desecration caused by an English company, on land in a country that has always had very close ties with my own. . . ."

It is true that the American Association is just one small part of your nearly L220m (\$500,000,000) secrecy-enshrouded corporate empire, of which *Investors Chronicle* magazine said, "What is quite unknown is how the empire is controlled, how the various companies relate to each other. This empire spans from Australia and Thailand to Canada and the West Indies, and includes pursuits so diverse as racetracks, rubber plantations, and equipment for hairdressing salons.

But the policies of the American Association spell the fate of the people and culture of the Clear Fork Valley. And they are now causing embarrassment to people of your own country.

You have shown charitable instincts in many ways. You have served as officer or director of six hospitals. In 1953 you were on the Executive Council of the Lord Mayor's National Flood and Tempest Distress Fund. Until 1948 you were Vice President of the League of Mercy.

Now you can apply this same sense of responsibility to the corporate realm.

What can you do? Such steps as the following, which you could set in motion at once, could begin to change your company from a hostile aggressor to a more responsible constructive citizen.

1. First, and most important, you should personally visit the region, for at least several days, to see first hand what your company's policies have done. You should meet with local residents to hear their views and to discuss your company's past actions and plans for the future.

2. Your company should inventory, and begin to correct, the damage strip mining on its land has done. Especially urgent is the need to correct damage to homes, farms, roads, and water supplies.

3. You should require all companies to whom the American Association leases, to restore carefully and completely the property on which they mine, and to repair any damage they do to the people or the region.

4. You should also require these companies to cooperate fully with tax officials, and to provide them with the information necessary to set fair and equitable property tax assessments. Such information should include lease agreements, royalty rates, and survey and estimates of coal reserves.

5. As a symbol of your desire to compensate the people of the region for the valuable land your agents tricked or threatened their forebears into selling, you should donate some of your 50,000-odd acres for community development.

6. You should keep in good repair the housing you rent to local people. And you should extend to them fair and adequate lease protection.

7. You should stop refusing to sell land to local groups seeking to build industry or housing.

8. You should instruct your General Manager, Mr. Alverado E Funk, to negotiate with local citizen groups a fair and equitable compensation for all the property taxes which the American Association has avoided in the past.

9. You should, in the future, consult with these citizen groups about changes in your company's policies in the area.

Such steps will help get your company out of its social red ink in Appalachia. But what of the many other companies you control? Are they too laying waste to forgotten corners of the world?

There is a larger lesson to be learned from your destructive Appalachian venture. It is simply to apply to social problems, on the corporate level, the old adage "To foresee is to forestall." It would be a signal act of corporate foresight and responsibility for you to set up now a special committee to monitor the social impact of all the businesses you control. This committee should comprise both people from within your enterprises, and representatives of outside groups speaking for important social concerns. It should have the full authority of your office, and should report directly to you.

"Come and join hands with us in the great enterprise which is worthy of the noblest efforts of us all . . ." proclaimed the sanguine founder of the American Association, Alexander Arthur. While the standard since then has fallen miserably, it is not too late to hoist it up again. In fact, the decline, like adversity, could be sweet. It could occasion an ascent to a truly higher standard of corporate action and accountability.

Will you exert your "noblest efforts" to that end? Or will your neglect be the occasion of a mobilized citizenry recovering their future through resurgent legal and political action?

Sincerely,

RALPH NADER.

AN ANCIENT RIVER

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1973

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken many times in this Chamber about the proposed Blue Ridge power project on the New River at the North Carolina-Virginia border.

I have spoken in opposition to this project when mine was little more than a voice crying in the wilderness, and it has made me very happy in recent months to see more and more public officials and other concerned citizens take so active a role in the opposition as well.

One group of environmentalists, the Izaak Walton League of America, has taken a particular interest in this project, and in a recent publication, it outlines the basic facts of the case and explores the weaknesses inherent in the project proposal.

For my colleagues' consideration and information, I am inserting the text of that article in the Record at this point:

STRUGGLE FOR AN ANCIENT RIVER

Several reservoirs built in southwestern Virginia and West Virginia near the turn of the century had an original depth of 50-100 feet. Today they are several inches deep. Their waters gradually melted away the man-made banks filling the reservoirs with silt and other accumulated debris. When the surface elevation of a reservoir is mechanically fluctuated, this process is accelerated.

The Appalachian Power Co. seeks to build two such reservoirs in western Virginia and North Carolina: reservoirs that would destroy the oldest river in the United States, much of its surrounding virgin woodland and the legacy of the people of the area—a legacy of life and land handed down from their forefathers who settled here generations ago.

The river is the New River, the second oldest river in the world—second only to the Nile. Geologists claim the New has been flowing over 100 million years.

From its source near Blowing Rock, N.C., the South Fork of the New River joins the North Fork (which tumbles down from the Tennessee line) near Sparta, N.C. The river flows north into Virginia where it twists and turns, crossing six southwestern counties, before heading northwest into West Virginia. Well inside that state, the New and the Gauley River merge to form the Kanawha. Continuing northwest, the river flows through the Charleston industrial complex, on to the Ohio and finally the Mississippi.

PREHISTORIC BEGINNINGS

The New is the only remaining segment of the much greater prehistoric Teays River which originated in the ancestral Appalachian mountains of North Carolina and travelled 1000 miles through Virginia, W. Virginia, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois. It then turned south to empty into an arm of the Gulf of Mexico which in ancient times extended as far north as Illinois.

During the last ice age, the glaciers moved south, covering the lower half of the Teays—from Ohio down river. The rest of the river was stopped short, backing up to form a long narrow lake in Ohio and W. Virginia. When the glaciers receded, the lake gradually drained, but the Teays never resumed its course. The glaciers had forever altered the flow of the Teays when its streaming meltwaters met with the overflow from other streams and forged a new path through the land. The downstream portion of the Kanawha was lowered to flow into a brand new river system—the Ohio, and a previously minor tributary became the mighty Mississippi. Only the New River portion of the Teays survived intact.

For more than ten years the Appalachian Power Co. has sought to dam and destroy this river; for almost as long, the people of the area have fought to save it.

Appalachian seeks a license to construct a two-dam pumped storage and hydroelectric project whose two reservoirs would inundate 40,400 acres in N.C.'s Ashe and Alleghany Counties and Grayson County, Va.

"The Blue Ridge Project", as originally proposed (1962), called for two reservoirs flooding 19,500 acres. Licensing of this project by the Federal Power Commission (1965) was blocked by the intervention of the U.S. Interior Department. Interior insisted that the project should store water for periodic releases to improve the quality of the Kanawha River 250 miles downstream in Charleston, home of several major industries. The larger, "modified proposal", was conceived to accommodate this request.

The people of the project area objected to being a flushpot for pollution dilution downstream with its resulting penalty of a 12-foot drawdown in the Upper Reservoir and a 56-foot drawdown in the Lower. (With a 12-foot drawdown a 60-foot wide strip of mudflats would be exposed around the entire 425 mile shoreline of the Upper Reservoir). Charleston made their own mess, they contended, let them take care of it.

Fortunately, the dangerous precedent of the pollution dilution concept has been all but abolished in the January, 1973 FPC's Draft Environmental Statement on the project. But for the people in the area, the project will remain the same: Appalachian has said they need the entire modified project, including drawdowns, to meet increasing power demands.

The reservoirs would flood 40,400 acres of some of the least spoiled, most beautiful, wooded mountain land in the country. Thousands of acres of rich bottom lands and pastures—all the best agricultural land in the area, and 212 miles of tributary creeks—much of it exceptional trout waters, would be inundated. Approximately 5,000 people will be forced from their homes and livelihoods.

And for the first time in 100 million years, the course of the New River would be altered.

The project will obliterate 44 miles of the river, changing forever its flow, temperature, aquatic inhabitants, recreation and simple majesty.

The Izaak Walton League (along with conservation agencies from Virginia and W. Virginia) submitted an extensive brief detailing the project's adverse effects on fish propagation and migration, the present species and quantity of fish and aquatic organisms and the entire recreational use of the river. Ignoring this research, the FPC statement declares, simply: "The presence of reservoirs would restrict the movements of game and other animals to a greater extent than the river does at present."

The project will severely restrict the survival of the abundant game species in the area. Woods that once sheltered deer, quail, pheasant, grouse, wild turkey, fox, raccoon and rabbits will be destroyed. The reservoirs with their huge drawdowns and vast mudflats will replace the clear mountain streams they watered at and bathed in. Wild berries and fruit that nourished them will give way to dams and towering transmission lines. Because the reservoirs will destroy many existing homesites, additional land will be razed and cleared and homes for people will replace still more animal sanctuaries.

Even proponents of the dam have acknowledged the breath-taking beauty of the area. The same glaciers that changed the course of the Teays, but stopped before reaching the New, are also credited with the juxtaposition of northern and southern vegetation in the area. The theory is that the area was close enough to the glaciers to maintain the northern evergreens and pines, yet far enough away to retain the flowering bushes and trees of the south. Botanists have described the area as the most unique—in terms of variety—of any in the world.

THE AUTHOR'S IMPRESSIONS

The destruction of the river necessarily involves the disruption and destruction of a way of life. So much is written on the vanishing buffalo, alligator, leopard or seal, yet these people are truly the vanishing Americans. Their life will be gone when their land is gone as the two are inseparable. For generations they have lived on and from their land, working on it, hunting and fishing on it, enjoying its peace and beauty. A people at one with their land—they work it hard and love it well.

Just as rare as their way of life is their way of looking at life—their sense of priorities. One man told me: "I've earned more money before and I could now. But my job took too much time away from enjoying my life and my family. I don't need much to do that. I have everything I want."

Another resident was concerned about construction that would accompany the reservoirs: "They'll widen the roads and all sorts of fancy motels will move in. We don't have the money to go to them—and we don't want to. So all outsiders will come in and they'll take control because they'll have the money."

The 5,000 people who will have to relocate have no place to go. There is not enough land available in the counties to house them—unless they'd settle for a house on a small lot. No matter where they go, life as they have known it will be over.

Appalachian promises to move all Church cemeteries and small family graveyards that will be flooded. And so the ancestors, many of whom have rested here since the 18th Century, will be uprooted also. No longer will you be able to witness the deep roots in this area by driving down country roads and matching the mailbox names with those in the graveyards. They'll all be scattered. The legacy of these proud, independent people will disappear forever under the waters of these dams. How ironical that their old friend the river should be forced to use its waters to do so.

The FPC report states there are no buildings, structures or objects located within the project area that are significant to American history, architecture, archeology or culture. If these virgin lands with their pure sparkling stream and waters—these people who trace their ancestors back to the first settlers of their present homeland—this only remaining portion of a prehistoric river—are of no significance to American history and culture, then we truly have no history and this project signifies much more than the death of a river.

ALFORD, MASS., CELEBRATING ITS BICENTENNIAL THIS YEAR

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1973

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the town of Alford, located in my First Congressional District of Massachusetts, is celebrating its bicentennial this year and I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the many attributes of this lovely community.

Tucked away in the beautiful Berkshire hills, Alford is one of the smallest but most charming towns in the region.

By population, just over 300, and land area, 6,332 acres, Alford is not large. But using the measure by which a community should be judged—the quality of life and the spirit of its citizens—the town may certainly be called grand.

Farming once flourished in Alford and is still pursued by several residents.

In its early years, Alford was also a small but important industrial center. A full century before its incorporation as a town, Alford saw the construction of its first grist mill.

The discovery, in 1799, of a high grade of marble within the town's environs stimulated excavation. Marble from Alford's quarries was used in the construction of the Old City Hall in New York City and in Albany, N.Y., the State House, the Market, and the Law Building were built of Alford marble.

When the railroad spread its spider-like arms through the western part of the State, Alford was bypassed in favor of other quarry towns. Thus, it might be said that Alford was spared the ravages of further industrialization.

Alford is a member of the Southern Berkshire Regional School District and its one-room schoolhouse, housing only kindergarten now, is one of the three public buildings in the town.

Religion has always played a major role in the lives of the inhabitants of the town of Alford and its common house of worship, the Union Meeting House, built in 1817, still stands as a reminder of the strong faith of the early citizens of Alford. In fact, one theory of how the town got its name is that it was titled after Col. John Alford of Charlestown, known for his philanthropic work in the founding of a missionary society for Indians and the endowment of a chair of theology at Harvard in 1761. Another theory holds it was named after Alford, England.

On Saturday, July 7, the meeting house, now known as the Alford Union Church, will be the scene of an ecumenical worship service as the citizens of Alford gather to thank Divine Providence for the blessings bestowed on the first 200 years of their town. That evening, the townspeople will gather for a community sing-along.

On the Friday preceding that, Alford residents will turn the clocks back for an old fashioned block dance in celebration of the bicentennial. And on Sunday, official ceremonies, a band concert, and an arts and crafts show will be held.

Mr. Speaker, today Alford is a small town that delights in its situation. It attracts summer residents, eager to escape from the clamor of city life to the peace and beauty of town living. Its streams and range of hills, crowned by Tom Ball Mountain, are delights for those seeking a tranquil setting.

I invite my colleagues to visit Alford during this year, its bicentennial year, or at any time. And I further ask you to join with me in saluting Alford on the occasion of its bicentennial.

A DEMOCRAT ON WATERGATE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1973

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the end of another week of the Senate Watergate hearings with the committee scheduled to recess after today's session until July 10.

According to press accounts and some opinion polls, the folks around the country have mixed feelings about the hearings—some are simply tired of them while still others feel they should continue for as long as necessary for all those involved to be questioned by the committee.

One noteworthy opinion was expressed by the Honorable Charles Sawyer, Secretary of the Commerce Department in the Truman administration in a letter to the editor of the Cincinnati Enquirer on June 13, 1973, and I include the text of the letter in the RECORD at this point.

A DEMOCRAT ON WATERGATE

TO THE EDITOR: I am a Democrat. I have participated in and observed politics for a long time. I am a realist, I hope, and perhaps even a cynic with reference to politics. As a Democrat I am happy and relieved that my party is not involved in the so-called Watergate matter. I am, moreover, quite willing to admit that Democrats at various times and places have been guilty of irregularities or even crimes—some of which have been made public.

I am moved to suggest that the persons in both parties who are, to the point of nausea, undertaking to display their self-righteous indignation, should be exposed for what they are—either completely dishonest in their proclamation of virtue, or so ignorant of what goes on in politics that they are not entitled to be heard. I believe many of my fellow Democrats, and probably many Republicans, despise the self-righteous politicians, who are trying to capitalize on the misfortunes of Richard Nixon.

In all the years that I have watched poli-

tics, I have never seen a campaign as mean and indefensible as the effort headed by the New York Times, the Washington Post and most of the television news media to crucify Richard Nixon.

I have said many times (not always in jest) that Republicans are stupid politically. In no case has my theory been more completely vindicated than in Watergate. The one thing properly chargeable to President Nixon is that, as a seasoned politician, he permitted his campaign for re-election to be run by men who were not politicians, who knew nothing about politics, and not one of whom had ever been elected to public office. One would have thought that such a mistake would not be made by Mr. Nixon. But we all make mistakes, and he is like the rest of us in that regard.

The publicity which this matter has received is completely out of hand. Rarely does anyone undertake to analyze the motives behind this episode. None of the men involved made this burglary attempt in order to benefit himself personally. They did not get in to steal money. They went in apparently impelled by some unexplained motive—at least so far unexplained adequately—which, however mistaken, did not involve any personal benefit. The whole episode is inexplicable. It was wholly unnecessary, and badly conceived.

One question which has occurred to me but has not, so far as I know, ever been answered, is: What part was played in this affair by the concern about Castro? Why did the men in the Committee to Re-elect the President think it was of any importance or would be helpful to involve the Cuban problem in Mr. Nixon's campaign?

This, of course, is merely one of many things which have not as yet been explained. My own feeling is that the episode has been overworked and the Senate committee has contributed to no result of any benefit to the American people. In fact, this monotonous piling up of second- and third-hand hearsay evidence has already dragged on far too long.

I do not agree with many things which President Nixon says and does, but I believe he is not stupid. That is why I believe he had nothing to do with the Watergate effort.

Personally, I am sick of the Watergate publicity. I believe the average American is sick of it, too. It is being exploited by publicity-seekers in both parties and, in particular, by the enemies of the President. In fairness to my own party, I believe that most of our leaders have been restrained and fair. I would include Sen. George McGovern (D-S.D.) in this group. I would not, however, include Sen. William Fulbright (D-Ark.), who suggested that the President and vice president should resign. He knows that this will not happen. President Nixon is not a quitter. He rather welcomes than avoids a fight.

Not only will President Nixon not resign, but why, in Heaven's name, should Mr. Agnew resign? It has never been charged or intimated that he had the slightest connection with Watergate. If Fulbright and others in both parties are so anxious to ditch Mr. Nixon, why don't they do what is called for by the U.S. Constitution—impeach him? That course is open to them. It is not a course which I, as a Democrat, recommend. Jim Farley recently pointed out the folly of any such action, but it can be tried.

I, of course, do not condone for one minute the things which were done by the Nixon committee. Those who have committed crimes should be punished. Let this be our sole objective.

I am moved to make one further comment. As I have watched the developing and mounting volume of attack on and criticism of President Nixon, I have tried to think of what other man there is in public life today, in either party, who could have taken the punishment which he has taken day after day, week after week and month after month, from the news media and television, and still

retain, as he has done, his sanity, his ability to function (involving a constructive readjustment of his own staff), and his determination to ride out this storm. In my judgment, most prominent Washington officeholders would have caved in under the pressures to which he has been subjected.

When the lawyer for James McCord, who is trying desperately to save himself, says that his own client is a liar, and McCord's second lawyer states that their objective now is to "go after the President," should not the sensible and bored voters of this country tell them all to close the show, and let those who may have committed wrong be tried by the efforts of the man appointed by the President—a Democrat, Archibald Cox—to punish whatever wrongdoing has been perpetrated?

MOMENT OF TRUTH

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1973

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the column which follows should be read by every Member of the U.S. Congress and, in fact, by every person committed to the idea of constitutional government and orderly process in our country:

MOMENT OF TRUTH

(By Anthony Lewis)

LONDON, June 27.—The United States has had many Presidents who took a broad view of their power under the Constitution but never before has any President sought to amend the Constitution by himself—brazenly, defiantly, by fiat.

That is what President Nixon has just done in vetoing the appropriations bill that banned any further money for the bombing of Cambodia. Even after all that we have learned in these last months, after the Watergate and its associated crimes, the import of that veto is breathtaking.

What it amounts to is this. If Mr. Nixon has his way, the Constitution will effectively contain a new clause that says:

"The President shall have power to wage war unless the Congress, by a two-thirds vote of both houses, shall order him to desist."

It is crucial that as many Americans as possible understand what is involved. Our country has had so many crises of conscience and law in recent years that a certain weariness is understandable. But this one is of a different character—a genuine constitutional crisis, in the words of that moderate and gentle man, Senator Mike Mansfield.

An explanation in ABC terms is therefore required. It must begin with the original language of the Constitution, which vested in Congress alone the power "to declare war."

Over the years, Presidents have taken military action of various kinds without a previous formal declaration of war. That is part of modern history, a gloss on the Constitution.

But until now these Presidential military adventures have been of limited character or duration, or else have depended for their legal support on the effective consent of Congress. The recent example was the Tonkin Gulf Resolution, which the Johnson Administration used as the legal equivalent of a Congressional declaration in the Vietnam war.

The bombing of Cambodia since the Paris agreements on Vietnam has been something quite different. For here Congress had not implied its consent in any way, not by resolution and not by ratifying any treaty that covered Cambodia. Nor could the President

cite his responsibility for the safety of any American troops.

Now President Nixon has gone one long step further. He claims independent authority to wage war, in the name of the United States, not only in the absence of Congressional approval but in the face of clear disapproval.

In short, he is attempting to reverse the constitutional assumption. Instead of the old idea that the United States should be at peace unless Congress declared otherwise, the new rule would be that a President may take his country into war—and keep it there indefinitely—unless Congress stops him.

And more than that, much more. For of course the veto provision of the Constitution requires two-third majorities to override. And by this veto Mr. Nixon would impose that same requirement on Congress—and on the American people who it represents—to stop a war.

The consequences of this veto, and of the House sustaining it, are therefore grave. The first is political, the crisis to which Senator Mansfield referred.

Unless events somehow dissipate the clash between the President and the Congressional majority, the talk of impeachment must now take a new and more immediate ground. For in the ultimate, if there is no other resolution, Congress is faced with an attempt at a Presidential coup d'état. It must consider its own ultimate weapon.

A second consequence is legal. The courts of the United States have been understandably wary of entertaining lawsuits that challenge the lawfulness of war-making. But that reluctance is likely to diminish when a President wages war in flagrant violation of law and the Constitution. On the legal merits, his attempt to impose a two-thirds rule on Congress' war power would certainly not protect any official sued by citizens seeking to enjoin unlawful military spending.

Finally, there is the consequence of conscience. Those of us who have opposed the war cannot be regarded as detached on this new question. And so it is fundamentally a problem for conservatives.

Will Barry Goldwater sit still for a unilateral Presidential amendment of the Constitution? Will Melvin Laird, who joined the White House staff as an avowed Congressional man? Will Elliot Richardson, who has begun to stake out his claim of independence as Attorney General? I hope and believe that the answer will be no.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK BATTAGLIA

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join in the special order of the majority leader in paying tribute to Frank E. Battaglia who has given this body 30 years of dedicated service as the dean of the corps of Official Reporters of Debates.

We are all deeply grateful to Frank for the years of conscientious and devoted service he has rendered in the House of Representatives. I think it is fair to say that we all look on Frank's retirement with feelings of sadness and happiness: We are sad that we will be losing Frank, but we are happy for his well-earned and richly deserved retirement. We are not only losing one of the most loyal and proficient servants this body has ever known, we are losing a

good friend as well, and we will miss both his services and his warm and personable friendship. I am sure all Members join with me in expressing our heartfelt appreciation to Frank, and in wishing him well in the years ahead.

REPRESENTATIVE DINGELL CRITICIZES SCOPE OF ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES BILL

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1973

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have carefully reviewed the June 18, 1973, version of the administration's 53-page legislative proposal to create a Department of Energy and Natural Resources and find it to fall just short of repealing the Constitution. I have written to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Mr. Roy L. Ash, and urged that the administration scale down its bill. My letter is as follows:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE
AND FISHERIES,

Washington, D.C., June 29, 1973.

Mr. ROY L. ASH,
Director, Office of Management and Budget,
Executive Office Building, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. ASH: I have read with great interest and skepticism the June 18, 1973, version (Part A and B) of the new Department of Energy and Natural Resources bill, together with its section-by-section analysis.

Leaving aside for the moment the provisions of the bill transferring various agencies or parts thereof to the new Department, I find that this bill, particularly Part A, provides unfettered power to the new agency, and in my judgment, falls just short of repealing the Constitution. It is so sweeping that I doubt that the new agency head will ever have to come to Congress for new legislative authority, except possibly to extend existing laws.

It quite properly includes the normal, administrative provisions, such as those relating to funds, personnel, and records of transferred agencies, required in any transfer bill of this nature. But then it goes well beyond this. For example, it—

1. gives the new agency head power to appoint up to 25 officials in the agency to any job, duty, function, or office he chooses at Level IV or V, without even the advice and consent of the Senate. These 25 officials, who will undoubtedly be political appointees, are apparently intended to be powerful officials, since their levels (IV and V) are now those of the Interior Department's present six Assistant Secretaries (Sec. 202(e));

2. weakens and amends the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, and takes away the present statutory authority set forth in the Coordination Act whereby the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife expresses its professional opinions and comments, without political interference, on water resource projects and permits and licenses and places this responsibility in the new Secretary (Secs. 301(a) and 303);

3. allows him to prescribe such policies, standards, criteria, procedures, rules, and regulations as he deems necessary or appropriate, without any statutory guidelines or limitations (Sec. 402(a));

4. permits him to organize the new Department at any time or in any way "as he may deem to be necessary or appropriate," without Congressional approval, so long as he does not "abolish" any of the 5 "Administrations" created by the bill (Sec. 403(b));

5. authorizes him to establish, alter, maintain, or discontinue, at any time or in any way, State, regional, district, local, or other field offices of any Bureau, agency, or office under his ambit, including those of any function transferred to him (Sec. 404);

6. authorizes him to appoint an unlimited number of advisory committees for whatever purpose he deems appropriate and apparently without regard to the requirements of the Advisory Committee Act of 1972 and, most importantly, with no requirements that such committees be balanced in view point, representation, and function (Sec. 407);

7. authorizes him to provide for "participation of military personnel" to help him carry out his functions; and such personnel shall not "be charged against any statutory limitation on strengths applicable to the Armed Forces". Thus, e.g., the Marine Corps could double its strength without Congressional approval. (Sec. 408(c));

8. authorizes contracts and agreements, "including grant agreements," with anyone without any dollar, percentage, or other limitation and then adds a catchall authorization to allow him to "generally take such steps as he may deem to be necessary or appropriate" to perform his functions (Sec. 410);

9. provides new authority for concession agreements of up to 30 years for the use of any real property or facility thereon under his jurisdiction, including areas of the National Wildlife Refuge System, National Forests, and Wilderness areas. In the case of the National Park System it makes no reference to the current statutory provisions (16 U.S.C. 20 et seq.) relative to concessions in the system (Sec. 413);

10. authorizes him to acquire, in carrying out his functions, copyrights, patents, licenses under copyright, patents, and applications for patents, and releases, before suit is brought, for past infringement of patents or copyright (Sec. 414);

11. authorizes unlimited power to conduct directly or by contract or grant R&D programs and to disseminate technological information (Sec. 415); and

12. authorizes him to accept gifts and bequests of property and provides that for Federal income, estate, gift taxes purposes such property "shall be considered as a gift or bequest". (Sec. 418).

It is interesting to note that, even in the case of the administrative powers that are normally included in a bill of this nature, the provisions differ, sometimes substantially, with similar provisions in other statutes creating new agencies, such as the Department of Transportation (Public Law 89-670).

After providing all these powers, section 422 of the bill states:

"Except as may be otherwise expressly provided in this part, all functions expressly conferred by this part shall be in addition to and not in substitution for functions existing immediately before the effective date of this part and transferred by this part."

But this provision is so vague and general that it will require years of costly litigation and wrangling to find out to what extent it limits the Secretary authority, if at all.

The bill transfers to the new Department important regulatory functions of the Corps of Engineers, in addition to other functions of the Corps and those of the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, and the Transportation Department. I view this provision with some alarm, because the bill provides no safeguards to insure that this function and related decisionmaking will be conducted openly and with full public participa-

tion. I think there is a distinct advantage to the public to have this regulatory function carried out by one agency and the review function by another.

Finally, I note the bill declares that "the Federal Government has a national responsibility to practice, with respect to the natural resources it administers, and to foster the practice of, with respect to natural resources administered by others, appropriate conservation, management and utilization policies. Such responsibility encompasses energy sources and the Federal Government must exercise leadership in the timely development and efficient and balanced utilization of such sources consonant with preservation of environmental values."

In reality, this is the only congressional guideline in the 53 page bill. But it is too broad and vague. It will not limit the Secretary. It will be used I dare say to foster any scheme that the Secretary believes appropriate.

In my view, the powers in this bill, if it is submitted in this form, must be scaled down and greater controls established before it can or should be enacted.

In an apparent justification for such broad powers, the section-by-section analysis points out that some of these powers are similar or identical to those set forth in other laws concerning other agencies. That is quite true. But, if this bill was enacted in its present form, it would be the first time that all of these broad powers would be available to one agency. For example, the broad contract and grant authority in section 410 is derived from the NASA Act, but it is not found in the DOT Act. The need for such broad powers must be examined carefully and fully justified. The section-by-section analysis does not provide that justification or demonstrate the need. Such blanket check legislation should not be approved. Congressional guidelines and greater safeguards to protect the public interest and insure adequate public participation must be included, at the very least.

I urge that the Administration reconsider this omnibus proposal and include only those powers necessary to carry out the reorganization effectively and seek these other broad powers, if they are needed, in separate legislation.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Fisheries
and Wildlife Conservation and the
Environment.

Mr. Speaker, I want also to call your attention to section 301(C) of the bill which on the one hand transfers to the new Department the functions of the Soil Conservation Service with regard to the "planning and carrying out" of small watershed projects—the Public Law 566 program—and on the other hand provides that "the carrying out" of such plans "shall be accomplished," not by the new Department, but "through and under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture." Now you see, now you do not.

I fail to see how two agencies, with all their bureaucratic tendencies, can both carry out the same program efficiently, economically, and effectively. I think this schizophrenic provision needs careful study, as does a similar one involving the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers.

STERILIZATION IN ALABAMA

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1973

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the horrific case of pseudo-voluntary sterilization of two young black girls, aged 12 and 14, in Montgomery, Alabama as reported in the press and television news on June 27, 1973 goes far beyond ordinary bureaucratic bungling and ineptitude in its implication.

The ostensible reason for the sterilization cited by the Director of the OEO-sponsored birth control clinic was that "boys were hanging around the girls too much," and presumably the latter might get pregnant and raise children at public expense.

By what right does a bureaucratic functionary, one supposedly helping the poor, order such an irreparable operation on innocent though ill-informed people? Because they are black? Because they are poor? Decent people may question whether anyone would have dared to recommend sterilization, let alone performed it, had the girls in question been either white or middle class. The mother of the girls was reported to be clearly mentally retarded and hence incompetent for her permission to be valid. No effort appears to have been made to locate the father. But it does not require a Justice of the Supreme Court to know that even fully competent parents may not authorize such a procedure except for overriding medical reasons, on girls of such a young age. It may also be fruitful to inquire into the ethics of physicians who performed this operation on the clinic's behalf.

This wrongful operation by the OEO makes it more difficult for supporters such as myself, to defend the agency against the determined onslaught of the Nixon Administration. That any agency of the Federal Government was instrumental in denying probably forever the right to motherhood for these girls because sterilization was a more "convenient" method of birth control, is an abomination. The action smacks all-too-strongly of the case recently brought to light, of the 1930's syphilis study which poor, black male volunteers were injected with syphilis and then "conveniently" ignored for treatment until their scandalous neglect was brought to the surface. There is a grim parallel in the callous disregard in the value and quality of life that some Federal agencies or their members have shown toward the less-privileged in our society.

I hope the suit brought on behalf of the children succeeds, and I have asked the Justice Department to initiate a full investigation of this case to ascertain whether a crime has been committed, and, if so, to prosecute the wrongdoers.

We must try to make certain that such

a flagrant abuse of power and trust does not occur again.

A SALUTE TO FRANK DEL BALZO

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1973

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a dedicated, conscientious, and effective public servant on the eve of his retirement. Many of us have observed the always willing and capable Frank Del Balzo in the pursuit of his duties here in the House for the past 12 years as Assistant Journal Clerk. For 22 years prior to that, he had a distinguished career in Government service and has served that Government admirably for a total of 34 years.

It is with a sense of sincere regret that I learn of Frank's intended retirement. His deportment and friendliness are a model which others on the House staff would do well to emulate.

I did not know him during the years of his career prior to his present vocation, but I am confident he did an equally able job as a Capitol Police officer, as a doorman in the House, and during his 3 years of service in the Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all my colleagues will take the time to personally thank Frank Del Balzo for being part of the team that so faithfully serves the Members of this House in the performance of their duties.

I personally wish to salute his dedicated efforts and to wish him complete happiness and continued health in his years of retirement.

I WOULD HAVE VOTED "AYE"

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1973

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, although I was granted an official leave of absence yesterday in order to attend the funeral of a close personal friend, the wife of the Rev. Joseph Bishop of the Rye Presbyterian Church, I did miss certain votes.

Most important of these, in my view, was roll No. 310, on the passage of H.R. 8947, making appropriations for Public Works and the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1974, and including some \$200,000 for the city of Yonkers in Westchester County, along with some \$20,000 for streams and rivers in Westchester and the Byram River in Connecticut.

Mr. Speaker, had I been present on this vote, I would have voted "aye."