

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

James F. Mayr Michael D. McGehee

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants and temporary lieutenant commanders in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

David W. Best Mark A. Larsen
Bedford W. Bonta Steven A. Muller
Ralph R. Chesson, Jr. James W. Townsend,
Gary D. Graham Jr.
Arthur B. Klieftho III

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

William K. Murray Thomas F. Styrlund
Harry M. Mynatt Richard T. Swanson
Richard C. Smith Marshall D. Walker

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

Charles S. Bailey Franklin H. Ewald
John G. English III

David A. John (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

Ronald W. Huggins (Naval Reserve officer), to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

Ben T. Chikaraishi Jowell D. Horton
Walter Doblecki Ronald W. Housley
Joseph A. Draude John W. Hubbach
Richard A. Guman Michael D. Johnson
William R. Evans Robert F. Kroeger
James G. Figschau Larry V. Kuhl
William L. Fullerton William F. Maroney
Gregory J. Gosch Jerry E. Morley
Larry G. Herrman Robert M. Moody

Gary N. Moyer George J. Tarquinio
Burke B. Peterson Raymond A. Tozzi
Dean C. Reifensahl James F. Walton III
Patrick J. Stetzel

Robert E. Eckstein (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps, in lieu of permanent lieutenant (junior grade) and temporary lieutenant as previously nominated to correct grade, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

Lt. Thomas O. White, USN (ret.) to be reappointed from the temporary disability retired list as a lieutenant (limited duty) for temporary service, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

Vernon C. Eshelby, ex-USNR officer to be permanent commander and a temporary captain in the line (merchant marine engineering) in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named U.S. Navy officers to be permanent commanders, in the Medical Corps in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

Edward M. Jewusiak Donald E. Roy
Talvaris Turais Donald K. Roder
Robert G. Winans

The following-named U.S. Navy officers to be commanders in the Medical Corps in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy for temporary service, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

Orin H. Bruton James V. Scutero
Gary C. Graham Robert E. Stetson
Robert B. Mallom Orville D. Wilson, Jr.
James E. Mullen

Doyle M. Lewis (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

Roger M. Chow (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

Lt. Cmdr. Harvey J. Swoboda, U.S. Naval Reserve, for a temporary promotion to the grade of commander in the Line of the Reserve of the U.S. Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

Richard R. Brown (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent commander and a temporary captain in the line (merchant marine engineering) in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 6, 1974:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

William W. Milligan, Ohio, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Ohio for the term of 4 years.

Robert G. Renner, of Minnesota, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Minnesota for the term of 4 years.

Richard A. Pyle, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years.

C. Nelson Day, of Utah, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Utah for the term of 4 years.

Jonathan L. Goldstein, of New Jersey, to be U.S. attorney for the district of New Jersey for the term of 4 years.

Eugene E. Siler, Jr., of Kentucky, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Kentucky for the term of 4 years.

Leonard E. Alderson, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Wisconsin for the term of 4 years.

Harry D. Berglund, of Minnesota, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Minnesota for the term of 4 years.

Raymond J. Howard, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Wisconsin for the term of 4 years.

Ollie L. Canlon, of Louisiana, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Louisiana for the term of 4 years.

Carl H. Slayback, Illinois, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Illinois for the term of 4 years.

(The above nominations were approved subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

THE JUDICIARY

Philip W. Tone, of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge for the seventh circuit.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A NEW "BEGINNING" FOR PORTUGAL

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post there is an article by Mr. Tad Szulc on the projected hopes for democracy in Portugal and the possible liberation of the African peoples of Mozambique, Guinea, and Angola. Mr. Szulc astutely points out, however, that the coup d'etat in Portugal may force the South African regime and the Portuguese settlers to harden their opposition against African Liberation forces.

Mr. Szulc also emphasizes the potential global confrontation between the United States and Russia or China that the hardening of southern African tensions may precipitate.

Mr. Szulc's article is as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 3, 1974]

A "NEW BEGINNING" FOR PORTUGAL

(By Tad Szulc)

Portugal's military coup d'etat of April 25 has produced some of the most encouraging news in quite a few years for the cause of freedom in the world.

At a time when new repressive dictatorships are sprouting elsewhere and the old ones are becoming more frozen, the Portuguese Junta succeeded in overthrowing the world's most durable dictatorship this side of the Soviet Union and, hopefully setting the peninsular country on the road to democracy for the first time in 46 years.

And while neo-colonialist and "white rule" tendencies were reasserting themselves in much of Africa, the Lisbon Junta's action carried the promise that the long and bloody colonial war in Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea may finally find a peaceful and rational solution.

Yet, in ejecting the Caetano dictatorship—essentially a combination of extreme rightist politics supported by a cruelly efficient secret police and powerful economic groups drawing their weight from the wealth of the African colonies—General Antonio de Spínola, the

Junta chief, has set in motion new and contradictory forces that still leave much of the future in doubt.

If there is a valid precedent for the Spínola coup, it is General de Gaulle's return to power in 1958, signaling the end of the Algerian war and the start of negotiations with the rebels that led to Algeria's independence. At first sight, there is a certain parallel between the conditions that moved De Gaulle and, 16 years later, Spínola to take national matters in their own hands. Both metropolitan nations were exhausted and embittered by lengthy colonial wars, and internal unrest was growing. Both De Gaulle and Spínola concluded that military victory was impossible and that new answers were required.

But this is where the similarities end. De Gaulle's basic problem was to win at home (and among Algeria's French colonists) the acceptance of the inevitability of a peace settlement largely on the Algerians' terms. To be sure, he had to endure for awhile the menace of military counter-coups and the terrorism of the OAS (Secret Army Organization). But he was spared the trauma of transforming a nation from a primitive dictatorship into a reasonably functioning democracy, when hatreds and frustrations

bottled up for nearly a half-century were surging to the fore. This, of course, is General Spinoza's primary task.

Furthermore, De Gaulle's decision to make peace in Algeria was chiefly a French affair. Spinoza, on the other hand, has created a situation in which other interests than those of Portugal and the African nationalist guerrillas are involved. What happened in Lisbon on April 25, affects deeply the immediate national security of South Africa and Rhodesia, as their governments perceive it, as well as the whole balance of power in sub-Saharan Africa.

The upheaval in Lisbon is also of concern to the United States and some of its allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. One fear is that the ultimate establishment of unfriendly black regimes in Mozambique and Angola, a distinct possibility in time, may threaten South Africa's stability and endanger the sea lanes around the Cape and to the Indian Ocean. The Soviet Union and China who have long supported the rebels, notably Frelimo in Mozambique, have a stake in the outcome as well. Among the fears is that lack of access to southern Africa may deprive the U.S. and NATO countries of raw materials, ranging from uranium and other strategic metals to gold.

As long as a year ago, when it became obvious that the rebels were gaining in strength in Mozambique, the U.S. and NATO began to draw up secret contingency plans for air and naval defense of South Africa. In June, 1973, NATO's Defense Planning Committee (DPC) instructed SACLANC (Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic) headquarters in Norfolk, Va., to draw up plans for an allied air-naval task force to stand ready to assist South Africa, should the need arise.

This was part of broader United States strategy, as visualized at the Pentagon, to reinforce positions in the Indian Ocean—from South Africa to the Indian subcontinent—against a Soviet threat in the area. Plans for establishing a naval base at Diego Garcia fit into this pattern. Following a December 1969 National Security Council decision to preserve a "balance" in southern Africa, the United States has been quietly selling Portugal "non-lethal" military end-items such as jeeps, radio systems and spotter planes as well as defoliants. It has trained Portuguese officers in counter-insurgency at the jungle warfare Army school at Ft. Gulick in the Panama Canal Zone and helped in training Portuguese pilots at bases in Western Germany.

In a bilateral arrangement, France has been selling arms to Portugal and South Africa (Britain, too, has been selling weapons to the South Africans during the Tory government). This month, South African and French naval units conducted joint exercises in the area. Rhodesian detachments have been fighting with the Portuguese in Mozambique against the Frelimo.

In the light of the new uncertainties emerging from the Lisbon coup, all parties concerned will inevitably rethink their strategies. Inevitably, General Spinoza will be the target of powerful international pressures.

But even in terms of direct dealings with the rebel movements, General Spinoza faces serious problems.

For one thing, unlike in the Algerian situation, there is no unified rebel leadership in the Portuguese "overseas provinces." Since the 1969 murder of Dr. Eduardo Chivambo Mondlane, the top leader, Frelimo has been run by a politburo group in which Samora Machel, who was Mondlane's chief lieutenant, is the only clearly identifiable personality. Very little is known about others, including Frelimo officials in charge of "liberated zones" in Mozambique.

In Angola, the rebels are divided into two groups: the National Front for the Liberation of Angola headed by Holden Roberto, and the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola led by Dr. Antonio Neto. A fairly firm leadership exists in the Portuguese Guinea.

Spinoza's problem, therefore, is to establish with whom he should negotiate and who has the power of decision.

The Junta seems to have defused the danger that white settlers in Mozambique and Angola would proclaim "unilateral declarations of independence" on the Rhodesian model to impose white rule.

What General Spinoza, therefore, must first do is to ascertain whether his "gradualism" approach—he has called for a federation of the three colonies with metropolitan Portugal—can serve as the basis for subsequent negotiations, possibly leading to a form of independence in which the three provinces would be tied to Portugal in the way in which the African Francophone states are to France.

Spinoza has ruled out a ceasefire for the time being, but domestic pressures from the newly emergent democratic parties—from Christian Democrats to the left—may force him to reconsider his stand and try for a De Gaulle formula, if he can find responsible interlocutors in Portuguese Africa.

April 25, 1974 in Portugal marks a significant new beginning for the country and its embattled colonies. But a great deal of flexibility is required of the Junta to find the proper solutions at home—and in Africa.

ADDRESS OF SHELBY McCAULEY: PILGRIMAGE TO THE TOMB OF THE UNKNOWN

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the annual address of the sovereign grand master of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington Cemetery. The address was given following a pilgrimage yesterday to the cemetery by a delegation of Odd Fellows.

The address pays a fitting tribute to the men who have died for our country. In a time of our history when there so often seems to be an apathetic, even blatantly unpatriotic, attitude in our country by some of its citizens, it is important that we take time to remember with gratitude the many thousands of brave men who, over the past 200 years, have given their lives so that all of us may be free. We must never forget what these men have done for us. We must never take for granted the liberty we have today which was preserved through these men who were willing to make the supreme sacrifice of their lives for this country.

The address by Sovereign Grand Master Shelby McCauley, who is from Clarkdale, Ariz., in the Third District, follows:

ADDRESS OF SHELBY McCAULEY: PILGRIMAGE
TO THE TOMB OF THE UNKNOWN

Brother Chairman, officers, members and friends of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, we are gathered here today, as is our annual custom, to express our love and gratitude to those entombed here. We are and ever shall be grateful to them, and to all

those whom they represent, for the sacrifice which they made to secure the blessings of liberty, peace and freedom for you and me and for this great North American continent.

As we reverently stand on this hallowed ground, in the quietness and beauty of this moment of remembrance, our hearts overflow as we search for words to express these sentiments.

James R. Howard, a 17 year old senior of Granite High School, Salt Lake City, Utah, was among the students chosen to visit Washington, D.C., a number of years ago. After visiting the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier he found the words and wrote the following tribute:

"TO THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER

"(By James R. Howard)

"You lie in your cold grave—triumphant in death because you defeated tyranny, peaceful in death because you died a free man.

"And I wonder what tribute I can pay to you—a patriot who loved freedom and country enough to forfeit life and name on a foreign battlefield?

"I would thank you—but words of thanks cannot penetrate the grave.

"I would weep for you—but tears can neither stir your silent body nor warm your still heart.

"I would laugh for you—but laughter would disintegrate against the walls of your joyless tomb.

"I would comfort you as a brother—but brotherhood cannot surmount the obstacle of eternity.

"I would show you the free land you helped to save—but your vision is blocked by the curtain of death.

"So I will offer you the one tribute which makes your death meaningful and my life worthwhile.

"I will honor your memory by pledging myself to the perpetuation of those ideals for which you fought and died—

"The Defense of Freedom; the Love of Liberty; and a peaceful future.

"Thus will your death enrich my life, thus will my actions honor your unknown name."

Can you think of a better way to honor the unknown name of those who repose here and the thousands upon thousands whom they represent, than to pledge ourselves to the unfinished task of building a better World of Liberty, freedom, peace and brotherhood?

They died for love of country and with a firm conviction that their sacrifice would bring peace and freedom to all mankind. From these honored dead let each of us take a full measure of devotion to the cause for which they fought and died. Let us resolve that every fibre of our being is now dedicated to the unfinished task of establishing the brotherhood of man throughout the world. May we continue to go forward to peace by serving all mankind with sincere friendship, unfeigned love and simple truth.

As members of this great fraternity, the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, we are obligated to the practice of friendship, love and truth. Our goal is not a victory of might, power or subjection, nor peace at the expense of freedom, but rather both peace and freedom because the causes of war have been destroyed. Our aim has always been and is now to make peace wanted where it is now unknown, to make it strong where it is weak and to make it permanent throughout the world. Let us then pray for understanding and sympathy, for wisdom and courage, for vision and strength to succeed in the awesome task of giving dignity, freedom, right and opportunity to every man, woman, and child.

War is the business of the barbarian the mad game of the dictator who would trample

meek humanity into the dust and glorify licentiousness, vice and lust. Any man who has seen one day of war prays to almighty God that he may never have to witness another.

The men entombed here loved life but they loved America even more. They loved their country and their flag. They loved freedom, they loved liberty and they loved justice. They lived by these ideals and would not surrender them to the mandate of anyone. They were strong men of courage and conviction, so let us ask them to speak to us about it. Let us call upon the unknown soldier to speak to us who are gathered here today. Listen as he says:

"I am the Unknown Soldier; I speak for all those brave men who died on San Juan Hill, in the Meuse-Argonne Forest, at Pearl Harbor and Corregidor, on Midway Island and Iwo Jima, on the burning sands of North Africa and the bloody beaches of Normandy. I speak for those who died for freedom in the air, on land and sea. I speak for those who died for justice, liberty and equality in France, Germany, Italy, Holland, Belgium, Japan, Korea, Vietnam, the Philippines, the islands of the Pacific and in other foreign lands. I speak for the members of your great organization, the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, who made the supreme sacrifice for friendship, love and truth; for faith, hope and charity; for fidelity, service, honor and universal justice.

"I speak for those buried here beneath the green grass of Arlington, those who lie under the poppies in Flanders Field, those who have been placed beneath the sod of the land where they fell, those entombed below the waves of the sea and those who were returned home to be laid beside loved ones gone before. I also speak for our Canadian brothers and comrades who fought and died beside us for freedom, equality and justice.

"When you placed me here in this silent tomb to represent all those who have died and for whom I speak, you said, 'sleep; rest in peace!' But there is no peace so we cannot rest.

"We cannot sleep! We died for freedom but there is no freedom. You have forgotten that freedom also has responsibility and that you cannot be free unless your neighbor is also free.

"We cannot sleep! We died for liberty, but you have no liberty. We died for equality, but you have no equality. You have mistaken liberty for license and equality for special privilege. You have become so ensnared and entangled with precedents, bigotry, pressure groups and politics that you have not the justice for which we fought and died, therefore, we cannot sleep; we cannot rest.

"We cannot sleep! We died for friendship but millions of lonely people still walk the highways and byways of the world and stalk the streets of your cities and towns, searching for a friendly gesture, a smile, a hand-clasp or a kind word of encouragement.

"We cannot sleep! We died for love and brotherhood, yet you still live in a world full of hatred, jealousy, lust, intemperance, sensuality and passion. How do you expect us to rest while you practice intolerance, envy, jealousy and hatred toward your brother?

"We cannot sleep! We died for truth, still falsehood permeates the land. You talk about truth in advertising, sworn statements, and affidavits under penalty of perjury. Fear controls your actions instead of honor and integrity; the only foundation on which a fully successful life can be built.

"We cannot sleep! We died for peace, but there is no peace. War and the threat of war is on every hand. Violence is rampant throughout the world. Terror strikes at the hearts of thousands. Militant groups rule your institutions through fear, vice, corruption, strife and destruction, and there is no

peace. Murder, rape, assault and robbery infest the land and you are afraid to walk your own streets by day or by night and we are sorely disturbed.

"We cannot sleep! We will not rest until you have accomplished that for which we fought and died, until you have brought peace to the world by abolishing war and the causes of war, until you have made peace live in the hearts of all men and made this truly a land of brotherhood from sea to shining sea."

Brothers, sisters and friends, we have heard the unknown soldier. Let us honor his unknown name and all those whom he represents by a revival of their spirit and their patriotism. They were strong men, men of courage and conviction. They loved life, but they loved America and freedom even more. They had faith in democracy and a clear vision of right and wrong. We must recapture their spirit and honor them by rededicating ourselves to the task of making America strong and keeping her free. We must rededicate ourselves and America to Almighty God and ask His divine guidance as only through Him can we succeed.

Then and only then can we say to those who repose here, "Sleep; rest in peace!"

CARIBOU, MAINE, SEEKS GOVERNMENT AID IN URBAN RENEWAL

HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Mr. Thomas F. Valteau, president of the Maine chapter of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, I am inserting in the RECORD a resolution I have received from the City Council of Caribou, Maine. This resolution outlines Caribou's futile attempts over the past 4 years to secure the assistance of the Federal Government in its urban development efforts. It justifiably points an accusing finger at the Department of Housing and Urban Development, whose inexplicable and unforeseen changes of policy and organization have cost small communities like Caribou great amounts of time and expense. I respectfully suggest that my colleagues consider Caribou's experiences as they reevaluate the role of the Federal Government in solving our Nation's critical urban housing and redevelopment problems.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNING BODY IN SUPPORT OF URBAN RENEWAL AND HOUSING PROGRAMS

Whereas: under Title 1 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, the City of Caribou did undertake an urban renewal project in 1969, known as the Sweden Street Project Me. R-23; with financial assistance to the local agency by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and

Whereas: the project was initiated to eliminate urban blight and slums and to create a more healthy and economic environment. The project did progress in a rapid and orderly manner and has been consistent with the general welfare of the citizens. The Council by resolution dated August 4, 1970 did elect to spend \$6,500.00 to prepare a survey and planning application for a second project with the advice and consent of

the Housing and Urban Development Region I office.

Whereas: the Caribou Urban Renewal Authority did submit the prepared application in August 1970 to the Region I office for approval. The application having been returned for re-submission to the new area office and attempts to re-submit have failed.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the City Council of Caribou, Maine:

1. That without federal assistance the Caribou Urban Renewal Authority and the Caribou Housing Authority cannot undertake the proposed project.

2. That the proposed project would fairly well complete the need for any additional redevelopment and housing program in Caribou.

3. That we, as the governing body of the City of Caribou, do hereby support and are cognizant to the need for the project to eliminate the blighted areas and sub-standard housing.

4. That we, as members of the governing body of the City of Caribou, do personally request your attention to our problems and needs along with other municipalities in the Nation.

CARIBOU CITY COUNCIL.

ARE WE GETTING ENOUGH FOR OUR MASS TRANSIT DOLLAR?

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Urban Affairs Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee I have been conducting a series of hearings on the effectiveness of our urban transportation expenditures. What is becoming clear at these hearings is that we are far from a definitive answer to our urban transportation problems. In fact, we are not even sure which programs have achieved success in the past.

Since 1965, the Federal Government has spent almost \$3 billion on programs of assistance to urban transportation. State and local governments have also made a considerable contribution in recent years for both urban transit capital and operating assistance. However, during this same period, the total number of annual revenue passengers riding urban public transportation has declined by 1.5 billion riders, or 22 percent. This decline has occurred in spite of a large financial effort from all levels of government. Essentially, our urban transportation systems have lost 1.5 billion annual revenue riders since 1965 at a cost to the Federal Government alone of almost \$2 per revenue passenger lost. While it is certainly not the intent of Federal funding to induce these riders to leave public transportation, this statistic does illustrate a certain lack of success on the part of the Federal program.

Certainly much of the lack of success of urban mass transportation expenditures has resulted from factors which were beyond the influence of our transportation systems. Growth in outlying regions, the diffusion of both employment and living opportunities and the

easy availability of the automobile have all contributed to the decline in ridership. However, as was pointed out by Prof. Martin Wohl, of Carnegie Mellon University, at our hearings, the transit market has not really disappeared:

Admittedly, all the growth in population, and the growth in employment, has been in areas outlying the central city, and more specifically in the suburbs. But the transit market has not really left. The people are still living in the central cities in absolute terms. The downtown job market has roughly held steady in the larger cities. The trouble is that people don't want the low quality service which is being afforded to them. They want a better service.

To the extent that our urban mass transportation expenditures have failed to provide the improvements in service that would keep old riders and attract new ones, they have been unsuccessful.

Part of this unsatisfactory record of accomplishment results from an inconsistent national transportation policy, resulting in an inconsistent level of funding. Both Congress and the executive have contributed to this fragmented policy and inconsistent commitment. We have argued long and hard about highways versus mass transit, rail systems versus buses, and capital versus operating subsidies, paying little attention to the impact of these vacillations on local governments attempting to solve their transportation problems. The cities desperately need to know that a consistent Federal transportation policy exists and that they can expect a level of funding sufficient to support the implementation of this policy. Mayor Maynard Jackson, of Atlanta, Ga., explained this problem so ably to our subcommittee last Monday:

In Atlanta's case we found ourselves caught up in a Federal movement of encouraging urban areas to move quickly and with substantial local commitment in the solution of the transportation problem we face. Having received not only the go-ahead but actually the aggressive encouragement of the Federal government, Atlanta got out there first. We stuck our necks out, and now we are looking at a potential transportation act which could have a very negative effect on us, the effect being somewhat consonant with the idea of our being on the limb and the Federal government being behind us saving it off.

In these times when energy and environmental considerations make urban mass transit so important, it is absolutely essential that we abandon these shifts in policy, identify and adopt specific national transportation objectives and then commit sufficient Federal funds to meet these objectives. If a national urban transportation policy is adopted and a Federal commitment made to the implementation of this policy, cities such as Atlanta would no longer feel like young trees bending in the Federal winds. Such an urban transportation policy would, in my opinion, have three basic elements.

First, it is necessary to clearly define the objectives we intend to achieve with our urban transportation programs. These objectives should be as broad-based as possible with input from consumers of our urban transportation services as well as from Government officials and the industry itself. At the same time

the objectives should be as specific as possible so we can clearly measure what expenditures are most successful in meeting our objectives, and also so they can be included in national transportation legislation. The objectives might include minimum levels of service, fare guidelines, environmental standards, minimum standards for energy efficiency, specific guidelines for serving the poor and the elderly and any other objectives which are judged to have sufficient national value to merit a commitment of Federal funds. If our present knowledge is not sufficient to make these determinations immediately, legislation should include enough money to develop meaningful objectives.

The second part of a national transportation policy would be a firm commitment on the part of the Federal Government to provide sufficient Federal funding to meet these objectives. The incorporation of these objectives into national legislation would signify a Federal commitment to providing this minimum level of transportation service.

Finally, each city would determine, with the assistance of the Department of Transportation, how much money is necessary to provide that city with the minimum standard of service stated in the Federal objectives. The Federal Government would then participate in the funding of urban transportation projects up to the amount necessary to meet Federal objectives. This funding scheme would not preclude any city from choosing the level of transit service they desired. If a city chose to provide less than the level of service embodied in the national objectives it would receive less than the maximum funding it would otherwise receive. Similarly, cities which desired a level of service in excess of the national standards would be required to support their stated priorities with local funds. This funding program would be a recognition of the Federal Government's responsibility to provide a satisfactory level of mass transit service, without committing the Federal Government to full support of large projects which are of local and not national interest.

The total level of funding necessary for this program would be determined by aggregating the specific allocations to opinion, be far superior to the present system in which estimates of total annual national transportation needs vary by several billion dollars, depending upon whether one is talking to the Department of Transportation or the mayors. In this manner, there would be a rational relationship between total funding for urban transportation and the objectives our urban transportation programs are designed to achieve.

Finally, a national transportation policy of the type I have just described would have the distinct advantage of providing local governments with the assurance that both Federal transportation policy and Federal financial commitments will be stable. With this assurance cities can begin to improve our urban transportation services with the belief that their plans will not be undercut by shifts in policy or funding.

SSI—THE UNENDING APRIL FOOL'S JOKE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, on April 1 social security payments were increased by 7 percent, but many of the Nation's poorest elderly never saw any of that money. They are the 1.9 million elderly who participate in both the social security and supplemental security income, SSI, programs. They lost the 7-percent social security increase because their SSI benefits were reduced by the same amount because of an unnecessary amendment to the Social Security Act.

This situation has been aptly termed a "cruel hoax," perpetrated on the most vulnerable of older Americans. After the problem became known, many of my colleagues and I introduced legislation to remedy this injustice. Our bills are still pending as the elderly are about to witness a repeat of that "cruel hoax." But the cause of the upcoming hoax will be State legislation.

Social security benefits are scheduled to go up another 4 percent in July. At the same time, SSI is scheduled to increase \$6 for an individual and \$9 for a couple. These increases will be granted by Federal amendment, and were it not for existing State laws that set ceilings on the payments permissible, these increases would actually be received. However, unless States which are supplementing SSI benefits take legislative action now to raise the overall payment level allowable, the State supplementary benefits will be reduced by the same amount as the social security and SSI increases. And, thus, the needy elderly will have been dealt another body blow in the battle against inflation.

Inflation continues to rage and its most vulnerable victims are those on fixed incomes such as social security and SSI. The net effect of not getting these three social security and SSI increases is not to stay in place but to fall further and further behind in the fight against the skyrocketing cost of living.

The plight of these persons is poignantly described in a recent letter to the editor of the New York Times. I am inserting that letter in the RECORD at this point for all of our colleagues to read:

SOCIAL SECURITY "FRANK"

To the Editor:

It has been years since I've been the object of such a well-thought-out April Fool's joke as happened to be this year. Now hear this: Being old and poor, I am on welfare and Social Security. I think it is an excellent thing that these things exist nowadays. And this I do mean; no sarcasm intended.

I am living in a charitable institution's place with a lot of other people who are in the same condition as I am. For my room and board this institution receives \$561 a month. They pay the necessary medication. I receive pocket money of \$28.50 a month.

Out of this pocket money has to come soap, toothpaste, shampoo, soap powder for laundering clothes, shoe repair (a pair of new heels costs now \$1.75 compared to the

60 cents of two years ago), new ribbons for my typewriter (I am trying to write something worth reading), eraser for typewritten copy (little bottle costs \$1), writing paper, stamps for both "business" and "personal" mail, an occasional newspaper, bus fare (I tire easily nowadays), mouthwash and deodorant (which I don't consider luxuries but necessities, especially for older people); sewing materials for repairs, Kleenex, a new toothbrush occasionally—all the things that have gone up in price just like anything else.

I would not know what to do if my wristwatch broke down or my shoes needed resoling; I simply could not afford that. Nobody slips me a \$5 bill since I have no relatives visiting. My husband is long dead; my son drowned a few years ago. I don't smoke. I don't eat candy and I certainly don't drink. I try to keep myself as well groomed as I possibly can.

But now about that April Fool's joke.

On the first of April we were to get an increase in Social Security. Who would have thought that the Government would take away with one hand what it gave with the other? Instead of a few dollars more pocket money, we got exactly our regular bounty of \$28.50, because welfare had been lowered by the exact amount of the increase.

Wasn't that clever of them? I certainly would not have dreamed up such a trick. You see, most of us—and I among them—would not go on a bender when presented with a few more bucks; you buy yourself a pair of stockings or a few apples or an interesting paperback. Or maybe you buy a nice plant for your room.

Boy, are those people diabolically witty. I would never dream up such a prank to play on oldsters. I laughed until I cried (or was it the other way round?).

R. B.

NEW YORK, April 9, 1974.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. JOHN Y. McCOLLISTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1974

Mr. McCOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 183d anniversary of the Polish 3d of May Constitution and I am happy to join my colleagues in commemorating this historic occasion.

Just 2 years after the adoption of the U.S. Constitution, Poland formulated a document which attempted to do away with the medieval and outmoded system of government in Poland and replace it with a modern constitutional monarchy and parliamentary type of government. The Constitution discarded those aspects of the old system which contributed to the constitutional and political weakness of Poland. It was the instrument through which the Polish people hoped to raise themselves to a condition of independence and security.

Unfortunately, it could not prevent Russian armies from invading the following year and destroying the new constitution. But the principles established in 1791 have lived through the years of oppression and foreign domination and are alive today.

Their proclamation of liberalism stated:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Generations of Poles have continued to strive for freedom and we take this opportunity to reaffirm our support of the courage and faith which sustains them. We look toward the day when Poland can once again live under the principles of the original constitution of 1791.

THE "CATCH 22" OF FEDERAL LAND-USE CONTROL

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, even before the floodwaters had subsided, the southern Mississippi community of Hattiesburg discovered the bitter "Catch 22" of Federal land-use control in the National Flood Disaster Act of 1973.

The city of 38,000 was one of the first communities to join the flood insurance program when it was begun in 1968. But in mid-January last year, it was kicked out and denied participation in the Federal program because the city council failed to adopt the stringent Washington-demanded land use measures for flood-prone areas. Residents whose property was washed away by severe flooding last month soon discovered that not only are they ineligible to buy the insurance, but that they are also denied Federal disaster assistance.

Here comes the "catch": Under terms of the 1973 act, all properties and buildings in a federally designated flood-prone area must be insured whether the localities have qualified for the Federal program or not.

But without the insurance, the properties are not eligible for any Federal disaster aid.

Communities throughout the country are in a similar situation. There are more than 115 cities in Louisiana which are labeled "flood prone," but have thus far refused to join the program. Only 12 of the 200 localities so designated in Virginia have qualified for the Federal flood insurance. Incidentally, an area is said to be "flood prone," based upon the 100-year high water level.

Like every other Federal program, the flood insurance scheme cannot give States and local communities anything without first taking something in exchange. In this case, they propose to take control of your property—the uses that you can make of your own land. Not only do the Federal guidelines, already rejected by many local authorities, dictate the selection of building sites in flood-prone areas, but rigid construction standards are imposed as well.

Proponents of the current land-use control bill pending before Congress (H.R. 10294) are fostering the illusion that there are no "sanctions" in the bill.

But it goes farther than sanctioning the State. Controls are directed against the individual private property owner himself. What Washington land planners are attempting to push through Congress is a standardized building and development code, including regulations against "material changes in the use or appearance of any (private) structure or land." "Development" in their dictionary includes, but is not limited to "erection construction, redevelopment, alteration or repair" of your property or buildings.

The sad experience already suffered under the flood insurance program will be multiplied if this potentially dangerous piece of legislation is bulldozed into law. It should be obvious to anyone who has had the misfortune to observe the workings of Federal bureaucratic controls over local affairs in the past, that Washington design is actually Washington disaster.

I include the related newsclippings at this point:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Apr. 18, 1974]

FLOOD INSURANCE: A SAD, SOGGY IRONY (By Emile LaFourcade)

Severe flooding of Hattiesburg, Miss., has been compounded by a manmade tragic irony—the city is the only Mississippi community kicked out of the federal flood insurance program.

As a result, flooded-out citizens who may have wanted to buy flood insurance were denied the privilege and had no way of avoiding the great losses they now will have to bear from damages wrought by raging flood waters earlier this week.

Information supplied The Times-Picayune by the National Flood Insurance Administration indicate flood victims in Washington Parish, La., are not much better off, since the parish and the municipalities of Franklinton and Bogalusa have been identified as flood prone, but public officials neglected to apply for participation in the program.

They are among more than 115 Louisiana communities that have been identified for some time now as flood prone, but which have neglected to join the program.

Hattiesburg, however, appears to be unique in the two-state area: the only community which once participated and was later ejected.

In an interview Wednesday, assistant NFIA administrator Richard Krimm said Hattiesburg was suspended from the program Jan. 15, 1973 for failure of its city council to adopt land use measures called for under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 which set up the program.

He said Hattiesburg officials were notified during the summer of 1972 they had six months to begin complying.

Krimm said that Hattiesburg officials were notified both by mail and by phone of the impending suspension.

Asked what reaction he got from them, Krimm said, "One of indifference. It sounded like they couldn't have cared less."

He said if only the city officials had evidenced good faith in developing land use measures during the six months grace period, suspension probably would not have been necessary.

"We realize that it is often impossible for communities to develop, enact and implement land use provisions all at once or within a short period of time," he said.

"In fact, changes in the act sometimes delay rapid implementation. So, we can't be so inhuman as to demand communities do the impossible, but we can expect them to

at least be working on it. Hattiesburg was not even in the process of developing a land use program at the time.

A lot has changed since then, and Hattiesburg was about two weeks away from submitting application for reinstatement in the flood insurance program when the high waters struck.

Willard Inman, manager of the planning assistance branch of the Mississippi Research and Development Center in Jackson which serves as the state coordinating agency for the flood insurance program, said he twice made personal appeals to the city administration in Hattiesburg in 1972 to adopt a flood plan ordinance to comply with new requirements of the program.

"Mayor Paul Grady, as I recall, was in favor of the flood plan ordinance," Inman said, "but members of the city council were not, and they failed to adopt it."

He added that a new city administration has taken office since then and it has been in the process of having a new flood plan ordinance drafted by city planner James Glad-den.

Hattiesburg was one of the first communities to join the flood insurance program back in 1968.

Inman said some 90 cities and counties in Mississippi are in the program, but none of those that suffered the heaviest flooding this week—Forrest, Lamar, Perry and Greene—are among them.

Commenting on this, Krimm said, "One of the saddest things about flood prone communities that have so far failed to apply is that our office continually gets letters from people living in them who say they have tried to get the coverage, but their local officials refuse to apply."

He added that every flood prone community in Louisiana and Mississippi not participating in the program has been notified by the NFIA at least three times that they are flood prone.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 30, 1974]
FEW IN VIRGINIA OBTAIN INSURANCE TO COVER FLOODING

RICHMOND, April 27.—Private property owners in Virginia's flood-prone areas—including some in Northern Virginia—are failing to take full advantage of the easier-to-obtain national program of flood insurance.

Some 106 local governments, among them Fairfax and Arlington counties and Alexandria, have initiated action to qualify for national flood insurance, but only 4,000 to 4,500 policies have been issued, said Louis F. Lombardi, coordinator of flood insurance programs for the State Water Control Board.

A minimum of 10,000 policies should be written to cover public and private properties and buildings in Virginia, Lombardi said. He added that the figure should go as high as 20,000 to 30,000 in the future.

"It's a publicity problem, and we are trying to expand the public's knowledge of the program wherever we can," Lombardi said.

He said many Virginia citizens aren't aware of the program, don't know what can be covered or where to get the insurance and some insurance companies aren't even completely familiar with the program.

The Insurance Co. of North America is coordinating the Virginia program, but it is being handled only through the INA main office in Washington.

So far, 12 localities in Virginia have qualified for full flood insurance protection under the National Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973—Alexandria, Arlington County, Big Stone Gap, Cleveland, Fairfax, Fairfax County, Glasgow, Hampton, Portsmouth, St. Paul, Virginia Beach and Waynesboro, Lombardi said.

He said the remaining localities are in what is known as the "emergency" phase of the

program, a preliminary step designed to enable property owners to seek the purchase of the insurance while the locality prepares up-to-date maps showing flood-prone areas for review by federal officials.

Lombardi estimated that by July 1, 1975, about 200 localities in the state will be included in the general designation of flood-prone areas. Under terms of the 1973 Act, all properties and buildings must be insured whether the localities have qualified for the federal program or not.

Without the insurance, the properties won't be eligible for any federal disaster aid, Lombardi said.

He estimated the total value of property that has been insured in the flood program at \$100 million. Very little of the property is state-owned, he said, because the state has yet to determine what properties are in flood-prone areas.

The program allows a home-owner to buy up to \$35,000 in insurance on his house and up to \$10,000 on its contents. Up to \$100,000 in insurance is available on business and commercial property and \$10,000 on contents.

FRAUD MADE PERMANENT BY POSTCARD REGISTRATION

HON. M. CALDWELL BUTLER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, last month editorialist Tom Powell of WDAU television in Scranton, Pa., made strong editorial comment against the postcard registration bill. Mr. Powell's statements about the fraud potential of postcard registration are especially frightening.

I agree with Mr. Powell that the House should "have the good sense to send the postcard bill to the congressional dead letter department."

The editorial follows:

POSTCARD REGISTRATION BILL

We'll soon know whether Congress feels that fraud should be made a permanent part of American elections.

The House is scheduled to vote this week on the postcard registration bill that has already passed the Senate.

It would be hard to conceive a bill so made to order for the vote stealers as this one. Under its terms, all one has to do to get a name on the voter rolls is to send in a postcard.

It's easy to see how the vote lists will be ballooned. Election corruptors and pranksters can send in hundreds of postcards, raising havoc with the registration system.

The idea behind postcard registration is that many persons who would like to vote are prevented from doing so by stringent registration procedures. That's hokum. The Census Bureau has reported that its surveys show most of those not signed up to vote in the last presidential election simply were not interested.

The question then is whether we should invite massive corruption of the election process to make life easier for those not concerned with the issues in the first place.

The notion is reminiscent of Ralph Nader's brainstorm that would make it a punishable crime not to vote.

We see little value for our democratic system—grounded in the notion of an informed and concerned electorate—in dragging recalcitrant voters, kicking and screaming, to the polling places.

We hope the House will have the good sense to send the postcard bill to the congressional dead letter department.

MONTHLY CALENDAR OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to insert in the RECORD each month the monthly calendar of the Smithsonian Institution. The May Calendar of Events follows:

MAY AT THE SMITHSONIAN

WEDNESDAY, MAY 1

Beyond the Planets: The Big Bang. Speaker: George Field, Center for Astrophysics. Final lecture in the 1974 Guggenheim Lectures in Astronomy, cosponsored by the Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum and the Astrophysical Observatory. 7:30 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. Free.

Free Film Theatre: The Unexplained—a documentary on scientific phenomena not yet understood. 12:30 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building.

THURSDAY AND FRIDAY, MAY 2-3

Free Film Theatre: The Unexplained. Repeat. See May 1 for details.

Washington Print Club Exhibition: Fifth biennial showing. Fifty graphics, all from the private collections of the club members, ranging in time from 1500 to 1973. National Collection of Fine Arts, through June 16.

Museum Education Day: Spot lighting programs in art, history and science offered to school children by the Smithsonian, including folk instrument workshops, Japanese tea ceremonies and improvisational tours. Designed for teachers and museum educators, 9 a.m.-2:30 p.m. Open to the public. National Collection of Fine Arts and National Portrait Gallery. Free.

Rehabilitation Medicine Lecture: *Splinters from a Wooden Leg*. Speaker: Henry Viscardi, Jr., President of Human Resources Center, a facility devoted to the rehabilitation, education, training and employment of the disabled. 12:30 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. Free.

SATURDAY, MAY 4

Shakespeare is the One: Special program for children over 12 years; including scenes from Shakespeare's *Love's Labour's Lost*. 2 p.m. The Folger Library. \$4 general, \$3 Smithsonian Associates.*

Boomerangs—5th Annual Festival: Lecture and workshop conducted by Benjamin Ruhe. The lecture, including a film, will cover the history and uses of the boomerang, and will be followed by a workshop in the skills of boomerang carving and throwing. Minimum age 9 years. 10:30 a.m. to 3 p.m. Baird Auditorium, Natural History Building. \$8 general, \$6 Resident Associates. Boomerang throwing competition will be held May 18.*

Saturday Shorts: *Gerald McBoing Boing*; *Betty Boop's May Party*; *The Floorwalker*, Charlie Chaplin; *The Balloonatic*, Buster Keaton; *The Big Thumb*, W. C. Fields; *Newsreel*. \$1.25 general, 75 cents Resident Associates; \$1 students. History and Technology Building Auditorium. Tickets sold at the door.*

SUNDAY, MAY 5

Concert: *The Madison Madrigal Singers*, under the direction of Robert Shafer. Program consists of works by four Washington

*Indicates programs presented by the Smithsonian Resident Associate Program. For attendance or other information call 381-5157.

composers—Robert Shafer, Russell Woolen, Robert Evett and Frederick Weck, and includes the premiere of a concerto for unaccompanied voices and film by Frederick Weck. 8:30 p.m., Hall of Musical Instruments, History and Technology Building. Free. Sponsored by the Division of Musical Instruments.

MONDAY, MAY 6

Concert: *Theatre Chamber Players and the Gregg Smith Singers, String Trio in C Minor opus 9* by Beethoven, *Tempest Destruendi, Tempus Aedificandi* by Luigi Dalla Piccola and *Pierrot Lunaire* by Schoenberg will be performed. 8:30 p.m., Baird Auditorium, Natural History Building. \$4.75 general, \$2.10 students and senior citizens, \$4.25 Resident Associates. For reservations call 381-5395. Sponsored by the Divisions of Performing Arts and Musical Instruments.

The Full Moon of Buddha: Suvira Kapur presents a program on the life and thought of Buddha and the values that distinguished them—charity, simplicity and equality. A film of Buddhist places of pilgrimage will be shown. Suvira Kapur was formerly with the University of Delhi and has taught at George Washington University and the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies. 9 p.m., Reception Suite, Museum of History and Technology. \$3 general, \$2 Resident Associates.*

TUESDAY, MAY 7

Museum Talk: Modern Philately. Speaker: Franklin R. Bruns, Jr., Associate Curator, Postal History. 12:30 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. Free.

Lecture: Indian Art of the Northwest Coast. Speaker: Dr. William C. Sturtevant, Smithsonian Curator of North American Anthropology. Dr. Sturtevant will discuss the American Indian art that reached its peak in the late 1800's. 12:30 p.m., The Renwick Gallery. Scheduled in conjunction with the current exhibition Boxes and Bowls: Decorated Containers by 19th-Century Haida, Tlingit, Bella Bella, and Tsimshian Indian Artists. Free.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 8

American Aviation Historical Society. Monthly meeting. 8 p.m., Conference Room, National Air and Space Museum. The public is welcome.

Free Film Theatre: *Alaskan Pipe Dream*—a new film on the proposed pipeline; *Landmark*—nuclear breeder reactors, an AEC film. 12:30 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building.

Puppet Theatre Opening: *What If...?* See reverse side.

Symposium: *Energy: The Last Upheaval?* A panel of three scholars of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars will discuss the problems of the energy crisis and the options that are being explored. The panel will consist of Chester Cooper, former Director, International and Social Studies Division, Institute for Defense Analyses; Lincoln Gordon, former President, Johns Hopkins University; and Ezra Mishan, Reader in Economics, London School of Economics and Political Science. David Challinor, Assistant Secretary for Science, will act as moderator. 8 p.m., Baird Auditorium, Natural History Building. \$5 general, \$3 Resident Associates.*

THURSDAY, MAY 9

Free Film Theatre: *Alaskan Pipe Dream*; and *Landmark*. Repeat. See May 8 for details.

Creative Screen: *The Royal Copenhagen Porcelain Manufactory Ltd.* The history of the oldest Danish enterprise in the field of applied art and the innovative producer of porcelain, stoneware and faience work from dinnerware to commemorative and unique art objects. 11 a.m., 11:45 a.m., 12:30 p.m., and 1:15 p.m. The Renwick Gallery.

Rehabilitation Medicine Films: *Run Dick—Run Jane*, distributed by the Wash-

ington Heart Association; *Within Our Grasp*, Veterans Administration; *Home for Supper*, Berk Rehabilitation Center. 12:30 to 2 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. Free.

SATURDAY, MAY 11

Saturday Shorts: *I Saw a Putty Tat*, *Betty Boop's Life Guard*; *The Immigrant*, Charlie Chaplin; *Blotto*, Laurel and Hardy; *Newsreel*. 10 a.m., History and Technology Building Auditorium. \$1.25 general, \$1 students, \$.75 Resident Associates. Tickets sold at the door.*

Library Theatre for Children: *Where the Wild Things Are*, *Jim and the Beanstalk*, and *The Million Dollar Summersaults*—three children's books presented with dance, puppetry and drama to introduce children to literature through the performing arts. Recommended for children ages 4-9. 1:30 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. \$2.50 general, \$1.75 Resident Associates.*

SUNDAY AND MONDAY

All Mozart concerts

Concert: *Piano Sonatas, Sonatas for Violin and Piano*, and Songs.

Concert: *Violin Concerto in D Major; Exultate Jubilate; Duos for Violin and Viola; Chamber Concerto for Piano and Strings.*

Two concerts held in conjunction with the Kennedy Center Mozart Festival. Works will be performed on historic instruments from the Mozart Era by Jean Hakes, soprano, Sonya Monosoff, violin and Michael Rogers, piano. The guest artists will be accompanied by a chamber group of strings and winds comprised of Washington musicians. Each program \$3.50 general, \$1 students and senior citizens; \$3 Resident Associates. 8:30 p.m., Hall of Musical Instruments, History and Technology Building. Sponsored by the Divisions of Performing Arts and Musical Instruments. For reservations call 381-5395.

TUESDAY, MAY 14

Museum talk: *America's Wooden Age*. Speaker: Robert P. Muthauf, Senior Scientific Scholar, Smithsonian Department of Science and Technology. 12:30 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. Free.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 15

Lunchbox Forum: *Interpol: Worldwide Police Organization*. Informal Discussion led by Kenneth S. Giannoulas, Chief of Interpol's National Control Bureau, Washington. 12 noon. Room 449, Smithsonian Institution Castle Building. Free.

Free Film Theatre: *The Energy Crunch*, parts I and II—*The Bottom of the Oil Barrel* and *Nuclear Power Dilemma*. 12:30 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building.

Hello Earth—Greeting from Endeavor: *Poetry Reading by Alfred Worden*, command module pilot of Apollo 15. Worden will read his own poetry inspired by his experiences as an astronaut and his emotions preparing for flight, during the journey and after returning to earth. 7:30 p.m., Baird Auditorium, Natural History Building. Free. Early arrival is advised.

THURSDAY AND FRIDAY, MAY 16-17

Free Film Theatre: *The Bottom of the Oil Barrel*; *Nuclear Power Dilemma*. Repeat. See May 15 for details.

Rehabilitation Medicine Film: *I am Joe's Heart*, distributed by the Washington Heart Association; *The Person Within*, Clark School for the Deaf; *Harlem Hospital Center*, Columbia University. 12:30 to 2 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. Free.

Exhibition: *The Goldsmith: Jewelry and Other Objects by Contemporary Artist-Craftsmen of North America*. The trend in American goldsmithing—the emphasis on

design, flamboyance, elegance and whimsy—is shown in 161 works by almost as many artists that use peacock feathers, gemstones, ivory and wood as well as metals. Among the craftsmen represented are Albert Paley, Arline Fisch, Ed Weiner, and Svetozor Radakovich. The Renwick Gallery, through August 18. Organized by the Renwick Gallery and the Minnesota Museum of Art.

SATURDAY, MAY 18

Boomerang Festival: Fifth annual boomerang throwing competition. Registration 3 to 4 p.m.; competition 4 p.m. Constitution Avenue and 20th Street N.W. Open to the public. Bring your own boomerangs. Free. See May 4 for boomerang lecture and workshop.

Saturday Shorts: *Betty Boop, M.D.*; *Origin of the Motion Picture*; *In the Desert*; *In the Park*, Charlie Chaplin; *Brats*, Laurel and Hardy; *Newsreel*, 10 a.m., History and Technology Building Auditorium. \$1.25 general, \$1 students, \$.75 Resident Associates. Tickets sold at the door.*

Children's Day: Annual all-day fantasy world for children, featuring demonstrations and participation activities. Local artists will demonstrate macramé, clay modeling and printmaking with an introduction to the art of printmaking by Allan Kaneshiro, NCFA artist-in-residence. Other events include music and dance, puppet shows by Kajaal, portrait sketching by Washington artist Allen Carter, improvisational Magical Tours of the museum, and animated films. Films include *A Scrap of Paper* and *A Piece of String*; *Hailstones and Halibut Bones*, and a short starring the alphabet. Activities are continuous throughout the day. Open to children of all ages—very young visitors should be accompanied by an adult. For further information call 381-6541. Sponsored by the National Collection of Fine Arts. Free.

SUNDAY, MAY 19

Jazz Heritage Concert: *Jim Hall Duo*, guitarist and *Jimmy Juffe III* playing clarinet, flute and saxophone. 8 p.m., Baird Auditorium, Natural History Building. \$4.50 general; \$3 students and senior citizens; \$4 Resident Associates. For reservations call 381-5395. A free Workshop/Demonstration is also scheduled for 4:30 p.m. in the Baird Auditorium. Sponsored by the Division of Performing Arts.

TUESDAY, MAY 21

Museum Talk: *American Pottery and Porcelain, from Colonial Times to 1900*. Speaker: Jay J. Miller II, Smithsonian Curator of Ceramics and Glass. 12:30 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. Free.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 22

Free Film Theatre: *The Energy Crunch*, part III—*Sunbeam Solution*; and *Lasers*—the manifold aspects of this rapidly developing wonder tool. 12:30 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building.

Walter Terry and the Royal Ballet: Two part event with lecture by Walter Terry (May 22), *Saturday Review/World* dance critic, 8 p.m., Reception Suite, History and Technology Building. \$25 general; \$20 Resident Associates.* Performance by the Royal Ballet (May 29) of *La Bayadere* and *La Fille Mal Gardée* at The Kennedy Center.

THURSDAY, MAY 23

Free Film Theatre: *Sunbeam Solution*; and *Lasers*. Repeat. See May 22 for details.

Creative Screen: *The Royal Copenhagen Porcelain Manufactory Ltd.* Repeat. See May 9 for details. Free.

Lecture With Films: *The Documentary*. Charles Guggenheim discusses his art and screens several of his award-winning films. Mr. Guggenheim has been awarded two Oscars—for *Nine from Little Rock* and *Robert Kennedy Remembered*—The Venice Film Festival's XI Gold Mercury Award and

top honors at the Beirut and Edinburgh film festivals, as well as the Nation's Conservation Service Award. 8 p.m., Baird Auditorium, Natural History Building. \$4 general, \$3 Resident Associates.*

FRIDAY, MAY 24

Rehabilitation Medicine Films: *Breath of Life*, and *Congestive Heart Failure*, distributed by the Washington Heart Association; *Lights Out, No Sound*, Schmidler; *Everything But Hear*, Clark School for the Deaf. 12:30 to 2 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building.

Exhibition: *Anne Ryan Collages*. Fifty works comprise the first major museum exhibition of collages by the late Anne Ryan (1889-1954). The cubist designs of Anne Ryan are a combination of fragility and strength, created with bits of paper, fabric, thread, and paint. Collages are from the artist's estate, the artist's daughter Elizabeth McFadden, Hirshhorn Museum, Metropolitan Museum of Art, Mrs. Paul Mellon, Alfred Barr as well as the NOFA collections. National Collection of Fine Arts, through July 14.

SATURDAY, MAY 25

Saturday Shorts: *Mother Goose Land*, Betty Boop; *Putting Pants on Phillip*, Laurel and Hardy; *In the Wilds*; *California Bound*, W. C. Fields; *A Night at the Show*, Charlie Chaplin. 10 a.m., History and Technology Building Auditorium. \$1.25 general, \$1 students; \$75 Resident Associates. Tickets sold at the door.*

TUESDAY, MAY 28

Museum Talk: *As Phony as a \$3 Bill*. Speaker: Raymond J. Hebert, Museum Specialist, Smithsonian Division of Numismatics, 12:30 p.m. Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. Free.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 29

Free Film Theatre: *Energy: A Matter of Choices*—an overview of the subject; *A Question of Values*—jobs vs. environment in a small New England town. 12:30 p.m., Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building.

Walter Terry and the Royal Ballet. See May 22 for details.*

THURSDAY AND FRIDAY, MAY 30-31

Free Film Theatre: *Energy: A Matter of Choices*; *A Question of Values*. Repeat films. See May 29 for details.

Rehabilitation Medicine Films: *Flow of Life*, distributed by the Washington Heart Association; *Kevin Is Four*, Ohio State University. 12:30 to 2 p.m. Carmichael Auditorium, History and Technology Building. Free.

Experimentarium

National Air and Space Museum

New Born Babe—a demonstration show that introduces the spacearium concept. Included in the program are a simulated Apollo launch, a look at the different colors of stars, a description of pulsars and an imaginary closeup look at a quasar on the edge of the universe. Tuesdays through Fridays, 4:30 p.m.; Saturdays and Sundays, 11 a.m., 12 noon, 2:30, 3:30 and 4:30 p.m.

Museum tours

Museum of History and Technology

Highlights: Weekdays, 10:30 and 11:30 a.m., 1:30 p.m. Weekends, 10:30 a.m., 12 noon, 1:30 and 3 p.m.

First Ladies' Gowns: Monday-Friday, 10:30 and 11:30 a.m.

200 Years of Needlework: Tuesdays only, 10:15 a.m. Begins at the Star Spangled Banner exhibit.

A Touch of Glass and Ceramics: Highlights of the Smithsonian collections. 3rd floor, Ceramics Hall entrance. Tuesdays and Fridays 10:15 a.m. Other days by appointment—call 381-5030.

The Spirit of 1776: Tuesdays through Fridays. For groups by advance arrangements. Call 381-6471.

Museum of Natural History

Highlights: Weekdays, 10:30 a.m., 12 noon (noon tour may be delayed) through May 17.

Radio Smithsonian

Radio Smithsonian, a program of music and conversation growing out of the Institution's many activities, is broadcast every Sunday on WGMS-AM (570) and FM (103.5) from 9-9:30 p.m. The program schedule for May:

5th—*Unearthing the Past*. Gus Van Beek, Smithsonian Curator of Old World Anthropology, talks about his exciting excavations at Tell Jemmeh in Israel. *The Creative Architect*. A talk with Moshe Safdie, creator of the innovative *Habitat*, seen at Expo 67.

12th—*Concert*, featuring recorder virtuoso Frans Bruggen and harpsichordist Alan Curtis.

19th—*The Smithsonian Tomorrow*. A conversation with S. Dillon Ripley, who recently completed ten years as Secretary of the Smithsonian.

26th—*The Great Louis Armstrong*. Martin Williams, director of the Smithsonian's Jazz Studies Program, looks at one of the giants of jazz.

Radio Smithsonian can also be heard over WAMU-FM (88.5), Fridays at 7:30 p.m. and over WBAL-FM (97.9), Mondays at 7:30 p.m. (Baltimore).

Deadline for June calendar entries: May 6. The Smithsonian Monthly Calendar of Events is prepared by the Office of Public Affairs. Editor: Lillas Wiltshire.

Hours

Open 7 days a week

Freer Gallery of Art, National Collection of Fine Arts, National Portrait Gallery. The Renwick Gallery, Smithsonian Institution Building—10 a.m.-5:30 p.m.

Anacostia Neighborhood Museum—10 a.m.-6 p.m. Monday through Friday; 1-6 p.m. weekends.

Extended Hours:

Arts and Industries Building, National Air and Space Museum, National Museum of History and Technology, and the National Museum of Natural History—10 a.m. to 9 p.m.

National Zoo Buildings—9 a.m. to 6 p.m.

Discovery Room, Museum of Natural History: An area where visitors of all ages can touch, handle and smell a wide variety of natural history specimens of all shapes and sizes ranging from whale fossils to petrified wood. Now open seven days a week—Monday through Thursday: 12 noon to 2:30. Friday through Sunday: 11 a.m. to 3 p.m. On weekends, free tickets are required and may be picked up at the rotunda info desk.

Puppet theatre

Begins May 8

What if...? A comic space fantasy that brings visitors from the planet Poggarobby-baloobanop into contact with the complexities and idiosyncrasies of Anytown, USA. Performed by fifteen puppets and Allan Stevens and Company. Wednesdays through Fridays, 10:30 and 11:30 a.m.; Saturdays and Sundays, 11 a.m., 12:30 and 2:30 p.m. Arts and Industries Building. For reservations call 381-5395.

Calendar Requests: Mail to Central Information Desk, Great Hall, Smithsonian Institution Building, Washington, D.C. 20560. For changes of address, please include mailing label.

Dial-a-Phenomenon—737-8855 for weekly announcements on stars, planets and worldwide occurrences of short-lived natural phenomena.

Dial-a-Museum—737-8811 for daily an-

nouncements on new exhibits and special events.

Continuing series

Single lecture tickets are now available for the following series. \$7 general, \$5 Resident Associates. Call 381-6722.

Freedom of the Press: May 1—The Paradox of Television; 8th—The Press and National Security; 15—Investigative Reporting; 22nd—A Free Press for Whom? 29th—The President and the Press.

Popular Culture: May 7—Television and Radio: The New Waves; 14th—A Scientific View of the New Cults; 21st—Films of the Seventies; 28th—Music Now.

American Folk Art: May 6—Germanic Folk Art; 13th—Three Dimensional Wood and Metal Folk Art; 20th—Folk Art of the Northwest.

Lost Cities: May 6—Chatal Huyuk and Mycenae; 13th—Hasanlu; 20th—Sar-O-Tar; 27th—Ipiutak.

Demonstrations

Museum of History and Technology

Spinning and Weaving—Tuesday through Thursday, 10 a.m.-2 p.m. 1st floor, and Sunday, May 5 and 19, 1-4 p.m.

Printing and Typefoundry: Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday, 2-4 p.m., 3rd floor.

Musical Instruments. A selection of 18th and 19th century instruments, and American folk instruments, Hall of Musical Instruments, 3rd floor, 1:30 p.m., Mondays and Fridays—keyboard; Wednesdays—lute and guitar; Thursday—folk.

Domestic study tours

For information on the following tours, contact Mrs. Howe, Room 106-SI, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560, or call 381-5910.

Albuquerque/Santa Fe/Taos: June 19-27, 1974.

Boston Art and Architecture: June 21-24, 1974.

Colorado River Float: July 7-12, 1974.

Berkshire Music Festival: July 20-26, 1974.

REMARKS ON THE POLISH 3D OF MAY CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. du PONT. Mr. Speaker, allow me to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the courageous nation of Poland on the eve of the Polish 3d of May Constitution Day. This Polish national holiday celebrates the adoption of the impressive Polish Constitution on May 3, 1791. The Polish nation has suffered deeply from tyranny of the Russian and German nations of the past. Today, the brave Polish people remain under the yoke of Soviet totalitarian rule. In the face of a history of oppression, the spirit of the Polish freedom has remained remarkable strong.

The Polish Constitution, a sweeping assertion of the principle of the sovereignty of the people, represented the pioneering light of liberalism in Europe and consequently, a threat to the rigid absolutism of nazism and communism. The similarity in the philosophy of government expressed in the constitutions of our two nations should inspire within all Ameri-

cans a fervent hope that Poland's ultimate destiny will be a lasting triumph of freedom and justice and a just reward for the unending faith of the Polish people.

If we truly cherish our own liberty, we, as Americans, must offer our sincere encouragement to the Polish people in their valiant struggle against Communist suppression. Let us hope that all citizens of Polish ancestry will enjoy a very memorable commemoration of this great event in the history of the Polish nation.

POST CARD REGISTRATION: AN INEFFECTIVE METHOD

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, the low voter turnout in the 1972 election has given great impetus to the proposal to establish a Voter Registration Administration to establish and administer a voter registration-by-mail program for all Federal elections. There is considerable debate over whether or not post card registration will actually increase the number of registered voters. The National Municipal League, after 2 years of study of all facets of the present regis-

tration system stated in hearings before the House Administration Committee, Subcommittee on Elections that post card registration "may appear to be an improvement over the present practices, but it will not significantly increase registration levels." For the 1973 election, the State of Minnesota implemented a statewide system of registration by post card, but it did not mail out the post cards. By analyzing the Minnesota experience in the 1973 election, it may be possible to determine whether post card registration actually did increase the number of registered voters, but the Minnesota system is not comparable to H.R. 8053.

THE MINNESOTA EXPERIENCE

The figures for the entire State of Minnesota are presently not available. However, there are some preliminary figures for the city of Minneapolis. A letter from Gov. Wendell R. Anderson states:

In 1973 there were 28,433—or 12.6 percent—more registered voters than in 1971. By contrast, in 1971 there were only 1,214 more voters than in 1969—an increase of just .6 percent. Clearly, our new law has had a significant effect on voter registration.

Yet, there may be other factors that account for this increase. For example:

First. Much of the increase of 28,433 could be accounted for by the 1972 registration levels; 1972 was the first year for the 18-year-old registration and since it was a Presidential year, registration efforts were maximized. Figures

from the 1972 election indicate that 39,566 people registered to vote, and indicates that a substantial portion of this increase occurred in 1972. In addition, about 20,000 names were purged in 1971 and many of these people may have registered again. Reregistration probably accounted for at least part of the 12.6-percent increase between 1971 and 1973.

Second. The 1973 election may not have been comparable to the 1971 election. In fact, the 1971 election occurred in June, when there was probably much less voter interest, because most people are accustomed to important elections being staged in November. Also, labor did not endorse for mayor in 1971, but did in 1973. Intensive registration drives by groups with greater interest in the 1973 election than they had in the 1971 election might also have accounted for part of the difference.

Third. Alternative methods of registration could have been used in 1973 that were not used in 1971—excluding post cards. Minnesota instituted election day registration system in 1973. This is perhaps the simplest form of registration possible. Eligible voters simply show up on election day, present proper identification and are allowed to vote. This eliminates the need for prior registration. In effect, there is no registration at all, because all a citizen has to do is show up on election day and prove that he is a citizen of that particular precinct. Election day figures follow:

	Change of address	Duplicates	Incompletes	Registered or voted illegally in the wrong ward or precinct	Notification form undeliverable as addressed	Total	New registrants
Primary.....	1,201	144	NA	NA	31	2,712	1,367
General.....	3,600	512	664	382	170	8,371	4,259
Total.....	4,801	656	NA	NA	201	11,083	5,626

According to these figures, about 20 percent of the increase of 28,433 between 1971 and 1973 was accounted for by election day registration, not postcard registration.

Governor Anderson, however, notes that 11,152 people registered by mail. New registrants, however, number only 5,411, as the following chart indicates:

REGISTRATION BY POSTCARD

	Duplications	Changes of address	Duplications and changes of address	Total	New registrants
August.....	181	627	808	1,742	934
September.....	115	544	659	1,680	1,021
October.....	440	3,371	3,811	7,297	3,486
November.....	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
December.....	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Total, August-October.....	736	4,542	5,278	10,719	5,441
Total.....	NA	NA	NA	11,152	5,411

Since only 433 cards were processed in November and December, the figures would not significantly change the above figures. Apparently, then 5,441 people or 20 percent or the increase of 28,433 registered by postcard.

However, the National Municipal League issued another caveat in its testimony:

This bill would mandate mail registration for federal elections to the unfortunate exclusion of more effective methods of registration.

In other words, Minnesota may have eliminated or curtailed other more effective ways of registering voters when it implemented postcards. In particular, registration involving face-to-face encounters is probably more effective than an impersonal postcard.

In Minnesota, this is apparently what happened. As Gov. Wendell Anderson noted:

Not only is this new system more convenient for the voters, it has also resulted in financial savings, as the City no longer has to staff its fifteen libraries with registrars several weeks prior to an election.

A check with the city of Minneapolis revealed that the following efforts were made in years before the implementation of postcards, but were eliminated in 1973:

1. One person was placed in each of 10 libraries and 2 people were placed in 5 libraries. \$25/day, days per week for 2 weeks..... \$5,000

2. An average of two and a half people a day were assigned to a mobile registration unit to register people in black neighborhoods. \$25/day, 4 days..... 250
3. Two persons each day were assigned to aid the League of Women Voters' Registration Drive. \$25/day, 6 days per week for 2 weeks..... 600
4. Four persons were assigned to process the registration forms. \$25/day, 4 weeks (2 for general and 2 for primary), 5 days per week..... 2,000

Total..... 7,850

The city of Minneapolis did not save \$7,850, because it still had to pay extra people to process the postcards. A total of 10 extra people were employed for 5 days a week for 4 weeks at a cost of \$25 a day. This cost comes to \$5,000 or a savings of \$2,850 for registering 5,441 voters.

However, the elimination of the previous methods of registration was not a savings if fewer people registered by postcards than normally registered under the old system. If more people registered under the old system, then postcard registration was probably responsible for an actual reduction in the number of registered voters. Unfortunately, the 1971

and 1972 elections years were not comparable to 1973, so an accurate comparison of the old system and postcards cannot be made. Consequently, any estimate will have to be crude and will have to rely on registration costs and figures in other similar areas.

The old Minneapolis system resembles the deputy registrar system. Dr. Dick Smolka, of the Institute of Election Administration, estimates that the deputy registrar system costs from 35 cents to \$1 per registrant. Because it depended on libraries, the Minneapolis system was less effective than many other similar systems and probably cost about \$1.25 per registrant. If the more efficient League of Women Voters' drive and the mobile registration unit are not included, the number of registrants probably averaged about \$7,850—the cost of the old system—divided by \$1.25 per registrant or about 6,280 registrants, 439 more voters than were registered by postcard in 1973. If the figure is reduced to \$1 to account for the increased effectiveness of the League of Women Voters' drive and the mobile registration unit, the figure would be 7,850 which is 2,409 more than were registered by postcard registration in 1973.

Whether or not the old system of registration is more effective than postcards is not the only relevant question. There may be better and more effective systems than either of these methods. Somewhat surprisingly, according to Dr. Smolka, a comprehensive, thorough door-to-door registration system may be the cheapest and most efficient system. Present methods, including postcards, are based on a many-step, fragmented, scattergun approach that wastes valuable resources and is actually very inefficient. A door-to-door canvassing system that included the purging of deadwood probably would cost only about 70 cents per registrant. If the money used under the old Minneapolis system was invested in door-to-door canvassing, slightly over 11,000 people would have been registered in 1973, or twice as many as were registered by postcard. If the lesser figure of \$5,000 is used, about 7,100 people would have been registered, or about 1½ times the number of people who were registered under the postcard system. The door-to-door canvassing system, if applied nationwide, would be far superior, because it would register all Americans, not just selected groups or individuals who took the time and effort to fill out a postcard.

If Congress wishes to increase the number of registered voters, the Minneapolis experience suggests that postcards are not the best way to do it. Not only did postcards apparently register fewer people than were registered under the previous system, it registered only about half as many people as would have been registered, at the same expense, if a door-to-door canvassing system had been implemented.

STATEMENT OF PERSONAL, OFFICIAL, AND CAMPAIGN FINANCES, 1973

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, because of the events of the past year or so, it is vital that public servants make clear the fact that they are not involved in any actual or potential financial conflicts, and that they are not profiting personally from their positions of public trust.

It is with this purpose in mind that I submit for the RECORD, the following summary of my personal, political, and officials during the year 1973:

I. PERSONAL FINANCES AND TAXES

A. TAXES

1. Federal income tax paid for 1973 (joint return filed by Frank and Marjorie Horton), \$5,054.34.*
2. New York State income tax paid for 1973 (joint return), \$1,900.00.*
3. Montgomery County, Maryland real estate tax on personal residence (jointly owned) paid for 1973, \$1,277.00.
4. Herkimer County, New York real estate tax on cottage (jointly owned) paid for 1973, \$400.00.

B. SOURCES OF ALL INCOME

1. Annual salary as U.S. Congressman, \$42,500.00.
2. Total dividends received on common stock in 1973, \$41.80 (received jointly).
3. Interest received on savings account and on notes outstanding, \$1,413.03.
4. Other: I received no income from any services rendered, including none from honoraria for speeches or appearances. It is my policy not to accept honoraria or expenses from persons, groups or organizations for appearances within my Congressional District.

Total 1973 income: \$43,954.83.

C. SUMMARY OF PERSONAL ASSET AND LIABILITIES

1. Family residence at 9607 Hillridge Drive, Kensington, Maryland: Approximate value, excluding furnishings, \$70,000.00; jointly owned with Marjorie Horton; mortgage amount outstanding as of May, 1974, \$39,500.00.

2. Cottage at Big Moose Lake (Herkimer County), New York: Approximate value, excluding furnishings, \$35,000.00; jointly owned with Marjorie Horton; mortgage outstanding as of May 1974, \$17,500.00.

(NOTE.—My residence in the 34th District is a rented apartment at 2123 East Avenue in the Town of Brighton, New York, in which I have no ownership interest.)

3. Common Stock (all owned jointly with Marjorie Horton).

(a) 10 shares of Eastman Kodak Company stock, valued in March, 1974, at \$113.75 per share, total value, \$1,137.50.

(b) 10 shares of Xerox Corporation stock, valued in March, 1974, at \$116.50 per share, total value \$1,165.00.

(c) 10 shares of Rochester Community Baseball, Inc., stock, valued in March, 1974, at \$3 per share, total value \$30.00.

4. Automobiles:

(a) 1973 Buick valued in March, 1974, by a Washington area Buick dealer at \$3,500.00.

(b) 1972 Buick valued in March, 1974, by the same dealer at \$2,300.00.

* See II.B. regarding deductions of official expenses not reimbursed by the government.

5. Other assets:

(a) I am owed \$34,500.00 by the partnership of Johnson, Relf and Mullan law firm as the proceeds of my sale to them of shares of stock in Blackacre, Inc., a Rochester, New York real estate corporation which owns the building at 47 S. Fitzhugh Street in which the law firm of Johnson, Relf and Mullan has its offices. I ceased all active practice of law at the time of my election to the Congress in 1962, and I am no longer affiliated with this or any other law firm. I no longer hold any stock in Blackacre, Inc.

(b) Not included in this statement of assets are such miscellaneous items as clothing and household furnishings, and cash value of life insurance, which have not been appraised and all of which are within the normal range of expectation for a man of my age and income.

D. PERSONAL DEBTS

(NOTE.—Mortgage liabilities for home and cottage are disclosed under C.I., assets summary.)

1. I owe \$4,000.00 on a loan account with the National Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C.

2. I owe \$1,350.00 to Blackacre, Inc., as part of the purchase price of stock in Blackacre, Inc., which I have since sold.

II. OFFICIAL EXPENSES AND REIMBURSEMENTS CONNECTED WITH MY DUTIES AS A U.S. CONGRESSMAN

(NOTE.—With the single exception of the Stationery Allowance, any unused portion of which is taxable to a Congressman as income, none of the other accounts accrue any personal benefit to a Congressman or to members of his staff.)

A. OFFICE ACCOUNTS

1. In 1973, each Congressman was authorized a Stationery Allowance of \$4,250.00 for office use. I expended the entire amount and deposited additional personal funds to make up the difference between this amount and the amount needed for the operations of my Washington, Rochester and Wayne County offices. At the end of 1973, this account showed a debit balance of \$51.46, which was carried over to my 1974 Stationery Allowance.

During the year, I also deposited into this account, a contribution of \$150.00 made by the David J. Kauffman Post of the Jewish War Veterans in Rochester. This was given to help defray the expense of purchasing American Flags for presentation to constituent groups. These flags are purchased in the House Stationery Room.

2. Each Congressman was authorized a postage allowance of \$910.00 for the year, of which I expended the full amount.

3. Each Congressman is permitted an actual transportation expense (auto mileage or air fare) reimbursement for 19 round trips to his home district per year. I claimed reimbursement for all of these trips, at a total reimbursement of \$1,889.36. In addition to these 19 trips, I made 11 additional trips to the 34th District at my own personal expense. Transportation expenses for these additional trips, car rental for all air trips, plus meals and other expenses for all trips are not reimbursed by the government and amounted to personal travel expenses of \$4,080.00 for me in 1973.

4. The staff of each Congressman is allowed a total of three government-reimbursed round trips to the home district per year. As in the case of the Congressman, the reimbursement is limited to actual transportation expense (auto mileage or air fare). Meals, lodging and other expenses are not reimbursed. Similarly, there is no reimbursement for mileage expenses of staff members of Congressmen who travel within the Congressional District on official business. In

1973, all three reimbursed trips were utilized by my Administrative Assistant, for a total reimbursement of \$288.00. He made seven additional trips to the District at his personal expenses in 1973, and other members of my staff traveled to the Rochester area less frequently either at my expense or at personal expense. I believe that personal contacts with government officials and constituent groups in my District by professional staff members contribute a great deal to the quality of my service and representation. However, this practice has had to be carried out at considerable expense to myself and members of my staff.

5. Each Congressman was permitted 16 staff positions and a total annual staff salary allowance of \$182,707.00 in 1973. The number is uneven because two changes were made in this allotment during the calendar year. I utilized a total of \$176,002.50 from this amount, with the balance of \$6,704.50 reverting to the U.S. Treasury. I currently employ 13 full-time and two part-time staff members, with nine of the full-time people serving in Washington, and the remainder in my District Offices.

6. Each Congressman was authorized a telephone and telegraph allowance of 100,000 message units in 1973. Unused message units may be carried over from one year to the next. I used 80,068 telephone message units in 1973, and 1,525 telegraph units for a total of 81,593 units used. All units used were for official communication by myself or my staff and the bulk of them were consumed in communications to constituents in Monroe and Wayne Counties about federal matters affecting the 34th District.

7. Each Congressman was permitted reimbursement up to \$4,200.00 in 1973 for the rental of space for District Offices. Since my Rochester office is in the Federal Building, and my Wayne County office is in the County Office Building, I did not claim any portion of this amount.

8. Each Congressman was permitted reimbursement up to \$1,200.00 for District Office Expenses in 1973. Since my District Office expenses exceeded this amount, I claimed the full \$1,200.00.

9. Each Congressman was permitted reimbursement up to \$1,950.00 for District Office telephone expenses in 1973. Although my actual District Office telephone expenses exceeded this annual figure, variations in these expenses from one quarter of the year to another enabled me to claim only \$1,478.55 of this amount. All of these reimbursements are applied to the payment of monthly bills to my office from the U.S. General Services Administration, which operates the phone service in the Rochester Federal Building. There is no phone service in my Wayne County office.

B. OFFICIAL EXPENSES MET PERSONALLY

Out of my personal income in 1973, I expended \$7,637.00 for official expenses above and beyond the amounts of reimbursements I received from accounts listed above. These official expenses met with personal funds were properly deducted from my Federal and New York State taxable income.

III. POLITICAL AND CAMPAIGN FINANCES

A. It has been my practice neither to accept nor expend any monies personally for campaign purposes. All campaign contributions for my re-election campaigns have been received and expended by one of two campaign committees which have been organized for this purpose.

1. The Committee for the Re-Election of Congressman Frank Horton was reorganized in 1972 for the purpose of that year's Congressional election campaign. Its treasurer is David Lang, a Rochester CPA with Price, Waterhouse. The Committee has submitted all required disclosure reports to the Clerk of the

House of Representatives (Washington, D.C. 20515) and with the Secretary of State in Albany, New York, as required under federal campaign finance disclosure laws. These reports are available for public inspection at these offices.

2. The Citizens Committee to Re-Elect Congressman Frank Horton was also reorganized in 1972, with Matthew Fairbank, M.D. of Honeoye Falls, New York as its Treasurer. It has also filed all required reports with the two offices listed above, which are available for public inspection.

NOTE.—None of the funds in these committees are subject to my personal control.

B. Each Republican Congressman was allowed \$2,000.00 by the National Republican Congressional Committee for use to defray public information expenditures in 1973. I utilized the full amount, for purposes such as the production of public service radio and television broadcasts, photographic services and other public information expenses related to my duties as a Member of Congress.

IV. AFFILIATIONS

I hold no directorships or partnerships in any professional or corporate profit-making entity, except I do serve as a director of Rochester Community Baseball, Inc., which I served as President prior to my election to Congress in 1962.

I also serve on the board of the Genesee Valley Arts Center, Inc. I receive no fees or expenses for membership or service from any of these organizations.

In addition, I serve on advisory boards of the Center for Migrant Studies at the SUNY College at Geneseo, of SOHI, a non-profit group which promotes investments in low and moderate income housing projects around the country, and of a group called Citizens for Decent Literature. These are relatively inactive, honorary positions in which I serve without fee. I am also a dues-paying member of a large number of Rochester area civic, masonic and community organizations, a list of which I would gladly provide upon request.

In my official capacity as a Member of Congress, I serve as a member of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Naval Academy, and as a Delegate to the Canada-U.S. Interparliamentary Conference, in addition to my service as Ranking Minority Member of the House Committee on Government Operations and its Subcommittee on Legislation and Military Operations.

I made no trips abroad at government expense or otherwise in 1973.

V. CONGRESSIONAL PAPERS

In 1967, I selected the University of Rochester as the repository for all of the files and papers resulting from my service in the Congress. In that year, I executed a document making a gift to the University of my Congressional papers then in existence as well as those that would result from further years of service as a Congressman. A substantial portion of my papers, from my first 12 years in the House are already filed at the University. At the time of this gift, University officials brought to my attention the availability of a tax deduction for the appraisal of these papers. Because much of the paper itself as well as much of the staff work which created the files was properly paid for by the government, through stationery and staff allowances, I declined the opportunity to take any tax deduction for this gift. In fact, I declined to have the papers appraised.

Therefore, the gift of my Congressional papers to the University of Rochester did not result and will not result in any tax or financial benefit to me whatsoever.

(Prepared as of May 1, 1974.)

CAN CONGRESS DO ITS JOB?

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, shortly, I hope, the House will consider the reforms proposed by the Select Committee on Committees. I trust my colleagues, while reflecting on these proposals, will take the time to read two articles which appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer on April 26. In the first article, the chairman of the Select Committee effectively summarizes the rationale behind the committee's recommendations in his customary lucid and concise manner. The second article constituted the Enquirer's lead editorial for the day; I wish particularly to underline its conclusion:

The fact remains that the House needs to update its machinery, and the Bolling Committee has provided a blueprint. For the full House to ignore it would be to invite a further diminution of public confidence in the House's capacity to do the multitude of jobs that need doing.

I hope my colleagues will read these articles carefully as they consider the proposed reforms:

IS CONGRESS DOOMED TO DIE ON THE VINE?

(By Representative RICHARD BOLLING)

The House of Representatives, as a result of the way it is organized, is unable to deal effectively with many of the national problems that come before it. Yet congressional reform is little beyond the talking stage because there are powerful forces both in and out of Congress whose vested interests would not be served by a change in the status quo.

To put it simply, efforts to protect political castles may override efforts to help make Congress a legislative body that can formulate intelligent policies for the people of the United States. Take a look at the energy problem, for example.

Thirteen different committees and subcommittees of the House have jurisdiction over aspects of the energy squeeze, and there is, thus, little wonder that a national, forward-looking national energy policy is still beyond our grasp.

All the chairmen of those 13 committees and subcommittees fumbling over energy policy want to keep their chairmanships. And so do the dozens of other committee and subcommittee chairmen dealing—in an equally chaotic manner—with problems such as transportation, health, environment and foreign affairs.

The problem, of course, does not involve only committee chairmen. Senior members who had to serve 15 or 20 years in Congress before they obtained meaningful roles in policy-making are not likely to give up any power voluntarily to members who have not served their impotent apprenticeship. For example, members now serving on two of the more important committees do not want to give up either assignment.

Outside the House, special interest groups—including such unlikely bedfellows as the National Association of Manufacturers and the AFL-CIO Executive Council—have for years carefully cultivated members who serve on committees these groups are most interested in. Any proposal that might remove "their guys" from the lineup right in the

middle of the ball game apparently deeply disturbs such lobbies.

But the House of Representatives, because of its chaotic organization, cannot exercise its proper responsibility in national government. And unless rational policy decisions can be generated by Congress—and generated soon—the way our nation is governed is going to change.

The current struggle to make some sensible order of the present tangle of House committee structure and procedure is expected to come to a head next month when the House membership will consider reform recommendations of the Select (temporary) Committee on Committees. But those of us advocating reform are not sure at all of success—either in the House Democratic caucus or on the House floor.

As chairman of the select committee, which was created in January, 1973, I know that its recommendations are the product of 13 months' intensive work. Witnesses from the House membership, from colleges and universities and from a variety of private special interest groups and public organizations have been heard. Weeks of discussion and debate—in open session—by the bipartisan committee (five Democrats and five Republicans) and by the bipartisan profession followed.

Our recommendations are based on two primary assumptions:

That as far as possible, meaningful one-stop jurisdiction of House standing (permanent) committees should be provided in at least the areas of energy, environment, health, transportation and foreign policy.

That each member of the House should have an important role in national policy decisions by virtue of his committee assignment.

To accomplish these basic objectives we had to do several things simultaneously.

To gain the best, meaningful "one-stop" jurisdiction in the five key areas listed we recommend reassigning total responsibility now scattered among a number of standing committees to single committees whenever feasible.

The report of the bipartisan committee was approved unanimously by the 10 members before it was submitted to the House.

But despite the bipartisan support and approval the committee and its recommendations have received, the opposition is so powerful and so deeply entrenched that we are not certain that the proposals will be accepted by the House.

It is important to understand that the opposition is not proposing another carefully thought-out proposal as an alternative. The opposition is only trying to find enough votes to defeat the select committee's proposal and thus protect its private areas of influence—with the consequence being an ineffectual Congress.

House Resolution 988—containing the committee's recommendations—is a balanced, interrelated package designed to enable the House to do its job. Another balanced, interrelated alternate might serve as well or better. I have considered several. But none is being offered except our proposal—unanimously approved by a bipartisan committee of 10 members from 10 different states and with House seniority ranging from 25 to three years.

The House of Representatives is not working. And I believe most Americans understand this better than some House members.

CAN CONGRESS DO ITS JOB?

One of the most stunning aspects of the contemporary political scene—and, in some respect, the most inexplicable—is the extent to which the U.S. Congress has declined in public favor and confidence.

It is far easier to understand that the White House, whose principal occupants have been sorely beleaguered on a variety of fronts for a year and a half, should be suffering from a crisis of public confidence.

Yet the opinion polls suggest that fewer Americans repose confidence in Congress than in the executive branch.

The apparent reason is that Congress, for one reason or another, has failed to respond swiftly and decisively to a variety of highly complex problems ranging from energy to inflation, from crime to world trade.

Those failures, in turn, are widely believed to stem from Congress—particularly the House's—antiquated system of committees.

A guest column on today's editorial page, by Rep. Richard Bolling (D-Mo.), cites as one example the circumstance that no fewer than 13 committees and subcommittees have a measure of jurisdiction in the field of energy. "Little wonder," he concludes, "that a rational, forward-looking national energy policy is still beyond our grasp."

Early last year, Representative Bolling became chairman of a special House committee to study the jurisdiction of House committees—a subject to which House members had not devoted themselves for a generation.

The result of that inquiry, which was undertaken by a broadly representative, bipartisan group of House members, is a reorganization plan that will come before the full House next month.

The committee's original plan, advanced last December, drew a storm of protests largely from groups with special interests to protect. The Bolling committee thereafter revised its plan to encompass many of the grievances offered by other House members. The result has been a unanimously endorsed revised plan that still adheres to the basic purpose of making the House better equipped to cope with the specialized problems presently before it.

One key aspect of the original plan as well as of the revised formulation is the reorganization of the powerful House Ways and Means Committee, which has ranked as one of the principal congressional bottlenecks. The committee's primary function is sponsoring and overseeing tax legislation, but it has acquired additional responsibility over the years for unemployment compensation, health insurance and foreign trade. That broad jurisdiction, combined with the unwillingness of the committee to divide itself into subcommittees, has left the House with no structure for dealing swiftly with proposed legislation in these highly technical areas.

The Bolling committee proposes leaving tariff and customs administration within Ways and Means' orbit, but other aspects of foreign trade would be shifted to the jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Health insurance would be shifted to a new Commerce and Health Committee. Unemployment compensation would go to a new Labor Committee (the present Education and Labor Committee would become two distinct committees). The Public Works Committee would become Public Works and Transportation. Government Operations, in addition to receiving jurisdiction over the U.S. Postal Service from the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, which would be abolished, would also be given responsibility for general revenue-sharing.

These, and other proposed shifts, abolitions and creations, were the products of an exhaustive examination of what the House needs by members of Congress long experienced in its traditions and operations.

Most members of Congress, and many laymen as well, can probably detect flaws in the Bolling committee's recommendations. But none, we venture to say, compares with the

basic defects the committee's work was designed to correct.

The fact remains that the House needs to update its machinery, and the Bolling committee has provided a blueprint. For the full House to ignore it would be to invite a further diminution of public confidence in the House's capacity to do the multitude of jobs that need doing.

ROLLOUT OF NORTHROP YF-17 AIRCRAFT

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago it was my privilege to take part in the unveiling ceremony for a new jet fighter built by Northrop Corp. at Hawthorne, Calif., in my district.

The plane is the YF-17, the first of two prototypes built by Northrop under a U.S. Air Force program to demonstrate how technology can be applied to improve performance and cut costs of advanced fighters.

Northrop has an enviable record in the development and production of new aircraft. Going back to 1959 when the first T-38 supersonic trainer rolled off the Northrop line, the company has produced more than 2,000 of the F-5/T-38 family of planes—without a single schedule delay or cost over-run.

At the unveiling of the YF-17, four of these high performance, low-cost Northrop planes provided the backdrop—the T-38 Talon, the F-5A tactical fighter, the F-5B fighter-trainer, and the F-5E international fighter.

An account of the unveiling ceremony, including a description of this newest Northrop airplane, was carried in the April 5 issue of the Los Angeles Times under the byline of Marvin Miles, veteran aerospace writer for the Times. At this point in the RECORD I would like to insert the text of that story:

ULTRAMODERN JET FIGHTER UNVEILED AT NORTHROP PLANT

(By Marvin Miles)

A new lightweight fighter that can maneuver 50% better than current operational combat jets and accelerate twice as fast was unveiled Thursday at the Northrop Corp. plant in Hawthorne.

Designated the YF-17, the sleek twin-tailed scrapper is one of two ultramodern fighter types ordered by the Air Force to assess technology in an innovative program that could lead to effective fighters at low cost.

The other aircraft is the YF-16 produced by the General Dynamics Corp., Ft. Worth, currently in test phase at Edwards Air Force Base.

Both firms were allowed wide latitude in their designs (two aircraft each) to assure high performance in the new day fighters that could lead to a new mix in the U.S. force structure, with more low-cost aircraft and fewer expensive, sophisticated types.

While the Air Force is under no commitment to buy either plane, it is expected the program will produce a wealth of technical knowledge on lightweight fighters that will

in turn develop understanding and confidence in their development and use.

Thomas V. Jones, Northrop president, told a press conference he preferred the designation "fightweight" instead of "lightweight" for his company's design, which he said will have a takeoff weight of but 23,000 pounds, compared with approximately 58,000 pounds for a new sophisticated fighter.

In addition to the fighter's maneuverability and acceleration, the YF-17, he said, will have other prerequisites for victory in the swirling arena of air-to-air combat.

Its turn rate will be 75% better than that of other current fighters in the U.S. or Soviet inventories and it will be the first air superiority type capable of supersonic speed without the use of an afterburner.

A single-place airplane, the double-sonic YF-17 was unveiled as a "a thing of beauty and deadly utility" when a giant covering of a parachute silk was withdrawn in the Thursday ceremony that featured remarks by Air Force Secretary John L. McLucas.

Prototyping, he said, is controlled innovation in which the government sets performance goals and lets industry work out the manner of achieving them.

"We can't afford not to prototype," the secretary remarked, "if we are to hold down costs and get the most out of technology."

In order to emphasize the low-cost objectives of the program, the USAF established a fly-away cost goal of \$3 million per airplane in fiscal 1972 dollars if 800 aircraft are produced at a rate of 100 per year. Sophisticated all-weather fighters' cost about \$10 million each.

The first of Northrop's two planes, the culmination of eight years of research and development in high-performance fighters, will be test flown next month at Edwards AFB.

There is no rigid time element in testing the two aircraft types, USAF officers said, and the evaluation will not be a head-to-head flyoff competition in the sense that a winner would be assured a production contract.

LETTER FROM COMMITTEE EXPRESSES CONCERN ABOUT DÉTENTE

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, a communication has recently come to me from the Committee for Human Rights in the Soviet Area which is based at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst, Mass.

It very succinctly and profoundly sums up many of my own concerns about American dealings in détente with the Soviet Union.

In print the communication at this point in the RECORD:

COMMITTEE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

IN THE SOVIET AREA,

Amherst, Mass., March, 1974.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The undersigned members of the campus community at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst wish to draw your attention to the following statement, prepared by the local Committee For Human Rights in the Soviet Area, which they endorse.

Is abstract sympathy the only response we are permitted with respect to Soviet dissidents, emigration rights for Soviet Jews, and the general plight of people living under to-

talitarian regimes in the Soviet area? Officials in charge of United States foreign policy seem to say as much: These humanitarian concerns, though praiseworthy, must remain sterile, lest they interfere with the cold calculations of the politics of détente.

Why should that be so? Is it really in our interest? Considering that these "cold calculations" seem to have resulted mainly in one-sided concessions to the Soviet Union, they should be subjected to close scrutiny. It is possible, for instance, that the administration takes this stand—as it does in the case of the Trade Reform Bill—because it feels under pressure to fulfill its end of some sort of understanding reached perhaps in connection with the end of open warfare in Vietnam. On the other hand, the notion that concern with conditions in the Soviet Union conflicts with rational policy making may be simply due to a failure to perceive clearly the implications of Soviet domestic conditions and of the struggle of Soviet dissidents for the long-term interests of the United States. This is the issue we want to explore.

We believe that it is wrong as well as dangerous to leave the state of the Soviet domestic regime out of our assessment of international power relations. At the basis of United States policy is the search for a stable peace. The totalitarian nature of the Soviet internal regime affects this policy both indirectly and directly. Therefore, we are concerned with endangered individuals. They should be seen in the full context of Soviet totalitarian controls, and of what they mean for the preservation of peace.

The greatest danger lies, to our thinking in the area of communications. We are unable to tell the Soviet people about our own intentions. They are unable to find out for themselves what the world is like outside their country. They are also unable to communicate freely with each other, and with their writers and thinkers, to find out about the true state of their country and their own potentialities for change. Between them and us, as well as between one Soviet citizen and another, there stands the regime's near-absolute monopoly of information.

The purpose to which this information monopoly is put is the creation of myths bolstering and sustaining the totalitarian regime. To justify its existence and rigor, the regime needs to keep alive the image of an external enemy. At the same time, it also needs to keep up the image of a Western world of cruel poverty and injustice on the brink of imminent economic and social collapse. ("Can black people in the U.S. own cars?" was one typical question addressed recently to an American). The falseness of the image of a threatening West is clear to anyone who knows about prevailing Western attitudes toward military budgets and economic assistance to the Soviet Union. However, internally, it helps the regime to exploit the profound emotions of patriotism for the loyalty of its subjects, and support of its military machine and expansionist stratagems.

Therefore, to preserve our own security and be able to divert the world's resources to more productive ends than armaments, we need to make the elimination of the Soviet monopoly of information a priority policy objective. Only if the Soviet people learn the truth will they be able to activate their own social energies and put their rulers under the constraint of their opinion and will, as we do ours. Only then will our negotiated agreements have a solid basis, instead of being subject to the risks of arbitrary changes of mind or hidden intentions of uncontrolled leaders.

Do you have the practical means to influence the course of events in that direction? Definitely yes. We are convinced that

our communications technology is sufficiently advanced, or can be developed, to penetrate the regime's information monopoly on a more effective scale than has been the case so far. Furthermore, with some degree of imagination, it should be possible to tie our various economic and other concessions effectively to concrete Soviet counterconcessions that would provide for a free and unrestricted travel of people in both directions, and for a free flow of information. While some may object to this as interference in Soviet domestic affairs, we believe that it is a legitimate interference since it promotes world peace as well as human rights.

Unless the connection between the domestic regime of the Soviet Union and our security is clearly understood, the warnings addressed to us by Andrei Sakharov, the dissident Soviet physicist and perceptive political analyst, will have been in vain:

"Detente without democratization, detente in which the West in effect accepts the Soviet rules of the game, would be dangerous. It would not really solve any of the world's problems and would simply mean capitulating in the face of real or exaggerated Soviet power . . . As a result, the world would become helpless before this uncontrolled bureaucratic machine . . . It would pose a serious threat to the world as a whole."

We count on you to use the influence of your office to counter these dangers by practical political and legislative measures. In this instance, our traditional sense of decency and human solidarity goes hand in hand with our most selfish interest in peace and security. And even though tangible results may not be within immediate reach, they are of such vital importance to us that they ought to be pursued steadily, consistently, and relentlessly until they are reached.

Thank you.

Professor VACLAV HOLESOVSKY,
Chairman.
Professor HOWARD BROGAN,
Vice-Chairman.
Professor LASZLO TIKOS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE RONALD SARASIN

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that in these difficult times an extraordinary effort must be made to restore public confidence in government. The people must know that the great majority of their elected leaders abide by the highest standards of integrity and citizenship. I am therefore reporting to you, to my colleagues in the House, and to the general public, the information contained in my 1973 Federal income tax return.

I filed a joint return with my wife, Marjorie, who was employed for a portion of 1973 as a teacher. Total income received by us from wages and salaries during 1973 was \$41,355, based on congressional salary payments of \$38,722—eleven-twelfths of \$42,500. This was augmented by dividend and interest income of \$396 and reduced by a net loss of \$476 for a total on line 13 of form 1040 of \$41,275.

The net loss of \$476 is the difference between \$14,636 received from the law

firm from which I resigned prior to taking my seat in Congress, representing final payment for services rendered prior to 1973, and a loss of \$15,112 as a partner in a real estate venture entered into prior to my election to Congress.

My deductible congressional expenses exceeded the amount I was reimbursed by \$4,421, reducing my adjusted gross income \$36,854. There were \$8,465 in itemized deductions, such as taxes and mortgage interest payments on my Connecticut home, and standard exemptions totaling \$2,250 for my wife, myself and one dependent child, age 11. This made my taxable income \$26,139, on which I paid Federal income tax of \$7,270.

As required by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, I have filed a statement of financial interests and associations with that committee prior to April 30, 1974, and included a complete copy of my 1973 Federal income tax return even though filing of such tax returns is not required.

A copy of the applicable sections of our 1973 tax return follows:

1973 U.S. INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RETURN—
(FORM 1040)

Name (If joint return, give first names and initials of both) Ronald A. and Marjorie G. Sarasin.

Present home address (Number and street, including apartment number, or rural route) 155 Munson Road.

City, town or post office, State and Zip code: Beacon Falls, Connecticut 06403.

County of Residence: New Haven.

Occupation: Yours; Congressman—Spouse: Teacher.

Filing Status—check only one: 2. Married filing joint return (even if only one had income).

Exemptions: 6a. Yourself; b. Spouse; c. Michael (son).

8. Presidential Election Campaign Fund.—Check x if you wish to designate \$1 of your taxes for this fund. If joint return check x if spouse wishes to designate \$1.

Note: This will not increase your tax or reduce your refund. See note below (italics).

INCOME

9. Wages, salaries, tips, and other employee compensation. \$41,355.

10a. Dividends: \$576. 10b. Less exclusion \$200, balance: \$376.

11. Interest income: \$20.

12. Income other than wages, dividends, and interest (from line 38): (-\$476).

13. Total (add lines 9, 10c, 11 and 12): \$41,275.

14. Adjustments to income (such as "sick pay," moving expenses, etc. from line 43): \$4,421.

15. Subtract line 14 from line 13 (adjusted gross income): \$36,854.

TAX, PAYMENTS AND CREDITS

16. Tax, check if from: x Tax Rate Schedule X, Y, or Z: \$6,430.

19. Other taxes (from line 61): \$840.

20. Total (add lines 18 and 19): \$7,270.

21a. Total Federal income tax withheld (attach Forms W-2, or W-2P to front): \$11,151.

22. Total (add lines 21a, b, c, and d): \$11,151.

BALANCE DUE OR REFUND

24. If line 22 is larger than line 20, enter amount Overpaid: \$3,881.

25. Amount of line 24 to be Refunded To You: \$3,881.

Note: 1972 Presidential Election Campaign Fund Designate.—Check x if you did not des-

ignate \$1 of your taxes on your 1972 return, but now wish to do so. If joint return, check x if spouse did not designate on 1972 return but now wishes to do so.

Preparer's signature (other than taxpayer): Donald L. Perliroth, CPA, 2405 Whitney Avenue, Hamden, Connecticut 06518.

PART I. INCOME OTHER THAN WAGES, DIVIDENDS AND INTEREST

28. Business income or (loss) (attach Schedule C): \$14,636.

31. Pensions, annuities, rents, royalties, partnerships, estates or trusts etc. (attach-Schedule E): (\$15,112).

38. Total (add lines 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, and 37). Enter here and on line 12: (-\$476).

PART II. ADJUSTMENTS TO INCOME

41. Employee business expense (attach Form 2106 or statement), \$4,421.

43. Total adjustments (add lines 39, 40, 41, and 42). Enter here and on line 14: \$4,421.

PART III. TAX COMPUTATION

44. Adjusted gross income (from line 15): \$36,854.

45a. If you itemize deductions, enter total from Schedule A, line 41 and attach Schedule A, line 41 and attach Schedule A. (b) If you do not itemize deductions, enter 15% of line 44, but do not enter more than \$2,000. (\$1,000 if line 3 checked): \$8,465.

46. Subtract line 45 from line 44: \$28,389.

47. Multiply total number of exemptions claimed on line 7 by \$750: \$2,250.

48. Taxable income. Subtract line 47 from line 46: \$26,139.

PART V. OTHER TAXES

55. Self-employment tax (attach Schedule SE): \$840.

61. Total (add lines 55, 56, 57, 58, 59 and 60). Enter here and on line 19: \$840.

Under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 all receipts and expenditures of campaign funds are made by the Sarasin Congress Committee, Waldo Robison, treasurer, Post Office Box 555, Waterbury, Connecticut 06701. That committee filed its own income tax returns for 1973, and showed no taxable income and, therefore, no income tax due.

NEW ORLEANS NAMED BICENTENNIAL COMMUNITY

HON. LINDY BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, last week, the city of New Orleans was officially designated a Bicentennial Community by the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration.

At this time, I would like to laud the diligent efforts exerted by Mrs. Verna Landrieu, chairwoman of the New Orleans Bicentennial Commission, and wife of our illustrious mayor, Moon Landrieu. Without her hard work, this honor would certainly have been much longer in coming.

Mrs. Landrieu has chaired the New Orleans committee since its inception in January when the mayor organized it for the purpose of coordinating New Orleans' Bicentennial festivities. At the time of her appointment to the chair of the commission, Mayor Landrieu said he designated his wife because of the organiza-

tional talents she has exhibited each morning by successfully getting all nine Landrieu children to school on time. Obviously, the mayor knows how to choose his chairpeople.

Although Louisiana was not a member of the Thirteen Original Colonies—the Louisiana Purchase not having occurred until 1803—the city of New Orleans was nevertheless an integral part of Revolutionary War activity. From 1776 to 1785, Don Bernardo de Galvez served as the Spanish governor of the Louisiana territory. He assisted American agents in New Orleans by supplying arms, ammunition and gunpowder. In addition, in 1779, he was instrumental in the capture of the British garrison at Baton Rouge, and again at the captures of Natchez that same year, and Mobile in the year following.

According to the esteemed historian and chronicler of New Orleans' rich past, Mr. Charles L. (Pie) Dufour, Governor Galvez had among his troops over 100 black soldiers fighting in support of the struggle for independence.

The territorial governor also helped to protect colonial shipping on the Mississippi River by giving his assistance to the Americans while at the same time, guarding against a British attack.

As you can see, the Revolutionary spirit infected the Louisiana settlement despite its status as a foreign territory. By aiding American activity in these ways, Louisiana and New Orleans contributed its own footnote to the history of the American Revolution.

TRIBUTE TO KARL WEBER—A MAN OF MANY TALENTS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, next month the Los Angeles Harbor College Chapter of the American Federation of Teachers will honor Karl Rowland Weber upon his retirement from the teaching profession.

Professor Weber has long been Harbor College Chapter President of the American Federation of Teachers and representative on the District Federal Executive Board. He has been a dedicated leader of his local union, working tirelessly and effectively for many years to improve working conditions for teachers. It is a pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues this man's career to serve as an inspiration to others.

Prior to entering the teaching profession, Karl Weber led a varied and interesting life. After graduating from high school, during which he served in the Massachusetts National Guard, Professor Weber attended business college. In 1928, Karl moved to the west coast where he worked as a roustabout and a teamster. He next went to sea with the Tacoma Orient Line, and later with the

United States Line sailing out of New York.

Karl Weber's next career was with the Federal Government in the Works Progress Administration, Navy Department, Agriculture Department, Joint Chiefs of Staff, War Labor Board, and many other agencies, where he used his excellent shorthand skills.

Mr. Weber joined the Navy in 1943, and served with distinction in the Pacific, first with the Seabees and later on the staff of Admiral Nimitz on Guam.

Upon leaving the service, Karl attended Lewis and Clark College under the GI bill. He received his bachelor of science degree in 1948; his master of arts degree in 1950 from Stanford University; and 13 years later, Karl Weber added to his academic achievements with a master's degree of business administration from the University of California at Los Angeles.

Karl began his teaching career in 1952 at the age of 43, and his first assignment was at Dana Junior High School in San Pedro, Calif.

Professor Weber joined the staff of the Business Department of Los Angeles Harbor College, located in Wilmington, in 1956. During his 18 years at Harbor College, he also taught night school and summer school and made three trips to Europe to continue his educational pursuits.

Karl Weber may be retiring from his professorship at Harbor College, but he does not intend to leave the teaching profession entirely. He looks forward to substitute teaching—and maybe starting yet another new career.

Karl Weber has, indeed, enjoyed a rich and full life, which he has shared with his dedicated wife, Beth, and their three children, John, Jay, and Maryanne.

I am pleased to join with the Los Angeles Harbor College Chapter of the American Federation of Teachers—and all of Karl Weber's many friends—in honoring him and wishing him the best in the years ahead.

NATIONAL DAY FOR HUMILIATION AND FASTING

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Hunt and I had the distinct honor of sharing the pulpit at St. Paul's United Methodist Church in Thorofare, N.J., on April 30, 1974. St. Paul's is a small Methodist Church—Pastor Stuart McKenzie is truly a dedicated servant of the Lord and doing an excellent job. We sometimes lose the real perspective of life by failing to observe specific occasions for prayer and it is my fervant hope that in 1975 we will have a national observance of this day spearheaded by our country's leaders.

ISRAELI INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, on April 24 we commemorated the 26th anniversary of the birth of Israeli independence.

This truly meaningful milestone is a shining tribute to those valiant men and women who more than a quarter of a century ago left the persecution and displacement of Europe to establish a Jewish state in the Promised Land.

The distinguished history of the Jewish people is one of a suffering and wandering group, yearning for freedom and peace in a land promised to them by God. This wonderful dream became a reality after centuries of perseverance in foreign lands, when in 1948 David Ben-Gurion proclaimed the establishment of the State of Israel.

Since those days, Israel has grown to become a true example of the accomplishments and great progress that can be made by patriotic energetic people proud of their country and their heritage.

Mention of David Ben-Gurion's name brings to mind the deep sadness experienced by all men and women who mourned his death last year. He was a patriot who loved freedom and worked long and diligent years to help bring his beloved country to great stature.

Truly, Ben-Gurion and his comrades have provided generations of Israelis to follow them with a strong foundation of ideals and accomplishments on which to increase the greatness of their small nation.

Since nationhood, thousands of acres of swamps and deserts, marshes and eroded hills have been claimed and made to bloom in the very shadow of the adversary. Israel's GNP has increased at an annual rate of 8 to 14 percent in recent years and the nation's exports exceed \$2 billion. From small villages, large cities have risen. The suffering and displacement of centuries of unfriendly exile in foreign countries have been transformed into a strong national character of unity.

Having come this far, the people of Israel need no further self-justification. Their only need now is peace. We all mourn with Israel the needless loss of life and awful destruction that are part of war. As Americans we dedicate ourselves to a partnership of common interests and objectives with the Israelis.

To seek peace in the Middle East and to continue to support Israel's deterrent strength, I have joined with several of my colleagues in cosponsoring a House concurrent resolution to insure the Israelis of the supplies they need to maintain their security.

It is unfortunate that such a dark cloud still hangs over Israel on such a jubilant day as the anniversary of Israeli independence. It is my profound hope that at long last peace will come to the Middle East and the 2.5 million people of Israel will have an opportunity to enjoy the fruits of their achievements.

SPECIAL SESSION OF U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, at the close of general debate during the special session of the United Nations General Assembly in New York, Secretary General Waldheim stressed the need for assistance to the countries hardest hit by the steep rise in oil prices. The World Bank lists those countries: Bangladesh, Bolivia, Ethiopia, India, Kenya, Mali, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda and Zaire.

The Secretary General further stated that another imperative was that developing countries earn better returns on their commodities so they would be able to pay for their imports. Hence, the Secretary General urged that the special session of the General Assembly make a renewed effort, "in the interests of both producing and consuming nations."

His closing paragraph was as follows:

If we have begun to face up to the most urgent needs, and if we have made the necessary arrangements to follow up what has been done here, then this session will indeed prove to have been a turning point in world affairs.

I insert Secretary General Waldheim's statement in the RECORD in its entirety:

TEXT OF STATEMENT BY SECRETARY GENERAL KURT WALDHEIM AT CLOSING OF GENERAL DEBATE IN GENERAL ASSEMBLY

For the past two weeks, the General Assembly has conducted a debate of remarkable scope and depth on the most pressing and fateful issues of our time. The high level of representation in the Special Session has been matched by the quality and substance of the interventions. It is no exaggeration to say that this Special Session is an unprecedented event, not only for the United Nations but for the world community.

We now have before us a vivid picture of the world economic situation seen from many different points of view and an extraordinary wealth of constructive proposals. No one has any illusions about the difficulties which will be encountered, or the efforts which must be made to combine and shape these proposals into agreed policies and plans of action, which will be the foundation of a new world economic order.

All over the world, the proceedings of this special session have been followed with extraordinary interest. The world expects, and anxiously awaits, the first concrete steps which this assembly will take to deal with the emergency situation which, in one way or another, now faces all nations. The anxiety and expectation of the world community is heightened by the undoubted fact that, quite apart from the medium and long-term problems which confront us, the fate of millions of people may well depend, within the next few months, on what this special session does, or does not do.

As I said in my opening statement, the perspectives of different nations or groups of nations vary enormously. Certainly the observation has been amply borne out by the general debate. But the debate has also, and perhaps more significantly, demonstrated a striking degree of agreement among

member states on a number of important aspects of the problem before the assembly. Clearly, the debate has provided the substance for a process of negotiation. Co-ordination and harmonization which will endure beyond the week of the special session remains to us.

At this stage in the work of the debate with the closest attention, I feel that a summary of my main impressions might be helpful in formulating the decisions which are necessary both for immediate action and for continuing expeditiously the vital work which this session has initiated. The following observations are made with full respect for the positions of member governments as stated in the course of the debate, and in full respect for the positions of member governments as stated in the course of the debate, and in full cognizance of the strenuous efforts being made in the ad hoc committee to formulate a declaration of principles and a programme of action.

First, no one could have failed to be impressed by the range, the relevance and the seriousness of the general debate, illustrating dramatically the undeniable interdependence of the many issues which must be tackled in the evolution of a new world economic order. It is imperative to maintain the momentum which this debate has generated and to agree on the principles which will give it direction.

Second, it is imperative to provide now financial and other assistance to those member states placed in the greatest jeopardy as a result of recent violent economic changes and great natural disasters. Individual member states and groups of states have undertaken steps bilaterally, collectively, and through international organizations to meet some of these needs. The international Bank for Reconstruction and Development, in the International Monetary Fund and the other members of the United Nations system are also striving to do all they can to help. However, all these efforts are not enough. A potentially disastrous gap continues to exist between minimum needs and the resources so far made available to meet those needs. It is imperative that we take steps to mobilize greater resources before the special session ends.

Third, it is imperative to effect the speedy transfer of the necessary assistance to those member states most in need, and also to make arrangements to monitor continuously future needs and responses to those needs from the world community. The United Nations system stands ready to act as catalyst and clearing-house for everyone's efforts, and would be willing to act in whatever manner and through whatever mechanisms the general assembly may decide. I wish to emphasize that any arrangements made by the United Nations system would be complementary to those made by individual member states and groups of states.

Fourth, it is imperative to recognize that the developing countries must earn more to pay for their imports, and that they still depend on commodities for the greater part of their export earnings. To the extent that progress could be made on this basic problem, progress could be made in ameliorating the acute financial crisis to which I have just referred. In the past, international efforts have failed to produce significant overall results in the field of commodity agreements. Today, however, and more than ever before, it is in the interests of both producing and consuming countries to initiate, during this special session, action which will lead to the resolution of this problem.

Fifth, and finally, it is imperative, as I have said, that the momentum generated by this special session should be maintained. The basic problems so courageously and constructively faced by this assembly will increase in the sooner realistic international policies can be established and effective ac-

tion taken to implement those policies, the sooner it will be possible to move from our present dangerously defensive position to one where bold and positive action can be taken to establish a new economic and social order for the benefit of all of mankind. Whatever the outcome of the special session, some relatively simple and effective arrangements must be made to ensure continuity and follow-up.

The administrative committee on co-ordination, which consists of the heads of all the agencies, organizations and programmes of the United Nations system, met here at United Nations Headquarters last week. The members of this committee, including the heads of the International Monetary Fund, asked me to inform this assembly of their readiness to make available immediately the services of their institutions in order to facilitate and support any action within their competence that may be taken by the general assembly. Recent experience has shown the usefulness of the United Nations system in focussing many forms of assistance to the maximum effect in dealing with a critical situation.

I believe that this special session will prove to have been a truly historic meeting. My main concern, which I know is shared by all of the distinguished representatives in this hall, is to get the maximum of agreement, the maximum of effective decisions, out of the few days of the session that remain. If upon the adjournment of this session we know where we are going, if we have begun to face up to the most urgent needs, and if we have made the necessary arrangements to follow up what has been done here, then this session will indeed prove to have been a turning point in world affairs.

COUNTY AGENT'S COLUMN

HON. DAWSON MATHIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening in Hahira, Ga., while visiting with some good people in my district, one of my fine constituents, Gary Hancock of Cook County, Ga., handed me a column written by the Cook County agent, Walt Smith, who is also a close friend of mine. In these days of increasing prices, I continue to remind the Members of the House that the farmers of this Nation are in a squeeze unlike anything they have ever seen before, and I would recommend that each Member take about 30 seconds and read this little article which appeared in the *Adel News* on May 1, 1974.

The article follows:

COUNTY AGENT'S COLUMN

(By Walt Smith)

"That'll be \$6.80, please," the store keeper said to the lady. The items purchased were five packs of cigarettes, Pepsi-colas and assorted goodies for snacks. "My food is high," replied the lady. Bill Smith related this real happening to me.

Bill's reply. "Get your chicken coops, and come to my poultry farm. I am cleaning out some 'laid-out' hens. I'll sell you sixty-eight of these birds for your \$6.80!" "I don't believe it," the lady replied.

Bill advised her to bring someone to help her, because she could not handle a crate of chickens by herself. The hens average 3.8 pounds each.

I guess I ought to editorialize a bit about the above true happening, but what can I say that will add impact to the incident. Is Bill Smith responsible for the high cost of food? Bill paid 60 or 70 cents for the day old chick, he sold her for a dime, or less than three cents per pound.

How in the name of common sense can Bill keep on feeding us for the amount of money he receives for his products? Yes, him and all the others like him. Food is high, but so is everything else. Corn and wheat are cheaper than a year ago. Is bread cheaper?

Must we bankrupt all our farmers before we see the handwriting on the wall? Hogs and cows are selling for less than the cost of production. One simple question, who is subsidizing whom?

THE 183D ANNIVERSARY

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1974

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, May 3 marked the 183d anniversary of the promulgation of the Polish Constitution. Following, as it did, hard on the heels of the American Constitution, which was adopted in 1789, the 1791 Polish Constitution gave another great people the inspiration and the vehicle with which to continue the Poles' centuries long fight for national expression and autonomy, just as the American Constitution helped firmly cement the Union of the Original Thirteen States.

The words of the Polish Constitution are worthy of note. Democracy in Poland was guaranteed in the following passage:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the State, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident to me that our two great peoples, as evidenced by the Constitutions which were devised by their citizens to preserve liberty and justice for all, were inspired by similar philosophies. I feel that it is particularly appropriate that we should commemorate the resemblances of these two documents and that we should thank God for His benevolence in allowing ours to flourish and remain strong. The Poles of the 18th century were not able to enjoy the fruits of their constitutional government for long. The third partition of Poland in 1795 put an end for many years to the concept of a united, democratic Poland.

The United States was greatly enriched by the influx of Polish refugees then and in the years that followed. They constitute a hardy, freedom loving stock that has given strength and durability to our American character. As we celebrate the ratification of the Polish Constitution of 1791, let us also remember her sons and daughters who came to this country and took up its ideals and freedoms for their own. Their contributions to our heritage stand as a tribute both to their race and to the principles of liberty and democracy that the Polish nation proclaimed so gloriously in the Constitution of 1791.

May 6, 1974

ENERGY TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ACT OF 1974

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) DU PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, the Energy Transportation Security Act of 1974—H.R. 8193—will be before the House this week. This bill would require that 20 to 30 percent of U.S. oil imports be carried in U.S.-flag vessels.

The bill is poorly drawn and has drawn unanimous disapproval from every department of the Federal Government asked for its view: Commerce, Treasury, State, Interior, and Defense. Two of the best communications I have received are from Kenneth Rush, Acting Secretary of State, and William Simon, Administrator of the Federal Energy Office. I commend their analysis to my colleagues:

The text of the two letters follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, D.C., May 1, 1974.

HON. PIERRE S. DU PONT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DU PONT: I wish to take this opportunity to express my personal views to the members of the House of Representatives on H.R. 8193 which if enacted into law would have adverse repercussions in a number of foreign policy areas.

First, an extension of U.S. cargo preference to commercial cargoes, such as petroleum imports, would be an undesirable deviation from U.S. shipping and overall foreign economic policy. Until now, United States foreign economic policies have been directed towards the maintenance and encouragement of open markets on a non-discriminatory basis, which we believe best serve the development of both U.S. and world trade and economic growth. These policies apply to a wide range of economic matters, of which shipping is one of the more important.

This basic approach is reflected in our many Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation treaties with other countries, and specifically in the most-favored nation or national treatment clauses customarily included in these treaties. Such clauses usually apply to shipping, and require that we grant the same treatment in the carriage of commercial cargoes to the shipping lines of the treaty partner as we provide for our own lines. In exchange, our shipping lines similarly are entitled to equal access to the commercial cargoes of the respective treaty partner. United States adoption of cargo preference for commercial cargoes, for U.S.-flag vessels, would be contrary to these treaty provisions. Such a unilateral action by the United States could not help but damage the attainment of U.S. objectives in a wide range of international economic matters, including the protection of our own shipping lines threatened by foreign government cargo preference measures.

Second, U.S. cargo preference for oil imports would encourage the adoption of similar measures by other countries, and particularly by oil exporting countries. At the present time much of our imported petroleum is carried by ships of allied or friendly countries. As other countries adopted cargo preference requirements it would mean the consolidation by the same countries of control of both the source and the transport of a large part of our oil imports. It would also mean less flexibility in the use of tankers on a world-wide basis and specifically in the transport of petroleum to the United

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

13303

States. These consequences would constitute a deterioration in the conditions of availability and security of supply of petroleum and petroleum products for the United States.

Third, the adoption of cargo preference legislation, applicable to commercial cargoes, would be viewed by a number of our NATO allies as directly detrimental to their shipping interests and would therefore adversely affect our relations with those countries.

In addition to the above foreign policy reasons for opposition to H.R. 8193, there are a number of primarily economic reasons which have been already cited by other Administration spokesmen, and which I will not repeat here.

I might just add, however, that cargo preference is, in comparison to direct subsidy, an inefficient and cumbersome means for promoting the merchant marine. In the case of cargo preference for oil imports, it would mean increased tanker costs, reduction in the flexibility in the use of tankers, and reduced incentives for U.S. ship operators to be competitive in world markets. We consider that the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, as amended, provides the best mechanism for promoting the bulk cargo carrying segment of the U.S. merchant marine.

I would hope that these viewpoints may help your colleagues in Congress to appreciate the serious foreign policy implications that would result from the passage of H.R. 8193.

Sincerely,

KENNETH RUSH,
Acting Secretary.

FEDERAL ENERGY OFFICE,

Washington, D.C., April 18, 1974.

HON. PIERRE S. DU PONT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DU PONT: Thank you for your letter asking for my views on H.R. 8193. I understand that the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has already voted out the Energy Transportation Security Act of 1974, H.R. 8193, which would require, starting immediately, 20% of all crude oil and product imports be carried on U.S. ships. This percentage would increase to 30% within three years. I oppose the passage of this legislation because I believe it (a) runs counter to our broad economic and trade policies, (b) would seriously worsen our current energy shortages and increase petroleum costs to the U.S. consumer while (c) making it more difficult over the long term to implement Project Independence. I want to describe in some detail these concerns and would be happy to discuss them with you further.

First, I believe this legislation violates a fundamental international trading policy which our country has long embraced calling for the free movement of international goods and services. If this Bill is passed, a dangerous and disruptive precedent would be set. Other importing nations would probably react to their own, creating an extremely inflexible tanker market and hindering world petroleum trade in general. This, of course, could spill over into other commercial policies countering much of the progress we have made to free up international trade these past 15 years. To date, our country has not established cargo preferences except in the area of government-owned or financed cargoes, and it would be decidedly unwise to create these commercial preferences now.

An immediate effect of the legislation would be to reduce the supply of petroleum available to the country simply because imports would be reduced due to the present unavailability of U.S. ships. The legislation would reduce U.S. importers' flexibility in the transport of crude and refined petroleum into the U.S. and mean some crude and products would not be brought into the country.

The potential for shortages this summer and next winter would be increased. Today, almost half of our petroleum imports come into the country as refined products. The availability of these products is uncertain because it depends on parameters that are difficult to predict such as foreign demand which is affected by climate, operational refinery capacity and other factors. In this situation importers most often act quickly to obtain their supplies when available and the introduction of cargo preference would create additional difficulties for them. Despite the waiver provision, which provides for the use of non-U.S. shipping if sufficient U.S. shipping is unavailable, we would end up losing some imports because of the difficulty of either getting U.S. ships or obtaining a waiver in time to transport it into the U.S.

Finally, the scarcity of U.S. tankers and the fact that transport costs in U.S. ships are greater than foreign flag vessels would increase the price of imports and increase the inflationary impact on the already overburdened U.S. consumer who would bear the brunt of higher transportation costs.

I believe strongly that before enacting legislation of this sort, we should carefully and systematically examine its desirability in the total context of our overall projected transportation requirements associated with Project Independence. We in FEO currently have such an evaluative effort underway and when the results of these studies are ready this fall, we will be ready to submit a coherent legislative program. Action prior to them would be premature.

Finally, I believe a better method than cargo preference for strengthening the U.S. Merchant Marine is our current mechanism of providing direct construction differential subsidies to bulk carriers. Since the passage of the 1970 Act, we have found the significant increases in tanker and other bulk vessel construction have been achieved through this method. We also believe this progress will continue in the future without the cargo preference legislation which could hinder our progress towards Project Independence and other national energy goals.

I have also expressed in writing these points to Carl Albert, John Rhodes, and Leonor Sullivan. If I can provide you additional information on these issues, I shall be happy to do so by phone or in person.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. SIMON,
Administrator.

"HANOI JANE"—THE RED'S FRIEND

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, another chapter in the travels of Jane Fonda unfolded last week in North Vietnam, the home-away-from-home for her, her husband, and baby. Returning to her adopted land, the one she has come to love and defend, she resorted to her usual rhetoric, damning the United States for what she called the creation and financing and commanding of a "neocolonial administration in South Vietnam."

The Fonda family apparently went to North Vietnam to make a movie which condemns the South Vietnam Government and its American allies. All of this is not surprising of course. What is surprising is that our Government continues to let her continue, with complete freedom, these treasonable pronouncements.

According to article III, section 3 of the Constitution:

Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort. No Person shall be convicted of Treason unless on the Testimony of two Witnesses to the same overt Act, or on Confession in open court.

Needless to say Mr. Speaker, she has given comfort to the enemy. And further, we have more than enough witnesses to attest to it.

As sick as I am over Jane Fonda and her anti-American diatribes, I shall continue in this body to expose her to all my colleagues and all Americans.

I submit for the RECORD the following article describing her latest foray into North Vietnam as printed in the April 28, 1974, edition of the Washington Post:

JANE FONDA HITS UNITED STATES FROM HANOI

HONG KONG, April 27.—American actress Jane Fonda has charged that the United States has created, financed and is commanding a "neo-colonial administration in South Vietnam."

Miss Fonda levelled the charge in a taped interview with the North Vietnam News Agency, which dispatched the story from Hanoi today.

Accompanied by her husband, Tom Hayden, on a tour of the post-war North Vietnam, she said: "As long as there are three flags in Vietnam, and particularly two flags in the South, the war is not over. If there are two flags in the South, it is not because there is a civil war, it is because the U.S. has created, financed and is commanding a neo-colonial administration in the south."

MRS. MATILDA M. GAYER

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, life is so uncertain and death so certain; however, we are never ready to give up our loved ones. On April 22, 1974 Mrs. Matilda M. Gayer, a fine Christian wife and mother and Federal employee working for the Post Office in Zeigler, Ill. passed away. Mrs. Gayer's husband, Paul Gayer, is my friend and valued representative at large in charge of my 24th Congressional District Office in Illinois. Before joining my staff, Mr. Gayer was mayor and commissioner of public health and safety for many years in the city of Zeigler and his wife, Matilda, was one of those sterling characters who gave inspiration and dedication to her husband, her children, her church and her community. Mrs. Gayer will be sorely missed in the Zeigler community and I am sure all of my colleagues in the Congress join me in expressing deepest sympathy to Mr. Gayer and his family at the passing of Mrs. Gayer at the relatively young age of 60 from cancer.

Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that just this week we have passed in the House a bill

to accelerate our research in the dread disease of cancer. Let us hope that prevention and cure can be found before many other persons such as Mrs. Gayer are taken from us. Almost 1,000 persons die every day from this dread disease; therefore, I hope and pray that this plague can be stopped as soon as possible. Mrs. Gayer was gallant to the end but she has left a void that can never be filled.

Mr. Speaker, under previous order granted me I herewith enclose a copy of a resolution adopted by Mayor Kermit L. Beals and the entire city council of the city of Zeigler and attested to by the city clerk, Geneva Sciranko that I wish printed in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION

Whereas: Matilda M. Gayer, wife of Paul Gayer, did pass away April 22, 1974, and,

Whereas: Mrs. Gayer had worked for the Post Office Department for several years and contributed to the general welfare of the Community. Mr. Gayer served as Commissioner of Public Health and Safety for 14 years and as Mayor 4 years for the City of Zeigler, now therefore be it, and it is hereby

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Zeigler, Illinois that it be spread upon the minutes and records of the said City of Zeigler as a tribute to her memory and respect for services to the community. Be it further resolved that the City Hall be closed from 10:30 A. M. to 1:00 P. M. April 25, 1974 during the hour of the funeral and burial.

Issued and Recorded this 23rd Day of April, 1974.

11500 BANANAS ON PIKE'S PEAK

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11500, the bill to eradicate surface coal mining, requires the coal operator to restore land to the approximate original contour. In the interim enforcement program it permits a few deviations, under very stringent restrictions. But practically no deviations are allowed after the long-term reclamation regulations take effect.

In a burst of nature worship that would do credit to the Druids, the sponsors insist that the only acceptable configuration of the land is just the way weathering, gravity, erosion and other natural forces had shaped it on the day before it was mined. There are no deviations for better environmental protection or for agricultural use.

It does not matter if the land before mining was a rocky slope incapable of supporting any crop. It does not matter if the mine operator wants to level it, reshape it to control erosion and conserve soil and water. This bill would tell the mine operator, "Put it back like you found it."

Of course, the logical solution would be to allow the coal operator to shape the land for its best possible use as he is reclaiming it. But logic seems to have no place in this bill. It is as cockeyed as trying to grow bananas on Pike's Peak.

OIL PROFITS CONTINUE TO RISE—
GULF UP 76 PERCENT; TEXACO
UP 123 PERCENT; OCCIDENTAL
UP 718 PERCENT; STANDARD OIL
UP 92 PERCENT

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the big oil companies continue to reap high profits from the whirlwind of the energy crisis at the expense in large part of the American people who continue to pay exorbitant prices for gasoline at the pump.

For the first quarter of 1974, for example, big oil profits ranged up to 718 percent for Occidental Petroleum over the first quarter of 1973.

Exxon, the world leader in the oil industry, came up initially with a reported 39 percent increase in profits. It appears, however, that the profits of Exxon and some other companies may be even higher because of bookkeeping devices which charged against profits millions of dollars in reserves held back purportedly to pay off possible expenses that might be chargeable to the first quarter.

These substantial profits were, of course, reflected in higher prices of gasoline for the American people and underline the importance of the acceleration of research and development efforts directed toward developing alternative sources of energy for fossil fuels such as gasoline and oil.

The \$2.2 billion special energy research and development appropriations bill recently passed by the House is therefore an historic bill—and a significant step in the right direction of energy self-sufficiency and independence by the United States.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in the high profits of the major oil companies, I place in the RECORD herewith an editorial and excerpts from articles from the New York Times concerning these profits.

The editorial and articles follow:
[From the New York Times, Apr. 25, 1974]

OIL: FAT CITY

The first-quarter profit returns of the oil companies are coming in, and the results are staggering—a mirror image of the prices that consumers are paying. Exxon was, in a sense, low with a gain of only 39 per cent and first quarter earnings of \$705 million. Texaco was up 123 per cent to \$589 million, Gulf up 76 per cent to \$290 million, and Indiana Standard up 81 per cent to \$121 million. Occidental Petroleum, a relative pygmy, increased its first-quarter earnings by 718 per cent.

The new head of the Federal Energy Office, John C. Sawhill, has managed to take these oil earnings in stride; he finds them "reasonable," and indeed "vital to our future well-being." With professorial equanimity, Mr. Sawhill told a Senate committee, "Where price elicits new supply, it serves a useful economical function and benefits consumers with increased supply, which ultimately results in lower prices."

It is difficult to argue with anyone's "ultimately," but what has actually happened to date is clear enough: As the price of this na-

tion's domestic crude oil has nearly tripled in the past eight months, domestic crude oil production has scarcely increased. In fact, in the last two months, domestic crude output has been 2 percent less than a year ago.

The explanation appears to be that crude oil stock are now slightly higher than a year ago, and producers are being careful not to let prices break downward. Refinery runs are also lower than a year earlier. Thus if the oil companies continue to be careful not to give consumers too much oil, prices should hold up nicely. So, for 1974, oil profits promise to double over 1973, and reach about \$8 billion.

The Administration continues to champion a so-called "windfall profits tax," but the version of this tax likely to emerge from the House Ways and Means Committee would not yield much revenue after its first year. This is because a "plowback" provision would permit the oil companies to recapture their windfall tax payments if they reinvested them in oil production—as they are likely to do anyway.

The plowback rule would not apply in 1974 and the windfall tax would thus yield about \$500 million this year. But the effect would be cut in half in 1975, and thereafter the oil companies could recapture the whole of any remaining windfall taxes.

Ways and Means has voted to phase out the 22 per cent oil depletion allowance by 1977—but with a string of exceptions for natural gas, small "stripper" wells, the first 3,000 barrels a day of other wells and the Alaska pipe line. The Alaska project is being given until 1979 to get in on depletion allowances before the goodies run out.

With the kind of profits the oil industry is making, it needs no special tax breaks any longer—if it ever did. The plowback provision of the proposed windfall tax should be eliminated entirely, not just in 1974. And Congress should act now to abolish oil depletion allowances without a long phase-out—and without exceptions.

[From the New York Times]

CONTINENTAL OIL RAISES NET 130 PERCENT—FIRST QUARTER'S PROFIT \$2.16 A SHARE AGAINST 94 CENTS—OTHER GAINS POSTED

(By Ernest Holsendolph)

The Continental Oil Company, eighth largest of the nation's oil companies, reported yesterday a 130 per cent increase in profits for the first quarter as the industry continued to show huge gains over its 1973 performance.

Profits for the first three months reached \$109.2-million, or \$2.16 a share, on sales of \$1.6-billion, compared with \$47.5-million, or 94 cents a share, on sales of \$931-million last year.

Two smaller companies, the Getty Oil Company and the Amerada Hess Corporation, also registered large gains.

Getty's net income rose more than 122 per cent to \$73.6-million, or \$3.93 a share, on sales of \$655.3-million, compared with \$33.1-million, or \$1.75 a share, on sales of \$400-million last year. The first quarter of 1973 included an extraordinary gain of \$6.1-million that did not recur this year.

Amerada Hess reported a first-quarter gain of 36 per cent as profits amounted to \$49.9-million, or \$1.33 a share, on sales of \$983-million, compared with \$36.7-million, or 99 cents a share, on sales of \$405-million in the first quarter of 1973.

The Standard Oil Company of California, which is expected to announce first-quarter results today at its annual meeting, said it would increase its quarterly dividend 7½ cents to 50 cents a share, payable June 10 to stockholders of record May 10.

Nine of the top 16 oil companies now have reported for the first three months, showing profits above the \$1.218-billion a year earlier.

Every company that has reported so far has had an increase from last year, attributable at least in part to higher prices for crude oil and oil products here and abroad.

Continental Oil's chairman, John G. McLean, said his company's earnings came from worldwide petroleum and chemical sales. But he added that the quarter also reflected about \$65-million of "inventory profits," as the company was able to sell lower-cost inventories for higher prices after Jan. 1.

Mr. McLean said these inventory profits were not likely to recur this year.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 27, 1974]

UNDERSTATING OF OIL PROFITS ALLEGED BY SOME ANALYSTS—BUT PROVISION ON FUTURE COSTS IS HELD PRUDENT BY OTHER EXPERTS
(By Ernest Holsendolph)

Profits reported by major oil companies for the first quarter have shown increases averaging nearly 80 per cent from a year ago, but some analysts estimate that they may be much higher.

A number of oil companies, including Exxon, Texaco, Mobil and others, indicated that they had set aside certain amounts of profits to cover first-quarter costs that might be incurred later this year. Such costs could include tax increases and higher retroactive costs of Middle East crude oil.

Some accountants and analysts described the moves by oil companies to "reserve" money for these costs as "prudent." They cited certain precedents for this, such as provision for higher expected labor costs by companies involved in union negotiations, where retroactive pay may be at stake.

The nation's second biggest oil company after Exxon, the Mobil Oil Corporation, reported yesterday a 66 per cent first-quarter profit gain, to \$258.6-million, and an increase in the quarterly dividend to 80 cents from 75.

Earlier this week, the Exxon Corporation, at the same time that it reported profits of \$705-million in the first quarter, said that it had held a reserve an unspecified amount of revenue to pay for possible retroactive taxes and to pay for expected increases in crude oil produced in the first three months.

Robert A. Albrecht, an oil analyst for Reynolds Securities, was reported to have said yesterday that Exxon might have held back more than \$400-million for these purposes, thereby avoiding the disclosure of more than a billion dollars in profit—which would have been a 118 per cent increase in earnings for the quarter.

But in its earnings announcement on Tuesday, Exxon said its increase was 39 per cent over the \$508-million posted in the same quarter of 1973.

Archie L. Monroe, controller of Exxon, said yesterday that Exxon had set aside \$37-million for possible retroactive taxes on some "nonpetroleum sources of income," but he refused to say how much allowance the company had made for higher-cost oil.

\$10-BILLION REVENUE

"We are not in a position to disclose that number," Mr. Monroe said. "We had a \$10-billion revenue quarter, and there were many costs that accrued—but it would be unfair to pull out one of those costs."

Texaco and Mobil indicated that they had put aside reserves to cover possible increases in crude oil costs, but they said that they had not provided for higher taxes.

Texaco said it had charged to earnings \$143-million in the first quarter for possible increased crude oil costs. Without that charge, the company would have had profits of \$742-million, a 181 per cent increase over the performance of the same quarter in 1973.

Instead, with the \$143-million charge, the company indicated profits of \$589-million, for a 123 per cent increase.

No other company specified the amount allowed for higher crude oil costs.

If the oil companies must finally buy back 40 per cent of the oil produced at or near the \$11-dollar-a-barrel posted prices, their retroactive costs for the first quarter will be much higher than they were last year at about \$3 a barrel.

A CATEGORICAL DENIAL

J. K. Jamieson, chairman of Exxon, denied yesterday categorically that his company had misstated its first-quarter earnings. He went on to say that Exxon's earnings report had been prepared in accordance with accepted accounting principles and that the accounting principles involved were reviewed with Price, Waterhouse, the company's auditors, prior to their release.

In its record performance last year, Exxon's profits were \$2.44-billion for the 12 months.

[From the New York Times]

MOBIL OIL RAISES NET 66 PERCENT IN QUARTER—DIVIDEND LIFTED TO 80 CENTS FROM 75 CENTS AS EARNINGS INCREASE \$103 MILLION—FOREIGN OPERATION GAIN—COMPANY ATTRIBUTES PORTION OF HIGHER PROFITS TO AN ADVANCE IN CRUDE PRICES
(By Ernest Holsendolph)

The Mobil Oil Corporation, second largest in the nation, yesterday announced a 66 per cent increase in first-quarter net income to \$258-million, compared with \$155-million in the same period last year.

On a per-share basis, the record earnings were \$2.54 a share, compared with \$1.53—on total quarterly revenues of \$4.4-billion—compared with \$2.8-billion in 1973.

The company also announced that it was raising its quarterly dividend to 80 cents a share from 75 cents. The new dividend is payable June 10 to stockholders of record May 6. The company said this brings the first six months' total to \$1.60 a share, compared with \$1.40 a share in the period a year earlier.

In a statement by Rawleigh Warner Jr., chairman of Mobil, the company said it increased United States earnings for the quarter from \$49-million to \$66-million, and the price of crude oil—which was \$3 a barrel higher than it was in the first quarter of 1973—made this possible.

PROFITS RISE EXPLORED

"The increased profit attributable to this crude oil price increase was greater than the entire earnings increase from our U.S. petroleum operations," Mr. Warner said. He went on to say that the company was unable to recover higher costs incurred in domestic refining and marketing operations.

Earnings from Mobil's foreign petroleum operations increased from \$109-million in the first three months of 1973 to \$177-million in the same quarter this year, Mr. Warner said.

As with Exxon, Texaco and other multinational oil companies, Mobil said its foreign earnings were based on estimated costs on Middle East crude oil because pending negotiations with producer nations are likely to result in higher costs for oil already drawn from the fields in the first quarter.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 26, 1974]

PROFITS UP 92 PERCENT FOR STANDARD OIL OF CALIFORNIA AND 52 PERCENT AT SHELL
(By Ernest Holsendolph)

The Standard Oil Company of California, the fifth largest oil company in the nation, announced first-quarter profits yesterday that increased 92 per cent over results for the first three months of 1973.

And the Shell Oil Company, one of only two large oil companies, that had a decline in profits in the fourth quarter, recorded

yesterday a 52 percent gain in earnings for the first quarter. The other company was the Standard Oil Company (Ohio), which had a 29 per cent rise in first-quarter profits.

For Socal, first-quarter net income totaled \$293-million or \$1.72 a share, on sales volume of \$3.9-billion, compared to \$153-million, or 90 cents, on volume of \$1.9-billion.

Shell, the domestic subsidiary of the Royal Dutch Shell Group, disclosed first-quarter net income of \$121.8-million, or \$1.81 a share, on sales of \$1.9-billion, compared with \$80.2-million, or \$1.19 per share, on volume of \$1.3-billion.

Eleven of the top 16 oil companies in the nation have now reported first-quarter results, and, for the group, aggregate net income has risen 77 per cent, from \$1.45-billion in 1973 to \$2.66-billion this year.

The huge gains in profits have put some oil companies on the defensive in recent months. Yesterday, Socal, in an annual meeting, noted that its first-quarter earnings were "an increase of 3 per cent" over the fourth-quarter results without mentioning that the profits were nearly double what they were a year ago—or that fourth-quarter results were 94 per cent ahead of the same quarter in 1972.

H. J. Haynes, chairman of Socal, told shareholders gathered in San Francisco that the company's huge improvement was attributable to improved margins in foreign operations and higher crude oil prices in the United States.

INVENTORY PROFITS CITED

He said that, like many other multinational companies, Socal realized large inventory profits on its oil reserves, built up when costs were low and then sold at the higher prices allowed in the first quarter.

Without this non-recurring advantage, Mr. Haynes said, "our company would have had essentially no increase in profits in the quarter as compared with the year-earlier period."

In another statement that appeared calculated to play down the big profit gain, Mr. Haynes said in a statement: "In contrast to the last quarter of 1973, the company's profits in the United States did improve modestly, but still only produced an annual rate of return statement released after its anon invested capital of about 6 per cent."

Actually the integrated company does more business abroad than it does domestically, and consequently its rate of return is much larger than 6 per cent over-all.

Harry Bridges, president of Shell, told a shareholder meeting in Houston that "by far the most important factor in the earnings performance was the higher prices received for crude oil produced in the United States."

UNSATISFACTORY LEVELS

But he said that earnings from oil marketing and manufacturing operations "remain at unsatisfactory levels" because the industry was prohibited by the Government from raising prices to a level to cover inflationary costs.

Shell, which is mainly a United States company, reported that chemical operations helped to lead the earnings recovery as revenues rose 41 per cent to \$252-million for the quarter.

PAPER POLLUTION

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, I thought my fellow colleagues might be interested in the following editorial published in

the Oakland Republican issue of May 2, 1974. Its content is self-explanatory, its message compelling:

PAPER POLLUTION

Business men are getting fed up with the great amount and they feel unnecessary mountain of paper work the government is requiring them to do daily, weekly, monthly, and on and on, in order to conduct their business. This certainly merits attention. They are already bombarding congressmen, federal officials and state legislators with complaints about the growing piles of records, forms, surveys and other documents that have to be filled out for various agencies.

Most of the time it is the small business man who is hardest hit and he appears to be complaining the hardest. The small business man as a rule doesn't have the money to hire another person just to take care of the paper work, and must spend long hours just to keep his head above the paper blizzard.

An article in U.S. News and World Report on this mountain of paper work quotes a small business man as saying more than 50 percent of his time is on unproductive requirements that did not exist a few years ago but now come under the guise of "fact finding" or "consumer protection."

Lack of coordination and duplication of effort are among the biggest gripes.

Since the Occupational Safety and Health Act was passed two years ago employers have had to file detailed reports on their compliance with health and safety standards. Other agencies take a similar amount of time and the small business man is really "run ragged."

In response to the rising tide of complaints the White House asked for a study, and hearings are being held in Congress. We can only hope that the end result might be a drastic reduction in the number of forms needed to actually survive in business, even when business is profitable.

NATIONAL MIGRANT EDUCATION WEEK

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I and several of my colleagues have introduced today a concurrent resolution declaring May 12 through 18 "National Migrant Education Week." This action is a first step in demonstrating congressional awareness of and concern for the special educational needs of migrant children. It is also a call for renewed efforts on the part of educators and legislators on the local, State, and national levels to meet the needs of the 2½ million children who follow the crops with their families—Americans who, despite their mobility, remain the people left behind.

More tragic than the plight of adult migrants is the future of their children. Forced into the fields at an early age, migrant children are deprived of educational opportunities that would enable them to escape migrancy in later life. Because of demands of migrant life and the need to help with the harvest, migrant children become the unnoticed dropouts, condemned to repeat the poverty of their parents. Few have the opportunity to advance beyond the third

grade of school. Unfortunately, our school systems are not committed to meeting the educational needs of these children. Lack of school records creates placement problems. Teaching materials are not culturally relevant or sensitive to the migrant experience, nor do they adequately deal with language differences.

While Congress has begun to provide for the special educational needs of migrant children, more has to be done, especially in the area of vocational education and counseling. Programs to encourage migrants to return to high school and continue on to college, begun by OEO and transferred last year to the Department of Labor, must be expanded. Remedial vocational education programs for migrant adults should be strengthened to give displaced workers a second chance.

It is my hope that Congress will not ignore its responsibility to the vast number of migrant children who have the right to an equal education in this country. I am pleased to have Representatives THOMPSON, BRADEN, FORD, McFALL, O'HARA, and PERKINS join me in this call for equality and concern for migrant children.

The concurrent resolution follows:

H. CON. RES. —

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

Whereas the migrant families which harvest food for this country's table are a unique national resource;

Whereas these families have, by the nature of their employment, no permanent home in any city, county, or State;

Whereas migrant children number over two and one-half million and rarely advance beyond the third grade of school;

Whereas the circumstances of these families often confine their children's lives to the fields;

Whereas the migrant education program is the only force currently providing migrant children choices, not circumstances, for their future; and

Whereas in recognition of the need for better continuous education of migrant children: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States hereby—

(1) designates May 12 through May 18, 1974, as National Migrant Education Week; and

(2) requests each Federal agency having programs which relate to migrant education to recognize such week by taking such actions as it may deem appropriate.

HOUSE REFORM EFFORT LAUDED

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, as the House reform effort reaches a climax it is good that the public and press is focusing on this body and ways that it might better perform its vital constitutional functions.

In this connection I urge my colleagues to note the Washington Post editorial, "Housecleaning in the House" published

April 30, 1974. It correctly notes the crucial and painful conflict between the career and personal problems which the Bolling committee's proposals would require and the long range institutional interests of the House and of the American people in having a more responsive, active institution.

While the House may wish to make some adjustments and changes in the Select Committee's detailed plan, it is in my judgment a carefully thought out package that moves committee jurisdictions together in a more rational way and provides for future flexibility in the years ahead. I believe it will strengthen the House as against the Senate and equip us to legislate today's and tomorrow's problems in a more orderly productive way.

The editorial follows:

HOUSECLEANING IN THE HOUSE

If ideas can be measured by the opposition they arouse, the package of House reforms advanced by Rep. Richard Bolling's Select Committee on Committees must be either very good or very bad. The swarm of active opponents of the plan includes Ways and Means Committee Chairman Wilbur D. Mills, Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee Chairman Leonor K. Sullivan, Rep. John D. Dingell, Rep. Phillip Burton, the AFL-CIO, the National Association of Manufacturers, transportation lobbies and some environmental groups. When such a formidable array of powers and interests becomes mobilized, something substantial has to be afoot.

What has stirred up all of these forces is an ambitious, bipartisan plan to overhaul the House committee system. Many in and outside Congress have been advocating such a housecleaning for years, in order to enhance the efficiency, capacity and image of the House and to improve members' ability to deal with complex subjects and to ride herd on the executive branch. But now that the select committee, under Rep. Bolling's determined leadership, has finished its year of study and presented a bold blueprint for reform, the predictable howls of protest have begun.

Many of the complaints arise from the select committee's attempts to equalize and rationalize committee workloads and jurisdictions. Rep. Mills, for instance, is mightily displeased because the Ways and Means Committee, which has gradually extended its domain over about 20 per cent of all the measures introduced in the House, would lose most of its authority over health and trade legislation. Others object to splitting the Education and Labor Committee, or to consolidating subjects such as transportation and environmental affairs, which are now fragmented among several groups. Some liberals and labor groups also fear that their influence would be diluted by other proposed reforms which would prohibit proxy voting and limit representatives to service on one of the 15 major committees.

Many of these objections obviously spring from self-interest or a fear that cozy relationships between legislators and lobbyists would be disturbed. Others are based on pessimistic speculation. Some environmental groups, for instance, worry that the proposed committee on energy and the environment would be industry-dominated, but that seems hard to demonstrate in advance, especially at a time of such extensive turnover in the membership of the House. What does seem clear is that many small baronies would be shaken up and substantial power would be reapportioned among more members of the House. The impact may be hard to predict in terms of issues or ideologies. In institutional terms, however, such a periodic re-

ordering is both healthy and overdue, since House committees were last overhauled in 1946.

Whatever its imperfections, the select committee's plan is the most serious—and promising—attempt in a generation to inject coherence and vitality into a legislative scheme which is now burdened with overlaps, imbalances and incongruities. It would be silly to expect too much; no reorganization, by itself, can restore the effectiveness and public esteem which the Congress has squandered over the years. At minimum, however, the committee's plan seems likely to make the domains of many House committees more rational, to open many panels to new viewpoints and considerations, and to insure that many complicated subjects will receive better scrutiny. All this is highly desirable. Important hurdles are still ahead: the House Democratic caucus, which has promoted many useful changes in the workings of the House, is still stewing over this plan, and action by the Rules Committee has not been scheduled yet. It would be a sad day if either panel put a few selfish concerns ahead of the long-range institutional interests of the House, and failed to advance one of the most provocative and potentially valuable reforms in many years.

WATERGATE CHRONOLOGY: A COMPENDIUM OF SCANDAL AND REVELATIONS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, when five agents of President Nixon's campaign were arrested at the Democratic National Committee's Watergate headquarters on June 17, 1972, White House Press Secretary Ronald Ziegler labeled the incident "a third-rate burglary." The Watergate break-in has since called "the opening act of one of America's greatest tragedies."

Watergate has mushroomed into a political scandal of unprecedented dimensions, with allegations, indictments, and events coming in rapid, bewildering succession. As Congress and the country debate impeachment of President Nixon, it is important to clarify our perception of the Watergate kaleidoscope.

From this chronology there emerges a clear picture of the Nixon administration showing flagrant and systematic violation of constitutional rights, subversion of the electoral process through illegal fund raising and campaign sabotage activities, abuse of the Federal bureaucratic machinery and willful obstruction of justice.

The chronology shows that Nixon illegalities began in 1969, for almost as soon as he became President, Richard Nixon began secret bombing of Cambodia and authorized illegal wiretaps on 17 reporters and Government officials. It also shows consistent White House efforts to block or impede the course of the Watergate investigation.

Yet despite Nixon's efforts to prevent full disclosure of the facts, the Watergate "bombshells" have continued. Now almost 2 years after the discovery of the Watergate break-in, we know that in un-

dermining public faith in the integrity of our leaders and governmental institutions, President Nixon and his administration have delivered the most sinister attack on American democracy in our Nation's history.

The chronology follows:

WATERGATE CHRONOLOGY

(Compiled by Americans for Democratic Action)

1969

January 20: Richard Nixon becomes President. John N. Mitchell is named attorney general. H. R. Haldeman becomes White House chief of staff, and Ronald Ziegler is appointed Nixon's press secretary.

March: Nixon begins secret bombing of Cambodia.

May: Nixon authorizes illegal "national security" wiretaps on 17 reporters and high government officials after leaks of information on SALT and the bombing of Cambodia.

August: At the request of the White House, the I.R.S. sets up an "Activist Organizations Group," later renamed the "Special Services Group," to crack down on "extremist organizations."

August 1: Justice Department initiates anti-trust proceedings against ITT in connection with an ITT-Hartford merger.

November: John D. Ehrlichman becomes Nixon's chief domestic advisor.

1970

April 30: Nixon announces invasion of Cambodia. Though U.S. air strikes begun in March 1969 total 3,875 by May 1970, Nixon tells the American people the U.S. has not moved against enemy sanctuaries in Cambodia for five years.

July: John Dean III becomes counsel to the President.

July 23: Nixon approves the "Huston Plan" calling for use of illegal methods to gather intelligence on demonstrators and domestic radicals. Five days later, Nixon allegedly rescinds his approval.

September: Pentagon allegedly begins pilfering of secret National Security Council documents, a project which continues through December 1971.

December: White House forms "Inter-agency Evaluation Committee" to serve essentially the same purpose as the Huston Plan, which apparently never went into effect.

December 16: Dairy industry group writes letter promising a \$2 million contribution to the 1972 Republican campaign in return for curbs on dairy imports.

December 31: Nixon places import quotas on certain dairy products.

1971

January 19: Herbert Kalmbach, Nixon's personal attorney, becomes unofficial fund raiser for Nixon's re-election campaign and begins soliciting illegal corporate contributions.

February: "National security" wiretaps authorized by Nixon in May 1969, and later declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, are terminated.

Spring: Nixon begins secret taping of all Oval Office conversations, ostensibly for historic purposes.

March 12: Agriculture Department announces decision not to raise milk price supports.

March 25: Shortly after a meeting between Nixon and milk producers, Agriculture Department announces milk price support increase. Nixon campaign contributions from the dairy industry—eventually totaling at least \$427,500—are forthcoming.

May 3-5: May Day—Over 13,000 anti-war demonstrators are illegally arrested in Washington, D.C.

June: Pentagon Papers are published in the *New York Times* after being leaked by

Daniel Ellsberg, Nixon directs creation of the White House "Plumbers" group, headed by Egil Krogh, Jr., and David Young, to investigate the matter. Ehrlichman hires E. Howard Hunt and G. Gordon Liddy to investigate Daniel Ellsberg.

June 25: Dita Beard, an ITT lobbyist, writes memo linking ITT pledge of \$400,000 for the Republican convention in San Diego to favorable settlement of the anti-trust case against ITT.

July 23: At Ehrlichman's request, C.I.A. Deputy Director Robert Cushman meets with Hunt to provide logistical aid and equipment for Hunt's "highly sensitive mission."

July 31: ITT anti-trust case is settled favorably for ITT.

August: Nixon approves Hunt-Liddy trip to California to develop information on Daniel Ellsberg.

August 5: ITT deposits \$100,000 in the bank account of the G.O.P. Convention Bureau in San Diego.

September: Hired by presidential aides, campaign saboteur Donald Segretti begins recruiting Nixon supporters to act as spies in Democratic campaigns and to perform "dirty tricks."

September 3: Ellsberg's psychiatric records are burglarized from Dr. Louis Fielding's office in Los Angeles. The burglary is financed with Nixon campaign money.

October 15: Billy Graham Day, Charlotte, N.C.—The Secret Service is involved in widespread violations of civil liberties at observances honoring Billy Graham.

December: Liddy becomes general counsel to the Committee to Re-elect the President (CREEP) and begins developing an intelligence plan for use in the campaign.

1972

January 27: Mitchell, Dean, Deputy Director of CREEP Jeb Magruder, and Liddy meet to discuss Liddy's proposed \$1 million intelligence plan. Liddy is told to develop a "more reasonable plan."

February 4: Mitchell, Dean and Magruder consider and reject a second Liddy intelligence plan, but instruct Liddy to continue his planning.

February 15: Maurice Stans becomes financial chairman of CREEP and immediately begins stepped-up fund-raising efforts.

February 29: Columnist Jack Anderson breaks story linking favorable settlement of the ITT anti-trust case to Nixon campaign contribution and implicating Mitchell and Kleindienst in the affair.

March: White House aide Charles Colson writes memo to Haldeman warning of evidence which could "directly involve" the President in the ITT scandal.

March 1: Mitchell resigns as attorney general to become director of CREEP.

March 29, 30: Mitchell, Mitchell's aide Fred LaRue and Magruder meet in Key Biscayne, Florida, and Liddy's third plan calling for illegal entry into and wiretapping of the D.N.C.'s Watergate headquarters is approved.

April 3: Gulf Resources President Robert Allen contributes \$100,000 to Nixon's campaign, and the E.P.A. subsequently abandons a pollution case against Gulf's principal mining and smelting company.

April 5: Hugh Sloan, CREEP finance committee treasurer, receives the Allen contribution after it has been "laundered" in Mexico and gives some of this money to Watergate conspirator G. Gordon Liddy.

April 7: New disclosure law requiring strict financial reporting of campaign contributions takes effect. CREEP has collected \$19.9 million in legal and illegal campaign contributions prior to this date.

April 10: Financier Robert Vesco, under investigation by the S.E.C. for stock fraud, makes a secret \$200,000 contribution to the Nixon campaign.

May 27: First Watergate break-in and wire-tapping of the D.N.C.'s headquarters takes place undetected. Magruder, according

to his own testimony, begins supplying Mitchell with copies of information obtained from the wiretaps.

June 9: Congress confirms Richard G. Kleindienst as attorney general.

June 17: Second Watergate break-in occurs, and five agents of the Nixon campaign are arrested by the Washington, D.C. police.

June 19: Press Secretary Ronald Ziegler labels Watergate break-in "a third-rate burglary."

June 20: Nixon, Haldeman and Ehrlichman, according to the Haldeman memo, meet to plan a "PR offensive" to divert attention from Watergate. During a telephone conversation with Nixon, Mitchell, according to his own testimony, tells the President that only the five men arrested at Watergate were involved.

June 22: Referring to the Watergate break-in, Nixon says the White House has had "no involvement whatever" in the matter.

June 23: At Nixon's request, White House aides Haldeman and Ehrlichman meet with C.I.A. officials Helms and Walters to discuss limiting the F.B.I.'s Watergate investigation.

June 28: Acting F.B.I. head L. Patrick Gray III, at a meeting with Dean and Ehrlichman, is given Hunt documents which Dean labels "political dynamite" and says "should never see the light of day."

June 29: Nixon's attorney Herbert Kalmbach begins funneling secret payments to Watergate conspirators.

July 1: John Mitchell resigns as Nixon's campaign manager after Martha Mitchell demands publicly that he leave politics and "all those dirty things that go on."

July 6: Gray calls Nixon to express concern over the interference of White House aides in the F.B.I.'s Watergate investigation, stating, "People on your staff are trying to mortally wound you." Nixon tells Gray to press ahead with the investigation.

August 1: G.A.O. begins investigation of CREEP finances after the *Washington Post* reports that a \$25,000 Nixon campaign contribution was deposited in the bank account of one of the men arrested at Watergate.

August 26: G.A.O. issues first of several reports citing Nixon's re-election finance committee for apparent violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.

August 27: CREEP Finance Chairman Maurice Stans denounces the G.A.O.'s report.

August 28: Attorney General Kleindienst announces the F.B.I.'s investigation of Watergate will be the "most extensive, thorough and comprehensive" investigation since Kennedy's assassination.

August 29: Nixon claims all those currently employed in his administration have been cleared of complicity in Watergate by an investigation by John Dean.

August 30: Nixon says he will not comply with a Democratic suggestion that a special, nonpartisan prosecutor instead of a Justice Department attorney be assigned to the Watergate case.

September 15: Grand jury indicts James W. McCord, Jr., Bernard L. Barker, Frank A. Sturgis, Eugenio Martinez, Virgilio Gonzales, E. Howard Hunt, and Gordon Liddy for their involvement in the Watergate break-in. At a meeting in the Oval Office, Nixon, Haldeman and Dean discuss Watergate and related matters. The President, according to Dean, commends Dean on doing a "good job" and says he is pleased the Watergate case has "stopped with Liddy."

October 10: CREEP dismisses *Washington Post* report of a widespread Republican network of espionage and sabotage directed against Democrats as "a collection of absurdities."

October 23: Citing Justice Department files, *Time* magazine reports that Donald Segretti was hired by White House aides Dwight Chapin and Gordon Strachan and was paid more than \$35,000 by Nixon fund raiser Kalmbach to sabotage the campaigns of Nixon's Democratic rivals.

November 7: Richard Nixon is re-elected President in a landslide victory.

December: Gray destroys Hunt documents received June 28, 1972.

1973

January 8: Trial of Watergate defendants Barker, Sturgis, Martinez, Gonzales, McCord, Hunt and Liddy begins, with Judge John Sirica presiding.

January 11: Defendant E. Howard Hunt pleads guilty.

January 15: Defendants Barker, Sturgis, Martinez and Gonzales also plead guilty.

January 26: CREEP finance committee is fined \$8,000 after pleading no contest to charges of failing to report to the G.A.O. cash sums given to Liddy by treasurer Hugh Sloan.

January 30: Liddy and McCord are convicted for illegal activities in connection with the Watergate break-in.

February 7: Senate Watergate Committee is established by a unanimous vote of the Senate.

February 27, 28: President Nixon evinces complete awareness of the Watergate cover-up and reassures John Dean that he has no legal problems, according to testimony by Dean.

February 28: Senate hearings on L. Patrick Gray for confirmation as permanent F.B.I. director begin, and new disclosures are made about CREEP officials' efforts to impede the F.B.I.'s Watergate investigation.

March 3: Attorney General Kleindienst testifies he was not pressured to drop the ITT antitrust case.

March 13: Nixon, according to testimony by Dean, says he has approved executive clemency for Hunt and there will be "no problem" raising \$1 million to silence Watergate participants.

March 17: Nixon learns of the Ellsberg break-in but does not immediately disclose this to Judge Matt Byrne, who is presiding at the Ellsberg trial.

March 21: According to his own account, President Nixon first learns of the Watergate cover-up, "personally assume(s) responsibility for conducting intensive new inquiries into the matter," and orders those conducting the investigations to report directly to him.

March 23: Judge Sirica makes public a letter received from McCord which charges that perjury was committed at the Watergate trial and that defendants were pressured to plead guilty and keep silent.

March 24: McCord tells Senate investigators that John Dean and Jeb Magruder had advance knowledge of the Watergate break in.

April 5: Gray's nomination as F.B.I. director is withdrawn, and Nixon and Ehrlichman meet with Judge Byrne to sound him out for the vacant F.B.I. post.

April 14: Ehrlichman, according to his own account, gives Nixon a complete report on the Watergate cover-up.

April 15: Dean, according to his own testimony, tells Nixon he has gone to the U.S. attorney's office to report the Watergate cover-up. Nixon, according to Dean, says he had been "joking" when he approved raising \$1 million for the Watergate defendants and was "foolish" to have discussed executive clemency with White House counsel Charles Colson.

April 17: Nixon announces there have been "major new developments in the case." After ten months of assailing Watergate news stories as "fiction," Press Secretary Ziegler declares past White House statements on Watergate "inoperative."

April 24: White House denies that Watergate defendants were offered executive clemency to plead guilty and remain silent.

April 26: Jeb Magruder, deputy director of CREEP, leaves the Department of Commerce, thereby becoming the first Nixon Adminis-

tration official to resign over the Watergate affairs.

April 27: Gray resigns as acting director of the F.B.I. after being implicated in the attempted Watergate cover-up. G.A.O. issues report charging Hugh Sloan, former Nixon campaign finance committee treasurer, with knowingly submitting false financial reports to the G.A.O. Office of Federal Elections in violation of the Federal Election Campaign Act.

April 30: Nixon announces the resignations of four of his closest aides: H. R. Haldeman, White House chief of staff, John Ehrlichman, chief domestic advisor, presidential counsel John Dean, and Attorney General Richard Kleindienst. The President nominates Elliot Richardson as attorney general, giving him full charge of the Administration's Watergate investigation and authority to appoint a Watergate special prosecutor. Accepting full responsibility for Watergate, Nixon pledges that justice will be pursued "fairly, fully and impartially, no matter who is involved."

May 4: Former campaign treasurer Hugh Sloan admits that a secret cash fund of \$1-2 million was never reported publicly.

May 9: Plumbers' head Egil Krogh resigns as under secretary of transportation. Nixon pledges Attorney General designate Richardson and the special prosecutor "will have the total cooperation of the executive branch in investigating the Watergate case."

May 10: Former Nixon cabinet officers Mitchell and Stans are indicted in connection with the Vesco contribution for which they allegedly promised to intercede on behalf of Vesco in a stock fraud case. Dean issues statement reporting efforts underway to prevent his testifying fully and freely.

May 11: Judge Byrne declares a "mistrial due to government misconduct" in the Pentagon Papers case and dismisses all charges against Daniel Ellsberg and Anthony Russo.

May 14: Deputy C.I.A. Director Lt. Vernon Walters says White House pressure was put on the C.I.A. to assist in the Watergate cover-up. John Dean denies ever having written, or been asked to write the so-called "Dean Report" referred to by Nixon on August 29, 1972.

May 16: Press Secretary Ziegler confirms a *New York Times* report that information for Nixon's August 29, 1972, statement did not come from a briefing by Dean as originally maintained. Former C.I.A. Director Helms testifies White House aides used Nixon's name in requesting C.I.A. aid in the Watergate cover-up.

May 17: Senate Select Committee on Watergate, chaired by Sam Ervin (D-N.C.), begins televised public hearings.

May 18: Attorney General designate Richardson names Archibald Cox as special Watergate prosecutor.

May 22: Nixon for the first time publicly admits Watergate cover-up efforts at the White House, but denies personal complicity. The cover-up, he claims, was necessary to protect "national security."

May 23: Elliot Richardson is confirmed as attorney general after a long Senate deadlock over the powers of the special prosecutor.

June 14: Former CREEP Deputy Director Magruder testifies that Mitchell approved the Watergate break-in and later participated in the cover-up.

June 20: CREEP finance committee is fined \$3,000 for failing to report the Vesco contribution.

June 25-29: Challenging Nixon's May 22, 1973 statement, John Dean testifies the President was aware of the Watergate cover-up as early as September 1972.

June 28: Senate Watergate Committee publishes list of 216 Americans on the White House "enemies" list.

July 6: American Airlines official admits to having donated \$55,000 in corporate funds to the Nixon campaign after solicitation by

Herbert Kalmbach. Subsequently, other corporations admit illegal contributions.

July 10: In testimony before the Senate Watergate Committee, John Mitchell denies having approved the Watergate break-in, but acknowledges his role in the cover-up.

July 13: *New York Times* reports that, according to their attorney, Watergate defendants Barker, Sturgis, Martinez, and Gonzalez pleaded guilty to the Watergate break-in because they were promised support payments and executive clemency by Hunt.

July 16: Surprise witness Alexander Butterfield, former deputy White House aide, discloses the existence of Oval Office tapes.

July 17: Senate Watergate Committee requests access to certain White House tapes. Dean's attorney predicts the tapes will corroborate his client's assertions about Nixon's awareness of a cover-up.

July 18: Special Prosecutor Cox asks for the tapes.

July 20: In a speech to the White House staff, Nixon says, "Let others wallow in Watergate, we are going to do our job."

July 23: Claiming "executive privilege," Nixon refuses to release the White House tapes. Senate Watergate Committee decides to subpoena the tapes, and Cox announces he too will seek subpoenas.

July 24: Ehrlichman, in testimony before the Senate Watergate Committee, cites "national security" as justification for White House intelligence operations.

July 27: Ehrlichman defends the Nixon campaign practice of spying on opposition candidates and states that the President was not fully briefed on Watergate until April 14, 1973.

July 30: Haldeman testifies that he and Nixon are innocent of wrongdoing in the Watergate affair, claiming they were "misled" by Dean.

July 31: Rep. Robert Drinan (D-Mass.) introduces first impeachment resolution.

August 2: Vice President Spiro Agnew is informed he is under federal investigation on charges of bribery, extortion and tax fraud.

August 6: Former F.B.I. head Patrick Gray testifies he received no orders after March 21, 1973, to report the progress of the F.B.I.'s Watergate investigation directly to the President.

August 14: In response to a federal prosecutor's request for his personal records, Vice President Agnew declares, "I have nothing to hide."

August 15: In an address to the nation, President Nixon again denies personal complicity in Watergate. Citing the need for confidentiality of presidential conversations and documents, Nixon says he will not turn over White House tapes to either the Senate Watergate Committee or the special prosecutor's office.

August 22: Nixon declares at a press conference, "We must move on from Watergate to the business of the people."

August 29: Judge Sirica issues court order for nine presidential tapes.

September 4: Krogh, Young, Liddy and Ehrlichman are indicted in connection with the Plumbers' break-in at the office of Ellsberg's psychiatrist.

October 1: Donald Segretti pleads guilty to having engaged in illegal campaign activities.

October 10: Vice President Agnew resigns after pleading no contest to income tax evasion.

October 12: Court of Appeals upholds Judge Sirica's order for White House tapes.

October 14: Rep. Jack Brooks (D-Tex.) says the expenditure of \$10 million in public funds on Nixon's private residences raises "serious questions of propriety."

October 19: Seeking resolution of the tapes controversy, the White House makes the "Stennis Compromise" offer: Sen. Stennis (D-Miss.) will be allowed to listen to the

tapes so he can attest to the veracity of White House transcripts. Special Prosecutor Cox rejects the offer. John Dean pleads guilty to obstruction of justice in the Watergate cover-up, saying he hopes that "others involved will also come forward and accept responsibility for their complicity."

October 20: "Saturday Night Massacre": Richard Nixon orders the firing of Special Prosecutor Cox; Attorney General Richardson and Deputy Attorney General Ruckelshaus resign rather than carry out Nixon's order; and Cox is ultimately fired by Solicitor General Robert Bork.

October 23: Yielding to public pressure, Nixon agrees to hand over the tapes.

October 30: House Judiciary Committee begins its impeachment inquiry.

October 31: Nixon's lawyers report to Judge Sirica that White House tapes of two key presidential conversations—Nixon's June 20, 1972 conversation with Mitchell and his April 15, 1973 conversation with Dean—do not exist. Former Attorney General Kleindienst admits for the first time that he was pressured by President Nixon to drop the ITT case.

November 1: Leon Jaworski is named as special prosecutor to replace Cox.

November 13: White House aide Stephen Bull testifies that Nixon knew about the missing tapes on September 29, 1973—a month before the White House announced their disappearance.

November 14: The firing of Cox is ruled illegal by U.S. District Court Judge Gerhard Gessell.

November 17: In response to newsmen's questions about his personal finances, Nixon declares at Disney World, "I am not a crook."

November 20: Having begun "Operation Candor," Nixon assures Republican governors there will be no more "bombshells."

November 21: White House reveals gap of 18½ minutes in tape of crucial June 20, 1972 conversation between Nixon and Haldeman.

November 26: Nixon's secretary Rose Mary Woods says that she may have caused the tape gap by inadvertently leaving her foot on the control pedal.

November 30: Panel of experts approved by the White House and the court begins examining the tape with the missing segment. Former Plumbers' head Krogh pleads guilty to federal charges in connection with the Ellsberg break-in.

December 6: Congress confirms Gerald Ford as Vice President.

December 8: Nixon releases his tax returns for the year 1969-72. Questions immediately arise concerning, among other things, the validity of a \$578,000 deduction taken for the donation of Nixon's vice-presidential papers to the National Archives.

1974

January 15: Electronics specialists appointed by the court conclude the 18½ minute tape gap could not have been caused accidentally in the manner suggested by Rose Mary Woods.

January 18: Judge Sirica recommends a grand jury investigation to determine whether indictments should be brought for criminal actions in the tape mystery.

January 30: In his state of the Union message, Nixon declares: "One year of Watergate is enough."

February 14: Special Prosecutor Leon Jaworski reports refusal of White House to comply with his request for tapes and documents relating to his investigation.

February 20: House Judiciary Committee staff study concludes that a President can be impeached for serious offenses against the public interest without proof of criminal misconduct.

February 25: Nixon declares at a press conference: "I do not expect to be impeached."

March 1: Watergate grand jury gives Judge Sirica a sealed report believed to deal with

Nixon's involvement in the Watergate cover-up.

March 2: Grand jury indicts seven of President Nixon's former White House and campaign aides for participation in the Watergate cover-up: H. R. Haldeman, John Ehrlichman, John Mitchell, former White House special counsel Charles W. Colson, former White House aide Gordon Strachan, former Assistant Attorney General Robert C. Mardian and CREEP Attorney Kenneth W. Parkinson.

March 6: Nixon once again insists that he never approved clemency or hush money for the Watergate defendants, but concludes that the tape of his March 21, 1973 meeting with Dean and Haldeman might lead to different conclusions.

March 12: Press Secretary Ziegler suggests the President will not supply the House Judiciary Committee with additional tapes until it defines an impeachable offense.

March 18: Judge Sirica rules that the Watergate grand jury's secret report should be turned over to the House Judiciary Committee.

March 19: Sen. James L. Buckley (Cons., R-N.Y.) becomes the first conservative Republican in Congress to call on Nixon to resign because of the Watergate scandal.

March 21: A House Government Operations Subcommittee reveals that over the past five years \$17 million in government funds have been spent on Nixon's San Clemente and Key Biscayne homes.

March 26: Federal Judge John Sirica gives the House impeachment inquiry the sealed report and the locked briefcase of evidence entrusted to him by the Watergate grand jury March 1.

April 3: The staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation finds that Nixon owes \$476,431, including interest, on back taxes for 1969 through 1972 for improper deductions and failure to pay capital gains taxes; Nixon agrees to pay \$432,787 plus interest that the Internal Revenue Service ruled was due. Lt. Gov. Ed Reinecke of California is indicted for allegedly having lied to a Senate Committee about the ITT pledge of money for the 1972 Republican National Convention.

April 5: Dwight Chapin, President Nixon's former appointments secretary, is convicted of two counts of perjury concerning his connection with political saboteur Donald Segretti.

April 11: The Judiciary Committee votes 33-3 to subpoena tapes and records of more than 40 presidential conversations.

April 28: John Mitchell and Maurice Stans are found innocent of all charges relating to the Vesco campaign contribution.

April 29: President Nixon agrees to turn over to the House Judiciary Committee edited transcripts of some of the subpoenaed Watergate tape recordings "blemishes and all."

May 1: The Judiciary Committee votes 20-18 to reject Nixon's delivery of edited transcripts rather than copies of the original tapes.

THE 183D ANNIVERSARY OF POLISH CONSTITUTION

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 2, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor and privilege to join with many of my colleagues in this special order commemorating the 183d anniversary of the signing of the Polish Constitution of 1791. As we celebrate this important day in the annals of world history, it is

only fitting that we take time to consider the tumultuous history of Poland since 1791, as well as pay tribute to the great contributions which the Polish American community has made to this Nation.

To Polish nationals and people of Polish ancestry everywhere in the world, this day is comparable to our own Fourth of July celebration. However, the similarity ends there. While we in the United States have realized and maintained the democratic ideals contained in our Constitution of 1789, for Poland, these have been years of tyrannical and oppressive occupation, and thus, they have far from achieved the great democratic goals contained in their constitution.

The greatness of the 1791 Polish Constitution lies in the principle it embodied; namely, the sovereignty of the people of the state. Yet an ironic and tragic indication of the present day control of the state over the people is seen in the fact that the people of Poland are not even permitted, by their Communist rulers, to celebrate this great national holiday.

We in the United States owe much to the Polish American community for their years of contribution to this Nation. They have served us in times of war, all the way from General Pulaski of the Revolutionary War to the thousands of Polish American who served in the Vietnam conflict. Further, they have achieved great successes in all facets of our cultural, political, and community life, and it is for these contributions that we as a nation pay tribute to them on this day.

It would serve us well to consider the present-day plight of the Polish people as well as those millions of other residents of Eastern Europe who continue to find themselves under the yoke of Communist oppression. We are embarking on an unprecedented era of international agreements between nations of widely divergent ideological ideas. Yet, before we can expect responsible participation by the Communists in these agreements, they must begin to permit the people they rule to have the right of self-determination. This is a fundamental right to a civilized society. The Polish people stand as examples of the inherent failure of communism, for while the Communists have ruthlessly deprived these people of basic freedom, their spirit and hopes for freedom remain as strong today as they were in 1791.

Mr. Speaker, as millions of Polish Americans celebrate this important day, let us as a nation redouble our efforts at championing the cause of true freedom and dignity for all the residents of the world community. If we are successful, the people of Poland may, after 183 years realize the true democratic ideals they so eloquently called for in their Constitution of 1791.

SOCIAL SECURITY COST-OF-LIVING DIFFERENTIALS

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, today the average elderly American living on a fixed

retirement income is at best living marginally. For those who happen to be living in major metropolitan areas, such as my home city of New York, an added burden is imposed; their fixed incomes are not enough to cope with the cost of living in places like New York City. Many retired New Yorkers find that they come out about \$100 short annually, which, although not a huge sum to a working person, looms very large in the estimation of the older citizen.

They desperately require some form of balancing mechanism to make up the difference in order to remain on a subsistence level. Therefore, I am joining in sponsorship of a bill that would, indeed, make available such special cost-of-living increases to older people in such high-price areas. It would guarantee the elderly a realistic annual minimum income above the level of enforced poverty. Current law already mandates annual cost-of-living increases for all, regardless of where they reside. But such a requirement fails to take into account differences between living in a large city and in rural areas.

We must sadly come to grips once again with a prime fact of life for the 25 million older people in the Nation; that from their ranks are coming the largest number of new recruits for those who are called poor. Further, inflation is cutting enormous swaths in their purchasing power. Job opportunities for them are minimal and decreasing. Federal programs for them are in disarray. All in all, time is of the essence, and we should act with dispatch.

Erosion of actual purchasing power is not just a catch phrase. The situation is serious for those in urban areas of size. The goods and services obtained by an elderly person in the rural South for \$1,788.64 would cost the same person \$1,867.88 in Baton Rouge, \$2,195.48 in New York City, and \$2,296.28 in San Francisco. These are figures offered by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for minimum levels of subsistence for older persons in those areas. But the social security check received by the elderly is the same everywhere in the United States—\$2,087.60 annually for the average retired worker. Many receive much less for a variety of reasons.

In New York, therefore, the average retiree is \$100 short annually. This means that Federal programs reaching such people should reflect the differences in realities of life where such people live. That is the purpose of the bill I am joining in supporting now.

It would establish a minimum standard of income for older Americans of \$3,850 a year for an individual and \$5,200 for a couple.

The sum would be adjusted annually to reflect changes in the intermediate budget level cost of living as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Benefits would rise for residents of large cities where the cost of living exceeds the national average.

We must bear in mind the fact that almost three out of every four Americans over age 65 subsist on incomes of less than \$3,000 annually. More than 2½ million have no income whatsoever. Yet last year food prices rose an incredible

19.1 percent, placing many items we consider essential out of their reach.

Nor is there much prospect for significant relief from falling prices. If anything, prices will continue to rise. Even though the Congress has pushed through several hikes in social security benefits, the inflationary spiral has outdistanced whatever new buying power these have given the elderly. They are still playing catchup. And in major cities, the situation is worse than anywhere else. What this bill is seeking to do is not to provide the elderly with more dollars in one area of the Nation over another area, but to equalize buying power of social security recipients.

Almost all of the elderly have worked all their lives and are not seeking a hand-out. To know these people is to understand their pride and desire to earn whatever they have. The levels of payment provided them now are no credit to this country, especially when we observe how other advanced industrialized nations treat their older people.

This bill recognized the facts of life for the elderly in large cities today, and we would do well to understand why they require such an equalizing benefit. For many, their income limitation reduces them to deciding between medicine for a chronic condition and a decent diet. Their needs and ability to suffer in silence is perhaps as great a shame for our Nation as the recently highlighted plight of the Vietnam veterans. If we could send them to fight, we can deliver their veterans benefits. If we could take advantage of a lifetime of labor on the part of these older people, we can make life tolerable for them now.

KYROS COMMENDS ALCOHOL TREATMENT ACT

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Senate amendments to the Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act (S. 1125). As a member of the House Public Health Subcommittee, which wrote the original bill, I can say from testimony we heard before the committee that the extent of alcohol abuse in the United States is staggering. It is the No. 1 drug problem in America today.

Let me just cite some statistics:

Some 9 million Americans—or 7 percent of our entire adult population—are alcoholics; 200,000 new cases develop each year.

Alcohol is directly related to half of the Nation's traffic fatalities and 40 percent of all non-traffic arrests.

An estimated 10 percent of the Nation's workforce have serious alcohol problems, costing the national economy \$15 billion annually.

Today we are in a position to continue the Federal Government's massive attack on the abuse that gives rise to these alarming statistics. This involvement in alcoholism research, treatment, and re-

habilitation began in 1947, when the Federal Government first supported State research efforts. It continued through the landmark comprehensive alcoholism bill passed in 1971 and written by my Public Health Subcommittee. And it can reach a new intensity under the Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1974, which has passed both Houses of Congress and now awaits action by the President.

Specifically, the bill:

Provides for a 2-year extension of the program of formula grants to the States to assist them in developing more effective and comprehensive means for meeting the problems of alcoholism. I am pleased to say that Maine's share of block grants under this program is now \$255,000 and is likely to increase under the extension.

Establishes and consolidates within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a single administration to supervise and coordinate the three fragmented groups that now deal with alcoholism. A new Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration (ADAMA) within HEW will coordinate and supervise programs carried out through the National Institute of Mental Health, the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, and the National Institute on Drug Abuse. These three agencies, working together, will redirect Federal efforts somewhat away from research and more toward the practical problems of prevention and treatment.

Extends the project grant and contract authority of the act for an additional 2 years, through 1976. This is an especially important provision of the legislation, since the desire for new approaches to alcoholism prevention and treatment can best come from the local level, in cooperation with the Federal Government, where local or regional projects can tailor their treatment plans to community needs.

Establishes a special grant of up to \$100,000 plus 10 percent of an equal amount to a State's formula grant allotment for States which have adopted the provisions of the Uniform Alcoholism and Intoxication Treatment Act, which requires that alcoholism and intoxication be a health and social service care responsibility. I am proud that Maine is one of twenty states that have adopted the act, and that alcoholism in our State will be treated more as a psychological problem than a criminal act.

Each of these provisions is crucial to continuing and improving our Federal effort to overcome this massive national problem. The initiatives begun by the original legislation is now going forward. I applaud passage of this bill.

BAN THE HANDGUN—XLVII

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on April 11 in this space, I included an article

written by Stephen Brill for New York magazine, entitled "How Guns Get To Town—Tracing the Southern Connection." I have now obtained a special report by Howard Metzendorf, deputy chief of the Intelligence Division of New York City's Police Department, which was the basis for the Brill article. This report documents the existence of an extensive black market in illegal handguns imported into New York from States with less strict or nonexistent gun control laws. I commend Deputy Chief Metzendorf for the thoroughness of this study.

I insert herewith the opening section of the 1973 New York City Handgun Study and will be inserting additional sections in ensuing editions of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

HANDGUN STUDY—NEW YORK CITY, 1973

SITUATION

There has been an alarming increase in crimes involving the use of handguns. Homicide, considered the "ultimate crime" may be a good barometer. In 1960 there were 390 homicides in New York City of which 75 or 19% involved the use of handguns. In 1972 there were 1,691 homicides, an approximate 450% increase; however, the use of handguns increased a staggering 1012% to 834 shootings. As of December 1, 1973, the number of firearms incidents has exceeded 14,600 cases.

ANALYSIS

This study was begun in August 1973 and involves a review of all handgun cases recorded between January 1, 1973 and July 31, 1973, over 5,000 cases in all. After review and elimination of cases which were obviously untraceable (starter's pistols, military, home-made or legally possessed guns, or those with obliterated serial numbers which could not be restored), 3,328 cases were selected for tracing; 322 of these are still under investigation and are listed as outstanding.

Completed tracing of 3,006 guns were reviewed, analyzed, and categorized; data concerning the following was developed:

1. Origin of illegal handguns and last retail outlet.
2. Purchasers of illegal handguns (to determine if persons arrested for weapons charges had purchased guns in violation of gun control act of 1968 and/or made large purchases of weapons).
3. Thefts of handguns, both legal and illegal.
4. Legally owned handguns (the presence of legally owned guns in the crime picture could not be overlooked).

Available data breaks down as follows:

Traced to states other than New York (includes 109 handguns which are subject of ATF investigation or arrests)	1,343
Traced to New York State (other than New York City)	1
Traced to foreign countries	13
Stolen (various states)	365
Apparently legal handguns not reported stolen and under current investigation	22
New York City permit holders (46 arrested)	48
Permit Holders other than New York City	10
Subtotal	1,802

Non-traceable weapons, identified as starter's pistols converted to fire projectiles or not converted, but serially numbered; however, non-traceable	111
Companies concerned no longer in business, or did not keep records at time of sale	781
Military handguns	31

Duplicate requests forwarded for same weapon	97
Gun involved in routine testings, or surrendered by the permit holder	184
Subtotal	1,204
Total	3,006

Of the guns traced to other than New York State, 69% were traced to four (4) southern states: South Carolina (427), Florida (176), Virginia (176), and Georgia (156). The remaining 31% were traced to 39 states, the District of Columbia and 9 foreign countries. 72% of those traced to the four southern states were classified as "Saturday Night Specials."

An examination of the 1,343 cases reveals that in approximately 49% of the cases, possession of a dangerous weapon was the only charge. Nevertheless, a random perusal of the criminal records of those arrested for simple possession indicates a prior arrest record in 58% of the cases (based on a random sample of 100 of 622 cases). Further, of the 1,343 cases, the person arrested was not the original purchaser of the weapon in 97% of the cases.

The study indicated that one gun was purchased outside New York City, but within New York State by an individual using fraudulent credentials; while those traced to foreign countries could not be traced to individuals. Of the 365 guns stolen in various states, which is approximately 21% of all the handguns traced, the breakdown is as follows:

Stolen from autos (outside New York State)	4
During burglaries outside New York State	17
During robbing (outside New York State)	10
From dealers (outside New York State)	58
From manufacturers (outside New York State)	20
Stolen in New York City (various ways)	91
Stolen in New York State (other than New York City)	6
Stolen in transit	96
Stolen in unknown manner	63
Total	365

A separate investigation and report has been made regarding the 46 New York City pistol permit holders mentioned in this report. Briefly, 58% of these used their licensed pistol in the crime for which they were arrested. Pistol license hearings restored their license in 78% of these cases. Of those who did not use their guns in the crime for which they were arrested, hearing restored the license in only 20% of the cases. The holders of permits issued by other than New York City were all charged with possession of dangerous weapons. In addition, there were also charged with other crimes.

Twenty-two cases are still under investigation. These involved apparently legally owned guns of law enforcement or other licensed persons which were apparently stolen; however, they were never reported as such.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion of this report indicates that:

1. Guns are purchased legally or illegally by residents of other states and jurisdictions and brought or sent to New York City.
2. Guns are purchased by New York residents in other states, using the services of residents of those states or through fraudulent identifications.
3. Guns are stolen in various states including New York City and New York State.
4. Foreign military weapons which are presumably war souvenirs, are brought into New York City.
5. Guns are stolen from military reservations.

6. Since in 97% of the cases of those arrested with handguns were not the original purchasers, we assume the existence of a black market. (Recent arrests by undercover men confirm this assumption.)

7. Although New York City has the most stringent gun control laws in the nation, it cannot stem the flow of guns into this city without federal gun control legislation.

SUMMARY: NEW YORK CITY HANDGUN STUDY— DECEMBER 10, 1973

[Based on population distribution]

Estimated handguns:	
In Nation	32,700,000
In City	1,310,000
Increase in handgun usage in homicides (percent of homicides):	
1960	19
1972	49
1973 (1-1-73 through 11-30-73)	48
Study:	
Ballistics Cases	8,887
Selected for tracing	3,328
Returned from ATF	3,006
To be returned from ATF	322
Traced to other States	1,343
Traced to New York State	1
Traced to foreign countries	13
Stolen (various states)	365
N.Y.C. Permit holders (arrested—46)	48
Legal handguns not reported stolen	22
Not traceable	1,204
Total	3,006

ANALYSIS

1. Guns traced out of New York came from 39 states, the District of Columbia and 9 foreign countries.

2. Of guns traced to other states 69% are from four (4) states: South Carolina, Florida, Virginia, and Georgia.

3. Approximately 72% of the guns traced to South Carolina, Florida, Virginia, and Georgia were classified as "Saturday Night Specials."

4. A random perusal of the criminal records of those arrested for simple possession indicates a prior arrest record in 58% of the cases (based on a random sample of 100 of 622).

5. Less than two-tenths of one percent of all of New York City permit holders were arrested during subject period (46 of 28,000).

6. 58% of 43 permit holders arrested used their licensed handguns in the commission of crimes (25 of 43).

7. Of the handguns traced to other states (excluding indictment cases) only 3% were purchased by the persons ultimately arrested with them (46 of 1,234).

8. Approximately 21% of all guns traced (excluding legal handguns) were stolen (365 of 1,722).

WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL AND BUSINESS ACT OF 1974

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, on April 9, 1974, I introduced the Women's Education and Business Equity Act of 1974 with Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. The purpose of this legislation is to assist and encourage women to enter and fully participate in business and all other areas of our society.

We are all aware that in recent years much effort has been made to end sex discrimination and to encourage the corporate world to make meaningful efforts

to hire and promote qualified women. For over a year, many top corporations have had "affirmative action" programs in effect the purpose of which is to provide opportunities for females who are seriously interested in pursuing business careers. Unfortunately from the reports that are now coming in these programs have not been successful.

On April 18, 19, the Wall Street Journal reported that—

By large and large, women aren't getting many important corporate posts.

The September-October 1973 issue of the Harvard Business Review reported—

The fact is that in the United States business operations have not been significantly affected by equal employment opportunity demands for women.

In effect then, progress for women in the area of equal employment has been slow, and the forecast is unfortunately not much brighter. Hence, there is a real, dramatic need for the type of legislation that I have introduced.

One of the major reasons for the lack of progress in this area has been the approach taken by the Government to encourage equal employment. The Harvard Business Review survey reported—

The manner in which the government has made its demands and organized its program has seemingly decreased rather than increased management support for female opportunity.

This is obviously a serious indictment of what has been the major impetus behind the "affirmative action" programs. The report goes on to point out why the approach has met resistance and been less than effective—

Typical of business's reaction to the government's EEO requirements is this comment by an insurance company vice president: "We pull out all our records for a review, which in itself takes precious time, and then the only comment we get is, 'You haven't met your objectives yet.' We knew that before the EEOC investigator walked in. Why can't the government offer us constructive, practical suggestions?"

I believe that the Government should offer help to companies which make the effort to open participation to women. I also believe that the Government should help prepare women for this participation. The Harvard Business Review report points out still another problem facing women in business:

Once affirmative action goals and timetables have been established on paper, they must be met in reality. And so the search begins for female talent, particularly for women to fill official, managerial, and professional posts.

On-campus recruiting has helped in some areas. In others, such as engineering, in which few women are to be found, companies have come up with poor recruiting results. This will change in the near future only if educational institutions, society in general, and women in particular stop characterizing certain jobs as "masculine."

I believe that the Congress should take meaningful steps to help alleviate the problems and remove the barriers that exist in this area. The Federal Government, through the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is already deeply involved, but as has been indicated, is not necessarily providing solutions.

It is my belief that the legislation

which has been proposed by myself and Ms. HECKLER will help women reach equity in business careers. There is no question that something needs to be done. The Harvard Business Review report indicates that out of 20 major corporations surveyed, employing nearly 2 million people, women represent less than 1 percent of the officials, managers and professionals.

We need to make a positive response to end the waste of sex discrimination. I urge that the Congress take prompt action on this legislation.

The bill follows:

H.R. 14074

A bill to provide educational and business equity for women

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Women's Educational and Business Equity Act of 1974".

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that present educational programs and business policies in the United States are inequitable as they relate to women of all cultural and ethnic groups and limit their full participation in American society.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act, in order to provide educational and business equity for women in this country, to encourage the development of new and improved curriculums; to demonstrate the use of such curriculums in model educational programs and to evaluate the effectiveness thereof; to provide support for the initiation and maintenance of programs concerning women at all levels of education (preschool through adult education); to disseminate instructional materials and other information for use in educational programs throughout the Nation; to provide training programs for parents, teachers, other educational personnel, youth and guidance counselors, community leaders, labor leaders, industrial and business leaders, and government employees at the State, Federal and local level; to provide for the planning of women's resource centers; to provide improved career, vocational, and physical education programs; to provide for community education programs; to provide programs on status, roles, and opportunities for women in this society; to provide for the preparation and dissemination of materials for use in mass media.

(c) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as prohibiting men from participating in any of the activities funded.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established within the Office of Education a Women's Bureau. The Women's Bureau will consist of a Council on Women's Educational Programs (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"). The Council will be composed of twenty-one members (including not less than twelve women) appointed by the President. The Council shall consist of persons broadly representative of the public and private sectors with due regard to their knowledge and experience relating to the role and status of women in American society, their active involvement in securing equal rights for women and with due consideration being given to geographical representation. The Director of the Women's Bureau in the Department of Labor, the Chairman of the Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women, and the Director of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Women's Action Program shall serve as ex officio members of the Council. The Women's Bureau and Council shall be provided with adequate staff and facilities to carry out its duties as prescribed by this Act.

(b) The Council will elect one member to serve as its Chairperson. The Chairperson

shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed the maximum rate prescribed for grade GS-17 in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) The remaining twenty members of the Council shall serve without compensation, except that they shall be allowed travel and subsistence expenses while actually engaged in the business of the Council as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) The members of the Council shall serve for terms of three years each, except that the initial appointments shall be made in accordance with procedures designed to allow for the staggering of appointments so that the member or members whose terms expire in any year will be approximately the same as the number of members whose terms expire in any other year.

(e) The Council shall—

(1) advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") concerning the administration of, preparation of, general regulations for, and operations of, programs assisted under this Act;

(2) make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to the allocation of any funds pursuant to this Act, with due respect to the criteria developed to insure an appropriate geographical distribution of approved programs and projects throughout the Nation;

(3) develop criteria for the establishment of program priorities;

(4) develop programs and procedures for review of projects assisted under this Act annually; and

(5) develop and disseminate an annual independent report of the programs and activities authorized under this Act.

SEC. 4. (a) The Council shall advise, review and make recommendations for the administration of the programs authorized by this Act, and the coordination of activities within the Federal Government which are related to women's educational programs.

(b) The Secretary shall annually present to the Council a design for a program of making grants to, and contracts with, institutions of higher education, State and local educational agencies, regional research organizations, and other public and private nonprofit agencies, organizations, and institutions (including libraries and museums) to support research, demonstration, and pilot projects designed to fulfill the purposes of this Act; and shall carry out a program of grants and contracts for such purposes in accordance with the policies of the Council; except that no grant may be made other than to a nonprofit agency, or organization, or institution.

(c) Funds appropriated for grants and contracts under this section shall be available for (but not limited to) such activities as—

(1) the development of curriculums;

(2) dissemination of information to public and private pre-school, elementary, secondary, higher, adult, and community education programs;

(3) the support of women's educational programs at all educational levels;

(4) preservice and inservice training programs;

(5) training and counseling programs for corporate personnel which will serve to recruit and upgrade women in business and management;

(6) projects including courses of study, fellowship programs, conferences, institutes, workshops, symposiums, and seminars for both education and business institutions;

(7) research, development, and dissemination of curriculums, texts and materials, non-discriminatory tests, and programs for adequate and nondiscriminatory vocational education and career counseling for women;

(8) development of new and expanded programs of physical education and sports activities for women in all educational institutions;

(9) planning and operation of women's resource centers;

(10) community education programs concerning women, including special programs for adults;

(11) preparation and distribution of materials;

(12) programs or projects to recruit, train, and organize and employ professional and other persons, and to organize and participate in women's educational programs;

(13) research and evaluation of the effectiveness of such programs;

(14) research and development of programs aimed at increasing the number of women in administrative positions at all levels in institutions of education and business enterprises;

(15) research and development of programs aimed at obtaining and maintaining an adequate distribution of instructors, counselors, and other professionals of both sexes in educational institutions;

(16) training, educational, and employment programs for unemployed and underemployed women;

(17) to increase programs for utilizing professional and nonprofessional women on a part time basis; and

(18) research and development of programs aimed at increasing the proportion of women in fields in which they have not traditionally participated.

(d) In addition to the activities specified in this section, such funds may be used for projects designed to demonstrate, test, and evaluate the effectiveness of any such activities, whether or not assisted under this Act.

(e) Financial assistance under this section may be made available only upon application to the Secretary. Any such application shall be submitted at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Secretary shall prescribe by regulation and shall be approved only if it—

(1) provides that the activities and services for which assistance is sought will be administered by, or under the supervision of, the applicant;

(2) describes a program for carrying out one or more of the purposes of this Act which holds promise of making a substantial contribution toward attaining such purposes;

(3) sets forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this Act for any fiscal year will be used so as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available by the applicant for the purposes described in this section, and in no case supplant such funds;

(4) sets forth policies and procedures which insure adequate evaluation of the activities intended to be carried out under the application;

(5) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this Act;

(6) provides for making an annual report, and such other reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may reasonably require, and for keeping such records and affording such access thereto as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports; and

(f) For the purposes of this section, the Secretary shall require evidence that an organization or group seeking funds shall have been in existence one year prior to the submission of a proposal for Federal funds and that it shall submit an annual report to the Secretary on Federal funds expended. The Secretary may waive such one-year existence requirement where it is determined that an organization or group existing for less than one year was formed because of policies or

practices of a predecessor organization which discriminated by sex: *Provided*, That such organization or group meets eligibility standards in other respects.

(g) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Secretary may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulation, be subject to approval in the same manner as the original applications.

Sec. 5. The Secretary, in cooperation with the heads of other agencies with relevant jurisdiction, shall insofar as practicable, upon request, render technical assistance to local educational agencies, public and private nonprofit organizations, institutions at all levels of education, agencies of State, local, and Federal governments and other agencies deemed by the Secretary to affect the status of women in this society. Such technical assistance shall be designed to enable the recipient agency or institution to carry on education and related programs concerning the status and education and the role of women in American society.

Sec. 6. The Secretary is authorized to make grants to, or enter into contracts with, public or private nonprofit agencies, organizations, and other institutions for planning and carrying out community-oriented education programs or projects on women in American society for the benefit of interested and concerned adults, young persons, ethnic and cultural groups, community and business leaders, and other individuals and groups within a community. Such programs or projects may include, among other things, seminars, workshops, conferences, counseling, and information services to provide advice, information, or assistance to individuals with respect to discrimination practices, and vocational counseling, and will include information centers designed to serve individuals and groups seeking to obtain or disseminate information, advice, or assistance with respect to the purposes and intent of this Act.

Sec. 7. (a) In addition to the grants authorized under section 4, the Secretary, from the sums appropriated therefor, shall have the authority to make grants, not to exceed \$15,000 annually per grant, for innovative approach to women's educational programs.

(b) Proposals submitted by organizations and groups under this section shall be limited to the essential information required to evaluate them, unless the organization or group shall volunteer additional information.

Sec. 8. In administering the provisions of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or private agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon. The Secretary shall publish annually a list and description of projects supported under this Act, and shall distribute such list and description to interested educational institutions, citizen's groups, women's organizations, and other institutions or organizations and individuals involved in the education, status, and role of women.

Sec. 9. Payments under this Act may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments.

Sec. 10. As used in this Act, the term "State" includes (in addition to the several States of the Union) the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Sec. 11. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and \$40,-

000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977, for carrying out the purpose of this Act.

THE MONEY SCENE—SAVINGS ETHNIC LIVES DESPITE INFLATION

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, Americans have always been known for their ability to save money. Now, regardless of the rising cost of living, Americans are saving even more money. This article might be of interest to my colleagues:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 28, 1974]

THE MONEY SCENE—SAVINGS ETHNIC LIVES DESPITE INFLATION

Despite the inflationary ripoff, the American breadwinner is still salting away whatever he can of his paycheck. He hasn't lost his saving ethics—not yet, anyway.

Actually, the consumer has been saying even more money in the face of a two-digit inflation rate that not even a business slump has been able to cool off.

The consumer's savings rate in the last quarter of 1973 rose to 7.3 per cent from 5.7 per cent in the previous three-month period. The higher savings rate was extended into the first quarter of 1974.

In other words, the consumer is still responding to inflation in his traditional way—by saving more money.

But the consumer is stunned by the price inflation which rose by an appalling 14.5 per cent in the first quarter this year—the biggest three-month boost in 23 years.

He can't believe this kind of Latin American inflation is actually happening to him.

Food prices have gone up about 20 per cent in the last year, and, presumably, they'll be in two-digit inflation territory for at least the rest of the year.

And of course, there'll be a general surge in prices when controls come off next Wednesday.

The experts expect consumer spending will be lethargic this year. Recent surveys show consumer confidence declined to a new low early this year. There aren't any signs that consumer spending will pick up soon.

Inflation has seriously eroded the financial position of consumers.

In a special economic study, the investment firm of Goldman, Sachs & Co. notes that at 1973 yearend the total financial assets of consumers amounted to \$2.3 trillion.

These assets include cash, demand deposits, savings accounts, pension and insurance reserves, stocks, and bonds.

Because of inflation, the real value of consumers' financial assets at the end of 1973 was actually lower than at 1968 yearend. And in the 1968-73 period, consumers added almost \$500 billion to their financial assets.

Between 1962 and 1968, the real financial assets of consumers' holdings increased at an average rate of 7.1 per cent a year.

Clearly, consumers have not been able to protect themselves against the ravages of inflation despite continued additions to their financial assets.

Their experience with inflation, as Goldman, Sachs notes, has been "very dismal" in these past years.

"We conclude that attempts by consumers to rebuild their inflation-eroded wealth position will limit the recovery of consumer spending in 1974 and perhaps in 1975," Goldman, Sachs said.

The firm said it expects the inflation rate

to continue at a high level this year. But with income growth slowing down because of the business slump, it will be difficult for many consumers to improve their real financial wealth.

The critical question, then, is how consumers will react to this erosion.

If inflation continues to soar, they could reduce their savings and spend more to buy goods they think will cost substantially more in the future. Or they may save even more in an effort to rebuild their asset positions.

"We know from the experiences of hyperinflation in Europe and South America that when inflation becomes rampant enough, consumers begin to view traditional forms of saving as futile," observed Goldman, Sachs.

"The urge to buy now those goods that will cost much more in the future begins to dominate consumer behavior."

"But no one knows how high the inflation rate would have to go and how long it would have to stay there before it shattered the saving ethic of many United States consumers."

Let's hope we don't have to learn the answer to that question.

SSI HAS DIFFICULTIES

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the supplemental security income program—SSI—is riddled with difficulties. The law placed a ceiling on SSI payments and so the needy blind, elderly, and handicapped, who depend on SSI to live without the threat of malnutrition or lack of shelter, cannot benefit from the recent increase in social security. This law has these people in a financial stranglehold. Nine members of the New York delegation and myself have introduced legislation that is designed to correct the glaring problems of SSI. Those members are Representatives BINGHAM, BRASCO, BADILLO, CHISHOLM, FISH, HORTON, KOCH, MURPHY, and POBELL. On the day my SSI bill, H.R. 14419, was introduced, April 10, WCBS-TV aired an editorial by Ms. Sue Cott, explaining how these poor, disabled, and elderly citizens will not be helped by the cost-of-living increase in social security. I insert Ms. Cott's editorial in the RECORD for it explains most clearly the plight of SSI recipients.

The editorial follows:

APRIL FOOL

If you are one of the almost 2 million Americans who are over 65 and poor, April 1st turned out to be April Fool's Day. That was the day you thought you'd be getting a seven per cent cost-of-living increase in your Social Security check. Right? But you didn't end up with seven per cent more income. Well, here's what happened.

If you were over 65 and on welfare, this year you were transferred to a new federal income supplement program. But the catch is that under the terms of the new program the cost-of-living increase in your Social Security check has to be deducted from your supplemental income check. And that leaves you back where you started—with no change at all in your total benefits.

Another weakness in the new system is that to qualify for this supplemental income, you can't have an income larger than \$227 a month. But since Social Security is con-

sidered income, the seven per cent increase may have nudged you over the line, even if only by a dollar or two, making you ineligible for any income supplement at all.

That's why we think the law setting up the supplemental income program should be changed. As it stands it defeats the whole purpose of giving the nation's poorest old people a little extra money to make their lives more bearable.

In July, Social Security recipients will be getting another cost-of-living increase. What a terrible irony that old people living on fixed incomes who need the cost-of-living increase the most won't be able to get it. That's why we urge Congress to act quickly. The elderly poor above all others should be allowed to get the cost-of-living increase in their Social Security payments. The federal government must stop taking with one hand what it gives with the other.

THE CONTINUING THREAT OF WORLD COMMUNISM

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that there is much hopeful discussion of "détente," the facts of life for the Russian people and for those who are the targets of continued Soviet expansionism remain much the same.

The Soviet Union, at the same time that it speaks of a new era of peace and coexistence, continues to build its military machine and, in recent years, has moved ahead of the United States in a number of important military categories.

Discussing this changing balance of power, Representative RICHARD ICHORD of Missouri, speaking to the Seventh Annual Convention of the World Anti-Communist League held in Washington, D.C., in April, pointed out that:

During the course of the 60s our military policy changed from superiority to parity and "assured destruction." In other words, the powers that be in the high counsels of government made the determination that we could control the Soviet nuclear threat by maintaining the ability to retaliate. . . . The balance of military power in the world is in a very precarious position with the Soviets now holding superiority in virtually every area except in the most advanced technology.

Unfortunately, when Americans speak of détente and peaceful coexistence they mean something far different than do the leaders of the Soviet Union Representative ICHORD stated that:

All of the Soviet leaders from Khrushchev to Brezhnev have taken great pains to emphasize that "peaceful coexistence" does not mean the abandonment of the struggle with the West and that there can be no such thing as a long-term coexistence with bourgeois ideology. Quite to the contrary they make no secret of the fact that "peaceful coexistence" is only a temporary strategy . . . in their "life and death" conflict with capitalism.

What the Soviet Union seeks from détente is quite clear. Mr. ICHORD points out that:

They want American goods, credits, and technology to expand and improve their staggering economy. They also hope to re-

ceive similar military concessions in SALT II as they received in SALT I. The United States, on the other hand, seems to be striving only for political moderation and cooperation. . . . How is each side fairing in their pursuits? Based on the evidence I have been able to obtain the Soviets are coming out much better than we are.

On July 8, 1972, the Commodity Credit Corporation agreed to lend the Soviets \$750 million at 6 3/8 percent interest to purchase \$750 million worth of wheat from private U.S. exporters. Mr. ICHORD declared:

This sale of wheat at a subsidized price and interest rate saved the Russians from a famine, allowed them to withstand the pressure to reform their system of collectivization of the farming industry, and cost the American taxpayer some \$300 million in subsidies.

It is time for us to rethink the policies which have been called détente but which often appear to be one-sided concessions to the Soviet Union. I wish to share with my colleagues the thoughtful address of Representative RICHARD ICHORD, presented on April 9, 1974, to the annual meeting of the World Anti-Communist League, and insert it into the Record at this time:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN RICHARD H. ICHORD

It is a pleasure for me to have the opportunity to speak to this 7th annual convention of the World Anti-Communist League with representatives from over 50 free and captive nations. Your goals and purposes and your willingness to spend the time and effort to fight to preserve freedom in the world is most commendable and I congratulate you on your dedication. The world today is still locked into a life and death struggle between the forces of freedom and the forces of tyranny. I strongly believe in conformity with the founding fathers of the United States of America that man has a God-given right to be free. No man ever chooses to live in slavery! Those living in totalitarian societies at this very moment would long to be here with us today if they had the choice to do so. Perhaps there are those living in the world who have never known the taste of freedom and would be hesitant to venture away from the only life they have known but I feel that only a small portion of those living in communist lands would fall into that category. I am very concerned, however, that all too many of those living in the luxury of freedom having never known what it is like to lose this precious gift of God do not really appreciate the liberty they enjoy. Freedom—like good health—is a treasure that many people don't really appreciate until they lose it. Alexander Solzhenitsyn, a man who knows what it is like from firsthand experience to live without freedom, made this very astute observation in the seventh section of "The Gulag Archipelago":

"Oh, freedom-loving 'leftist' thinkers of the West! Oh, leftist Laborites! Oh, progressive American, German, and French students! For you, all (that I have written) counts for little. For you, my entire book amounts to nothing. You will only understand it all when they bellow at you—'hands behind your back'—as you yourselves trudge off to our archipelago."

The President of the United States tells us that we have moved from the age of confrontation into the age of détente—that the goal of his Administration is to create a generation of peace. Certainly we all share the hope of seeing peace in the world—no rational man wants war. Yet, we cannot help but ask ourselves: what price are we willing to pay for détente? what type of peace are we really talking about? what does the free

world have to gain and/or to lose by the course we are following at the present time? what risks are reasonable for us to take in our pursuit for better relations and understanding between the two super-powers?

First, let me make the point that we must consider the fact that the world situation has changed drastically in the past twenty years and the balance of military power has shifted. We may not want this to be so but we have to face the realities of the matter. At the time of the Korean War, the uprising by the Hungarian freedom fighters, the Berlin crisis, the Cuban missile crisis, the United States of America was the unchallenged military power in the world with absolute strategic superiority. At that time U.S. policy was that we could best preserve peace in the world by maintaining military superiority. During the course of the 60's our military policy changed from superiority to parity and "assured destruction." In other words, the powers that be in the high counsels of government made the determination that we could control the Soviet nuclear threat by maintaining the ability to retaliate in kind if they launched a nuclear attack. The balance of military power in the world is in a very precarious position with the Soviets now holding superiority in virtually every area except in the most advanced technology.

Yet, the struggle between the free world and communist bloc countries has never been limited to a simple military struggle; the economic and political struggles are certainly of equal if not greater importance. We have to some degree understood the basic military, economic, and political conflicts between the free system of government and the communist system but we have never quite understood still a fourth dimension of struggle—the psychological struggle for men's minds and loyalties. We don't define terms and mean the same thing by our words as do the communists.

For example, what does the word "détente" mean to us and what does it mean to the communist? I am not totally certain exactly what "détente" means to this Administration and I am totally convinced that it means something entirely different to the communists than it does to us. The dictionary defines "détente" as a relaxing of tensions and a bringing together of two rival camps. Does this mean that the Soviets have abandoned their goal of world conquest? Are they now ready to cease fanning the fires of revolution all over the world and to stop supporting so-called "wars of national liberation" in Vietnam, the Middle East and anywhere else there seems to be a chance for a communist takeover? Are the Soviets now ready to redirect their priorities from military to domestic concern and truly join the family of peaceful nations? If so, where is the evidence? I submit to you that such an examination of the evidence indicates exactly the opposite is true.

To properly understand the meaning of détente from the Soviet point of view and the challenge we are facing we must clearly understand what they mean by "peaceful coexistence." I am convinced that the average American believes that "peaceful coexistence" means "live and let live" just like he feels that détente means that the Soviets have somehow given up their goal of world domination. Yet, all of the Soviet leaders from Khrushchev to Brezhnev have taken great pains to emphasize that "peaceful coexistence" does not mean the abandonment of the struggle with the West and that there can be no such thing as a long term coexistence with bourgeois ideology. Quite to the contrary they make no secret of the fact that "peaceful coexistence" is only a temporary strategy or a temporary stage in their "life and death" conflict with capitalism.

In February of this year Director Colby of the CIA appeared before the House Armed Services Committee. His very first words

were "detente does not mean that the Soviets have had a change of heart." Later on the Secretary of Defense Schlesinger appeared before the same committee and testified that detente does not mean that the Soviets have changed their objectives. They are now aiming at acquiring American technology. A short time later Dr. Currie, the head of Research and Development in DOD testified that in basic research and development the Soviet Union and United States are just about equal but where the superiority of America lies is in technology spread throughout our entire industrial base. That is the capability of conceiving of fashioning, developing and producing all that technology that is necessary to do that does give us the superiority that we have over the Soviet Union.

This brings us down to the practical point of asking what do we want from detente and what can we expect to obtain? what do the Soviets want from detente and what do they expect to receive? what price have we already paid for detente? how great are the prospects for detente leading to a lasting peace? and what price should we be willing to pay for the goals that we hope to achieve?

It is quite obvious that the Soviets are seeking economic gains and military concessions. They want American goods, credits, and technology to expand and improve their staggering economy. They also hope to receive similar military concessions in SALT II as they received in SALT I. The United States, on the other hand, appears to be striving only for political moderation and cooperation from the Soviets and a slowing down of the arms race together with an eventual, mutually balanced troop and arms reduction.

How is each side fairing in their pursuits? Based on the evidence I have been able to obtain the Soviets are coming out much better than we are at this point in time. Let's look at the record: on July 8, 1972, the Commodity Credit Corporation agreed to loan the Soviets \$750 million at 6 1/4% interest to purchase \$750 million worth of wheat from private U.S. exporters. This sale of wheat to the Soviets at a subsidized price and interest rate saved the Russians from a famine, allowed them to withstand the pressure to reform their system of collectivization of the farming industry, and cost the American taxpayer some \$300 million in subsidies in addition to a tremendous inflationary rise in the cost of food. Secondly, in a secret agreement on October 18, 1972 the Administration agreed to loan the Soviets up to \$500,000,000 in Export-Import Bank credits at a 6% interest rate before we would require the Soviets to submit financial information required for all EXIM Bank transactions. Most of the requested loans have already been granted and preparations are being made for even larger loans and exportation of American technology. Thirdly, it now appears clear that the eagerly sought Soviet signature to the first installment of the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT I) may have locked the U.S. into second place in strategic power. I would conclude, based on these facts, that the Soviets are coming out very well in the initial stages of detente.

What about our side? What concrete expressions of cooperation and friendship have we experienced from the Soviet side. Honestly would compel me to speculate that the Russians probably did offer some assistance in the Vietnam settlement. However, this may not have been much of a concession for them since it still appears that we are in great danger of losing South Vietnam in the long run. The Soviets certainly were of no help in the Middle East crisis—they armed the Egyptians and Syrians to the hilt, their threatened intervention in the war caused us to put our troops on worldwide alert, they not only made no contribution to the cease fire agreement but criticized the Egyptians for sign-

ing the treaty, they urged the Arabs to continue the oil embargo against us after the cease fire, and they encouraged the Arabs to use their oil won dollars to disrupt Western currencies. The Russians have all but scuttled the European Security Conference aimed at a reduction of forces between the NATO and WARSAW pact countries.

These facts all lead me to the conclusion that we are paying a very high price for detente and appear to be willing to pay an even higher price in spite of every indication that the Soviets are pressing ahead with each of our concessions to further their goal of world domination.

In recent months, I have led a fight in the Congress to force the Export-Import Bank to refrain from making any further loans to the Soviets until Congress has had the opportunity to thoroughly debate all the ramifications of our giving credit and technology to the Russians and until we have worked out some of the basic problems between our two societies.

How can we offer the Soviet Union huge loans of American money—at low interest incidentally—and make our modern technology available to them and yet have the President turn around and request a record-breaking \$85 billion plus budget for defense? Now I certainly am not opposed to spending \$85 billion or whatever we need to maintain the military strength we need to defend ourselves and the free world. As a matter of fact, I have consistently fought for more money for research and development in order that we do not lose what advanced technological lead we have over the Soviets. But what I am saying is how can we justify loans and assistance that will make them better able to divert even more of their money and resources to military matters and then have to spend even more ourselves to keep up?

The Soviet Union is now engaged in the largest peace-time military buildup in the history of man. In the fact of all this, on January 8, 1974, the Soviet Defense Minister called for the strengthening of the Soviet military might and additional military spending. This would lead me to conclude that detente is not working in the most important area.

Apparently, turning a blind eye and a deaf ear to this Soviet military buildup and their lack of commitment to a really meaningful detente, that lessens tensions in the world, we are even being urged by the Administration and some business leaders to volunteer our financial resources and technology for the development of the Soviet oil and gas fields in Siberia. Rather extensive plans have been drawn up which would ultimately involve the United States in investments of over \$10 billion in loans and extensive use of our drilling and pipeline technology to develop the oil and gas reserves in Western and Eastern Siberia in return for a Soviet promise that they would repay us with the extracted product. Such a proposal completely ignores the national security interest of this nation and would cause us to become partly dependent upon the Russians for our vital energy needs.

In my efforts to block further loans to the Soviet Union, I have focused my attention especially on these proposed oil and gas deals and hopefully—in view of the fact I obtained 223 co-sponsors—a majority of the membership of the House of Representatives—for my resolution calling for a moratorium on credits to the Soviet Union—these transactions have been delayed for the present. The real fight will come in the next few weeks when we consider the bill to extend the life of the Export-Import Bank and the proposal to expand their loaning authority from \$20 to \$30 billion dollars.

I intend to insist that provisions are included in the Export-Import Bank legislation that will extend and preserve congres-

sional control over the policies of the Bank. I will further insist that any future loans to the Soviet Union be contingent upon a re-ordering of priorities on their part from a military oriented economy to a consumer-oriented economy. If they want our money and technology let them abandon their aggressive ways and show signs of working for peace in the world. This leads me to another point that those of us who love freedom cannot ignore, I do not like as a general rule to meddle in the internal affairs of other nations but I cannot love my freedom without sympathizing with and striving to improve the lot of those who are denied it.

A source of constant concern to a bi-partisan majority of the Congress is the matter of granting concessions or otherwise extending favors to the Soviet Union while that Communist tyranny and its satellites continue the persecution of the peoples of Eastern Europe for their intellectual, political or religious beliefs.

Thanks to a relatively few brave men and women who have had the courage to write and to speak out despite the awful prospect of confinement in labor or concentration camps, mental hospitals or one of the scores of Soviet prisons, we have been able to verify the dimensions of the terror that has gripped the U.S.S.R. since Lenin's time, destroying or crippling tens of millions of people.

We know the same cruel oppression exists in Communist Cuba and the Communist-run states in Asia—mainland China, North Korea and North Vietnam. We know it was about to occur in Chile under Salvador Allende until the people themselves, aided by their Army, brought that ill-starred regime to an end last September.

And we know from the experience of many in this audience that the Communist system which has already enslaved half the world can, ultimately, enslave us all if we let down our guard, relax our vigilance and fail to compete on every front with the Communist challenge.

Those who are gathered in convention here, feel strongly that the world in this last Twentieth Century must not—not more than could these United States during the Presidency of Abraham Lincoln—continue half slave and half free without vigorous and unrelenting protest from all free men.

It is most fitting that the World Anti-Communist League is honoring, in this convention, several of those who have fought so long and hard against their oppressors and who, in their fighting, have altered us all to the menace of Communism.

Unquestionably, the single most influential spokesman for freedom in recent years has been that great Nobel prize winning novelist, Alexander Solzhenitsyn. Yet in honoring Solzhenitsyn, we must not forget Andrei Sakharov, the brilliant nuclear physicist who has confronted the Soviet leadership repeatedly in his clamor for freedom.

This convention pays homage to Cardinal Mindszenty who has been a symbol to people of every religion for his stubborn resistance to the atheism for Marxist-Leninist-Maoist dogma. Yet in our hearts and minds we can never forget the dramatic effect the Jewish effort to emigrate from the Soviet Union to Israel has had in mustering an international outcry against the Kremlin's denial of religious freedom and the right to emigrate.

We also are honoring that great Ukrainian teacher, historian and writer, Valentine Moroz. But we must not forget that just as Moroz languishes in prison today, so, too, does Vladimir Bukovsky who is reportedly near death in his cell and whose mother has begged the Soviet authorities to let her take her sons place so that he—a brilliant poet—may survive in freedom.

There are so many more, both among the living and the dead, who are deserving of our recognition and appreciation for their heroic contributions to the cause of freedom. Con-

sequently, I must assume that in honoring Solzhenitsyn, Mindszenty and Moroz, we are, in effect, honoring all.

Were we to do less, Solzhenitsyn's inspiring essay of February 12, 1974, entitled "Live Not By Lies" might come to apply to all of us. In the essay he wrote—(and I quote)—

"We have been so hopelessly dehumanized that for today's modest ration of food we are willing to abandon all our principles, our souls, and all the efforts of our predecessors and all the opportunities for our descendants—but just don't disturb our fragile existence. We lack staunchness, pride and enthusiasm."

We don't even fear universal nuclear death and we don't fear a third world war. We have already taken refuge in the crevices. We just fear acts of civil courage. We fear only to lag behind the herd and to take a step alone—and suddenly find ourselves without white bread, without heating gas and without a Moscow registration." (end of quote)

And both Solzhenitsyn and Sakharov have signalled this clarion call to us: do not make trade and military concessions to the Soviets until and unless they make concessions on granting their subjects basic human and civil rights. Do not—say repeated messages from the oppressed—make it easier for the masters of the Kremlin to continue their oppressive policies by yielding to Moscow's requests for credit and technology which will give the Soviet Union in an instant what 50 years of Marxism-Leninism and Stalinism was incapable of achieving.

Frankly, I am far more inclined to heed the advice of those who have experienced the suffering of the oppressed under Communism than the rather wishful thinking that I sense among those who argue that detente is so beneficial that we should extend the credit and technological knowhow of the United States as a concession for detente's continuation.

I see no evidence of the benefits of detente—except to the Soviets. I see no evidence of a Soviet willingness to provide any quid pro quo for the concessions we are presently considering. I see no evidence that the Soviets and their communist satellites are prepared to extend civil and human rights to their peoples or to opt for greater freedom.

Those of us who believe in freedom must remain unremittant in our determination not to pay the high price of detente presently being demanded by the Communists. If the Communist world wants to pick America's brains and pocketbook, it is up to them to pay the price and that price is no higher than the simple, clear granting of those inalienable rights of Man . . . those freedoms . . . which are fundamental to any free society.

HARLEM'S SMALL CLAIMS COURT

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, too often government places itself beyond the reach of the citizen. Agency offices, courthouses, and institutions are often situated in hard-to-reach locations. Physical distance helps breed psychological distance, so the people feel far removed from an impersonal government.

The Harlem Small Claims Court was designed to put at least one part of our judicial system within reach of the poor. It has been successful, but its full po-

tential, both in Harlem and nationwide, may never be achieved due to funding problems. Government at the local level and at the Federal level has the resources to keep this experiment in operation, and there is no excuse for letting Harlem's Small Claims Court die. I have been in communication with State, city, and Federal officials in the hopes that the necessary funds can be made available.

At this point in the RECORD, I include an article on the Harlem Small Claims Court:

HARLEM'S SMALL CLAIMS COURT

(By Sylvia Porter)

Time: 7:30 p.m.

Place: Second story of an old courthouse in the heart of Harlem.

Characters: Several dozen plaintiffs, primarily blacks and Puerto Ricans; a judge; three arbitrators; others.

Action: Real-life decisions in suits brought by hundreds of "little people" in the model two-year-old Harlem Small Claims Court, a part of New York's Civil Court, against those whom they believe have cheated them in a wide range of deals.

Illustration 1: A Puerto Rican couple bought a color TV from a local merchant and paid to have it delivered to their apartment. The delivery boy was held up and the set was stolen before it even got to its new owners. The couple claimed they should get the set ordered; the merchant claimed the holdup was not his responsibility. The arbitrator to whom the case was assigned decided in favor of the couple.

Illustration 2: A semi-literate tradesman was lured into signing up for more than \$2000 worth of training to become a computer programmer. He made a \$95 down payment, signed a contract to pay the rest, then decided not to go through with it. In presenting his case to the arbitrator he pointed out that a computer-programmer aptitude test he was supposed to get under the contract was never given to him and that he had canceled within the stipulated period of time during which he was permitted to cancel and get a refund. The arbitrator concluded the man deserved to get back his \$95 down payment.

Illustration 3: A 9-year-old boy whose mother had sent him with a list to buy \$8 of school supplies came back with supplies not on the first list that he shouldn't have bought. His parents sent him back with the supplies but the shopkeeper wouldn't give him a refund. When the shopkeeper turned up with a lawyer to defend himself in Small Claims Court, the judge demanded that he refund the boy's money on the spot.

Illustration 4: A lady who had bought nearly \$500 of food to stock her freezer before she went on vacation found on her return that it had all gone bad. It turned out that a crew of workmen from the housing authority had unplugged the freezer. The lady sued the housing authority for the lost food—and won.

Other cases run the gamut from inaccurate utility bills to shoddy shoe repairs, from complaints about nonworking air-conditioners to dry cleaners who ruin your clothes.

Many of the Small Claims Court plaintiffs are referred there by Harlem's two Community Complaint Centers staffed by consumer specialists and run by New York's aggressive Dept. of Consumer Affairs. Before the plaintiff presents his or her story to the judge or arbitrator, a trained community advocate goes over the case, at no cost, helps develop and document it, and advises on court procedures, how and whom to sue. "We do everything possible to keep things simple," says Sam Ingram a lawyer, who directs the program.

The Harlem system is a model because

of its unique complaint centers and community advocates; because the court sits at night when working people can come and costs amount to only \$3.18 (refundable if you win your case); because waiting time between filing and trial is just a few weeks; because it has Spanish interpreters. Owing to the careful preparation and screening of cases, a full 75 to 80 percent of the claimants win and have so far collected well over \$1 million in refunds.

So successful has been this record that other similar courts have been started in places from coast to coast.

In the face of all this, it is astonishing that the Harlem Small Claims Court is fighting for survival as the Federal Model Cities program—provider of the modest \$240,000 annual budget—is phased out. It is, in fact, incredible that a program which cries out for expansion, not execution, is in danger of not lasting beyond the summer.

Perhaps, though, the outlook will brighten with the possible passage of a little-publicized bill in Congress that would federally fund such exemplary consumer-complaint mechanisms. Details in tomorrow's column.

COMMENTS ON THE ABORTION ISSUE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, we have all considered the issue of abortion in our official capacity, as well as from a personal viewpoint. The two are not always the same. I have always thought that the ability of the American people to tolerate differing religious values was one of the strengths of this country.

The issue of abortion can be approached from many different directions, but they all rest upon value judgments that affect the life of a woman. The proposals for a constitutional amendment prohibiting abortion are an attempt to place in the Constitution one set of religious beliefs and values. Mr. Speaker, I have not concurred with this approach, nor the language of the proposed amendments. I am not prepared to play God with other lives and impose my beliefs on all women. Because of my refusal to capitulate to the demands of the Right to Life organizations, I, like many others, have been denounced. Many words can be said about this issue, but I sometimes wonder if the advocates of a constitutional amendment are listening. In this emotional climate, how can good legislation be written or considered?

An enlightening article on the abortion issue was written by David Broder and published in this morning's Washington's Post. I believe that it very thoroughly describes the situation.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 6, 1974]

HILL FEARS ABORTION ISSUE

(By David S. Broder)

Two hours a day, every working day for the past three months, a line of pickets has appeared outside each of the two district offices of Rep. Don Edwards (D-Calif.).

Edwards is a member of the House Judiciary Committee, which is handling the impeachment of President Nixon, and the as-

sumption is natural that some of Mr. Nixon's supporters are putting pressure on the liberal Democrat.

But that is not the case. The picketers are supporters of Mrs. Marian Banducci, Edwards' opponent in the June 4 Democratic primary and an active leader in the "right-to-life" movement in what is rapidly becoming a vocal part of 1974 politics.

Edwards is a natural target for the anti-abortion forces, for he is the chairman of the judiciary subcommittee which has jurisdiction over the several constitutional amendments to revise or reverse last year's Supreme Court decision sanctioning surgical termination of pregnancy.

Despite intense pressure, Edwards has refused to call any hearings on the amendments. "There is," he maintains, "no real desire on the part of most members of Congress to move ahead."

One reason, obviously, is that abortion is an emotional issue on which politicians feel they lose votes whichever side they espouse. The safest course of action in that situation is delay.

But that is not the course which Edwards' Senate counterpart, Sen. Birch Bayh (D-Ind.), has taken. Bayh, who heads the Senate judiciary subcommittee on constitutional amendments, started hearings on the anti-abortion amendments in March and has been continuing them, at intervals, ever since.

"In my judgment," Bayh says, "this is probably the most volatile issue in American politics—or it will be before it's over. A lot of my colleagues don't want it to come to a vote before November. In fact, a lot of them wish that I wouldn't even hold hearings—and some of them are people who are normally the most avid advocates of free debate."

Until this year, abortion had not become a major problem for most members of Congress, because the battleground for the issue had been in the state legislatures and the courts.

But when the Supreme Court, in 1973, invalidated two state anti-abortion laws on grounds that the government may not intervene with a decision to terminate pregnancy, at least in the early months, the opponents of abortion turned to a constitutional amendment as their only remedy.

Sen. James L. Buckley (Cons.-R-N.Y.) and Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) are sponsoring the major amendments on the Senate side, with a score or more variants in the House.

The pressure and counter-pressure for hearings and action on the amendments has brought into being several national coalitions on each side of the issue.

The National Right to Life Committee, the National Committee for a Human Life Amendment and the Life Lobby confront such groups as the National Abortion Rights Action League, the Religious Coalition for Abortion Rights, the Planned Parenthood Federation and the American Civil Liberties Union.

Both sides are focusing on individual members of Congress. Last November, the National Right to Life Committee began compiling what its newsletter called "an elaborate profile" on each member of the House and Senate. "We need . . . to know his position on human life issues, his voting record, his committees, his friends, his source of campaign funds, his basis of political support, his family, his constituency, his district and anything else that will give us an advantage in influencing his vote."

"While all of this is being done," the memo said, "we must become fully organized, especially in those congressional districts where we know or suspect that the congressman is not with us . . . We must understand that above all else, votes motivate congressmen."

While the exhortation and the information-gathering may be done at the national

level, anti-abortion leaders say theirs is genuinely a grass roots movement, with hundreds of autonomous local committees. Warren Schaller, director of the National Right to Life Committee, estimates that the 855 organizations on his mailing list constitute less than half the working units in being.

The political activity at the local level also has a spontaneous air. Minnesota right-to-life backers moved into the precinct caucuses of both the Republican and Democratic Farmer-Labor parties, in unexpected numbers, last month, in an effort to get both parties to pass anti-abortion resolutions in Utah, where the anti-abortion position of the Mormon Church is influential with almost all of the politicians, an initiative effort is under way to strengthen the existing state abortion law. Similar but diverse activities can be found in almost all the states.

While right-to-life forces are agitating the issue, deluging Congress with mail and securing anti-abortion resolutions from almost one-third of the state legislatures, those who support the Supreme Court decision are working—with less publicity—to put out the fires and calm the politicians nervous about the anti-abortion pressure.

Their main effort, as Arlie Schardt of the ACLU said, is to convince the legislators that while abortion may be "the most volatile and emotional issue in the election today, it does not have the priority of inflation, unemployment or impeachment."

Their main talking point is the special election in Cincinnati this spring, in which Rep. Thomas Luken (D-Ohio) defeated William Gradison (R) in a traditionally Republican district with a sizeable Catholic population.

Luken promised during the campaign to support the anti-abortion amendments, while Gradison declined to make such a pledge, and the abortion issue became a focus of debate.

But the point that the Supreme Court decision supporters make is that a post-election survey by pollster Peter Hart showed less than 5 per cent of the voters mentioned abortion stands as one of the issues on which they made their choice.

Overall, they point out, the Supreme Court decision is backed by significant majorities of voters of each religious faith. A Gallup poll, for example, showed 64 per cent of all voters—including 86 per cent of the Roman Catholics in the sample—regarded abortion as a private decision by a woman and her doctor.

But as with other issues that stir the emotions of some voters, the problem is one which is vexatious for politicians. The case of Bayh and a Republican member of his subcommittee, Sen. Marlow Cook of Kentucky, illustrates the cross-pressures of the issue.

Both are facing stiff challenges for reelection this year. Bayh is a Protestant running in a state with a substantial Roman Catholic population; Cook, a Catholic convert, is running in a strongly Protestant state.

Both of them decided that the prudent course was to participate actively in hearings on the issue while deferring their decision on the matter until the testimony is in—presumably some time after next November.

In Indiana, where the South Bend-headquartered Right-to-Life group claims 15 local affiliates, Republican senatorial hopeful Richard Lugar, the mayor of Indianapolis, has been hinting at support for the group's stand.

By contrast, Mrs. Robert Hunt, its president, told Washington Post correspondent Gordon Engelhardt, that Bayh "has not committed himself, pro or con, publicly or privately, as far as we are concerned. . . . We can't say he is against us, but neither can we say he is for us . . . and we will not vote

for anybody, regardless of political party, who will not take a pro-life stand."

In Kentucky, where the 2,500-member Right-to-Life affiliate was instrumental in getting the legislature to petition Congress for an antiabortion amendment to the Constitution, the group's president, Mrs. Schumann A. Montgomery says she is chagrined that only two of the state's seven congressmen have signed the discharge petition to bring the amendment, now bottled up in Edwards' subcommittee, to the floor.

Mrs. Montgomery told Post correspondent Bill Billiter that her group would poll every congressional candidate on the amendment, adding that the issue "is nonnegotiable" to her.

Although there is reason to think that Indiana and Kentucky mirror the national averages in overall support for the Supreme Court decision, both Bayh and Cook are handling the issue with kid gloves.

At the opening of the hearings, Bayh said "there are more strong emotion and deep convictions on both sides of this issue than any issue I have ever seen before this committee."

Cook chimed in with the observation that "this matter has caused a great division in this country . . . which had to be aired . . . We look forward to a rocky road of decision, one way or the other."

Bayh has been called a "genocidal pro-spermist" by a feminist letter-writer who bitterly criticized his decision to hold hearings. Cook has had a steady stream of mail along the lines of the letter from a Covington, Ky., anti-abortion woman, who said, "This issue is most important to me, and if you do not give a strong affirmative answer, I will not vote for you again."

So far, both senators—and most of their colleagues—are seeking shelter in silence.

GOUGING THE MOTORIST

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the price of gasoline at the pumps is higher than at any time before in our motoring history—some 15 cents or more a gallon than only a few months ago. Meanwhile, our oil companies have reported the highest profits in their experience.

It is highly disconcerting to read the figures. Exxon, Texaco, Gulf, Standard of Indiana, and Occidental have run first quarter profits from 75 percent to 718 percent over the levels a year ago. Getty Oil scored a 122-percent gain. Continental is up 130 percent. Murphy Oil, one of the small ones, checked in at 257 percent.

Now we hear charges that even these figures may be rigged, that the full profits story is not being told, that income, normally reported for a quarter, has been hidden and spread over months ahead lest the percentages become even more startling than those announced.

It seems to me that all the excuses for this plundering of the hapless motorist lack validity. In fact, I think we all are becoming tired of hearing how the bonanzas are needed to finance exploration for new oil sources, the building of new refineries, and so forth. What other business is permitted to gouge the public to pay the costs of its own expansion?

The oil companies stand convicted by their fiscal reports. They have taken full advantage of an emergency which they largely created themselves by failing to assure the fuel supply. They have violated the public trust and then shamelessly have made the most of it.

The only recourse for Government is take away the depletion allowances and all the other advantages which a generous nation has afforded this industry in the belief that it had to be kept financially healthy in the public interest. We see now that it has not played fair and does not deserve special consideration. It has plundered the people and, with unbridled arrogance, has served notice it plans to continue to do so. Its leaders are speaking of still higher gasoline prices in the same breath as they are revealing their unconscionable profits.

It is a sad commentary that the oil executives of today are a throwback to the "robber barons" of yesterday. The only recourse is for the Government to deal with these freebooters of today as it dealt with their nefarious predecessors.

THE CASE FOR A FEDERAL OIL AND GAS CORPORATION—NO. 27

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Journal of Commerce on April 24, in which Mr. Andrew Biemiller, the legislative director of the AFL-CIO, called for the creation of a Federal Oil and Gas Corporation. In testimony before the Senate Commerce Committee, Mr. Biemiller charged the private oil companies with failing to meet their public responsibilities and suggested that the public corporation be established to insure our Nation's energy needs are met. The AFL-CIO's endorsement of the public oil company is indicative of the expanding support for the Federal Oil and Gas Corporation, and I would like to direct my colleagues' attention to Mr. Biemiller's remarks.

The article follows:

LABOR SUPPORTS FEDERAL OIL-GAS CORPORATION CREATION
(By Dan Skartvedt)

WASHINGTON.—Spokesmen for two of the nation's top labor organizations voiced support yesterday for creation of a federal oil and gas corporation while criticizing the high profits of major oil companies.

Both Andrew Biemiller, legislative director for the AFL-CIO, and Leonard Woodcock, president of the United Auto Workers, backed the proposal for a TVA-like government enterprise to explore for new fuel on public lands as they testified before the Senate Commerce Committee.

INCLUSION OF SHALE OIL

Mr. Biemiller pointed out that "most major industrialized countries already have such a public body," and urged that the corporation's authority be expanded to include development of shale oil also.

Drawing a parallel with the historic climate which led to TVA's creation during

Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal, the AFL-CIO spokesman said: "Just as the private electric companies failed their public responsibilities in the 1930s, the oil and gas companies failed their responsibilities in 1974. It is time for the government to take strong action."

He argued that the Nixon Administration is refusing to protect consumers from what he termed the "rape of the pocketbook," making it imperative for Congress to act.

Mr. Woodcock argued along similar lines, claiming that "only the public sector is strong enough to create effective competition for existing, highly-integrated, monopolistic energy companies."

He said that the proposed federal oil and gas corporation "will not only directly expand available energy supplies, it will also provide us with a yardstick by which to evaluate the performance of the private sector."

At another hearing yesterday, also before the Senate Commerce Committee, Chairman Russell Peterson of the Council on Environmental Quality explained and defended CEQ's recently-released report on the ecological hazards of offshore drilling.

The report, made public last week, has been criticized in some circles for not firmly recommending either for or against permitting drilling at various locations. Mr. Peterson defended the logic of this approach yesterday, pointing out that CEQ's study does say when the risk "is greater than that of an available alternative, then we should not move ahead until we know more and can do better."

The report "is intended to advise the President on the relative risks" of offshore drilling in the Atlantic and the Gulf of Alaska and "to suggest ways in which the risks can be minimized or prevented," Mr. Peterson said.

It ranks various potential drilling sites according to the environmental hazards likely from such things as oil spills, but stops short of making any outright recommendations against drilling in the "high-risk" areas.

Mr. Peterson said he is hopeful the areas designated as lower risk sites will be given first priority by the Interior Department as it grants leases, and that the required environmental impact statements will be studied very carefully before any actual drilling is allowed to commence.

COSTLY BILLS COULD BANKRUPT NATION

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article written by the most distinguished writer and correspondent for the Indianapolis Star, Mr. Ben Cole. His comments illustrate clearly and concisely the direction Congress is headed if we do not, Mr. Speaker, look more closely at the bills Congress plans to take action on this year.

The article follows:

COSTLY BILLS COULD BANKRUPT NATION
(By Ben Cole)

Once upon a time there was a congressman who boasted that he kept the affections of his unfortunate constituents by carefully voting for every appropriations bill and against every tax bill.

The example conjures up the epigram spoken by the late Adlai Stevenson: "The public's public servants serve it right."

For better or worse, the lawmaker who dedicated himself to big spending without taxation is no longer with us.

But some of his political descendants, in a more respectable guise, practice his formula with fascinating variation. They face up to votes on appropriations and taxation, but in-between they are wanton promoters of programs that load more and more onto the broad but burdened shoulders of the payers of taxes.

The key to this mystery is the "authorization bill." Most people don't pay attention to the distinction between a bill that "authorizes" a program and a measure that "appropriates" the money to pay for it.

In fact, the whole appropriating process in Congress is an esoteric matter that barely moves most of us at all except when the pending issue has to do with some pet item of our several selfish concerns.

In a manner of speaking an "authorization" bill is something like an order phoned to the local merchant for goods put on the purchaser's charge account. An "appropriation" bill, then, is roughly analogous to the check that settles the account. This is oversimplification, but it might give the picture.

Once a program is authorized by Congress, and signed into law, it becomes public policy. There is usually big pressure to fund it and put it into operation, and all kinds of arguments are brought forth to demonstrate how critical it is.

Representative Jack Kemp (R-N.Y.) and two of his colleagues recently took the House floor to warn their colleagues that a whole catalogue of 460 bills is waiting action—each one calling for outlays over the next four years that when added together exceed \$880 billion and might approximate \$1 trillion.

What were they trying to say is this: No matter how good they sound, all these programs are too expensive.

But they come before Congress and the public one by one—\$100 million there, \$10 billion there, and so on. The spreading commitment grows like Topsy.

When the President refuses to spend money that Congress may decide to force on him for some of these programs, a Constitutional confrontation ensues. Congress even now is trying to figure a way to make the President carry out its spending mandates whether or no.

Representative Kemp and his friends, Representative Samuel Devine (R-O.) and Del Clawson (R-Calif.) were like voices crying in the wilderness. But somebody had better listen to what they're crying about because it is a hard truth that once the government gobbles up everything the people produce, there will be nothing left—and all the lofty aspirations within those multitudinous bills will be in vain.

A GOOD CHOICE

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Marion, Ind., Chronical Tribune.

I most certainly agree with the comments of this widely respected, long-established newspaper concerning a former Member of Congress, the Honorable Richard L. Roudebush.

The editorial follows:

A GOOD CHOICE

Under fire from many quarters, Donald E. Johnson, current administrator of the United States Veterans Administration, Monday night announced he would resign from the post, probably in June.

As is common in Washington, there was immediate speculation about who might succeed him, and one of the names frequently mentioned was that of Richard E. Roudebush, who served five terms in the United States House of Representatives from several different districts in Indiana before losing a contested Senate election to Sen. Vance Hartke.

If anyone has the qualifications to head the sprawling, multi-project Veterans Administration, we certainly think Roudebush should fill the bill more than adequately.

He is a former national and Indiana commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, but Johnson is a former national commander of the American Legion and, at least in the eyes of critics, has fared miserably as the top man in the important Veterans Administration.

Directing the Veterans Administration, which tries to supply veterans with so many different services, certainly is no simple task. Far from it. It may well be the most difficult government agency to administer, since it is involved in so many different programs serving so many people.

But Richard Roudebush long ago proved his ability to administer and one office he held for eight years with the Veterans of Foreign Wars especially qualifies him to handle the post in a manner which will provide veterans with the services and assistance to which they are entitled.

The eight years to which we refer were spent as VFW service officer for the state of Indiana. During that period he handled compensation and disability claims for veterans of all wars. During that time, he learned first hand the problems faced by veterans. He had impressed on him the frustrations which can result from dealing with a huge national agency, and knows well the problems of individual veterans.

As a Congressman, the boundaries of his district changed many times, and one of those terms was spent representing the district of which Grant County is a part, and he became familiar with the operations of the Marion VA Hospital and the problems faced there by the staff and the patients. One of the chief complaints about the VA in recent months has been the health care and hospital services. This will not be new to Roudebush. A combat veteran of World War II he knows the difficulties veterans sometimes encounter. As a former member of Congress, he also knows the government side of the situation.

In addition to the veterans of World Wars I and II and the Korean War, the Veterans Administration now must deal with young men home from an unpopular war in which many of their countrymen turned their backs to them. Some Vietnam veterans groups charge this is the general attitude of the country toward them, and they include the Veterans Administration in their charges.

We feel that Richard Roudebush would never slight any man or woman who served in this country's armed forces, instead he would almost certainly battle tooth and nail to see that their needs were met, and promptly. He may be considerably older than these young Vietnam veterans in years, but we believe he would be able to communicate with them and understand their feelings of frustration. And we also believe he would do something to solve the problems.

Unlike Roudebush and other veterans of World War II, these men did not come home as conquering heroes. They served their country when it asked, and it was just as dangerous to serve in Vietnam as in Europe or the South Pacific during World War II or in France in World War I. Possibly more so.

They should not be forgotten, nor should they be short-changed by the Veterans Administration, the Congress or the people of this country. We believe Richard Roudebush would do everything in his power to see this

does not happen, and we believe he would succeed.

GOOD IDEAS FOR AMERICA

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from a resident of my Sixth Congressional District of Texas. The letter is from Mr. Robert S. Tapley of Bryan, Tex. He poses some good ideas and good thinking in his letter and it deserves some thought and study. The most interesting thing about the letter is that Mr. Tapley has a rule that he follows that reads, "don't bitch if you can't suggest a better way."

I commend this letter from Mr. Tapley to you, Members of Congress and the general public.

The letter follows:

BRYAN, TEX., March 19, 1974.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: I have a good idea for America, but no platform from which to launch it. You do.

Let me ghost-write it for you, and if you get widely acclaimed for the innovation you will deserve it. Contrary to popular ballyhoo, ideas are a dime a dozen—idea implementation is the scarce commodity.

The idea; the theory/concept/philosophy of legislation must switch from rules/enforcement to the creation of psychological situations.

Why? Modern technology, especially communications and transportation have completely changed the society game since the venerable Greeks founded the concepts of law in Athens 2500 years ago.

Even the military has given up on discipline—they train leaders from corporals up in the psychological methods of behavior modification, e.g. create a situation so that the guys will want to do what you want them to do. Why don't legislators use the same technique?

Don't think for a minute that I am a Skinnerian. I detest Skinner's concept of Controlled Society and firmly believe they won't work. But the whole idea of legislation is to control society within limits—limits hopefully safeguarded by the bill of rights and the balance of power. Shouldn't the control be as effective and efficient as current knowledge can make it?

EXAMPLES

A. Drugs—making drugs available and inexpensive through pharmaceutical houses and doctor's prescriptions would take the profit out of illicit drug activities.

Money currently spent for enforcement of drug laws could be spent on public education—really propaganda—to make drug use socially unacceptable. These people who sell VWs and Alka-Seltzer are scientists in moulding human drives—use them.

B. Fuel—every high school economics book will state that increased price will cause decreased consumption. Why freeze the price then charge the taxpayer for administering an allocation/rationing program which will never be as equitable as increased prices in the distribution to those in need. In our materialistic society how else is need and/or desire measured other than by how much one is willing to spend?

C. National Productivity—the current tax allocation/welfare system may obtain funds to

help those in need, but my God! Look at the psychological direction it creates. The less one produces the more is given and the more one produces (measured in pay) the more is taken away. If anyone wonders why the welfare expenditure increases, he is ignorant of behavior reinforcement, or an idiot.

If the government feels obligated to help under-privileged dependent children it should—but take them from their mothers and really help them not their mothers and midnight fathers. In so doing the government will stop subsidizing their production and eliminate an environment where the young are taught the ease of the welfare road.

If the government feels that a family of 4 is poor if they earn less than X number of dollars then don't tax their income until they earn Y dollars, the amount the government feels is an adequate income to prevent deprivation—whatever the sociologists mean by that. (As an aside, surely the amounts should be different in Bryan and Washington). This way a producer (worker) will not feel the effects of tax discouragement until he has tasted luxury.

Fill in the missing tax revenue with voluntary taxes, that is, National Lottery, alcohol, tobacco, passive sports equipment, et cetera.

D. Gun Control—Recognize that rules will have no effect on would-be murderers or armed robbers—there would be enough guns left over after a national confiscation to supply this element for 200 years. Next, if the number of available guns were reduced, so would the number of passion killings. But, why are guns available? Because people feel they need them for protection. So—Sponsor development of a non-lethal defense that costs less than a Saturday night special and convince the public that it is as effective against assailants as conventional weapons. Then in the honky tonk pockets and purses you will find Mace instead of 25 cal. Autos. Talk to them—they don't want to kill anybody, but they don't want to be "wupped" either.

There is more—such as, a complete cure of the national ills could be accomplished by updating the American philosophy to incorporate the successes of science and technology. Using modern communications, a change could be brought about in one-tenth of the 300 years it took to develop the current materialistic philosophy. Given time, and interest on your part, I could further illuminate and substantiate these concepts.

I am a man of varied experience (construction, Airforce, industry, physics professor at A & M and currently chef-owner of the Texan Restaurant) who for the past ten years has been actively questioning the basics of the world in which we live. From this come solutions to today's problems—not the only solutions, of course.

You see, I have a rule—don't bitch if you can't suggest a better way. Here are the suggestions—I'll save the bitching for people with more time and less important things to do than you.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT S. TAPLEY.

TIME FOR SPECIFICS

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, having read nearly half of the edited transcripts of recorded Presidential conversations, I find Mr. Anthony Lewis' column in today's New York Times particularly

relevant. I insert it for the interest of my colleagues:

TIME FOR SPECIFICS

(By Anthony Lewis)

"Whoever willfully endeavors by means of bribery . . . to obstruct, delay or prevent the communication of information relating to a violation of any criminal statute of the United States . . . shall be fined not more than \$20,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."—18 U.S. Code sec. 1510

"Whoever commits an offense against the United States or aids, abets, counsels, commands, induces or procures its commission is punishable as a principal."—18 U.S. Code Sec. 2.

CHICAGO—The first press and public comment on the edited White House transcripts has dealt largely with the President character revealed—the meanness of spirit, the isolation, the hatred, the conspiratorial air. That is understandable. But now it is time to focus sharply on what must overwhelmingly concern the House impeachment inquiry: the evidence of specific crimes.

By the standards of what is required to bring an ordinary indictment, there is overwhelming evidence in these transcripts that Richard Nixon committed Federal crimes. It is easy to understand now why the Watergate grand jury wanted to indict him.

The Chicago Daily News asked an experienced former Federal prosecutor, David P. Schippers, to study the transcripts. He concluded that they would support indictments of the President for "six different kinds of criminal activity": obstruction of justice and of criminal investigation, subornation of perjury, misprision of a felony, conspiracy and interstate transportation in aid of bribery.

The two main themes are obstructing justice and suborning perjury. They were also sounded by Philip Kurland, the distinguished and conservative constitutional scholar of the University of Chicago Law School. In an interview in The Chicago Tribune, Professor Kurland said there was "strong evidence" of both in the transcripts.

The evidence of obstruction of justice relates to the demand for more hush money by E. Howard Hunt, one of the convicted Watergate defendants. John Dean reported the blackmail demand to Mr. Nixon in their talk of March 21, 1973, warning him explicitly three times that payment would be an obstruction of justice. The President nevertheless repeatedly indicated his approval of paying the money.

"I know where it could be gotten," he said, and he agreed that John Mitchell was the man to handle it. "It seems to me we have to keep the cap on the bottle that much, or we don't have any option."

Ten times during that March 21 talk, Mr. Nixon returned to the subject of Hunt's blackmail demand. After H. R. Haldeman joined the conversation, Mr. Nixon said, "the Hunt problem . . . ought to be handled now" and "his price is pretty high, but at least we can buy the time on that as I pointed out to John."

Then, toward the end of the transcript, there is this most significant exchange:

P: "That's why for your immediate things you have no choice but to come up with the \$120,000, or whatever it is. Right?"

D: "That's right."

P: "Would you agree that that's the prime thing that you damn well better get that done?"

D: "Obviously he ought to be given some signal anyway."

P: "(Expletive deleted), get it. In a way that—who is going to talk to him? Colson? He is the one who is supposed to know him?"

Very few criminal cases have such direct, first-hand evidence in the words of the conspirators. After that discussion, Professor Kurland said, "everyone in the room knew

that the money was to be paid." And \$75,000 was paid to Hunt that night.

A direct obstruction prosecution would reach Mr. Nixon, though he did not pay the money himself, under the Federal law on aiding, abetting or inducing crime. The same evidence would also support an indictment for conspiracy to obstruct justice, the required overt act being the payment to Hunt.

A charge of subornation of perjury is supported by at least two passages in the March 21 transcript. In one the President advises on how to avoid perjury prosecutions when testifying before a grand jury: "You can say I don't remember. You can say I can't recall." And in a discussion of cutting off disclosures, there is this exchange:

D: "But to accomplish that requires a continued perjury by Magruder and requires—"

P: "And requires total commitment and control over all of the defendants..."

Mr. Nixon's lawyers and flacks are busy trying to suffocate judgment with upside-down characterizations of the transcripts and with attacks on Mr. Dean, whose recollections are of marginal import now that we have the President's actual words. These attempts at fuzzing the picture show a fine contempt for the nation's good sense. The answer is to focus on the facts—the facts of crime in the White House.

HUD AIDE SAYS CONSTRUCTION OF NEW HOUSING FOR THE POOR IS "WASTEFUL"

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, low-income housing is becoming a real problem in the Chicago area. This Government subsidized housing is poorly constructed and a waste of taxpayers' money. For the benefit of my colleagues, I insert the following article which informs us of a better way to house low-income families:

HUD AIDE SAYS CONSTRUCTION OF NEW HOUSING FOR THE POOR IS "WASTEFUL"

(By Robert Young)

WASHINGTON, April 27.—James L. Mitchell, undersecretary of housing and urban development, said today that government-subsidized housing for the poor emphasizing new construction is "wasteful, inefficient, and inequitable," and now benefits only one out of 15 eligible families.

The most housing per dollar of subsidy for low-income Americans, he said, can be obtained by using existing housing. He said the most promising solution to the problem is the administration's plan for direct cash assistance to enable lower-income families to shop around and buy housing where available.

"Their basic problem, it seems to us, is not so much a housing problem per se, or a health problem per se, or food and nutrition problem per se, but an income problem," Mitchell said in an interview.

Mitchell, a native of Evanston, Ill., and formerly a partner in a Chicago law firm, was appointed undersecretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development April 2. He had been HUD general counsel and special assistant to the commerce secretary for policy development. At 36, he is the administration's youngest undersecretary.

Last month, the Senate brushed aside administration objections to continuing sub-

dies for new housing for the poor and voted to reinstate those programs that HUD suspended in January, 1973. Mitchell said today the administration is pinning its hopes for new approaches to housing for the poor and federal aid for community development on legislation now being drafted in the House.

HUD now is implementing a rent subsidy program for low-income families which makes up the difference between market levels for rental housing and what they can afford to pay. This Mitchell said, is close to the administration's direct cash assistance plan for home buying.

According to Mitchell, using available existing housing is not as costly to the taxpayer as building new dwelling units for the poor. He criticized new construction as "the expensive way to serve lower-income people."

The administration's objective, Mitchell continued, is up to obtain the maximum amount of housing for the poor per subsidy dollar. Channeling this money into buying or renting existing units appears to be the best bet, he said.

"I would hope," he said, "that in time Congress will understand this principle and seek with us the goal of providing the housing units for all our families in need, not simply the one in 15 that happens to get a new unit."

He also was critical of the section of the housing bill voted last month by the Senate which restricts federal funds for community development to previously authorized grant levels rather than actual need. He predicted that if this formula is continued, urban areas like Chicago which have grown rapidly in recent years and are most in need of assistance will be short-changed in the scramble for funds.

PRESS CAMPAIGNS

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, in these days of bitter public controversy, when the press and other media have jumped into the ring as contestants, it is well to stop and take stock once in a while.

The trend of the media has been moving toward activism in recent years at a galloping speed. Both newspapers—particularly the big metropolitan press—and the television and radio owners, sometimes the same, deny this. The public, however, by all accounts remains highly skeptical.

That freedom of the press is highly desirable goes without saying. Unfortunately the guarantee of the first amendment is easily abused. The public nevertheless has not surrendered its basic right of self-government or its right to have something to say about it. Since the media now presume to take a hand in shaping our Government, the principle of self-government demands that we the people have something to say about any media practices that may subtract substantially from the power of self-government by the citizenry.

Recently O. R. Strackbein, who has had long experience in public affairs, addressed a letter to Mr. Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, publisher of the New York Times, on this general subject. I believe that Mr. Strackbein's observations are both rational and cogent, and deserve the

attention of all who have an interest in present-day practices of the big press and electronic media. The letter follows: Mr. ARTHUR OCHS SULZBERGER, Publisher, the New York Times, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. SULZBERGER: For some time, as you know from previous correspondence, I have been interested in the function of the press and how faithful it is to the principle of freedom which it enjoys under the First Amendment.

I have been particularly concerned about the press practice of conducting campaigns relating to political, economic, social and similar subjects. My conclusion is that dominant elements of the press have abused this practice in a gross manner; and that in so doing they have been guilty of a high degree of unfairness arising in some measure from the nature of the press itself, attributable to its extraordinary power in communication with the public.

The proper function of the press is to gather and disseminate news and expressions of opinion. This function is unquestionably entitled to the protection of the First Amendment.

However, there is a distinction between that function and using the press as a private instrument for conducting a variety of campaigns. A conflict of interest looms immediately when the press launches a campaign, as distinguished from simply printing the news. This distinction becomes obvious when the two purposes are compared. One is to provide the public with news, presumably as accurately as possible. The other is to influence public thinking through the devices open to "advocacy journalism". The first course makes no special demand on the newspaper beyond the presentation of facts. This, of course, is difficult enough. It, however, calls for neither subtle nor concealed nor blatant or partisan efforts to persuade readers to accept the newspaper's views or preferences. The second course, i.e., campaigns, do precisely that. The newspaper publisher is not satisfied with straightforward presentation of the news. His ego demands that he seek to influence the course of events, not merely to report the news. This great temptation, poorly resisted, if at all, is the curse of journalism today and is the source of much disapprobation and outrage.

Once a newspaper mounts a campaign in behalf of, or in opposition to, a candidate for office, a public figure or some plan or proposal, a grievance or a reform, it has a goal in view and inevitably assumes the function of an advocate. Its aim will be to win the contest, even as a legal representative in a legal action seeks victory. However dedicated the newspaper may fancy itself to be to the principles of journalism and ethical practices, it will now no less surely than the attorney, glean from the collection of facts gathered from all sources those facts and appearances that will, in its opinion, best sustain and promote the side in the campaign to which it has given its support; and will be inclined to neglect or even bury countervailing facts.

If the newspaper has a circulation of hundreds of thousands its reporters will be specialists who are given assignments by the managing editor. They are assigned a beat, so to speak, and achieve intimate knowledge of the field of their assignment. They develop discriminating judgment about the meaning of statements, messages, acts and purposes, a grasp not usually within the reach of the ordinary citizen. This gives them grounds for interpretation of wide latitude, and therefore places them in a position to inject their own views with no one except other experts aware of the additives or coloration infused.

Perhaps as reporters they pride themselves on their dedication to the high principles of journalism in point of independence, fairness and objectivity. In any large organi-

zation, however, a mixture of firmness of dedication, or in degree of determination will be found, modified by ambition, opportunism or other considerations.

Each reporter, in any event, is on a payroll and seldom feels that his salary is commensurate with his talents and contribution, or equal to what he regards as his true deserts. One of his pressing endeavors will be to repair the deficiency. It is natural then that he will be motivated by a desire to stand well in the eyes of his superior, even as the latter in turn is similarly motivated, on up the different levels of the hierarchy. In a contest between what the boss desires, on the one hand, and those beautiful principles of journalism to which the reporter holds himself to be dedicated, on the other, the odds may not be very reassuring. We are all "trimmers", to a degree, in a showdown, with the exception of a bare handful of the martyr contingent.

In the face of a choice between journalistic principles and pleasing the boss there is much room for mental maneuvering, especially when the marvelous powers of rationalization are given their inning at self-justification. Sometimes the most outraged among reporters when they are accused of slanting their writing are also the most self-righteous and ego-blind of the lot. It may be guessed in any event that they are human. They may indeed be under instructions to write what they see, hear or learn, as it is or was.

For that reason the newspaper has rewrite men, copy editors and similar reviewers who have the power of the blue pencil and may be interested in much else beside grammar, punctuation, abbreviation or the rules of rhetoric. They were perhaps selected by their own superiors for their competence and skill and particularly because they had demonstrated that they knew how to read the boss without too obvious a need to be coached. In any event they were not so obtuse that they could not soon appreciate some of the seamy "facts of life", in newspaper editing: that the best way "to get along is to go along".

Without laboring the point it is quite evident that publishers, editors and managing editors have not been frustrated or wrecked in their designs to produce newspapers that quite faithfully mirror the ambitions, purposes or predilections of the owners-publishers by the adamant stand of editors against bending the knee. The reporter in the ranks may try "to reason why" but he can satisfy himself perhaps quite honestly by saying that he turns in true copy and that it is not his affair what happens to it later. His conscience thus neatly passes the buck.

The commentator, columnist or cartoonist may, of course, be selected in the first place by the management because he has already displayed his views as a liberal or conservative, a radical or a mugwump from his previous writings and expressions. He may then be given his head. If he needs some coaching to fit him into the team, the approach may be made through delicately worded innuendoes, clever and sportive ambiguities, subtle encomium or craftily seasoned jocular fare carrying a warhead. He does wish to be respected and may be induced to sway to the wind through solemn acknowledgment of the respect due him which he finds so pleasing without admitting it. If his name is a household word he may indeed disagree with his employer's policy with impunity, but, of course, within limits. He may even influence the management.

The "activist" publisher or editor will know how to build a stable of by-line reporters, "name" columnists, editorial writers and cartoonists who can be relied upon to carry out an orchestrated campaign without too much chafing at the bit or wild prancing out of the appointed path. Higher pay than the prevailing scale will have remarkable healing powers over a smarting conscience.

What then is wrong with an ensemble to proficient and, at least outwardly, so smooth?

Does it represent a fraud on the public? That depends on a variety of possibilities. The options open to reporters who are willing confederates to the boss are almost unlimited. If the reporter is a clever writer his "copy" will not need much editing, if any. There may be a hundred different ways open to him to turn a descriptive phrase, by adding color to give it sting, or leeching to make it pale, whatever the purpose may be; to impart a favorable gloss or patina or to dismiss with even less than faint praise; to promote enthusiasm for a favored project or personality or to apply a dampening despondent or worse; or to convey roundabout disdain or, conversely, instigate an attitude of acceptance or even happy attachment. The scope is virtually infinite and cleverness is the master key. The highest skill lies in advocacy or denigration without seeming to do either: a highly valued achievement.

"Slanting" of news and commentary to produce preconceived effects is an art. Not only the reporter, the rewrite editor but the headline artist, all working as a team, takes his turn. The options of the latter, the headline architect and layout designer, are also almost unlimited. The powers of promotion, demotion, relegation to oblivion or launching to summits are in his hands, to use as effectively as he can. He may make or unmake or in any event give immeasurable impetus to, or frustrate and halt a candidate, a movement or a cause. He may drop an unfavored person or cause into the dark pit of oblivion by nonmention and thus write *finis* to the one or the other. In combination the press may thus exert fateful influence.

It is because of the endless means of producing desired effects at the command of reporters, editors and commentators that they may practice bias without detection by the public that reads as it runs.

The selection of news items and their placement in the newspaper under contrived headlines, purposively designed and placed with an eye to emphasis or de-emphasis, offers opinion-moulding powers to the newspaper owner that is not matched or overcome by the ordinary reader-skepticism. The public is prepared to regard the editorial page as an area set aside for opinion but if opinion or bias becomes inextricably mixed with the news, or if the news is run through the process of caricaturization in the form of cartoons loaded with prejudice and exaggeration, or if nearly all the commentary by columnists is at one with the editorial policy, thus depriving the readers of a balanced view, the journalistic function of the newspaper is vitiated and dishonored.

The distinction between the two types of advocacy, which is to say, that of the attorney in a courtroom and that of the newspaper conducting a campaign, becomes readily visible. The legal advocate openly practices the promotion of his client's interest. The attorney is not looked upon as objective or unbiased; and if the judge or the jury were exposed to the plea of only the one attorney the process would represent an outrageous travesty of justice.

The newspaper in conducting a campaign is also an advocate, but denies acting in that capacity and may take elaborate precautions to conceal its true colors. It therefore acts as a disguised advocate while purporting to be objective in its presentation of the news. Thus while the public treats the attorney's plea as a one-sided expression and awaits the rebuttal from his opponent, the reader of a newspaper becomes a captive of a biased campaign without access to full and competent rebuttal—unless newspapers of an opposite orientation are readily available to him. If they are indeed available he must spend more money and time for his news than he perhaps cares to budget for that purpose.

Most newspapers do open the door slightly to contrary opinion expressed by letters to

the editor; but the newspaper selects what it wishes to print and no outside monitor is on hand to assure an unbiased selection. In any event letters to the editor are no adequate antidote to the bias of which the press may be guilty. Printing such letters, without bias is a commendable practice but falls far short as a counter-point against the newspaper's uninhibited powers of campaigning. Measured against the outpourings of biased news reports and especially those of the commentators, the letters, usually one-shot assaults, fall far behind in effect. The columnists successively come back to the same subject, commenting on intangible appearances, motives, probabilities, uncertainties and dubious meanings with an air of certainty and conclusiveness that only omniscience could support. Hardly the shadow of a doubt is tolerated. The positive assertion bulldozes all uncertainty or doubt out of the way. The commentator sets himself up as the last word by virtue of his rhetoric, mode of expression and invincible self-assurance. He cannot, of course, be held to account from the outside.

All civic, political and economic rules, laws and regulations are subject to reform at the pleasure of the popular majority, in accordance with their experience over a sufficient period of time. This possibility represents the very essence of the power of self-government. The press regards itself as lying outside of this otherwise universal rule. The public as it becomes increasingly enlightened through education and political experience deserves better of the press; and the press should not for the sake of the future of journalism become a stand-pat imitator of the political reactionary whom it generally purports to despise.

The remedy? How to establish accountability without abridging the freedom of the press?

Perhaps the most sobering answer would lie in removing the profit motive, by converting the news-supplying operation into a nonprofit enterprise. How does the need differ from that financing of political campaigns? Have you, Sir, a better suggestion?

Sincerely,

O. R. STRACKBEIN.

A LISTING OF OIL COMPANIES WHICH WOULD BE EXEMPTED BY THE ANDERSON AMENDMENT TO H.R. 8193

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, this week, we will be considering H.R. 8193, which requires that a percentage of oil imports be carried on U.S.-flag ships. I plan to offer an amendment to exempt from this requirement the small refiners that have less than 30,000 barrels per day capacity. I am inserting in the RECORD, for the information of other Members, a list of small refiners located in each State which would be exempted by my amendment:

A listing of oil companies which would be exempted by the Anderson amendment to H.R. 8193

	Daily refinery capacity
ALABAMA	
Hunt Oil Co., Tuscaloosa	15,008
Marion Corp., Alabama Refining Co., Inc., Theodore	15,000
Vulcan Asphalt Refining Co., Cordova	3,500
Warrior Asphalt Corp., Holt	3,000

ARIZONA			MISSISSIPPI	
Arizona Fuels, Inc., Fredonia	8,500		Vermont Gas Systems, Inc., Southland Oil Co.:	
ARKANSAS			Lumberton	5,500
Macmillan Ring-Free Oil Co., Inc., Nophlet	4,400		Sandersville	11,000
Wood, Charles J., Petroleum Co., Cross Oil & Refining Co., Smackover	3,500		Yazoo City	4,500
			Total	21,000
CALIFORNIA			MONTANA	
Edginton Oil Refineries, Inc., District V, Long Beach	29,500		Thunderbird Resources, Inc.:	
Powerline Oil Co., District V, Santa Fe Springs	28,500		Kevin	5,123
San Joaquin Oil Co., Oildale	27,000		Cut Bank	4,658
Reserve Oil & Gas Co., Mohawk Petroleum Corp., District V, Bakersfield	22,100		Diamond Asphalt, Chinook	1,000
Fletcher Oil & Refining Co., Carson	15,000		Total	10,771
West Coast Oil Co., Oildale	13,000		Jet Fuel Refinery, Mosby	450
Golden Eagle Refining Co., Carson	13,000		NEW MEXICO	
Lunday-Thagard Oil Co., South Gate	3,000		Suburban Propane Gas Corp., Plateau Inc., Bloomfield	5,200
Pauley Petroleum, Inc., Newhall Refining Co., Inc., Newhall	8,500		Famariss Oil & Refining Co., Monument	5,000
Road Oil Sales Inc., Bakersfield	840		Thriftyway Oil Co., Bloomfield	4,020
Sabre Oil and Refining Co., Bakersfield	2,500		Navajo Refining Co., Artesia	20,930
Beacon Oil Co., Hanford	12,100		NORTH DAKOTA	
Macmillan Ring-Free Oil Co., Inc., Signal Hill	10,000		Thunderbird Resources, Inc., Williston	5,200
Witco Chemical Corp., Golden Bear Oil Co., Oildale	11,000		OKLAHOMA	
Edginton Oxnard Refinery, Oxnard	2,500		Crystal Oil & Gas, Stephen	3,240
Sunland Refining Corp., Bakersfield	9,000		OKC Refinery Inc., Okmulgee	20,000
COLORADO			Midland Cooperatives, Inc., Cushing	17,740
First General Resources Co., The Refinery Corp., Denver	17,500		Tonkawa Refining Co., Arnett	5,000
Gary Western Co., LaJunta	8,300		Swift & Co., Bell Oil & Gas Co. (A division of Vickers Petroleum), Ardmore	30,000
FLORIDA			Allied Materials Corp., Stroud	4,292
Seminole Asphalt Refining, Ltd., St. Marks	4,500		PENNSYLVANIA	
GEORGIA			Witco Chemical Corp., Bradford	8,500
Young Refining Corp., Douglasville	2,500		Quaker State Oil Refining Corp.:	
ILLINOIS			Emleton	3,320
Wireback Oil Co., Plymouth	1,200		Farmers Valley	6,500
Yetter Oil Co., Colmar	1,000		Total	9,820
Richards, M. T., Inc., Crossville	63		TENNESSEE	
INDIANA			Earth Resources Co. (the Southland land Co.), Delta Refining Co., Memphis	29,500
Ingot Oil & Refining Co., East Chicago	29,500		TEXAS	
Rock Island Refining Corp., Indianapolis	29,500		Dorchester Gas Producing Co., Car-gray	1,000
Laketon Asphalt Refining Co., Laketon	8,544		Eddy Refining Co., Houston	3,250
Gladieux Refinery, Inc., Fort Wayne	5,500		Flint Chemical Co., San Antonio	1,200
Indiana Farm Bureau Cooperatives Association, Inc., Mount Vernon	12,500		Allied Chemical Corp., Union Texas Petroleum, Winnie	9,400
Witco Chemical Corp., Hammond	7,500		JOW Refining Inc., Palestine	10,000
KANSAS			Pride Refining Co., Abilene	14,125
North American Petroleum Corp., Shallow Water	5,000		Texas Eastern Transmission Corp., La Gloria Oil & Gas Co., Tyler	24,000
Mid-America Refining Co., Inc., Chanut	3,000		Winston Refining Co., Fort Worth	15,000
KENTUCKY			Crystal Oil & Gas:	
Somerset Refining, Inc., Somerset	3,000		Longview	7,500
Kentucky Oil & Refining Co., Betsy Layne	500		La Blanca	4,000
LOUISIANA			Total	11,500
North American Petroleum Corp., St. James	11,000		South Hampton Co., Silsbee	5,617
Anchor Gasoline Corp., Canal Refining Co., Church Point	3,200		Wood County Refining Co., Quitman	3,000
Bayou State Oil Corp., Hosston	3,500		Texas Fuel & Asphalt Co., Inc., La Coste	2,310
Calumet Industries, Inc., Calumet Refining Co., Princeton	2,400		Petroleum Refining Co., Lueders	2,150
Evangeline Refining Co., Inc., Jennings	4,000		Three Rivers Refinery, Three Rivers	1,500
Clalborne Gasoline Co., Lisbon	6,500		UTAH	
Gasland Inc., Good Hope Refineries, Inc., Good Hope	29,292		Arizona Fuels, Inc., Major Oil Corp., Roosevelt	12,000
MICHIGAN			Crown Refining Co., Inc., Woods Cross	10,000
Dow Chemical Co., Bay City	11,746		Morrison Petroleum Co., Woods Cross	15,000
Lakeside Refining Co., Kalamazoo	4,000		Caribou Four Corners Oil Co.:	
Crystal Refining Co., Carson City	6,200		Kirtland, N. Mex.	2,200
			Woods Cross, Utah	5,000
			Total	7,200

WASHINGTON	
U.S. Oil & Refining Co., District V, Tacoma	16,000
Kewanee Oil Co., Sound Refining, Inc., Tacoma	3,400
WEST VIRGINIA	
Quaker State Oil Refining Corp.: St. Mary's	5,000
Newell	9,700
Total	14,700
WYOMING	
Southwestern Refining Co., La Barge	330
Mountaineer Refining Co., La Barge	175
Oriental Refining Co., Greybull	150
Little America Refining Co., Casper	22,000
Sage Creek Refining Co., Cowley	1,000

VICE PRESIDENT FORD EXPRESSES SOLID NATIONAL DEFENSE BELIEFS

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, of definite interest and importance, both at home and abroad, are the views of the Vice President of the United States which bear on the military security of the Nation. Vice President Ford spoke out candidly on this subject recently to one of America's top military reporters. An article and interview resulted which appeared in the March 1974 issue of Sea Power magazine.

Most of us recall John G. Norris, author of the article, as the former military reporter of the Washington Post and later editor in chief of Sea Power. He was last year's winner of the Navy League's Alfred Thayer Mahan Award for Literary Achievement.

The subject of his article is a Navy shipmate from World War II. It is always pleasant to see someone like him get ahead in the world. More than that, it is most comforting to his fellow citizens to know that a man of his competence and caliber stands able and ready, though not at all anxious, to command the ship of state.

Mr. Morris' article and interview with the Vice President follow:

FORMER NAVAL PERSON MAKES GOOD—INTERVIEW WITH VICE PRESIDENT FORD

(By John G. Norris)

Vice President Gerald R. Ford, who may well be the next President of the United States, sees the nation facing "a real test" this year over whether it will continue as top world leader or decline toward "second best."

In an interview in which were discussed American troubles abroad and at home, the rise of Soviet Russia and the doubts of such people as Winston Churchill and others over whether the United States has the will to "stay the course" as world leader for a span comparable to the great nations of the past, Ford was asked: "Are we already fading?"

He replied: "no, not yet. But a real test might come in calendar 1974." The President has requested a substantial increase in the Defense Department budget—I think it's around \$8 billion.

"If the Congress doesn't respond affirmatively to this," said the Vice President, "it will be a real indication that we are not going to 'stay the course' . . . it will mean that

there is a serious trend developing to end up second best.

"I don't think it's going to happen," he said, "I know the President is going to do his best to prevent it and I hope Congress will [cooperate] this time. I think it is mandatory."

Ford's experience in defense matters—including duty aboard an aircraft carrier through many battles of World War II and long service on the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and as House GOP Leader—gives him particular insight both on matters of national security and in judging what Congress may do.

In the wide-ranging exclusive interview, the Vice President also gave his views on the current status of American/Soviet nuclear and conventional military power, the direction in which U.S. strategic nuclear and conventional arms emphasis should head, the need for control of the seas, prospects for a proposed new U.S. Indian Ocean Fleet, the outlook for an all-nuclear Navy and a nuclear American merchant marine, and a number of other foreign and military policy matters. The text starts on page 10, but here are the highlights:

While the U.S. is not "seriously weakened" today in such elements of national power as military strength, natural resources, wealth, technology, unity, and leadership, and has not suffered, as a result of recent agreements, any real security loss relative to Russia, the upcoming SALT II and other talks "will be a better test."

Although there is still "rough parity" in strategic nuclear arms, there is also "ample evidence" that the Soviets are "moving ahead in research, development, procurement and deployment of some nuclear weapons." If the two nations can't agree on parity, Ford says, the USSR is going to continue to expand and "it is up to us to do the same. . . . the American people would not let us not do it."

If arms limitation talks do fail, Ford said, the United States should "certainly move forward on Trident," look into the feasibility of mobile landbased missiles (which Ford views as having a "great potential") and build B-1 bombers.

Discussing "general purpose" or conventional forces, Ford said he would not try to match potential foes man for man or weapon for weapon, but would concentrate on the Navy, where our "problems are serious. . . . I don't think we've lost [superiority at sea but] the Soviet Union is [building] at a much more accelerated rate. . . . Their Navy is much more modern," said the Vice President. "We've got to continue the modernization program of the Navy, our Navy, at an accelerated rate." He added that he also favors upgrading the performance capabilities of tactical Air Force and Navy aircraft.

The Vice President made it plain that the basic problem of control of the seas in world strategy is that, while the Soviets are largely self-sufficient in raw materials, the United States must import many vitally important materials from overseas to keep U.S. industry and life going, and in doing so must be prepared to cope with the Soviet Union's large and modern submarine fleet. "We're facing a situation where we must control [the seas], where all they have to do is deny us control, and that makes their problem a lot simpler," he said.

Asked how the United States will cope with superior Soviet sea power in the Indian Ocean-Persian Gulf-Red Sea area—particularly when, after the expected opening of the Suez Canal, Soviet warships can come from the Black Sea, rather than from Siberian, Arctic or Baltic bases—Ford said the United States should keep up a sufficient Mediterranean Fleet and "actively explore the desirability of having an Indian Ocean Fleet." He said it is "important to explore vigorously" the military requirements—ships and bases both—for such a fleet.

The Vice President also came out strong

for stepped up construction of more nuclear powered naval surface ships. Asked whether the Arab oil embargo and subsequent fuel price rises make nuclear vessels more attractive economically, he said that, while some in the Navy have tried to persuade him otherwise, the logic of a nuclear navy seems "rational" to him. He also favors "further research, further development" on a nuclear merchant fleet.

The Vice President said he "vigorously" opposes a unilateral scaled-down of U.S. troops in Europe, but knows there is growing pressure for it in Congress. He believes the Nixon Doctrine—postulating greater reliance on troops of U.S. allies overseas, but supported by American sea and air power—is sound and should be followed by future Presidents, of whatever party. And if that policy is followed it will mean "a greater role for the Navy."

Predicting a major battle this year over the defense budget, Ford made it clear that he views the struggle as not merely another fight over key military programs, but rather a major policy showdown which might well determine whether the United States will continue as a world leader or become an increasingly inward-looking nation largely concerned with domestic priorities.

The Vice President's views are of essential importance not only because he is "only a heartbeat from the White House," as the saying goes, but because he would become President should Mr. Nixon become incapacitated, resign, or be removed by impeachment. Ford might in any case, of course, be just what the country is looking for when it chooses a new leader in 1976.

READY ANSWERS FOR CONGRESS

After Watergate and Agnew, Ford made a strong and favorable impression on most Americans during hearings before Senate and House committees which conducted the most exhaustive investigation ever given a nominee for high office. He made a complete exposure of his affairs, putting into the record FBI raw files, his Navy fitness reports, financial records, and other data rarely exposed. He emerged not only as Mister Clean, but as solid, sincere, forthright, and a man of integrity, in the eyes of liberal as well as conservative members of Congress, most of whom supported his confirmation. The handful of votes against him were based solely on his record and views as a conservative—an active, consistent one, although to the left of the far right. Some commentators and some members of Congress also apparently believed Ford to be perhaps too loyal and too much a follower of the President, rather than an independent leader. But early criticism that Ford lacks the intellectual qualification and/or is not qualified in the intricacies of foreign and domestic affairs disappeared under the testimony of leading Democrats who spoke for him, the unprecedented exposure of his record, and, perhaps most important of all, that strong, almost but not quite stern, countenance, charm, poise, manner, and ready answers.

Gerald Rudolph Ford, Jr., was born Leslie King, Jr., in Omaha, Neb., July 14, 1913, and was reared in Grand Rapids, Michigan. After his mother and father were divorced, his stepfather, a prominent businessman, adopted him and gave him his name. Young Ford, six foot and 200 pounds, went to the University of Michigan where he was center on its national championship football team and a collegiate all star. Graduating in 1935 with a major in economics, Ford chose Yale Law School and a job as assistant coach over professional football offers.

Graduating from Yale in 1941, Ford practiced law until he was commissioned an ensign in the Naval Reserve in early 1942 under the pre-flight athletic conditioning program for aviators and was assigned as a physical instructor at Chapel Hill, N.C. He applied for sea duty aboard aircraft carriers and was

assigned to the new light carrier Monterey (CVL-26) in May, 1943.

Lieutenant Ford soon qualified as officer of the deck underway, assistant navigator and antiaircraft battery officer, and served aboard Monterey until the end of 1944. He participated in the Gilbert Islands, Bismarck Archipelago and Marshall Islands operations, the 1944 Asiatic-Pacific Raids, Aitape and Humboldt Bay Hollandian operations, and the Marianas, Western Carolines, Western New Guinea and Leyte Gulf operations, earning the Asiatic Pacific Campaign Medal with eight bronze stars, Philippine Liberation Ribbon with two bronze stars, and American Campaign and World War II Medals. He made lieutenant commander before his release in early 1946.

All of Ford's World War II skippers gave him high ratings, Monterey Commanding Officer Captain S. H. Ingersoll, now a retired vice admiral, praised Ford as "outstanding in all respects," and possessing a "thorough knowledge and ready grasp of seamanship and tactics." Ford was "steady, reliable and resourceful . . . an excellent navigator and all around ship's officer," said Ingersoll, adding that "his unflinching good humor, pleasing personality and natural ability as a leader made him well liked and respected by the officers and men."

Should Ford become President he would be the fourth consecutive Commander-in-Chief and Chief Executive who had been a naval officer during World War II.

REBOUNDING RE-ELECTIONS

After the war Ford returned to law practice in Grand Rapids, but soon ran for Congress, with the encouragement of the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg, a friend of Ford's stepfather. Ford, like Vandenberg, had altered his thinking from isolationist to internationalist as a result of the war. He defeated the incumbent, still isolationist Congressman, and was easily re-elected to succeeding Congresses, getting 60 to 69 percent of the total vote each time out.

In the House, Ford won a coveted spot on the House Appropriations Committee and spent long years on that panel's Defense Subcommittee, also serving on the Foreign Aid and CIA Subcommittees. The long hours of briefings by and questioning of Pentagon, State, AID and intelligence officials that appropriations committee men experience gave him an invaluable education in foreign and military affairs.

Although not active in the Naval Reserve, Ford remained on the Navy rolls until 1963, when he resigned, opting for discharge rather than honorary retirement because he wanted, considering his congressional position, to avoid any possible conflict of interest.

Ford's voting and speaking record was the subject of a detailed Library of Congress Reference Service study made for the Senate Rules Committee when his nomination as Vice President was considered. One conclusion summarized in the study: the Vice President has been a "forceful and consistent advocate of a strong U.S. national defense," and a supporter of an "active role for the United States abroad, involving close working ties with this country's allies and a willingness to confront serious challenges to the nation's security."

The record confirms this. Ford criticized President Kennedy for withdrawal of vital air support during the abortive Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba and, while generally supporting the Vietnam war, was a critic of President Johnson's conduct of the conflict, urging early bombing of Hanoi, a naval blockade of Haiphong, and a generally more vigorous prosecution of the war.

Ford has demonstrated political courage, as well. Since taking his present office, he told a B'nai B'rith meeting that American Jews could not have it both ways—they could not

back defense cuts and still expect the United States to support Israel from a position of strength. He himself has voted for strength, coming out strong, for example, for the sometimes controversial CVN 70 and other weapons programs.

Ford also has backed the Sea-Grant College plan and other oceanographic programs, as well as various measures designed to strengthen the U.S. merchant marine. In the non-defense area he has favored a Constitutional amendment to permit school prayers and legislative proposals to bar busing for racial balance and to let states decide whether abortions should be permitted. Perhaps his most controversial action was to lead a move to impeach liberal Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas.

ENOUGH, BUT NOT TOO MUCH

During his Senate confirmation hearings, Ford was asked a pointed question about his priorities on how America should spend its money.

"I really feel," he replied, "that the number one priority in the very controversial world we live in is adequate funding for our national security. That does not mean that I would vote whatever funds are requested," he said.

"Now, once you have an adequate national security, and that means enough, not too much, then I think you have to take the rest of the pie, and you have to divide it, bearing in mind what taxes we want to pay, what borrowings we want to make, and allocate according to the proper balance."

Jerry Ford has become perhaps the busiest Vice President in history. The day of his Sea Power interview he had an early breakfast with Secretary of the Treasury Shultz and aides, joined President Nixon for a meeting with congressional leaders, met with an Indian tribe leader and a state governor, was the featured speaker at a large lunch as well as, later, at dinner, and also found time to talk to two "interns" who had worked for him for several months and were returning to college in Michigan.

The Vice President's major task is handling relations with Congress, a job previously held by former Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, but Ford also sits in on Administration leadership meetings—and heads them in the President's absence. He has five offices on Capitol Hill: a ceremonial one just off the Senate floor, a working office nearby, a staff office in the New Senate Office Building, and two rather more private "cubbyholes" of the type traditionally maintained by the powers that be on Capitol Hill, one in the House and one in the Senate. His main office, housing his 50 member staff, is next to the White House in the Old Executive Office Building—formerly the old State, War and Navy Building.

Robert T. Hartmann, an ex-newsman (former chief of the *Los Angeles Times* Washington Bureau) and retired Naval Reserve captain who worked for Fleet Admiral Bull Halsey throughout the Pacific war, is Ford's chief of staff. Former Virginia Congressman John O. Marsh, Jr., was recently shifted from the Pentagon where he was Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs to replace now-retired Army Major General John M. Dunn as Ford's assistant for defense affairs. Commander Howard J. Kerr is Ford's naval aide and Lieutenant Colonel Americo A. Sardo is his Marine Corps aide. At this writing, there were no Army or Air Force aides.

Jerry Ford married Elizabeth Boomer, a tall, slim former Powers model, just before he came to Washington as a Congressman. They have four children, 16 to 23, three boys and one girl, all in high school or college. The oldest son is studying for the ministry. The Fords are Episcopalians. They live in Alexandria, Va., near Washington, in what the Washington Star-News called an "unpretentious

house" with an all-weather pool—Ford swims early every morning to keep fit. His favorite sport, however, is skiing, which he indulges in at the family lodge in Colorado, and he likes to watch football.

Mrs. Ford once told a reporter her husband is a "square," and his early photographs confirm that description, literally—straight mouth, straight eyebrows and a straight hairline (the latter, now receding, has changed with the passage of the years).

The term "square," in its best sense, still fits, however. Many years ago Jerry Ford told a sports reporter his pet peeve was, at that time, anyway, "unknowing and unreasonable critics of football coaches and players" and that his favorite people were New Dealer Thurman Arnold, actor Paul Muni, actress Betty Grable and singer Paul Robeson.

Asked during his Sea Power interview if he still holds those views, the politically adept Ford said he might amend his favorite people list, but declined to "update" his criticism of sportswriters "because of the delicacy of the relationship between politicians and the news media."

When asked whether well-done steaks smothered in onions were his favorite dish, Ford replied with an emphatic "Yes."

INTERVIEW

(Following is the text of his Sea Power interview conducted by Mr. Norris, with Mr. Hartmann, Commander Kerr, and Editor-in-Chief James Hessman sitting in.)

SEA POWER. Mr. Vice President, Winston Churchill publicly pondered whether the United States, as the new world leader has the will to "stay the course," and that question has been more recently asked by such people as Arthur Krock and others. In light of our troubles over the past decade and the upsurge of the Soviets, are we already fading?

VICE PRESIDENT GERALD R. FORD. I don't think we're failing right now. I believe a real test might come in calendar 1974. The President has requested a substantial increase in the Defense Department budget—I think it's around \$8 billion. If the Congress doesn't respond affirmatively to this, it will be a real indication that we are not going to stay the course. I think it's needed mostly to replenish drawn down mobilization reserves, to replenish some of our stocks that were used in the Middle East, and if the Congress fails to support this budget increase for the Defense Department it will mean that there is a serious trend developing to end up second best. I don't think it's going to happen. I know the President is going to do his best to prevent it and I hope the Congress will this time; I think it's mandatory.

S.P. To follow that up, many things make a nation a world leader—size, wealth, abundance of natural resources, technology, unity, good leadership and the power and will to provide and use, if needed, strong armed forces. Haven't we been weakened in some of these strengths, particularly in our defense, with relation to Russia?

FORD. I don't believe we've had any serious weakening in those areas listed. We have made some agreements with the USSR. We've gotten something from them in return for something given by us. So there hasn't been any weakening *vis a vis* one another. I would agree that we have some real important negotiations going on right now. SALT II, MBFR—those negotiations, those agreements will be a better test, I think, than where we are today.

S.P. To be specific, has not the USSR captured at least rough parity in strategic nuclear arms and is apparently aiming at superiority? Can we afford to let this happen, and what should we do to avert it, aside from SALT negotiations?

FORD. I think we have a situation today where there is rough parity in strategic nuclear

clear weapons. If the Soviet Union doesn't come to some agreement with us, there is ample evidence that they are moving ahead in research, development, procurement, and deployment of some nuclear weapons. We can negotiate a limitation and maintain relative parity; if we don't, you and I know they're going to continue this surge they've had; and then it's up to us to do the same. I think the American people would not let us *not* do it. The American people will want us to do it, if we can't negotiate some limitation. It's a lot of easier for the Soviet Union to continue this program than it is for us.

S.P. If we must bolster our nuclear arms, would you favor emphasis on: (1) Trident submarines; (2) landbased forces; or (3) B-1 bombers. Or some of these other things, such as mobile land missiles, cruise missiles from submarines, etc.

FORD. I would certainly move forward on the Trident submarine; I would advocate, certainly, investigation as to the feasibility of mobile landbased missiles. I think we should proceed with the B-1. We certainly couldn't remain static with just the programs we have. We'd probably have to accelerate research, development, procurement and deployment of all of those. With a new factor, maybe, of mobile landbased missiles.

S.P. Do you believe strongly in mobile rather than stationary landbased missiles?

FORD. Yes. It's got a great potential, Jack, if it's feasible.

S.P. I mean mobility, at sea and in the air.

FORD. I'm talking about mobile landbased missiles.

S.P. Since the "nuclear umbrella" has prevented all-out war to date, do we need to bolster our conventional arms to cope with lesser crises? Are we not falling behind in numbers, modernity and readiness in land and air forces and sea forces, and are we losing our superiority? I think things have gotten so bad that we are maybe losing our superiority at sea, I don't know what you...

FORD. I don't think we've lost it, the building program of the Soviet Union is at a much more accelerated rate than ours. Their Navy is much more modern. We've got to continue the modernization program of the Navy, our Navy, at an accelerated rate, if we are to maintain any degree of naval superiority. I don't think on the land we have to match the Soviet Union or China man for man, or weapon for weapon. I think that is a responsibility for some of our allies. We can help with the supplying of weapons. But Navy problems are serious, and that's one thing that we really are qualified to do anything about.

S.P. How about modernizing the naval air force?

FORD. Aircraft?

S.P. Aircraft.

FORD. Well, we are moving up in light bombers, we are moving forward in fighter aircraft; I think we have to continue upgrading our actual capabilities in these areas. But I do not think we have to significantly increase manpower.

S.P. Everyone now is aware of the importance of the Persian Gulf, Red Sea, Indian Ocean oil, owned by militarily weak Arab countries, and should be aware of the burgeoning Soviet naval power and its concentration of ships and bases in that area. Is there not only a future threat of a cutoff of oil supplies to the West, not only by the embargo, but, with the opening of the Suez Canal, letting the Soviets gain control of the seas there? That will certainly enable them to strengthen their position there, will it not?

FORD. I think we've got to maintain a task force of sufficient size in the Med to be a deterrent. Now, I think also that we've got to actively explore the desirability of having

an Indian Ocean Fleet. I can't tell you the number, I can't tell you what the bases ought to be, but I think it is important to us to explore vigorously the military requirements of such a force being deployed.

S.P. There's been an announcement that we're asking for \$20 million to bolster Diego Garcia...

FORD. I saw that...

S.P. ... which is a pretty small atoll, but it would make it more of a base. Could you tell us what they're going to do there? It seems like they're going to make it a longer airport so it can take anything.

FORD. Jack, I can't tell you what the details are on that.

S.P. Well, the initial plan, as I understood it, in time, projected by the Navy and the Air Force, was to make the airstrip long enough to handle any type of plane. If this is needed, do we need to increase the size of the Navy? This would be another commitment, would it not?

FORD. There's no question that, if you're going to go into an area that you've never had an active fleet in before, you will have to accelerate your modernization program or you have to add more ships. If you add more modern ships, I suppose you could stretch them a little further. But I suspect we'd probably have to do both.

S.P. With the new awareness of U.S. shortages, which go far beyond oil, do we need to strengthen the U.S. Fleet to assure continued control of the area to bring in the bauxite, tin, and many other strategic materials which we lack and are so necessary to U.S. industry and life? Do we need to keep control of the seas?

FORD. It would certainly be desirable, looking back at the catastrophe in the early days of World War II. Frankly, I just don't know how big a fleet you have to have to meet the challenge, the underseas challenge of the Soviet submarine fleet. I honestly can't answer that. I would assume that enemy submarines are far more capable of attacking surface ships today than the ones were in 1940-41. I'm sure they've got more sophisticated weapons, they're more silent, they're faster. I think we're facing a situation where we must control, where all they have to do is deny us control, and that makes their problem a lot simpler than ours. I think you've got to be cognizant of that problem, but I don't know how many new ships you need to meet that problem.

S.P. The Arab oil embargo has cut off most fuel sources for American ships—warships and merchantmen—overseas and the price of oil has multiplied. Does this change the outlook for a nuclear surface Navy? Should we then build more nuclear warships, and possibly develop a nuclear merchant marine?

FORD. Well, I'm sympathetic to an all-nuclear Navy. Some naval officers have tried to convince me otherwise. But I better not quote them. They aren't supposed to make policy decisions. But the logic of it escapes me—that we shouldn't move more rapidly into a nuclear navy. I guess I've been brain-washed, perhaps, by Admiral Rickover, but this looks to me like the most rational decision.

S.P. What are the prospects for a scale-down U.S./U.S.S.R. force in Western Europe or for unilateral reduction or withdrawal of American troops there? Does this mean possibly a greater role for the U.S. Navy—particularly with the loss of relative power *vis a vis* Russia in the Mediterranean and on the northern flank of Europe?

FORD. I'm very much opposed to unilateral reduction of American forces in NATO. I believe there is a good prospect for an equitable downward reduction agreed to by the Soviet Union, its allies, ourselves, and our allies. I think there's a good possibility.

S.P. You're opposed, but what do you think

might happen, either as to a unilateral reduction or withdrawal.

FORD. Well, there's a growing pressure in the Congress to force us out; it was not successful last year; but it's increased in pressure. I'm vigorously opposed to it. But I have to deal with the realities.

S.P. Well, take the second point of our question. Does either the unilateral reduction or agreed withdrawal of American troops mean a possibly greater role for the Navy, particularly with the loss of relative power *vis a vis* Russia?

FORD. I don't see that unilateral reduction of U.S. troops in Europe means automatically a greater role for the Navy in either the Mediterranean or in Northern Europe.

S.P. What do you see as the future of NATO? Are there any prospects for a NATO Indian Ocean Force in light of the heavy reliance of Western Europe on Mideast oil?

FORD. I don't see any evidence of a NATO Indian Ocean Force. It seems to me that our best prospect would be for a U.S. force that would handle that responsibility. It would be better if we could get NATO to do it, but I haven't seen any evidence of their willingness to expand their naval capability.

S.P. Do you feel that the "Nixon Doctrine," will continue, under any name, in future administrations? If so, does this mean a greater role for the Navy?

FORD. The "Nixon Doctrine" overseas is sound; any subsequent administration would be wise to follow it. And if the program or policy is continued there is probably a greater role for the Navy.

S.P. In view of present and prospective mineral shortages, as well as shortages of food and other essentials, do you expect a major enlargement of oceanography programs to obtain these needed resources from the seas?

FORD. The answer is yes.

S.P. Some people have long felt that our national leaders do not fully appreciate the importance of the seas to this country, and that this stems from the lack of maritime input and advice at the top. The Secretary of the Navy was dropped from the Cabinet by post-World War II unification of the services. The top merchant marine official is an assistant secretary. Do you see any merit in the argument that, because the oceans are foreign to most Americans and most officials lack knowledge and appreciation of the problems and advantages of three-quarters of the Earth's surface, the President should have a top "maritime advisor" reporting directly to him?

FORD. I don't necessarily see the need for that. After all, we have had, since the Chiefs of Staff were established, we've had Admiral Radford for four years, we've had Admiral Moorer, for two, and two more years.

S.P. That's what this question really stems from. During those periods when there was no input of the maritime—meaning navy/maritime—at the top. A great many Navy thinkers are saying this and writing this, because the generals can't quite think in such terms.

FORD. Helen Bentley [Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission] hasn't had any difficulty in being heard.

S.P. Well, she's interested in the maritime, and right there I've got another question. Do you think there's any need or any prospect for starting work on a nuclear merchant marine?

FORD. I certainly do. The one we had, the SAVANNAH, was, unfortunately, unsuccessful. But I think we ought to proceed with further research, further development in this area.

S.P. One great problem of the military today is personnel. More than half of the defense budget—56 per cent, I think—goes for pay and related items, compared to 25 per cent in Russia, thereby permitting them to

spend much more for weapons development and procurement. We now have an all-volunteer force, but enlistments are lagging and quality is a continuing problem. If this continues are there alternatives or remedies that can be applied? Can you discuss this?

FORD. If we are unsuccessful in maintaining the quality and numbers needed in the Defense Department, all services, with the abolition of the draft, then I think we'll actively be forced to reconsider the draft again. I think it's fair to point out, however, that it will be darn hard to get Congress to enact it. I think it will be very difficult.

S.P. Can you think of an alternative?

FORD. Universal military training? With a six-month or one-year obligation? I don't think so.

S.P. What is your view of the treaty that's about to be signed that will turn over the Panama Canal?

FORD. I have many reservations. I haven't seen the newest version, the details of it. But I've had many reservations about the one that's been discussed over the previous three or four years.

S.P. I have a few little personal questions here, that I'd like to throw out quickly. That scrapbook of your wartime service has a cartoon from a Cedar Rapids paper . . .

FORD. Grand Rapids.

S.P. Excuse me. Sorry, Grand Rapids. It says: "His pet peeve is 'unknowing and unreasonable critics of football players.'" Would you care to modernize, update that a little?

FORD. Because of the delicacy of the relationship between politicians and the news media I don't think I ought to move my criticism from athletics to the current political scene.

S.P. Are well-done steaks smothered in onions still your favorite dish?

FORD. Yes.

S.P. Last question: do you remember any little things about ship life that you would care to tell me? You were there on the U.S.S. *Monterey* 18 months, two years . . . ?

FORD. I think a little over two years. Before I forget it, I think in our House Committee hearings, or Senate Committee hearings, we put my whole fitness report in. Probably the most interesting experience that I had was during the Battle of the Philippines. We got caught in that real tough typhoon—off the Philippines. I've forgotten the exact date but it was the day leading up to the worst day. I think it was December 18. We were refueling. Ourselves and destroyers and others were being refueled. And boy, the weather was just hell. That night, of course, three of those destroyers rolled over in the sand. But, anyhow, that night we rolled and pitched; I had the midnight to 0400 watch as officer of the deck. I went down to my sack when I was relieved; then we had general quarters at about 5:00, 5:30. We secured from general quarters and I went down to the sack and all of a sudden general quarters sounded again.

S.P. Sounds like the old Navy . . .

FORD. . . . and my relief was on board and he had never been to sea before. And I woke up—it must have been about a half hour after we secured—smoke was coming up through the corridors and my relief came by and said, "Jerry, Jerry, get up!" And I tell you, there was fear in his eyes. I didn't know what had happened, but I could see smoke. Rather quickly it became obvious we were on fire. My battle station was the bridge; I was officer-of-the-deck under general quarters. I went from my stateroom, went forward, which was the way I always went, turned right, went up on a catwalk, got up on the flight deck and then went back to the island structure, which was the quick-

est way to get up there. I went up the catwalk, up the ladder, and as I got on the flight deck and the ship rolled like this [the Vice President slanted his hands at about a 45 degree angle] and I took off just like I was going down a toboggan. Well, I'm sure you know that on a carrier there's a metal raised strip around the flight deck, which is to keep things from rolling over the side. Well, as I went down just like a toboggan, pretty damn fast since it was raining, it was slippery, and there was oil and everything on it, I could just visualize going over the side. So I spread out as broadly as I could; I hit that thing, and I spun around and rolled into the catwalk, instead of going over the side. We had catwalks, you know, all the way around, on starboard and portside. But we lost four or five people over the side that day. That's about as close as I ever came. And, boy, I had a bruised back because, as I went over the side of the flight deck, I landed sort of on my back against the rail. So I had a sore back for about a month. So other than being in general combat, in operations, etc., that's about as interesting a time.

S.P. That's thrilling enough. Now they'd have to get sideboys out.

FORD. Yes, we had a lot of fun.

A REUBEN FOR HAGAR

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the high honor accorded one of my constituents, Mr. Dik Browne of Wilton, Conn., who was recently presented with a Reuben for his Hagar the Horrible.

This may sound like a gastronomical treat for an unruly pet to some of you not privileged to read the right newspaper and not familiar with the world of cartoonists, but it in fact represents a stellar achievement in this popular of graphic art forms.

The Reuben Award, named for the late Rube Goldberg, the inventive cartoonist whose name has become a synonym for complexity carried to the insane limit, is the prestigious top honor awarded by the National Cartoonists Society. Mr. Browne was selected by his peers in the society for this award, recognition of his unique talent and the high regard in which he is held by his fellow cartoonists.

Hagar the Horrible, for those of you not familiar with the popular Norseman, is a daily comic strip which appears in papers across the country. It depicts the humorous antics of a viking clan led by the humorously fierce Hagar, one of the more improbable pillagers of all time.

I would like to add my personal congratulations and best wishes to Dik Browne on the occasion of this richly deserved award and suggest to any of my colleagues not familiar with his work that the humor of his creations can offer a welcome respite from the cares of the day.

PENSION REFORM

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, on May 2, 1974, I had the privilege to appear before the Delaware Life and Health Sales Congress at the University of Delaware to discuss the pension reform legislation which is currently in conference.

As a member of the Senate Finance Subcommittee on Private Pensions, I have supported efforts to protect the hard-earned pensions which employees have come to depend on as the high cost of living makes personal saving progressively more difficult.

I am also particularly pleased with a provision in the legislation which would permit workers not covered by pensions to set aside up to \$1,500 per year, tax free, from their earnings. This provision would apply to the one-half of our gainfully employed people who do not have the benefit of an established pension plan.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my speech be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

PENSION REFORM

Good Morning. I am delighted to be here at the Delaware Life and Health Sales Congress to discuss the pending pension reform legislation. The argument for pension reform legislation can best be summed up this way. If you remain in good health and stay with the same company until you are 65 years old, and if the company is still in business, and if your department has not been abolished, and if you haven't been laid off for too long a period, and if there is enough money in the fund, and if that money has been prudently managed, you will get a pension.

I would like to begin this talk by commending your industry in particular for its history of untiring support for our efforts to strengthen this country's private pension plan system. I, along with the majority of my colleagues in Congress, share your concern that we must have a viable system to assure adequate retirement income.

Let me also take this opportunity to express my support for your industry as a whole. A strong, viable life insurance industry, one which does so much to relieve the Federal Government's fiscal burden, is essential to our economic well-being.

It has been over thirty years since the basic pension provisions were adopted by the Congress. And, it is now time to conform our pension laws to our present economic system. During our considerations of the bill, many observers argued that it is our national duty to provide for complete and comprehensive coverage, vesting and funding provisions. However, we must remember that our private pension plan system is entirely voluntary and the additional costs of restrictive standards would discourage employers from voluntarily setting up retirement plans for their workers.

After three years of consideration, the Congress is on the verge of enacting legislation to establish minimum standards and guidelines to improve our private pension plan

system. The pension legislation will increase the number of individuals participating in employer-financed plans. It will insure that those who do participate in such plans actually receive their benefits. And, the bill will make the tax laws relating to qualified retirement plans fairer by providing greater equality of treatment under such plans for different taxpayers. To put pension reform legislation into proper perspective it might be useful to review briefly for you the history of this legislation.

Early in 1973, an ad hoc Subcommittee on Private Pensions was appointed to review an enormous amount of material relevant to the need for legislative reform. As a Member of that panel, I supported efforts to protect the hard earned pensions which employees have come to depend on more and more as the high cost of living makes personal saving progressively more difficult.

In late summer of 1973, after weeks of intensive work, the Senate Finance Committee, of which I am a member, approved legislation stipulating that companies that have plans must conform to minimum standards for guaranteeing pension rights to their employees. Since the Labor and Public Welfare Committee also had approved a pension reform bill, a compromise was worked out by the two committees and a final bill was passed by the Senate by a 93-0 vote.

On the House side, the Education and Labor, and Ways and Means Committee worked to develop confronting legislation. By the end of February of this year, the House had passed their bill by a vote of 376-4.

The Senate and House bills, which are now in a joint conference committee, parallel each other in principle, but differ in specific detail. I understand that the conference committee, which will hold its first formal meeting within the next few days, hopes to have a final bill completed by June. I am confident that the Congress will quickly accept the conference report, and we will have a new pension law on the books by this July.

Since today's program includes presentations by a number of experts on the pension legislation, I will not discuss the technical aspects of the bill. But, I would like to discuss Congress' main objectives in developing this legislation.

This legislation is designed to extend the coverage under our pension system more widely. Despite the phenomenal growth in the pension system, which has seen the participants in private plans soar from about four million people in 1940 to more than thirty-five million people in 1973, our national coverage has often been inadequate and restrictive. In fact, pension coverage is rare in such areas as agriculture and some small businesses.

Pension reform should also liberalize the vesting practices of companies by establishing a new minimum standard with which companies must comply. Our present law generally does not require a retirement plan to give a covered employee vested rights to his benefits if he leaves or loses his job before retirement.

This issue of eligibility has all too often been used to the disadvantage of individuals who are approaching their date of participation. Every year loyal workers are summarily dismissed from service just before they are to become vested beneficiaries. To the man who is on the eve of receiving his pension rights, this eleventh hour news can wipe out years of expected income, and put him back at square one, bringing hardship of a very serious nature.

Additionally, the failure to vest sooner could interfere with the mobility of our labor force to the detriment of our economy. Therefore, Congress has dealt with this issue by requiring qualified pension plans to grant

covered employees minimum vested rights after serving a specified number of years.

Congress also has had a concern that many employees currently covered by pension plans, anticipating retirement income, will not receive benefits because of inadequate funding.

Since a significant number of plans have not accumulated sufficient assets to pay benefits in the future to covered employees, the Congress has established minimum safeguards to insure that there will be enough money to pay the guaranteed rights of retiring employees.

After all, the Federal Government long ago took steps to insure that applicants for jobs not suffer discrimination in hiring, and that once on the job, reasonable health and safety standards would protect them from many occupational hazards. I feel it is high time we did something to protect these same workers' hard earned pensions.

While these new vesting and funding requirements will make pension plans much more effective, they will have little effect on a pension plan that is suddenly terminated. For this reason, the Congress has established a plan for insuring employees against loss of benefits resulting from a plan's termination.

When I served on the Senate Banking Committee, we spent many hours reviewing the insurance funds which now protect the savings deposits and securities investments of the American public. While we now protect more than \$300 billion in savings institutions, present law provides no safeguard at all for the more than \$200 billion in pension assets that now exist.

In a highly mobile economy, as companies merge or liquidate, plan terminations can cause economic panic in the lives of those who worked under the honest assumption they would have a "nest egg" with which to retire.

The Congress has also acted to provide fairer tax treatment of contributions to pension plans. The one provision that I am particularly pleased with, since I was an early supporter, would permit workers not covered by pensions to set aside up to \$1500 per year, tax free, from their earnings.

I have always felt that our present law discriminates against the many employees not covered by retirement plans and against the self-employed. This is because personal retirement savings of individuals not covered by pension plans must be made out of after-tax income, while those covered by retirement plans are permitted to defer tax on their employer's contributions.

I want to give you some figures that illustrate this unequal tax treatment received by our citizens. Let us take the case of the individual who does not have the benefit of a pension plan. Let us assume that he earns \$50 for saving and that he is in the 19 percent tax bracket. His \$50 earned income would be reduced to \$40.50 because of the tax. We will assume that his savings earn 5 percent interest. If such an individual earned \$50 for saving and kept it up from age 35 for 30 years or until he was 65, he would accumulate \$27,498. This would pay him a life annuity at age 65 of \$221 a month.

Now, if another individual earns \$50 to be saved, and he has the benefit of our tax laws for pension plans, the \$50 is not taxable and so the full amount goes into his retirement fund. The earnings from his \$50-a-month saving likewise are tax-free. This person with the generous tax treatment would over the same 30-year period accumulate \$39,864, or enough to pay him a lifetime annuity at age 65 of \$319.

About half of our gainfully employed people do not have the benefit of an established pension plan. This is the national average. In Delaware there are many people who do

not have the benefit of a private pension plan because of our agricultural interests. This new proposal of ours will benefit everyone—employees, employers, the self-employed—everyone. It will promote thrift. It will provide tax equality. It will enable people to provide for their own old age and they will be less dependent upon government programs.

The Senate and House versions of this provision are somewhat different, with the Senate version insuring that a pensioner's widow and children receive both the tax benefits and the incidental benefits. As an early supporter of this provision, let me assure you that I strongly support the Senate version of the bill. I have spoke with officials at the Treasury Department in regard to this matter, and they have assured me that the Administration will support the Senate version. I have also discussed this matter with several of my Senate colleagues on the conference committee, and they have assured me that they will support this life insurance factor in the final bill.

This bill is the amalgam of many different proposals, heard jointly by four separate Congressional committees. In my opinion, the legislation represents a major breakthrough in retirement security for the millions of American workers who are now covered by corporate or self-employed plans. With its final enactment, we will be affirming our promise to insure that economic disaster does not befall those who have worked so hard to assure America's prosperity and who are deserving of financial security in their retirement.

HONORING DONALD K. CURRLIN

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, May 7, Donald K. Currlin will retire as counsel to the Santa Clara Valley Water District. He has served the district since its creation by the California State Legislature in 1952, as legal adviser, as manager-counsel, and as general manager. In these 22 years, the Santa Clara Valley has grown from a sleepy, semirural collection of communities to a major metropolitan area. Without Mr. Currlin's many contributions, this growth would never have been possible.

Shortly after World War II, the Santa Clara Valley began to experience major water shortages as the result of population expansion and lack of flood control. Mr. Currlin was instrumental in developing new water resources, initiating water importation, and instituting water conservation measures. In later years when the flood control and water conservation districts were merged, he also became responsible for flood controls. Under his guidance flood protection was extended to thousands of previously unprotected citizens and their property. A coordinated system of flood planning for the valley was also instituted. Most recently, he has focused attention on the need to anticipate water requirements and plan accordingly. In this connection, he has been a leading advocate of developing water reclamation programs.

In sum, Don leaves the Santa Clara Valley Water District having accomplished a great deal. His leadership and counsel will be sorely missed, but the basic framework for water management he created should continue to serve as a valuable guide for the future.

On behalf of all the citizens of the Santa Clara Valley, I wish him a retirement as productive as his years with the water district.

OEO: WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Education and Labor recently reported H.R. 14449, a bill to continue the programs administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity—OEO—by transferring them to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Since Congress will soon be voting on the fate of OEO, I call the following memorandum to the attention of my colleagues. It was prepared in 1972 by Howard Phillips, formerly Director of OEO, at the request of the White House:

OEO: WHAT IS TO BE DONE?

Why Does It Matter?

With "only" \$3 billion under its direct authority, one might conclude that OEO, however bothersome on occasion, is relatively insignificant in the overall context of Federal domestic activity. Such a conclusion would be perilously off the mark. One might also conclude that while the problems are well known, practical solutions are not possible. This too would be incorrect.

As many of OEO's proponents have boasted over the years, it is the "cutting edge" of social change in America. But what kind of change? And why?

The objectives of OEO and many of its grantees have included:

- *Fostering the notion that America is an "oppressive" society whose existing institutions and systems cannot justly serve "the poor" against whom they are alleged to be arrayed;

- *"Educating", radicalizing, and organizing the poor for direct action to "confront" the system with demands, demonstrations, boycotts, rallies, marches, and other forms of protest and pressure which, however legal and however peaceful, tend to result in the shaping of public policy without the normal majoritarian, democratic safeguards and accountability incident to the electoral process;

- *Attempts at "reform" through erosion of such socially stabilizing values and institutions as the family, the work ethic, majority rule, parental authority over children, school authority over students, love of country, respect for law enforcement, control by prison authorities over inmates, military discipline, etc.

- *Glorification of dissent and dissenters, whether rebelling prisoners, conscientious objectors, women's libbers, welfare mothers, abortion proponents, peace marchers, lettuce strikers, homosexuals, etc.

- *Politicization of institutions, ranging from prisons to schools to nursing homes;
- *Attempts to "overload" state and federal budgets by adding millions of dollars to wel-

fare costs (a training program for this purpose is currently underway at Federal expense).

- *Conscious assignment of responsibility for social decision-making to elite groups of bureaucrats, lawyers, community organizers, consultants, and poverty professionals who are beyond recall by the people as a whole or by the duly elected representatives of the people;

- *Tendency to define and treat poverty as a cultural characteristic to be celebrated, rather than an economic disability to be overcome;

- *Efforts to make individual poor people "conscious" of their "collective identity" and interests "as a class".

The scope of OEO vastly transcends the impact of the 2000 people directly employed by OEO:

- *The combined total of persons employed under the Economic Opportunity Act in funded agencies is nearly 300,000 (including HEW & DOL EOA funded programs);

- *There are 986 Community Action Agencies (CAAs), 81 migrant and seasonal farmworkers program locations, 90 Indian projects, 934 Legal Services offices, and numerous other offices funded under OEO health center projects, housing, community development corporations, etc. etc. It is the largest and, in many ways, only nationwide domestic network or organizations funded by the U.S. government;

- *OEO has funded the staffs of colleges, legislative lobbies, newsletters, TV and radio stations, hospitals, housing corporations, and much more. Virtually each week it is in session, the Supreme Court hands down far reaching decisions on cases brought by OEO funded lawyers. We have financed the travel of thousands, direct training of thousands more, as well as the publication of numerous pamphlets, manuals, and the like.

OEO AND THE FUTURE

Premises for future action

In considering alternative policies and courses of action regarding OEO, it is useful to keep in mind the following observations:

- *In selecting personnel to run social programs, Republicans too often discriminate against Republicans. Too many of our appointees, lacking self-assurance and confidence in their own judgment regarding Great Society programs, become infected with credentialitis, deferring to those most intimately involved in the creation and management of LBJ-Shriver programs. Loyalty, shared values, judgment, and ability must be treated as more important than credentials. Credentials and knowledge can be acquired; loyalty and shared values usually are not. Co-optation is likely when a person without a firm entering point of view is put in charge of an activity which is conceptually-rooted and ideologically flavored by the bureaucrats who have psychological, political, or pecuniary stakes in its unchanged perpetuation.

- *The problem of OEO would be dangerously exacerbated if its various components were merely broken up and reassigned without being fundamentally reformed. Nor should we delude ourselves by thinking that the mere rhetoric of reform can effectively substitute for the fact of it.

- *The failures of the War on Poverty are primarily failures of concept, rather than of technique. It is less that particular programs fall into the wrong hands (although they frequently do) or that leadership has been lacking, than that its root premises are deeply flawed. Basic reforms, as well as tactical ones, are necessary.

- *Research and development is not neutral. At beginning and end, that which is to be examined, the manner of examination, and that which is to be done with the result are inevitably influenced by the values and, indeed, the political objectives of those mak-

ing the decisions. *Evaluation isn't neutral either.*

- *In administering GSA or IBM, one can generally conclude that "operations is operations" and middle-management, to perform faithfully and effectively, need not share top management's values and political objectives. However, in OEO and other social program agencies, "operations is policy". If elections are to be meaningful, therefore, top management must either require policy loyalty from middle managers or, alternatively, deny them the opportunity to superimpose their own objectives over those set forth by the President.

- *Progress against poverty is not a function of how much "staff" is put in place or how many dollars are spent. Professionals are not needed to solve all problems. Indeed, it can be persuasively argued that the "agency" or "staff" system funded by OEO is destructive of real community development and wastefully diverts dollars from meeting people's needs. Help, as opposed to service delivery, must reach inside. Furthermore, institutions which are politically sponsored tend to operate politically.

- *Why must we conclude that once a project is funded, it must be forever funded, regardless of result? *Non-profit programming often fails to develop a mechanism for phasing out failure.*

- *One may be pleased that confrontations are less prone to violence, while still being fully concerned at the fact of their subsidization by the Federal government.

- *Some proponents of the OEO status quo suggest that, if confrontation outside the electoral process is non-violent, it is good, and that community action is theoretically consistent with Republican notions of decentralization, community control, and diversity. Whatever the style, however, confrontation or constructive cajolery, the concept still involves a kind of bureaucratic apartheid, placing the poor in a system separate from that of the society at large, a system in which new bureaucracies, representative only of those who constitute them, stand in structural defiance of "equal protection of the laws." Federally anointed, often dominated by small cliques, yet fully accountable to neither Federal nor local authority, they serve only some of the poor.

- *The grant system often discriminates in favor, not of need, but of artful grant hustling.

- *Funds expended to promote the availability of abortions or disseminate contraceptives could instead be used to improve adoption opportunities and communicate family values;

- *Funds which are now used to encourage dissent within correctional institutions could instead be expended on prisoner rehabilitation;

- *Funds now used to challenge military justice and administration could be used instead to improve post-service career opportunities for veterans;

- *Funds now used to promote "welfare rights" could be used instead to develop receptivity to gainful (as opposed to "meaningful") employment;

- *Funds now used to undermine control of parents over their own children could be used instead to foster policies which will hold the family together;

- *Funds currently used to promote busing for racial balance could be used instead to strengthen neighborhood schools;

- *Funds used to liberalize drug laws and assist "addicts rights" groups could be used instead to further drug prevention;

- *Funds now used to organize student protest and dissent could be used instead to help school administrators improve the quality of education;

- *Funds now used to recall and impeach

*(Statistics based on a pending OEO study).

public officials could be used *instead* to strengthen our system of justice;

*Funds now used to liberalize bail procedures and secure early release of accused criminals could be used *instead* to assist those poor people who are the victims of crime;

*Funds which are now used to organize rent strikes can be used *instead* to expand opportunities for private home ownership;

*Funds which have been used to subsidize literally thousands of Democratic party leaders and left-wing social activists in permanent jobs can be returned *instead* to people who would prefer the opportunity to help themselves over the subsidized imposition of the paternalistic, politicized policies of radical ideologists (who may have never endured economic hardship);

*Funds now used to attack the police could be used *instead* to strengthen the forces of order in poverty communities (since order is a necessary precondition to both liberty and opportunity).

Aid to the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee (UFWOC) in opposition to the Teamsters Union should be brought to a halt, as should aid to such groups as the National Tenants Organization, National Welfare Rights Organization, the American Friends Services Committee, the Council of Churches and the many others which are essentially political in objective and function.

Decisions should be made to discontinue funds to grantees which promote racial disruption, desecrate the American flag, idealize the likes of Che Guevara or engage in similar activities on official time which are repugnant to the taxpayers who pay their salaries.

Get out of the business of funding grantee and non-profit delegate agencies to engage in independent, unaccountable advocacy on matters of public policy. Just as it would be wrong, in terms of our constitutional traditions, for the Federal government to directly fund the Archdiocese of New York to retain Washington and state house lobbyists (freedom of religion), so also is it improper for OEO to subsidize literally hundreds of quasi-political organizations for precisely the same purpose (freedom of speech). Often, in addition to administrative and legislative activities, subsidized lobbying take the form of film production, training sessions, newsletter dissemination, and promoting grass roots protests, both on ad hoc and on sustained organizational bases.

As a general rule, funding decisions, both in terms of the subject areas on which funding shall be concentrated and the groups which will be subsidized to carry out the assignment, the actual decisions and priorities are established at a middle-management level by persons either unaware of or opposed to the policies of top agency leadership. The process must be reversed so that funds are expended in a manner consistent with an overall policy and plan. The same problem of making Administration policy part of inter-agency decision-making processes applies to program evaluation procedures.

The standards by which current expenditures shall be evaluated can often determine the outcome of funding decisions. To cite one outrageous example, until very recently, evaluators of Legal Services programs have been instructed to check with the Black Panthers to see how local programs are doing. Another embarrassment which flows from having decision making authority flow upward is the fact that policy makers sometimes discover that the agency has hopelessly and irrevocably committed funds on questionable projects and to questionable grantees before the policymakers have a chance to make their views known.

Recognize that government is more effective as a generator of choices than a provider of services (for proof, compare, on the one hand the Post Office and, on the other, the

educational voucher system). We should be empowering people to do things for themselves in diverse ways rather than continuing the subsidization of generally inefficient governmentally funded systems.

It is wrong to delegate decision making authority to quasi-public non-profit groups which are generally neither accountable to those they seek to serve or to the public as a whole. The President should be in a position to directly hold accountable agency officials for decisions on policy and program content. While policy-executing may be privatized, policy-setting should never be.

Efforts should be made to substitute for centralized staff bureaucracies self-energizing systems which involve less reliance on federal subsidy and which facilitate (indeed require) greater involvement by more people in each community.

A major thrust in regard to operational programs should entail assigning ever greater responsibility to state government and away from control of federal bureaucrats. In the context of clearly established national policies, public officials can and should be accorded broad discretion in terms of oversight of the dollars in their areas. One advantageous result of increasing reliance on state and private approaches to poverty problems is to reduce the likelihood of putting "all of our eggs" in single "basket" approaches. Diversity will enhance the likelihood of finding effective approaches to poverty problems.

Without totally dismissing the importance of money in achieving goals and objectives, it is also important to remember that, (1) there is simply not enough money to solve all problems and (2) money mispent can do even less good than money never spent. One favored argument is that "if X program is not funded, Y program will increase commensurately." Alternatively, it is argued that, even though Y problem increased rapidly despite X program, it would have increased even more without X program. This is referred to in the vernacular as "non-reduction by subtraction."

A vastly neglected aspect of the "war on poverty" is in the area of strengthening those values and incentives which reinforce efforts by the poor to help themselves out of poverty. Enhanced motivation and self-esteem have been objectives of many successful efforts to overcome poverty. They should be attempted more broadly. Studies indicate that fewer than 5% of those who are non-poor (as opposed to near-poor) return to poverty. Every 3 years 40% of those who are poor become near-poor or non-poor. Instead of focusing research on negative aspects of why some poor people remain poor, greater emphasis should be placed on understanding why some of them escape their condition of poverty. Merely finding work which may be performed at home by female poor persons who are also family heads would deal with 25.3 percent of the entire poverty population.

Limit the opportunity for anti-Nixon activists to gain control of the boards of OEO grantees and delegate agencies (where they impact on decisions concerning hiring of employees, approval of activities, and disbursement of funds). Widespread improvement could be achieved, for example, by the simple act of disqualifying such groups as the National Welfare Rights Organization from representing the "private sector" on CAA boards. In addition, funding leverage can be used by appointed administrators to prevent funds from going to groups which have acted improperly (in most cases a flat 20% discretionary cut is possible, at a minimum). The agency's operational leadership should be encouraging the involvement of members of the New American Majority in seeking public and private sector seats on CAA boards,

and professional seats on, for example, Health and Legal Service boards.

Prevent manipulation of delegate programs by barring interlocking directorates and placing tight limits on the use of travel and training funds for political organizing purposes.

Instead of being defensive about changes in Great Society programs, whether in terms of programs, policies, or personnel, defuse the impact of potential criticism by telling the truth. Let the American people have examples of problems which resulted in decisions for change.

In the past, OEO funds have often been expended in a manner tending to discriminate against elements of the New American Majority, particularly the elderly and ethnic poor. In some cases they have been excluded by designation of target area boundaries which do not encompass areas in which they live, in others, the indices of poverty according to which funds are allocated tend to be weighted against them. There are many OEO funded agencies in which small cliques, through concerted action, gain control of funding and personnel decisions simply by being well organized and holding a bare plurality of votes at an organizational meeting. Rules which discriminate against the unorganized and non-radical poor can be changed and should be. In many cases, however, this kind of discriminatory activity is the inevitable consequence of funding private bureaucrats in competition with duly established government. If the poverty program is to genuinely be effective in the use of the taxpayers' dollars, the poor must be helped because they are poor, not because they are white, or black, or yellow, or red, or urban, or rural, or young, or old.

Previous efforts to more fully involve elements of the private sector in the "war on poverty" have been disappointing, in part because of their excessive reliance on good intentions, as opposed to reliance on enlightened self-interest. We must apply the profit motive to social programming, especially since non-profit systems have been so unsuccessful in phasing out failures: ownership systems, development systems, privatization of public services in poverty communities, experimental competitive alternatives to "natural monopolies"—these offer hope for the future.

We should prevent the indirect channeling of agency funds to private political or quasi-political organizations by denying grantees and delegates the opportunity to transfer funds to such organizations as "dues payments" or "meeting fees".

One of the most serious problems has resulted from the fact that, in accordance with a general plan to decentralize grant-making authority to regional offices, many of the more controversial activities are removed from review and notice by headquarters officials. This can be easily corrected without damage to the decentralization concept by changes in personnel and procedures.

Clear eligibility standards for participation in OEO funded programs must be established in order to limit the arbitrary diversion of funds to the non-poor in support of political or ideological objectives.

The fact is that professionals are not needed to solve all problems. Government need not be the problem solver of first resort. Governmental help in seeking to privatize solutions to problems and expand consumer choice can have a better chance of success, because such approaches reach inside and energize people to help themselves by giving them greater control over, and responsibility for, their own lives.

"Above all, let's stop funding the left-wing of the Democratic Party and find new ways to better serve the new American majority."

RESERVE MINING CASE

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, on April 20, Judge Miles W. Lord issued an extraordinary order which halted the pollution of Lake Superior by the Reserve Mining Co.

Shortly thereafter, a three judge panel of the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals stayed—or suspended—the order, pending review by the Appellate court.

The decision and order handed down by Judge Lord, particularly his "Findings of Fact," should make enlightening reading for those who have not had the opportunity to closely follow the Reserve Mining case.

I ask that his decision entitled "Memorandum and Order" be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

U.S. DISTRICT COURT, DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA,
FIFTH DIVISION

(United States of America, et al., Plaintiffs,
against Reserve Mining Co., et al, Defendants)

Memorandum and order

This action for injunctive relief is before the Court after 139 days of trial, which included testimony from well over 1000 witnesses, over 1621 exhibits, and over 18,000 pages of transcript. Of necessity, it will require several weeks before the Court will be able to set forth in writing its detailed findings of fact and conclusions of law. Inasmuch as the case deals with issues concerning public health, the ultimate resolution of the problem should not be delayed by this procedural matter. The Court has carefully considered all of the evidence and hereto sets forth its essential findings of fact and conclusions of law to be refined and supplemented at a later date.

FINDINGS OF FACT

(1) Reserve Mining Company (Reserve) is set up and run for the sole benefits of its owners, Armco Steel Corporation (Armco) and Republic Steel Corporation (Republic), and acts as a mere instrumentality or agent of its parent corporations. Reserve is run in such a manner as to pass all its profits to the parents.

(2) Reserve acting as an instrumentality and agent for Armco and Republic discharges large amounts of minute amphibole fibers into Lake Superior and into the air of Silver Bay daily.

(3) The particles when deposited into the water are dispersed throughout Lake Superior and into Wisconsin and Michigan.

(4) The currents in the lake, which are largely influenced by the discharge, carry many of the fibers in a southwesterly direction toward Duluth and are found in substantial quantities in the Duluth drinking water.

(5) Many of these fibers are morphologically and chemically identical to amosite asbestos and an even larger number are similar to amosite asbestos.

(6) Exposure to these fibers can produce asbestosis, mesothelioma, and cancer of the lung, gastrointestinal tract and larynx.

(7) Most of the studies dealing with this problem are concerned with the inhalation of fibers; however, the available evidence

indicates that the fibers pose a risk when ingested as well as when inhaled.

(8) The fibers emitted by the defendant into Lake Superior have the potential for causing great harm to the health of those exposed to them.

(9) The discharge into the air substantially endangers the health of the people of Silver Bay and surrounding communities as far away as the eastern shore in Wisconsin.

(10) The discharge into the water substantially endangers the health of the people who procure their drinking water from the western arm of Lake Superior including the communities of Beaver Bay, Two Harbors, Cloquet, Duluth, and Superior, Wisconsin.

(11) The present and future industrial standard for a safe level of asbestos fibers in the air is based on the experience related to asbestosis and not to cancer. In addition its formulation was influenced more by technological limitations than health considerations.

(12) The exposure of a non-worker populace cannot be equated with industrial exposure if for no other reason than the environmental exposure, as contrasted to a working exposure, is for every hour of every day.

(13) While there is a dose-response relationship associated with the adverse effects of asbestos exposure and may be therefore a threshold exposure value below which no increase in cancer would be found, this exposure threshold is not now known.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

(1) The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the various claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1345 and 1331. As to those claims based upon state law, the Court exercises its jurisdiction pursuant to the doctrine of pendant jurisdiction.

(2) Reserve's discharge into the water is in violation of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act as amended in 1970. 33 U.S.C. §1151 et seq. The violations involve both interstate and intrastate waters and are subject to abatement pursuant to 33 U.S.C. §1160(c) (5) and (g) (1). Specifically Reserve's discharge is in violation of water quality standards referred to as WPC 15 (a) (4), (c) (6) and (c) (2).

(3) Reserve's discharge into the water creates a common law nuisance in both interstate and intrastate waters of Lake Superior.

(4) Reserve has no permit that sanctions its violations of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act as amended in 1970.

(5) Reserve has no permit that sanctions its creation of a common law nuisance in the waters of Lake Superior.

(6) Reserve's discharge into the air creates a common law nuisance condition in the ambient air in Silver Bay and the surrounding communities and is subject to abatement. Furthermore, the air discharge violates Minnesota Regulations APC 5, 6 and 17.

(7) Industrial standards for asbestos exposure do not apply to environmental exposure and are therefore not applicable to the facts in this case.

(8) In that Reserve is a mere instrumentality or agent of its parents who have used Reserve as a shield to protect themselves from the consequences of Reserve's illegal pollution of Lake Superior, Armco and Republic must bear legal responsibility for Reserve's actions. Furthermore, since Reserve's profits are siphoned off by its parents, in order to insure an effective remedy if civil fines or other monetary relief are called for, the independent corporate entity of Reserve must be disregarded.

(9) All additional legal questions including the question of civil fines, financial responsibility for water filtration systems in Lake Shore communities, alleged violations

of the Refuse Act, 33 U.S.C. § 407, specific Wisconsin criminal and civil statutes as well as the Wisconsin Public Trust doctrine, and Reserve's counterclaims against the State of Minnesota are taken under advisement and will be decided at a later date. The question as to what part of the potential fines and penalties should be awarded to Reserve employees or others who would lose their jobs is likewise held for further argument and consideration.

MEMORANDUM

It has been clearly established in this case that Reserve's discharge creates a serious health hazard to the people exposed to it. The exact scope of this potential health hazard is impossible to accurately quantify at this time. Significant increase in diseases associated with asbestos exposure do not develop until 15 to 20 years after the initial exposure to the fibers. The state of the scientific and medical knowledge available in this area is in its early stages and there is insufficient knowledge upon which to base an opinion as to the magnitude of the risks associated with this exposure. The fact that few fibers have been found in the tissue of certain deceased Duluth residents may indicate that the general contamination in the community of Duluth has not yet reached alarming proportions. Unfortunately, the real answer to the problem will not be available until some ten to twenty years from this date when the health experience of those exposed to the fibers emitted from Reserve's plant is reviewed. At present the Court is faced with a situation where a commercial industry is daily exposing thousands of people to substantial quantities of a known human carcinogen. Emphasis is placed upon the fact that the Court is not dealing with a situation in which a substance causes cancer in experimental animals where the effect of humans is largely speculative. Fibers identical and similar to those emitted from Reserve's plant have been directly associated with a marked increase in the incidence of cancer in humans.

The Court has been constantly reminded that a curtailment in the discharge may result in a severe economic blow to the people of Silver Bay, Babbitt and others who depend on Reserve directly or indirectly for their livelihood. Certainly unemployment in itself can result in an unhealthy situation. At the same time, however, the Court must consider the people downstream from the discharge. Under no circumstances will the Court allow the people of Duluth to be continuously and indefinitely exposed to a known human carcinogen in order that the people in Silver Bay continue working at their jobs.

Naturally the Court would like to find a middle ground that would satisfy both considerations. If an alternate method of disposal is available that is economically feasible, could be speedily implemented and took into consideration the health questions involved, the Court might be disposed to fashion a remedy that would permit the implementation of such a system. However, if there is no alternative method available, the Court has no other choice but to immediately curtail the discharge and stop the contamination of the water supply of those downstream from the plant.

With these considerations in mind, the Court on February 5, 1974, took the unusual step of relating to the parties the Court's view of the evidence to date concerning the public health issue. The Court had heard in one form or another from substantially all of the world's experts in the area. The Court was led to believe by Reserve that little had been done in the way of devising an alternative method of disposing of the tailings on land and, in fact, that Reserve knew of no feasible way to accomplish such as system.

At that time, it was Reserve's posture in this litigation that the only feasible alternative to the present discharge was the creation of a pipe system that would carry the tailings to the bottom of the lake. If, in fact, the deep pipe system was unacceptable, the Court was led to believe that Reserve had no alternative method for disposing of the tailings. Hence the Court found it essential that Reserve's attention be focused directly on the problem and a possible on land disposal alternative be developed as quickly as possible.

The Court was at one and the same time hearing a motion for a temporary restraining order and a permanent injunction. The reluctance of the Court to make a formal ruling on the temporary restraining order at an early time was done out of caution with the anticipation of hearing from more of the world's experts. It was after hearing all of this evidence that the Court gave its tentative findings on the health issue with the caveat that further evidence would be taken. The statement was made with a view toward giving Reserve an impetus to start resolving its problem and to give Duluth and the Lake Shore communities time to seek clean water. It did not have the desired effect in either instance.

As it turned out, after days of testimony on the underwater disposal alternative proposed by Reserve, it became clear to the Court that this alternative in no way lessened the public health threat and possibly created additional problems relating to public health. The Court's findings in this regard turned out to be superfluous in that later testimony by representatives of Armco, half owner of Reserve, indicated that Armco had long since disregarded this underwater disposal system on the basis of engineering infeasibility alone, without any regard to its effect on the lake or public health. Upon further inquiry to officers of Armco and Republic, who also serve on the Board of Directors of Reserve, it appeared that several plans had been developed dealing with the possibility of on land disposal. Although these plans had been asked for by plaintiffs by way of interrogatories and by the Court by direct order, they were not produced nor mentioned until the representatives of Armco and Republic were deposed on March 1, 1974.

The Court is apprised that defendants fail to produce these plans for on land disposal will be the subject matter for motions by the plaintiffs to collect costs involved in the litigation so this matter will be dealt with at that time. The Court has stated on the record and will repeat here that Reserve's insistence on advocating the underwater disposal system which had been deemed infeasible by one of its owners and the failure to timely produce the documents dealing with possible on land disposal systems has substantially delayed the outcome of this litigation in situation where a speedy resolution is essential.

The Court refers to this history in the case only to point out that since February 5 defendants were informed that the present method of discharge would stop and that if they chose to keep Reserve in operation they had to come up with an on land disposal alternative that would satisfy the health problems created by the present discharge in the air and water. It was the Court's fervent wish that the health hazard could be abated without the economic problems that would be imposed upon the people in the North Shore communities if Reserve in fact closed down permanently. The documents of Reserve's parent companies indicate that they have known for some time that they would have to make modifications in their discharge. Judge Eckman in December of 1970 came to this same conclusion. In *Reserve Mining Company v. Minnesota Pollu-*

tion Control Agency, Sixth Judicial District of Minnesota he stated:

"In view thereof the Court finds that the continuance of the present method of discharge for any substantial period of time, and particularly for the next forty-year expected life span of Reserve's operations, is intolerable and that substantial modifications must be put into effect." Even when faced with the evidence in this case that their discharge creates a substantial threat to the health of the people exposed to it, defendants are reluctant to curtail their discharge until the latest possible moment, presumably in order to prolong the profitability of the present discharge.

It was not until a few days ago that there was any indication to this Court that Reserve had a feasible plan for the disposal of tailings on land. The testimony in the case by Reserve and representations by Reserve's counsel indicated that they not only had no such plan but that the engineering problems of such a system were insurmountable. The plaintiffs, on the other hand, introduced testimony indicating that on land disposal is feasible.

Reserve took issue with this testimony even after the major engineering problems were solved and maintained that it would simply be too expensive to change their method of disposal to on land.

The evidence in the case indicates that the daily profit in the operation at Reserve is in the neighborhood of \$60,000.00 per day. Each year that the plant remains in operation there is a 90 per cent return on owners' equity. In other words, for every dollar Armco and Republic initially invested in Reserve, they get back ninety cents each year the plant remains in operation.

This is not to say that the companies could not afford to make modifications. The testimony adduced at trial was to the effect that (with product improvement) Reserve, Republic and Armco could afford at the very least a \$180,000,000 to \$200,000,000 capital outlay with reasonably associated operating costs without substantially changing their economic situation as to profitability, intra-industry position, interest coverage, bond rating, etc. This figure should come as no shock to the defendant. Their own documents, recently discovered, support this fact. In this area it should be noted that any reduction in the royalty rate paid by Reserve or the interest rate, by such devices as revenue bonds or industrial bonds, would make even larger capital outlays, with accompanying operating expenses, possible. The defendants deny that they have made any overtures towards the Mesabi Trust with respect to a possible adjustment of the royalty rate and that no such overtures are contemplated. Therefore this Court's finding as to the financial ability of Reserve, Armco and Republic to abate the discharge is made without reference to any reduction in the royalties. This is not an occasion that calls for massive public aid to a dying industry. There is no evidence that either state or federal assistance is needed by the defendant to make this investment. The protestations by Reserve that it cannot do it alone must be put in the same class of assertions as the one that the "deep pipe" plan was the only possible alternative method of tailings disposal. The evidence is clear that Republic and Armco are two of the largest corporations in this country. They are prosperous now and would remain prosperous even after the necessary alterations are made. Defendants have had the means to implement a feasible, economical alternative. It was their choice whether they would make the investment or abandon their employees and the State of Minnesota.

It should be noted in this regard that the

State of Minnesota is here in the posture of asking the Court for fines and penalties as well as injunctive relief. Reserve on the other hand still has outstanding counterclaims against the state. It would, therefore, be inappropriate and premature for this governmental unit to subsidize the company before these matters are decided by the Court.

Today, April 20, 1974, the chief executive officers of both Armco and Republic have testified that they are unwilling to abate the discharge and bring their operation into compliance with applicable Minnesota regulations in an acceptable manner. They proposed a plan for an on land disposal site in the Pallasades Creek area adjacent to the Silver Bay plant. Although this particular plan was in existence for several years it was not brought forward until the latest stages of this proceeding. The plan, which has been rejected by the plaintiffs because it is not environmentally sound, is totally unacceptable to the Court because of the conditions imposed with it. In the first place implementation of the proposal fails to effectively deal with the problem caused by the discharge of amphibole fibers into the air. Secondly, the plan contemplates that the discharge into the water will continue for five more years. In light of the very real threat to public health caused by the existing discharge, this time period for abatement is totally unacceptable. Third, it is suggested that the Court order all appropriate state and federal agencies to grant permits that would immunize Reserve's operations from ever complying with future environmental regulations as they might be promulgated. The Court seriously doubts that it has the power for such an order, and states flatly that if it had the power it would not grant such an order. Reserve in this case has argued that certain state and federal permits granted years ago sanctions their non-compliance with existing regulations and should preclude the Court from abating the discharge of human carcinogens into the air and water. Such a claim is preposterous and the Court will have no part in perpetuating such claims. The proposal is further conditioned on obtaining compensation from the federal and state governments. The Court has previously discussed the lack of necessity for such a subsidy and finds the suggestion absurd. Finally, the proposal was conditioned upon favorable findings by the Court as to the public health issues. The Court finds this condition to be shocking and unbecoming in a court of law. To suggest that this or any other court would make a finding of fact without regard to the weight of the evidence is to ask that judge to violate the oath of his office and to disregard the responsibility that he has not only to the people but also to himself.

Defendants have the economic and engineering capability to carry out an on land disposal system that satisfies the health and environmental considerations raised. For reasons unknown to this Court they have chosen not to implement such a plan.

In essence they have decided to continue exposing thousands daily to a substantial health risk in order to maintain the current profitability of the present operation and delay the capital outlay (with its concomitant profit) needed to institute modifications. The Court has no other alternative but to order an immediate halt to the discharge which threatens the lives of thousands. In that defendants have no plan to make the necessary modifications, there is no reason to delay any further the issuance of the injunction.

Up until the time of writing this opinion the Court has sought to exhaust every possibility in an effort to find a solution that would alleviate the health threat without

a disruption of operations at Silver Bay.¹ Faced with the defendants' intransigence, even in the light of the public health problem, the Court must order an immediate curtailment of the discharge.

Therefore, it is ordered:

(1) That the discharge from the Reserve Mining Company into Lake Superior be enjoined as of 12:01 A.M., April 21, 1974.

(2) That the discharge of amphibole fibers from the Reserve Mining Company into the air be enjoined as of 12:01 A.M., April 21, 1974 until such time as defendants prove to the Court that they are in compliance with all applicable Minnesota Regulations including but not limited to APC 17.

THE WAR IN SOUTH VIETNAM

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, despite the American withdrawal of troops from South Vietnam and the signing of a truce designed to bring peace, the war in South Vietnam has not ended. Charles J. V. Murphy is a journalist who has traveled widely in Asia. He has specialized in political and strategic matters. Mr. Murphy wrote a perceptive article on the situation entitled, "The Shocking Sabotage of the Vietnam Truce," which appeared in the March 1975 issue of the Reader's Digest. I highly recommend it to my colleagues.

THE SHOCKING SABOTAGE OF THE VIETNAM TRUCE

(By Charles J. V. Murphy)

South Vietnam, early 1974; automatic-weapons fire rips through the night as North Vietnamese troops, backed by Soviet-built T-54 tanks, overrun an army outpost in the Central Highlands. In the Mekong Delta, a Village chief is led into the town square and assassinated by a communist terror squad. Just outside Saigon, well-trained North Vietnamese sappers flee into the jungle as their explosive charges trigger an ammunition dump into an awesome eruption of smoke and flame.

On the cease-fire record to date, it is depressingly plain that South Vietnam remains, as it has been for nearly two decades, an arena of vicious combat in communism's implacable effort to achieve hegemony in Southeast Asia. After a year of the bloodiest truce in history, these are the gruesome statistics:

¹In an effort to alleviate the health risk, the Court ordered that the Army Corps of Engineers provide potable water to the affected communities. This, however, is only a temporary stop-gap solution. In the first place, it does nothing to lessen the air pollution problems and is an unsatisfactory answer over the long run to the problems caused by the discharge into the water. It is possible that water filters can be installed which would have some degree of success at reducing the number of amphibole fibers ingested, but actual installation of these filters is months away and their effectiveness is uncertain. The only real answer to the problem is curtailment of the discharge. This would have a dramatic effect on the air pollution problem and result in a tenfold decrease in the fiber concentrations in the Duluth water supply within a two month period.

More than 12,000 South Vietnamese village and hamlet chiefs, policemen, schoolteachers and civil servants have been murdered, wounded or kidnaped by communist terror teams.

Thousands of clashes have occurred North and South Vietnamese troops, with more than a dozen full-scale battles involving tanks and heavy artillery.

Thirteen thousand South Vietnamese soldiers have been killed and 50,000 wounded. North Vietnamese casualties over the period may be twice as great.

Today, even those American and foreign observers who once refused to believe that the Paris cease-fire wouldn't work now soberly admit that there is scarcely a section of the agreement that has not been flagrantly violated. Consider the main points:

TROOP BUILD-UP

Article 7 of the Paris agreement prohibits the communist forces in place at the time of the cease-fire from strengthening themselves by introducing fresh "troops, military advisers and military personnel" except for purpose of rotation or replacement. The expectation on the Americans side was that if the truce lasted the forces on both sides would be progressively drawn down. Instead, as U.S. troops departed, some 75,000 fresh communist conscripts entered the battle zones during the first ten months of the cease-fire. Only a handful of sick and wounded were withdrawn, and perhaps 25,000 to 30,000 more were lost in battle. The net result has been to raise the combat strength of the communist forces inside South Vietnam by 40,000 to 50,000 troops.

WEAPONS REPLENISHMENT

The same Article 7 limits both sides to the periodic replenishment of weapons and other fighting gear and materiel destroyed, damaged or worn out, but only on the basis of "piece for piece, of the same characteristics and properties." In blatant disregard of this constraint, the communists have tripled their armored forces by sending from 350 to 400 new Soviet and Chinese medium tanks into South Vietnam, and as many as 350 pieces of heavy artillery (twice as many as they had when the cease-fire went into effect). These heavy weapons include large numbers of Soviet 130-mm. guns—extremely accurate, highly reliable field pieces that far outshoot the U.S. 105-mm. and 155-mm. cannon on the South Vietnamese side. (In contrast, the Saigon government has been replacing supplies at less than the "piece for piece" rate, and all foreign troops have left South Vietnam.)

In the past, the South Vietnamese Army (ARVN) relied heavily on U.S. air support to negate the communist big guns. Now the U.S. aircraft are gone, and there are grave doubts whether ARVN's own jets can restore the balance in the battle equation—especially in the northern and western parts of South Vietnam where the communists now have heavy anti-aircraft guns and even some surface-to-air missiles.

RESUPPLY ROUTES

Because the 1973 cease-fire agreement fixed communist forces in the positions they then occupied, scattered in pockets down the entire length of South Vietnam, resupply has been for them a major burden. To prevent them from simply transforming the demilitarized zone (DMZ) into a handy transmission belt for war gear, Article 15(b) of the Paris agreement required that communist equipment and supplies be moved south only through predetermined points of entry.

The communists have totally ignored this understanding. A dozen usable roads have been bulldozed through the wooded hills of the DMZ, and columns of troops and long truck convoys make regular use of them, mostly in support of a massive communist buildup of infantry and armor in the north-

ernmost provinces of South Vietnam, possibly for another fierce assault against the old imperial capital of Hue. One of the best roads has become the departure point for an ambitious new north-south route inside South Vietnam which parallels the famous Ho Chi Minh trail network for 300 miles. When finished, the all-weather road will provide the communists with a second major supply corridor all the way to the jungle strongholds near Cambodia, within a day's march of Saigon.

EXPLOITING CAMBODIA AND LAOS

Under Article 20 of the Paris agreement, Hanoi promised to withdraw its forces from both Cambodia and Laos; to refrain from starting up or supporting any new military adventures in either country; and to give up the sanctuaries there that have long served as bases for operations against the South Vietnamese government.

The North Vietnamese have unabashedly broken all three stipulations, sending men and supplies down the Ho Chi Minh trail through Laos and Cambodia without interruption. Some of these reinforcements have already gone into combat—in the struggles for control of the Central Highland road system, the Cambodian approaches toward Saigon, and the rice paddies of the Western Mekong Valley.

PRISONER INFORMATION

Articles 7 and 8 of the Paris agreement require both sides to cooperate in obtaining all possible information about missing civilian and military personnel. Although more than 1300 Americans are still unaccounted for, all attempts to obtain communist assistance in confirming the death of these men and bringing their remains back to the United States have been blocked. By wrangling over procedural details, North Vietnam has circumvented requests to allow any outsiders, including the International Red Cross, to make on-site inspections either in the North or in communist-controlled areas of South Vietnam and Laos. This is particularly cruel for numerous families who must live in a state of agonizing doubt, not knowing for sure whether their loved ones have perished.

SABOTAGING TRUCE INSPECTION

The North Vietnamese have reduced to near futility the functions of the International Commission on Control and Supervision (ICCS). At the start of the truce, four countries (Poland, Hungary, Canada and Indonesia) assumed responsibility for policing the cease-fire and investigating the communist claims that they had stopped the infiltration of troops and weapons into the South. Under the Paris agreement, the communists are legally bound to allow the commission teams to be positioned in predetermined sites, and to accord the inspectors all reasonable freedom of movement, assistance and courtesy. It has not worked out that way.

Communist gunners have shot down one of the commission's helicopters, killing all aboard, and fired upon others. Two Canadian officers were seized, roughly handled, and held incommunicado for 18 days. So far, the truce force has taken up residence in but one of the five localities that the communists agreed to open up for observation.

Moreover, the Hungarian and Polish members have behaved like the loyal communists they are—opposing, obstructing, filibustering and in diverse ways defeating every attempt by the commission to expose what is really going on. Last July, after Canadian members had protested the "massive" and "unrelenting" infiltration of North Vietnamese troops across the border, Canada withdrew its delegation in disgust. The only serious violations it had found during its tenure were committed by the North Vietnamese. (In fact, Saigon has cooperated fully

with the ICOS, abiding by the troop and resupply provisions of the Paris agreement to what—given the situation—must be considered an extraordinary extent.) The Iranians have taken the place of the Canadians, but the obstructionism of the Hungarians and Poles has worsened. In truth, the ICOS is all but dead.

ALL-OUT WAR AHEAD?

There is no debate among intelligence analysts about the renewed capacity of the North Vietnamese to launch yet another full-scale offensive, should such be Hanoi's intention. Will it happen?

President Thieu and his senior generals are by-and-large convinced that recent intense and costly preparation on the part of Hanoi presage an imminent return by the communists to an all-out offensive. General Giap launched the 1972 offensive on the mistaken assumption that the ARVN could be ground down to helplessness as U.S. infantry drew back into reserve position. Now the fear in Saigon is that the absence of both American air and ground forces may tempt the Hanoi strategists into yet another try for a knock-out blow—all the more so because of the unexpected decline of President Nixon's prestige and influence.

At the U.S. embassy in Saigon, and in the intelligence community in Washington, the prevailing view is somewhat more sanguine. This hopefulness derives in some degree from a widely based judgment that neither Peking nor Moscow, for all their incessant jockeying for political and strategic advantage in Asia, is disposed at this juncture to arouse American sensibilities on the issue of South Vietnam's continued survival. An equally important factor for optimism has been the stout behavior of the South Vietnamese armed forces under fire.

In the ascending sequence of battles since the start of the cease-fire, the ARVN has demonstrated repeatedly that it will stand and fight. Thus there has been no significant loss of territory or seeping of population into communist hamlets, and no discernible erosion of the government's authority. Instead, the central government in Saigon has come into effective control of all but five percent of the population.

Finally, Thieu himself has emerged from the cease-fire testing period as a strong leader. He has been the driving force in assembling the generally competent administrative elements which now permeate the countryside and have all but shut off the Delta's rice deliveries to the communists. Given his expanding performance, and the now established battle competence of ARVN, many U.S. observers are persuaded that the communists will stop short this year of another all-out assault. They see Giap limiting himself to a creeping, tentative campaign, the purpose of which will be to probe, test, deplete and wear down the South Vietnamese resolve and resources, as prelude to a climactic blow to be struck when circumstances are more favorable.

Thieu is acutely aware of the situation, and of the pressure upon him. And Americans who remain sensitive to the meaning of a free Vietnam also feel pressure. As Graham Martin, our experienced ambassador to Saigon, recently put it: "The Republic of Vietnam is finally functioning on its own. It will go on to become a vigorous, self-supporting and friendly society if we Americans only have the good sense to continue to give it the economic and material support we have promised."

ENERGY: THE CRISIS THAT WAS; JIM WECHSLER; PERCEPTIVE COMMENTS

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, during the past winter, the energy crisis was the subject of deep concern. At the time, I was one of those who expressed the view that as inconvenient as it was, the crisis might serve to wake up the country to the need to conserve resources. I also expressed the view that we had become a Nation of wastrels and that this was an extremely serious long-term problem.

I am inserting after these brief remarks an excellent editorial from the Granite State Gazette/Mascoma Week expressing very perceptive thoughts along these lines. One can hope that Jim Wechsler is wrong in observing that people may not have learned the lesson, but only time will tell.

Jim Wechsler's thought-provoking editorial follows:

ENERGY: THE CRISIS THAT WAS

(By Jim Wechsler)

Remember the crisis about a year ago over meat prices? Remember the housewives' "beef boycott"? Not, too well, do you now? The American consumer has been proven to have a short attention span and the energy crisis is just the latest in a long series of incidents that would tend to prove the theory.

Six months ago, it was crisis. Don't be fuelish. Drive at 50. Will there be gasoline rationing? We'd better get a wood burning stove in case we run out of heating oil.

Today, much of it is forgotten.

True, we gripe when the electric bills come out—although the longer daylight hours have tended to reduce the bills' totals and thus the amount of griping; sure, once in a while when our favorite gas station is out, or we realize that we just paid 55 to 60 cents for a gallon, we gripe.

But it appears that not too much of the lesson we learned last fall and winter is sticking. And it's a shame, too.

Many people seriously concerned about this nation's energy crisis and the impending long-range shortages thought that last winter's "crisis" was the best thing that could happen to us as a nation. It might, they reasoned, bring us to our senses while there was still time to do something to conserve on energy sources. Reaction to the mini-crisis might, they hoped, lead to long-term solutions.

It sounds good, but we doubt it.

A case in point occurred last weekend and brought home that unfortunate message, as, for the first time in several months, this editor went on something resembling a trip—a drive to Connecticut.

It's about 240 miles each way and—we admit as much out of curiosity as anything else—we did what we've been told should be done.

Our car's engine had been recently tuned up. And we stayed within the recommended speed limits.

The return trip Sunday of 240 miles took us about 25 minutes longer than it used to, because our speed stayed generally in the 50 to 55 range, instead of the pre-crisis 60 to 70 at which we used to cruise I-91.

There were several interesting results. First of all something must have been working.

Where we used to average about 13 to 15 miles a gallon on that same trip, we got a shade less than 19 miles a gallon Sunday, and pulled into Lebanon with better than a quarter of a tank of gas left. (We used to either have to stop for gas, or coast home on the fumes and a prayer.)

But, cruising along at 53-54-55 Sunday afternoon, to while away the time, we kept track of cars—and, in the 70 mile stretch of I-91 from the Massachusetts border to White River Junction, we passed just three vehicles—two of them ancient farm trucks wheezing their last, we're afraid. In that same stretch, more than 60 vehicles passed us—and half of them were pushing 70, to be charitable.

Where, oh, where, are those "Drive 50, Don't Be Fuelish" ideas?

It reinforced our theory and worry about the short memories some people have. Of how we had a fuel shortage last summer even before the Arabs turned off the spigot.

The experts' fears have been stilled. Gas is once again reasonably plentiful, albeit at premium in price. The fact that April and May should be the two best months for it goes right by the public. (The reasoning is that there's more gas being produced since less crude oil is needed for home heating now, yet there isn't yet the summer vacation demand.)

And so, sadly, it appears that the same people who learned the hard way last fall, are going to have to learn the hard way all over again this summer and fall.

And, whatever did happen to that beef boycott?

NEW DISTRICT COURT CHIEF FEISTY, BUT FAIR

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, in the Maine Sunday Telegram of May 5, 1974, an article appeared about the Honorable Ralph Ross, recently appointed chief district court judge in Portland, Maine. Judge Ross, a personal friend, is not only an outstanding attorney, but also a very fine judge, as I believe this article will illustrate. Judge Ross has the reputation of being one of my State's most colorful and outspoken magistrates; but one who is eminently fair to all those who appear before him. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following article to the attention of my colleagues. I believe it is a fitting tribute to one of Maine's outstanding public servants.

The article follows:

NEW DISTRICT COURT CHIEF FEISTY, FAIR

(By Lynn Liljeholm)

The sobered culprit of a drunk driving arrest stands in the dock.

The judge turns to the trooper who is testifying on behalf of the state and asks the results of the blood test.

"Point two zero, your honor."

"That's not blood," Judge Ralph Ross explodes, "that's a bloody Mary!"

Judge Ross, elevated to chief District Court judge a month ago, will still be "sitting"—i.e., presiding—in his own inimitable style in Maine's 33 district courts scattered over its 16 counties "at least 50 per cent of the time," he believes.

Happily for the public at large, though not always for the man in the dock, Ross' elevation to chief judge and his new load of administrative duties will not deter him from his one-man crusade to rid Maine roads of drunk drivers, slow down speeders and read the riot act to kids who have gone astray on pot.

One of Maine's most colorful and outspoken judges, Ross on the bench gives the impression of being pugnacious, tenacious, feisty but fair. He once suspended the driving license of his own daughter, then 18, when she appeared in his court on a stop sign violation. His sentences are apt to be heavily larded with Shakespearean quotations and Biblical exhortations. Anyone who has faced the wrath of Ross in the dock does not soon forget his peppery salvos.

"The law says one point zero is enough," he recently told a Portland woman who had a breath test showing two point zero. "This is slightly more than driving under the influence. You had twice as much. You were half embalmed." Ross then ran up the sliding scale of fines—the more inebriated, the heavier the fine—winding up, "Over 3.6 you don't pay a fine. You're dead!"

Ross' frequent allusions to the "Sharpe Hilton next door"—the county jail supervised by Sheriff Charles Sharpe—seem to be more of an oral deterrent than a concrete threat. It may be, as a fellow judge puts it, "Ross' bark is worse than his bite."

Ross' own belief is that long sentences accomplish little. He puts it in the form of an analogy: "If a man goes to church every Sunday and listens to the minister, the priest or the rabbi and learns nothing the first 10 minutes, he won't learn anything the next 50."

Particularly in the case of young people, Ross is a strong believer in rehabilitation and "the county jail is not the place for rehabilitation. Of course, you have a continuous repeater—he's done 30 days, he's done 60 days, he's back. I say let's try six months. . ."

The crimes and misdemeanors handled by the Maine district courts are punishable by fines up to \$1,000 and jail sentences of 11 months or less.

The 180,000 to 185,000 cases that Ross and his 19 District Court judges will handle this fiscal year are the small fry caught in the tolls of the law—the speeders, red light runners, unregistered and unlicensed drivers, the rock hurlers, pot smokers and shoplifters.

Ross feels he can move 50 simple traffic cases through in an hour, through he frequently has to hear feeble excuses such as "the wind blew off my inspection sticker," or "I wasn't driving without a license, I was just driving under suspension."

"What you need," Ross says in exasperation to the latter, "is a license to drive without a license."

However, most offenders in district court, confronted by the evidence, usually brought by a state trooper or police officer, plead guilty and pay up. Those who plead innocent or opt for a trial are usually fighting to keep points off their driver's license or to avoid a conviction that could hurt job chances later.

Speeding Ross sometimes refers to as "the honorable crime," and notes that on this charge he has had people before him that have lived 50 or 60 years and never before been in court.

In addition to the petty crimes and misdemeanors handled in its huge workload, Maine's district courts also adjudicate juvenile cases, small claims, and civil cases, such as auto accident injuries, where damages run less than \$20,000. It also handles 98 per cent of all divorce and domestic relations cases in the state.

Of the crush of work, Ross says, "I've trained myself to move a docket." He cites

days when, as a full time presiding judge, he worked from 8 a.m. until 8 p.m. with only a sandwich and a glass of milk on his desk for lunch at noon, moving 150 cases a day.

"It's not unusual for a judge to have 100 to 125 cases a day. When you get through a day like that, you've had it."

Last week in Portland three district courts were in session simultaneously, one handling traffic, one domestic relations and the third criminal cases. Ross feels that Portland could use three district court judges the year round. As things stand, he may augment one or two judges with a third judge-at-large who comes in for three days a week until the current backlog is cleaned up.

He also plans to redistribute the case workload "Where one judge, in a sparsely populated area like Presque Isle or Madawaska, may have 5,000 cases a year and another, in Portland, 16,000 cases."

Technology will also arrive in Maine district courts when Ross sets up tape recorders in each of them. Prior to this time, there was no record of district court sessions other than a scribbled disposition on the complaint. The tapes will be transcribed and records stored.

Ross is also in the process of negotiating with townships, municipalities and contractors to renovate existing down-at-the-heels courts or to lease existing facilities for court use. He says about half of the district courts facilities in the state are in "terrible shape."

In the past, all district courthouses were either county or town-owned buildings and rent-free. "Now," Ross says, "we have reached the point where we must negotiate with private enterprise."

Renovations have been completed at the Kittery courthouse, and Ross is in the market for a courthouse in Sanford, Biddeford or Saco.

The old Aroostook County courthouse in Caribou is being refurbished, and some renovations are being made in the Houlton courthouse. Newport is also in the process of being renovated. The city of Lewiston is building a new courthouse and Ross last week signed a contract with Livermore Falls, which is constructing a new municipal building in which a district court will be incorporated.

The money district courts collect in fines—which can hit upwards of \$2 million a year—reverts to the general fund where it is set aside for the courts for administration of the system. Salaries of court officers, clerks, judges and other personnel in the system is in excess of \$1 million a year. Another chunk of the budget, for rentals, runs into some \$200,000 a year. In the first few years, district courts in Maine didn't pay their own way, but in the last two years there has been distributions of \$750,000 and \$600,000, "left-over" funds which are divided among all the counties on a per capita basis for county administrative expenses.

If you were to write a success story with a Maine background, in which a poor boy makes good against all the odds, Ross' story might well be the prototype.

Ross was born 50 years ago in Sanford, the son of French-Canadian immigrants with a dash of Scottish blood—the Ross name traces back to Fergusson, Scotland, a number of generations ago—and one of seven children in a large, poor Catholic family.

It was sheer grit and pluck that got him through high school. His father, a mill worker, broke his leg when Ross was in high school and the family was thrown onto unemployment, which in those depression days was \$8 a week. Ross worked in the mill cardroom as alley boy and bobbin spinner while sticking it out for his degree. In his senior year he worked the mill's third shift, 10:30 p.m. until 6 a.m. He was accustomed to come home, take a bath and a bite of breakfast,

then walk a mile and a half to Sanford High School.

He graduated seven months after World War II had started, and he was classified 1-A by his draft board.

Though the war disrupted the life of every fit youth in that era, it provided an unexpected turn of luck for Ross after he served on China duty with the Marines. He picked up a copy of the Stars & Stripes and saw that the mill was no longer the end of the road, thanks to something called the GI Bill of Rights.

He realized that here was the way to a law degree—but, holding a high school commercial diploma, he didn't have the credentials to get into college. At that time the Sanford school board created a new program called the "Veterans' School," which gave returning veterans a chance to finish high school. With typical determination, Ross accumulated his required college credits in one year.

When he entered the University of Maine, in the then-Brunswick branch, set up because Orono was jam-packed with returned GIs, Ross got another break. The Maine legislature decided that any young man who had been in the services had earned two years' college credit. With that leg up, Ross enrolled in the second class of the Portland University Law School.

"We had the front rooms of the second floor of the YMCA on Forest Avenue," Ross recalls the makeshift arrangement of Maine's first law school. "One room was for freshmen, one for sophomores."

Typically, Ross was working to put himself through law school, and his young wife was working as well. He was pounding an 82-cents-an-hour beat as a Sanford policeman until his last year at law school.

When he graduated in 1951, he had a wife, two children and an honors degree (cum laude).

Ross is proud that his stubborn determination got him through college "without a nickel from my parents." It may be that, because he knows it can be done, he tends to get testy with youthful offenders who appear before him, long-haired or ponytailed, jobless, aimless and up for an infraction of the law.

One of these who appeared on multiple marijuana charges was asked by Ross: "Do you go to school or work?"

The boy, 18, said: "Neither."

"What do you do," Ross demanded, "besides breaking the law?"

Ross is hard-nosed about pot and he discounts the younger generation argument, once posed to him by one of his own children, that it is "no different than liquor was in your day."

"You drink beer," Ross points out, "so you go on to gin, rum, vodka. It's still liquor. But I've seen them start off with marijuana and go on to speed, cocaine, the big stuff."

Ross, who handles cases of young people who have "freaked out" and hit the psych wards, says that the drug picture in Maine today "didn't exist when I became a judge in '68." Maine's largest city doesn't have a corner on drug infractions, either. "There are as many drugs in Houlton and Madawaska, percentage-wise, as there are in Portland. In fact, the drug scene in the border towns is heavier."

Ross claims the atmosphere of permissiveness that not only lands youths in the dock on pot counts, but has now decriminalized truancy, incorrigibility, runaways and living in circumstances of manifest danger of falling into immorality.

"Children today have the advantages of television, are far superior intellectually than we were. Now they know if they don't go to school there is nothing you can do about it. . ."

Ross, as a district judge-at-large, was, before the truancy laws were scratched this past year, something of a "specialist" in getting wayward youths to toe the mark. School boards and administrators waited until he was scheduled to bring their truants into court.

In the same trend in softening the law, intoxication will be decriminalized on July 1.

Ross sees this as a new problem for police officers and hospitals. "If a police officer sees a drunk on the street (after July 1) he is supposed to take him home. But from Kittery to Fort Kent I know drunks whose only home is the county jail. Or they'll have to take him to a hospital. But there are no hospital beds. We've put the cart before the horse."

Ross feels the "standards and goals and concepts" of more humane treatment of the perpetrators of these "victimless" crimes "are fine. But the problem is today you haven't got a community ready to implement these concepts."

While the legislature has tightened a law in another area—breaking, entry and larceny now carry a mandatory jail sentence on a second conviction—Ross is dismayed because he feels the new law is weakened because of a second new law relative to bail.

"Anyone who appears in court short of murder can now get out on personal recognition discretionary with the presiding judge," Ross says. "If that person is supporting a habit for which he needs money, and is let out (pending a court appearance) he can commit 25 more breaks."

Ross sees himself as a "liberal conservative."

"I'm a firm believer in governmental fair play," he says. "The Constitution of the U.S. and of Maine make it very difficult to put a man away and this is the way it's got to be. If there's a doubt, no matter how slight, it must be resolved in favor of the defendant."

"Some people say these bums—these crooks—have more rights than honest people. But bear in mind that when you give these rights to the drunk, the arsonist, the murderer, you are doing nothing more than preserving these rights for your own family."

"In other words, take these rights away from the accused, and somebody can take them away from you."

ISRAEL INDEPENDENCE DAY—MAY 7

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, with the gravity of the problems now confronting the world in the Middle East and more particularly our concern for the peace and security of Israel we could easily overlook the observance of Israel's Independence Day, May 7. However, it is my belief that while tensions are high in this area as they are now, it is of tremendous importance to all of us to pause on this 25th anniversary and see how Israel has progressed in that short span of years.

Seldom, if ever in history, has any nation matured and developed as rapidly and as soundly as has Israel. Its economic growth has been little short of miraculous. Its military potential has developed with amazing strength on land and in the sea and in the air. Its cultural achievements are most remark-

able and today Israel's writers, artists, musicians, and scientists are on a par with the best any nation can offer. Israel's political growth has likewise been amazing. Her statesmen have safeguarded her sovereign rights and have advanced her place in world affairs to a superb degree and at a spectacular rate.

For all of us who led in 1948 the vanguard in helping to establish this new nation and to insure its proper infant and child care during its tender years, the sound maturity of Israel today is of greatest personal satisfaction. I have been proud of the part I was permitted to play giving world Jewry a real homeland. I have always been gratified on my visits to Israel to see with my own eyes the growth and advancement of this fledgling state. In fact, every attainment of Israel over the ensuing years has been even more than a vicarious achievement for me. It has indeed seemed a personal accomplishment.

It has been with real regret that I have watched so many of Israel's resources being tapped and drained off for military use because of war or the threat of war. It has been a source of real concern to me to note the extent to which Israel's young people have had to devote themselves to military duties instead of the important tasks of building up her economy.

I hope that in these coming months Israel may secure her full independence from the costly climate of political or boundary alertness. I hope, too, that all the forces for peace and rational progress will be reunited to the extent that all of us can say to the people of Israel, "many returns of the day."

I am happy to extend my personal best wishes and my heartiest congratulations to my many friends in Israel who have given such magnificent leadership to this beloved state.

NATIONAL WEEK TO HONOR YOUNG LADIES' RADIO LEAGUE, INC.

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution setting aside the first week of each November in recognition of the outstanding achievements of the Young Ladies' Radio League, Inc.

This international organization of women radio amateurs, most of them in the United States, provides emergency communication services in times of crises, aids servicemen to talk to their families via the YLRL voluntary wireless network, makes radio tapes for the blind, holds competition to increase radio knowledge and skills, and sponsors girls around the world who want to participate in electronic communication.

In my own area of Ohio I know firsthand of instances in which these selfless ladies have provided important services, notably during the July 1969

storms that caused such havoc along Lake Erie. I am very proud of the fact that the 1974 president of YLRL is Mrs. James L. Russell of Fairview Park and Kelley's Island, Ohio. When the 1969 storm struck Kelley's Island, Ella and Jim Russell operated their radio station, providing communication for islanders with worried relatives ashore.

The State of Ohio has honored the YLRL for the past 3 years with a "Buckeye Belles" Amateur Radio Week, and New York State has honored its YLRL similarly in the past.

At a time when person-to-person service is gaining increasing recognition, I hope that my resolution will focus attention on a unique group of women which for years has been providing just that humanitarian facet to the fascinating field of amateur radio.

WCET-TV HELPS SCHOOL CHILDREN IMPROVE READING SKILLS

HON. THOMAS A. LUKE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. LUKE. Mr. Speaker, the city of Lincoln Heights, Ohio, has recently enjoyed great success in cooperative action to solve a community problem. Significant improvements in the reading skills of young grade schoolers was achieved through the use of television programming and because diverse groups of people were willing to take part. School teachers and officials of Lincoln Heights, the staff of WCET-TV in Cincinnati, the General Electric Aircraft Engine Group, the Ford Motor Co. Fund, and others combined their efforts to achieve this significant accomplishment.

So that my colleagues can see how this dynamic group of people were able to work together for the improvement of their children's education, I include the full report on "The Electric Co.," as printed in the Children's Television Workshop Newsletter of March 8, 1974, at this point in the RECORD:

THE ELECTRIC CO.

TEC Turns School on to Reading: The Electric Company was credited by elementary school teachers and officials in the Cincinnati suburb of Lincoln Heights with playing a major role in revitalizing reading interest and skills among students who watched the series daily on an experimental multi-channel closed circuit videotape system installed in the Fall of 1972.

The impressive results of two sets of standardized achievement tests were cited by Ernest Ector, principal of the 780-pupil Lincoln Heights Elementary School where the TV system was installed, to show that second and third graders exposed to the system and to the Electric Company for a school year were five and six months more advanced in acquisition of reading skills than previous second and third graders not exposed to the system. These results were in marked contrast to the situation three years earlier when 75 per cent of Lincoln Heights School District students tested well below appropriate achievement levels for their ages and grades and some elementary school students were trailing contemporaries in other schools

in reading achievement by as much as two and three years.

Ector credited the gains to his schools' intensified reading program that was built mainly around use by teachers of the videotape system and the Electric Company. The series was the program most frequently used in the first year of the system's operation. It was the only program shown almost continuously all day long and was available to teachers any time during the day. The Electric Company and Sesame Street, which was shown to Early Start, kindergarten and first grade classes, were assigned two of six in-school channels that feed, along with the on-air broadcasting of Cincinnati's educational station, WCET-TV, educational material to monitors in every classroom.

The WCET-TV staff, including Charles Vaughan, president and general manager, and Mrs. Marjorie McKinney, director of instructional television services first conceived of the idea of tackling a no-progress-in-reading-achievement trend with a highly flexible closed-circuit system tailored to meet teachers' needs.

With a population of 7,000, Lincoln Heights is the largest all-black city in Ohio and possibly the nation. Severe reading and math deficiencies among its 1,800 students were revealed in testing in 1970 when the local school district was merged with its larger, more affluent and primarily white neighbor, the Princeton City School District.

A crash remedial reading and math program instituted by school officials resulted in some gains but, according to Ector, the conclusive improvements in reading began with the installation of the videotape system suggested by WCET-TV. The first indications that Lincoln Heights students were indeed closing the gap in reading achievement came in the form of results from Gates-MacGinitie standardized tests administered in May 1972 and again in May 1973 after the new system had been in operation for eight months.

The tests, according to Ector, showed that second graders in 1973 were five months more advanced in acquisition of vocabulary and six months more advanced in reading comprehension than their non-viewing counterparts a year earlier. Third graders, the test showed, were five months ahead in vocabulary and three months ahead in comprehension of the previous third grade, said Ector, who also reported that the Gates-MacGinitie results were substantiated by Stanford Achievement Tests administered in May 1972 and October 1973. "We finally reversed a no-progress trend that is still evident in other area schools," the principal said. "We were finally making progress in reading achievement."

Flexible System: The WCET-TV staff—which not only originated the idea for the system but also designed it, obtained funding, oversaw its installation and maintains it—recognized the need for a totally flexible system that would put maximum control in the hands of the teachers. This meant equipping each classroom (40 in all) with a 23-inch color TV monitor and six sets of earphones. Teachers have found the earphones especially handy when singling out individuals and small groups for special attention. The educational material seen on the in-school system is taped from Channel 48 (WCET) and commercial stations by the system's operator using a videotape recorder (VTR). Six other VTR's broadcast previously taped material to the school's channels. THE ELECTRIC COMPANY and SESAME STREET are taped automatically each day by the control room operator, while other educational TV programs are taped and used only when requested by teachers who are kept apprised of upcoming educational programs by WCET.

The entire cost of the system, underwritten by the General Electric Aircraft Engine Group, the Ford Motor Company Fund

(separate from the Ford Foundation) and the Andrew Jergens Foundation, was \$42,250. The outlay included expenditures for the 40 monitors, 240 sets of earphones, seven VTR's, 50 videotapes, peripheral control room equipment and two years of servicing.

Teachers like Tom Hinkle feel that having the videotape system is, in his words, "Like having another arm." About THE ELECTRIC COMPANY, Hinkle said, "That show stays with the kids. Weeks later they remember segments with material I'm trying to teach." He's noticed that even though his second graders are exposed to THE ELECTRIC COMPANY in school they go home and watch it again. "This type of thing is great reinforcement. It's kind of like bringing the home and school together," he said.

Mrs. Anzola MacMullen, head of the school's resource center where the videotape system's control room is located, said that THE ELECTRIC COMPANY has had a definite impact on students. "It's most obvious in the way the kids are using the library. Circulation is up and there is much greater interest in using the center especially on the part of third-to-sixth graders," she explained, and then added that teachers and students come clamoring down to the control room to find out what's wrong when a system malfunction interrupts THE ELECTRIC COMPANY.

RAISIN ENERGY WEEK

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I again join with my colleagues, Mr. MATHIAS and Mr. KETCHUM, in calling attention to the 65th National Raisin Week, which will be known this year as National Raisin Energy Week. My two colleagues and I have the honor of representing this Nation's raisin industry, and we join with them in giving special recognition May 4 through May 12 to National Raisin Energy Week.

We are convinced the more than 200,000 tons of California raisins produced in a normal crop year could, if properly converted into British thermal units of energy in the form of people power to be used in walking to work and the propelling of such gasoline-saving vehicles as bicycles and pedal cars, substantially alleviate the Nation's present energy shortage.

The California raisin industry produces the entire U.S. output of raisins and produces and processes and markets one-half of the world's raisin supply.

National Raisin Energy Week will call attention to a quarter-billion-dollar industry which directly involves many thousands of people in the production, distribution, and sales of raisins in the retail grocer and industrial and institutional handling of raisins in all forms.

Raisins from California vineyards and the related industries engaged in producing, processing, and distribution, have returned to the marketplace after a year of shortage. Once again U.S. consumers are energizing themselves with this delicious product used for eating out of hand, for cooking, for baked goods, and in gourmet dishes.

High commendation for its work in this effort and its activities in the fields of research, promotion, and advertising is merited by the California Raisin Advisory Board.

Utilizing funds provided by participating producer and processor members, CALRAB carries on its program of aggressive advertising and promotion not only domestically, but in countries throughout the world in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Foreign Agricultural Service.

I also wish to point to the important role of the Raisin Bargaining Association, which has successfully brought raisin growers and packers together in a concerted effort to give them a better voice in marketing.

Raisin packers and growers are also deserving of praise for their efforts on behalf of this major industry.

Also meriting special commendation in the raisin industry is the work of the Federal Raisin Advisory Board and the Federal Raisin Administrative Committee, who operate under Federal marketing orders which have done so much to bring about the orderly marketing of our raisin crops and have also been instrumental in the development of export markets.

The raisin industry, which effectively utilizes the self-help tools of sales promotion and advertising in the best American tradition, well deserves a special salute during this National Raisin Energy Week.

MAGAZINE LAUDS HOUSE PASSAGE OF TVA POLLUTION CREDIT BILL

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the House recently passed H.R. 11929, a bill which will assist in holding down electric power rates of the Tennessee Valley Authority by crediting pollution control costs incurred by the agency against its annual repayments to the U.S. Treasury.

Passage of this bill—which I was pleased to cosponsor with many of my colleagues from the Tennessee Valley—was praised in an article written by Mr. John Stanford entitled "Pollution Control Credit Bill Vital to TVA Rates" and published recently in the Tennessee magazine.

The article points out that private utilities have been given similar relief from pollution control through tax credits and that the people of the Tennessee Valley "deserve the same good treatment as other U.S. citizens."

The article details my testimony in support of this bill before a subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this matter, I place in the Record herewith a copy of the article.

The article follows:

POLLUTION CONTROL CREDIT BILL VITAL TO TVA RATES

(By John Stanford)

It isn't news that electric rates in Tennessee have been going up during the past six years, within a total range of some 50 to 70 percent for residents, due almost entirely to seven wholesale rate increases which the Tennessee Valley Authority has passed along to distributors—primarily electric cooperatives and municipal systems. Distributors, in turn, have been economically forced to pass along all, or most, of these wholesale increases to their consumers.

TVA points to increasing costs of coal and materials, higher interest rates on borrowed money, higher wages for employees and the high priced devices which must be installed at most generating plants in order to comply with pollution control regulations as the prime reasons that the agency has had to increase its wholesale rates so often in recent years. (Indications are that still another increase, possibly as much as 20% is in the offing for mid-summer.)

Whether or not we like or consider these considerable wholesale increases as justified, chances are that as long as the inflation spiral continues upward, so will the wholesale and, in turn, the retail rates, with only one possible deterrent standing partially in the way of the upward rush. That one exception to the above list of prime reasons that TVA lists as basically responsible for its wholesale increases concerns the pollution control devices.

This doesn't mean that TVA will no longer be required to install this expensive equipment at a cost which runs to more than \$3-million per week.

If, however, legislation now pending in the U.S. Congress becomes law, TVA will be allowed to deduct from its annual payments to the U.S. Treasury certain funds spent for pollution control devices. The amount involved should be more than enough to affect TVA's future rates.

This legislation, sponsored or cosponsored by every member of Tennessee's Congressional Delegation along with, among others, Representative Bob Jones of Alabama and Representative William Wampler of Virginia, was introduced in the House in December but committee hearings were not held until last month.

At the time of the hearings, Tennessee Electric Cooperative Association Executive Manager J. C. Hundley dispatched a letter of support and request for passage of the legislation, sometimes referred to as the TVA Pollution Credit Bill. Hundley's letter, noting that the subject legislation had been introduced in Congress, continued: "This seems particularly appropriate since the Congress has provided private industry with tax credits for similar costs. Tennessee's electric users deserve the same good treatment as other U.S. Citizens. We are vitally concerned with the increased costs of electricity to our cooperatives and thus to their member-owners. We urge your strong support of this legislation, so that we may avoid facing additional rate increases which could result in an increase to the consumer in excess of 50 per cent of their current rate."

Replies from the Congressmen were immediate, all promising active support, including appearances for Representatives before the House Public Works Committee, to which the Bill was assigned after introduction, or to one of its sub-committees.

Lead-off Congressional witness in support of the Bill, listed as House Resolution 11929, was Tennessee's veteran Fourth District Congressman, Joe L. Evins. Congressman Evins' testimony was so complete, so objective and so typical of the testimony offered by others in Tennessee's Congressional Delegation that it is herewith printed in full:

"TESTIMONY BY CONGRESSMAN EVINS"

"Certainly I want to thank you and other distinguished Members of the Subcommittee on Water Resources for the opportunity of stating and emphasizing my strong support and endorsement of H.R. 11929, a bill which would authorize the Tennessee Valley Authority to credit any expenditures for pollution control against its required repayments to the Treasury.

"This bill is needed and necessary to provide some relief to the people of the Tennessee Valley who recently received the seventh electric power rate increase by TVA in six years. Power bills of \$100 and more for a single month are not uncommon for relatively modest homes. Homeowners were encouraged for years to utilize "low-cost electricity" for heating, cooking and other uses—and now the owners of these all-electric homes are bearing the brunt of almost prohibitive electric bills.

"Industries are also suffering in the TVA service area because of heavy increases in their electric power bills.

"During TVA appropriations hearings held by our Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations last year, representatives of several industries testified that electric power for their plants was costing more in Tennessee than in other states.

"One industry spokesman said further that his plant would not have located in Tennessee if it had been made aware of the planned escalating rate increases—and would locate no additional industry in the Tennessee Valley area.

"One of the major TVA expenses is its repayments to the Treasury and another is the cost of pollution control of its steam plants, which burn enormous quantities of coal. This bill would have the effect of eliminating environmental control costs by crediting such costs against repayment requirements.

"By way of background, in 1959 the Congress gave TVA authority to issue bonds to assist in financing its power program—in an amount not to exceed \$5 billion at any one time.

"Prior to 1959, funds required to finance TVA's power program were obtained from appropriations by the Congress.

"However, the 1959 act required that TVA make payments into the Treasury of—first—a return on the net appropriation investment in power facilities and—secondly—annual repayments of such investments.

"The return on the investment is based on the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its total marketable price obligations and the unrepaid appropriations investment at the beginning of the fiscal year.

"To give you some idea of the amount of these repayments, prior to 1959 under various repayment sections, TVA had repaid \$250 million 131 thousand to the United States Treasury.

"Subsequent to 1959—or 1961, when the amendment went into effect—TVA payments have totaled \$891 million.

"Therefore, TVA repayments since its inception have totaled more than \$1 billion 141 million.

"In fiscal 1974, TVA will make a \$20 million payment toward its appropriations investment and \$63 million payment as a dividend—a total payment into the U.S. Treasury of \$83 million in one year.

"Indications are that \$170 million will be spent on pollution control equipment in fiscal 1974.

"Furthermore, if the Environmental Protection Agency requires very stringent measures to remove pollution from steam plant stacks—as it has indicated it will—TVA will be forced into an outlay of \$1 billion during the next few years on this new and untried technology.

"Under the bill before your Committee, the cost of these pollution control facilities would be applied the next year to cover the required dividend payment to the Treasury. The remainder would be applied to reduce the \$20 million investment payment—further, if the costs of pollution facilities exceeded these payments, the remainder would be applied to a further reduction of the remaining investment.

"It is estimated the bill would save TVA \$85 million in the first year with benefits increasing substantially each year.

"I would like to point out that the Tax Reform Act of 1969 provided an amortization deduction for certified pollution control facilities built by private corporations—TVA has no such recourse for relief.

"In other words, the Congress has provided private industry with tax credits for the costs of pollution control measures—but has not provided any similar relief for public utilities or their customers who, in many instances, ultimately pay the higher costs in higher power rates.

"This bill would provide some relief not only to TVA, but to its customers and consumers in the Tennessee Valley.

"As you all know, TVA has long enjoyed its traditional role as a low-cost power yardstick and in my view is in danger of losing this image because of the sharp increase in power rates over the past seven years.

"TVA rates are rising more rapidly than the Nation as a whole, and TVA customers are paying a higher electric bill because four out of ten homes in the service area are all-electric.

In the Tennessee Valley today, residential customers are paying approximately 65 percent more for the same amount of electricity used seven years ago—and industries are paying 90 percent more.

"We need some relief, gentlemen, and I appeal to you—I urge you—to look with favor on this bill.

"I urge you to report the bill to the full Committee—recommending prompt and favorable action thereon.

"Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen."

It is good to note that H.R. 11929 has been favorably reported by the full House Public Works Committee and is expected to be brought before the House of Representatives for debate and consideration in the near future.

Hopefully, similar action will be taken in the Senate at the earliest possible time.

Even more hopefully, the action of both Houses will be favorable to TVA, this in terms of what it means to ultimate consumers financially and to TVA in its role of the "yardstick" by which, in service and rates, the electric industry in America is measured.

SOVIET SEA CHALLENGE

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a recent speech by Vice Adm. George C. Dyer, USN, retired, a distinguished officer in the U.S. Navy, has come to my attention, and I commend it to the Members of Congress.

In it, Admiral Dyer points up the challenge to this country's seapower posed by the Soviet Union, and I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

THE SOVIET SEA CHALLENGE

My talk about the Soviet sea challenge will be divided into three parts, just as we learned in our long ago Latin lessons that all Gaul was so divided.

First, I will briefly bring you up to date by reminding you of previous sea power challenges which have occurred during the twentieth century against the then current #1 sea power.

Second, I will name briefly the elements of sea power, as they exist in the decade of the 1970's, and point out some of the trends that are taking place in the Soviet navy, and in the United States Navy.

Third, I will give you one man's opinion of where the United States Navy, the most important element of sea power of the United States, stands today in relation to the Soviet navy, and where it might stand in 1980.

And all this in twenty-five minutes.

PREVIOUS SEA POWER CHALLENGES

In the early years of the twentieth century, it was axiomatic that "Britannia rules the waves". Great Britain had over fifty colonies and dominions scattered around the world and tremendously long lines of communication extending to Egypt, India and Australia in the East and to Newfoundland, Canada, the Falkland Islands and Fiji to the West. Britain needed a large and active navy to protect these lines of communication and a strong merchant marine to sustain the commercial trade of the dominions and colonies with the mother country. Britain had both and was definitely "number one sea power".

Kaiser Wilhelm in Germany, and his predecessors and their advisors, found time to study the books of our Admiral Mahan about the influence of sea power on history and took to heart the lessons set forth in Mahan's mighty volumes. If Germany was ever to be number one in the world, Germany had to have sea power and a large Navy. Germany set forth to challenge Great Britain in sea power.

At the great sea battle at Jutland in 1916, the British Navy turned back this challenge, and at the end of World War I, the German fleet was surrendered to the British fleet.

Based on a strong suspicion that the German challenge just might succeed, a success which would be an undesirable turn of events for the United States, President Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson built up our Navy to close comparability with that of the #1 sea power, Great Britain.

The Washington inspired limitation of Naval Armaments Treaty of 1922 sought to freeze naval strength as it then existed and put an end to naval challenges. Great Britain and the United States were allowed an equal big ship strength of 5, Japan a relative strength of 3, and France and Italy each a relative strength of 1.67.

I call your attention to the fact that the navy of the Soviet Union in 1922 was a distinct "also ran" in naval strength, altho back in 1900, the Russian navy had been the third navy in size in the world, not too far behind France, which followed at a respectful distance behind Great Britain.

During the twenty year period between World War I and World War II, the Soviet navy built up its submarine strength so that this part of the Soviet navy was the largest in the world, amounting to, in 1940, some 240 submarines. But the Soviet fleet was very unbalanced, being without an air arm or an amphibious arm, and the basic essential, the skill of going to sea and staying at sea.

More importantly to the United States Navy, during the twenty year period between World War I and World War II, the Japanese government, disregarding the Japanese treaty obligations, built up the Japanese navy

beyond the limitations set on naval strength by the 1922 Limitation of Naval Armament Treaty, as well as the later 1930 Naval Limitations Treaty. Japan denounced the treaties in 1934 and commenced its unbridled sea power challenge. Germany, getting a somewhat later start, also commenced to build up her Navy at a rapid rate for her second sea power challenge.

Great Britain easily turned back the second German Naval challenge and the United States slowly but surely, and a bit painfully, commencing in mid-1942, turned back the Japanese Naval challenge.

In the period following World War II, and immediately following the formation of the United Nations organization, the Soviet Union torpedoed the formation of the planned for and the charter prescribed "United Nations Armed Forces". She insisted that each and every nation of the five permanent members of the security council must make equal contributions of land, sea, and air forces to the "United Nations Armed Forces". Since, at that time, 1947, China had no navy to mention, and specifically no carriers, no battleships or large cruisers and no amphibious forces, this proposal meant that the "United Nations Armed Forces" would have available no real seagoing naval power with a wallop and that only land and air forces would be available in any United Nations crises. It was quite natural that the United States, Great Britain and France would not accept such an unbalanced "United Nations Armed Forces". So the "United Nations Armed Force" died aborning.

But the Soviet leaders of 1951 were brighter than they had been in 1920 and 1930 and 1940 and much brighter than they had been in 1947. In 1951, after observing what sea power had done to them in Korea, they decided to build up their sea power and that of course included their navy.

As the years passed after World War II and Korea, the lessons of Mahan in regard to the influence of sea power on history were heeded less and less in the United States and shoved under the table in Great Britain. The British excused themselves from doing what they knew was the right thing to do, on the basis of poverty. The United States was content to slumber as a self confident No. 1. On the other hand, the Soviets having taken the decision that the Soviet Union couldn't be No. 1 in the world without having the No. 1 sea power forces in the world, put their rubles behind their ambitions. They have gotten results.

On the Presidents of the United States from Harry Truman to Richard Nixon, the present incumbent, Richard Nixon, is the only one to clearly perceive that the United States can do little overseas for herself or for her allies in the cause of freedom, without the broad means to get overseas and the power to stay. These objectives take sea power. President Nixon has moved naval appropriations from being No. 3 amongst the services to the No. 1 spot, money wise. President Harry Truman had the lesson of lack of sea power wallop forced upon him, when on the 24th of June 1950, the Communist North Koreans poured over the borders into South Korea. As President, however, Harry Truman had not only tolerated but supported Louis Johnson as Secretary of Defense and Francis Mathews as Secretary of the Navy. These two, in 1949 and 1950, viewed sea power as an anachronism.

So the lesson of history in sea power of the first seventy years of the twentieth century has been that since the German challenge was turned back twice and the Japanese challenge was turned back once, that when the chips are down on the field of battle, challenges by even just slightly inferior forces don't succeed. On the other hand, con-

frontations as we confronted Great Britain during the first two years of World War I, and as the Soviets confronted us during the Cuban missile crisis, are the energy foods which spur on the No. 2 sea power to become the No. 1 sea power.

Now, let us look at my second point.

ELEMENTS OF SEA POWER

What are the elements of sea power in March 1974, and what are the trends taking place in these elements in the United States and in the Soviet Union today? Is the Soviet sea challenge for real?

Sea power is first and foremost the ability to conduct war at sea. But it is also the ability to exploit the economic, political and psychological advantages of a strong maritime presence. This latter requires a wide ranging fishing fleet, an active and strong merchant marine and a highly financed oceanographic research and exploration program.

First, a word about the Soviet merchant marine and a sad word about ours.

In 1960, I finished a book for the Naval Institute titled "Naval Logistics" and took my wonderful wife on a freighter trip around the world, as I had promised her to do. Except in ports like Okinawa, Olongapo and Manila, I was amazed, truly amazed to find that merchant ships of the Soviet Union outnumbered United States merchant ships by two to three and even four to one. I had spent two years, 1947-1948 in the Mediterranean as a cruiser division commander and the very opposite had been true in the Mediterranean then. But, in 1960, in ports like Madang, Sourabajo, Port Swettenheim, even Penang and Singapore, these large fine looking Soviet merchant ships were always to be seen and in profusion.

And today, the imbalance has become more marked. By and large, our active merchant marine has shrunk from 2926 ships during the period from 1960 to 1972. In the same period, the Soviet active merchant marine has grown from 873 to 1480 ships. The active Soviet merchant marine is now two and one quarter times the size of our active merchant marine. The Soviet Merchant Marine is the fifth largest in oceangoing ships in the world, and what is more important it is remarkably new. And if you are wondering who the first four are, Japan, Great Britain, Norway and Liberia are the current leaders in active merchant shipping on the highways of the oceans.

Another element of the Soviet Unions' strong maritime presence is the Soviet's open ocean fishing fleet. It is the largest in the world and still growing.

And finally, the Soviet oceanographic research and exploration programs. They are beyond the range of any simple formula to rate, but they are judged by those who claim to know as "highly aggressive" and no less than "second to none," to borrow an old U.S. Navy slogan.

Summarized, the Soviet merchant marine is large and active and growing rapidly: Ours is shrinking steadily: Their fishing fleet is first and growing: Their oceanographic research is "second to none".

ONE MAN'S OPINION

And now, my third point. And it is just one man's opinion as to where the United States stands today in relation to the Soviet sea challenge.

Is the challenge for real? I answer "yes".

With the challenged and the challenger being in the general area of equal strength, it would seem to me that the battle result in the years ahead might well be determined by the "professionalism of the officers corps" of the two navies. I do not see how the United States Navy can expect to excel in this area in the years ahead when Secretaries of the Navy and at least one Chief of

Naval Operations, the present one, downgrade seagoing command achievements and capabilities in sea going skills and upgrade fiscal management, so called "people to people" relationship, "management skills" rather than "command skills". They have done this in their letters of instruction to the flag officer selection boards, flag officer plucking boards, and in administrative practices and policies.

It was a lesson of World War II that not every Naval officer wearing a flag officers uniform had the personal courage, the professional capability to fight well and to keep on fighting well over long periods of time to permit building up successful fighting teams. There were a lot of "trial and error" details of flag officers to combat assignment during World War II.

In World War III, it will be a lot more difficult for the United States Navy to resist the Soviet sea challenge, if the Navy starts out without a very large backlog of professionally qualified flag officers who have won their spurs at sea. Where will the United States Navy be with its flag list filled with officers who have won their spurs ashore and kept themselves on active duty by saying "yes sir, it's a fine idea"?

The Soviet Navy has, at long last, in 1973, launched their first large aircraft carrier of about 40,000 tons, and have laid down the keel of another. When the Soviets have commissioned and outfitted these ships, put them thru a shakedown cruise and a considerable series of tactical exercises, they will have taken a big step ahead.

As the Soviets press ahead in this area of large carriers, with the laying down of more keels and then have more launchings and more shakedown cruises, and more tactical exercises and deep water fleet problems, say in 1978 to 1982, the Soviets will be in a position to make a chips down sea challenge to the United States Navy.

For the Soviet Navy already has three times as many submarines as the United States Navy. The Soviet submarines have been patrolling off our coasts for some years with their thirty-one yankee submarines each armed with sixteen missiles good for 1,300 to 1,500 miles from launch position. And in 1972, the Soviet Delta submarine each armed with twelve 4,000-mile missiles commenced cruising in our offshore waters, able to pinpoint any location in the United States from either the Atlantic or Pacific Ocean. And even more worrisome, the Soviets are now carrying sixteen 4,000-mile missiles.

As one more fact pointing up that Soviet sea power is on the move is that the Soviet Marine Corps has reappeared together with seagoing landing ships and craft.

To reinforce the statement that the Soviet Navy is "on the make", let me advise you that from 1965 to 1972, the number of ship days the Soviet Navy is spending cruising at sea, that is one ship one day cruising in the Atlantic, the Mediterranean, the Caribbean, the Indian Ocean and the western Pacific Ocean increased from 6,000 in 1965 to 48,000 in 1972. An eightfold increase. From these figures you will know that the Soviet Navy is learning to go and to stay at sea.

The present emphasis in the United States Navy, currently accentuated by decreasing amounts of fuel oil available, seems to be on how much time the ships can stay in port, and how frequently officers and men may go ashore, and how small the watch on duty aboard may be.

During the recent Israel-Egyptian war, the United States Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean had its forces increased from 50 to 60 ships. The Soviet forces in the Mediterranean at the same time were increased from 50 to 90 ships. "This is the portend of things to come."

THE PORTEND OF THINGS TO COME

My opinions are: (1) the decision has been taken in the Kremlin to become the

No. 1 in sea power, and to make the Soviet Navy the largest in the world. I believe this will be accomplished, because there has been no decision taken in Washington by the President and the congressional leaders of both political parties that the necessary steps must be taken to keep the United States ahead of the Soviet Union in sea power, expensive as such a decision would be. (2) The Soviet decision to be No. 1 will be brought to fruition shortly after 1980. (3) There will be some confrontations in the intervening years, but no "chips down" challenge. (4) The United States Navy does not appear to be acting like a navy under very serious challenge, although it has not reached the nonchalance of the British Navy as it slid quietly from being No. 1 to No. 2 to a "way back" No. 3.

When the chief of naval operations of our Navy can take time from not only leading his subordinates, but pushing them a bit to develop professional excellence in meeting the sea challenges ahead, to personally out the hair of a sailorman before television cameras, then it seems to me that the reality of the sea power challenge of the Soviet Navy has been missed.

So I recommend to each of you that you have your back yard bomb shelter built and ready for occupancy before 1980, because, by that date, at the present rates of growth and relative decline of the two leading sea powers, the Soviet Navy will be "Number one."

RAPE: SOCIETY'S CRIME AGAINST WOMEN

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, the Rape Prevention and Control Act, H.R. 10848, which I sponsored along with 62 of my colleagues, addresses itself to a growing problem facing this country, the crime of rape. This legislation would establish the Center for the Prevention and Control of Rape, and would provide grants to local agencies and organizations for research and demonstration projects related to rape prevention and treatment.

The pressing need for this legislation has been demonstrated in recent months by the growing number of sexual assaults on this Nation's campuses. The University of Pittsburgh, like other institutions, has been plagued by such assaults. For this reason, and in light of growing national concern over the increased incidence of rape, the Pittsburgh New Sun recently devoted an entire issue to an in-depth study of rape, its perpetrators and its victims.

The following is an excerpt from this special edition, dealing with the incidence of rape, the rapists' motivations, the callous treatment often experienced by rape victims, as well as the victims' physical and emotional scars. I hope that this thoughtful and informative article receives the full consideration and attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

RAPE: SOCIETY'S CRIME AGAINST WOMEN

Over 40,000 rapes are reported to the police in the U.S. each year; this is only the iceberg's tip, for although no one knows exactly how many rapes there are, the FBI calculates that ten occur for every one that is reported.

A woman is raped every several minutes in America; anywhere from 300 to 3,000 occurred in Pittsburgh last year.

The rapist's victim may suffer severe injuries or beating in addition to physical degradation; she then is subject to rumors and suspicion by her neighbors, who harbor society's prejudice that only deserving women are assaulted, that they seduce their attacker to satisfy forbidden promiscuous urges.

Legislatures and juries also share that prejudice, which produces laws which safeguard the accused's right to a fair trial more rigorously than society's right to justice, and which produces acquittal verdicts because, "I just couldn't believe that a boy whose girlfriend was as pretty as the one who came into court to testify would have even wanted to rape such a plain-looking girl."

RAPE AND RAPISTS

Rape, ironically is often not a sexual crime.

Two years ago Ellen, a 17 year old high school student, met Joe at a party. They had several mutual acquaintances, but had never socialized. The two later met on the street once or twice, and several months later Joe invited Ellen and a girlfriend to his apartment to listen to records.

When Ellen and her friend arrived, Joe was alone; his roommates were gone for the evening. As the three were listening to records, Ellen dialed the serviceman's check number to start Joe's phone ringing. She lifted the receiver, mumbled a few words, and hung up. When Joe demanded to know who had called, she told him it was just a joke—she had dialed herself. He became irrationally angry at the prank and pushed her around the kitchen. As his anger increased he violently slammed her against a wall, with her friend present, and railed: "You've never been hurt, have you? Well, I've been hurt and you deserve to be."

The popular image of a rapist as a man suddenly and uncontrollably overcome by sexual need is denied by those members of the medical profession who study and treat rapists. Generally, rape is a premeditated crime of violence.

In his 1971 report, Dr. Menachem Amir concluded that rapists "do not constitute a unique or psychopathological type; nor are they as a group invariably more disturbed than the control groups to which they are compared." A parole officer working with convicted rapists at San Luis Obispo in California said, "Those men were the most normal men there. They had a lot of hang-ups, but they were the same hang-ups as men walking out on the street."

Rapists are motivated by any number of conscious or unconscious drives. Their intent, however, is to achieve sexual gratification by asserting and affirming their masculinity, or to forcibly degrade women.

"I'd say 75% of the girls raped provoked it by wearing outrageously sexy clothes and flashing their bodies around. I really think that some girls dig being raped."

Dr. Robert Loisselle, a staff member of Western Psychiatric Hospital and an associate professor of clinical psychology at Pitt, describes the rapist's motivation and behavior. Of the first type, those seeking sexual gratification, he says:

"In our society it is a given fact that a man is expected to prove his masculinity—aggressiveness—sexually. Rape is a very good way to exert that aggression. Ultimately, masculinity equals aggression and that equals rape. There is a *super* need and pressure to be a MAN in our culture." Because the rapist is seeking positive affirmation of his weak masculine identity, "he may be deterred by flattery. If a victim tells him: 'You're so strong, handsome, masculine, etc.; why pick on me, a stranger—you must have lots of girlfriends?' He may be sufficiently gratified. Also, it is contrary to the stereotype of virility for a

man to rape a pregnant woman." Men are the protectors of the honorable state of motherhood.

Again and again we find that the sexual aspects of rape are not the primary or motivational factors. "Rape is a crime of violence and violence is a part of the American culture and its stereotyped definition of the masculine identity."

The more dangerous and less predictable rapist is less concerned with proving himself than with expressing his violence and anger through a sadistic sexual act. Dr. Loiselle points out, "Rape is often a crime committed not against an individual woman—but against the entire sex." The motives of these men are highly complex and usually deeply rooted in the subconscious. Because such rapists are rarely treated, little is known about their sadistic drives.

Every woman knows a potential rapist. They aren't confined to socio-economic class, age, race, or background; there are as many in Mt. Lebanon as there are on the Hill. They are usually married, and have families. Rapists frequently repeat their act. In Pittsburgh one man committed 60 reported rapes before he was arrested. The odds are good that if convicted, upon release he will resume his criminal activity.

Dr. Loiselle feels that rapists can be successfully treated. However, because there are no medical rehabilitation programs within our penal system (with exceptions in Wisconsin, Massachusetts and California) to deal with the offenders, their problem is never treated.

As our society's attitudes about sex open up and become more liberated, rape and other sex offenses should decrease. Pat Farley of Magee Women's Hospital explains that, "Sex has always been thought of as something a man does to a woman. I think rape arises out of that." Dr. Loiselle and other experts hope that as definitions of masculinity and femininity become less restricted, human sexuality more open and honest, and sex associated less with taboo and ignorance, the need to dominate, brutalize and degrade women will diminish.

Until that time, rape continues. The rapist may, but often will not, be subjected to the humiliation of arrest; even if arrested, he need not be overly fearful, for less than a third of the accused rapists brought to trial in Allegheny County in 1973 were convicted.

So the rapist's story often ends with his act. The woman's unfortunately, is barely beginning.

Following rape, a woman should obtain medical aid immediately, for even if she has suffered no obvious injuries, there is a risk of internal wounds, venereal disease, and pregnancy. In addition, a medical examination is critically important in prosecuting the rapist, if he is caught; for this reason the victim should not tend her own injuries unless first aid is really necessary. So it is that medical people, often emergency room staff, are the first with which the victim must deal.

A woman choosing to involve the police in her case will be first escorted by them to the hospital nearest the spot where her rape occurred. (Until recently, all local rapes were taken to Magee Women's Hospital.) However, if she decides against reporting the incident she may select the hospital of her choice, or may seek a private physician. Upon entering the hospital emergency room and reporting her attack, the victim is asked by hospital officials, if alone, if she would like to call the police, since many women often run first to a hospital and then think of calling the police only when it is too late. Whatever her decision, there should be no difference in the manner, or thoroughness, with which she is examined.

CALLOUS TREATMENT

After giving some of the details of the rape and her own medical history, the patient must enter an examining room and undress.

During the daytime the emergency rooms of most hospitals are staffed by full time doctors, but at night, since they must be called from their homes, a woman raped has a lesser chance of being examined by an experienced physician rather than an intern. Ms. Pat Farley, a Magee Women's Hospital social worker, commented that the rape victim's chances of being cared for by a full-time physician are even less than those of the typical emergency case, because "doctors hate to be called out for rape cases, since they usually must deal with an overwrought woman, and must perform many tedious tests if the woman is accompanied by a policeman."

A woman often must face this type of callousness from all the emergency room staff. Many do not understand or sympathize with her, and of course emergency room conditions are rarely conducive to understanding on anyone's part. The victim should, if possible, bring a friend for support, for although police forces and feminist groups elsewhere maintain special personnel to counsel and comfort the victim, no such assistance is available in the Pittsburgh area.

Beyond treatment for her wounds, at many hospitals, women not using some type of birth control are offered a simple procedure known as a prophylactic "D and C" (dilation and curettage), a scraping of the womb which removes an implanted egg from its lining. Often, more simply, she is offered a "morning after" pill, which dislodges the zygote from the womb. However, many forms of the morning after pill contain a powerful hormone, DES (diethylstilbestrol) which has been discovered to cause vaginal carcinoma (malignancy) in women who take it frequently, and also in their daughters. When used infrequently, as in the case of rape, it is unlikely to do so, but it will produce harsh side effects such as nausea, vomiting, and diarrhea, and since the pill must be taken for five consecutive days, many women opt for the painless D and C.

(One form of the anti-abortion bills considered last year by the—all male—Pennsylvania legislature would have outlawed these prophylactic measures offered to rape victims.)

Some time during the examination the victim is told that she might have been exposed to some type of venereal disease, and that it would be wise for her to return to the hospital or to her own doctor in two or three weeks for a blood test. Because it would not have had time to infect her body and thus appear in a blood sample taken at the first exam, the test for syphilis cannot then be performed. A smear is taken to check for gonorrhea at that time, however, since its presence might be detected.

Contrary to the scenes in recent movies about rape, a police officer locally need not be present during the victim's internal exam. A doctor and nurse are recognized to be medical witnesses at least as competent as a cop. If the victim hopes to prosecute, the following steps must be taken. First and most important, a culture is taken from the woman's vagina to check for semen and blood left there by the attacker; this establishes the fact of penetration, and may help to identify him. Then samples of the woman's head and pubic hair are taken, in the event that the attacker is found with any of her body hair still on his person. A sample of his saliva may be taken from her body, if necessary. Any scrapings of skin from under her fingernails or toenails are taken if the woman attempted to scratch and kick her attacker, and all other possible evidence, such as clothing with blood stains on it, is considered.

PHYSICAL INJURIES NOT WORSE

But except for the sometimes severe wounds, the most serious damage to the victim is psychological. She has been violated

and degraded as a person. She may feel shame and guilt, for society commonly blames her more than the attacker.

Boyfriends and husbands may react in that way also, making the tacit assumption that she provoked or encouraged the attack through her manner or actions. Though these reactions are usually not critical in the long run, they afford much anguish for the victim and can be instrumental in breaking up already unstable relationships.

Morbid curiosity on the part of friends and neighbors intensifies the problem, leaving the victim with a feeling of being on display.

Counselors, who of course only deal with women who have reported their rapes and are therefore atypical, have identified three stages common to most women's reaction and adjustment to rape.

Immediately following sexual assault, the victim's feelings include shock, disbelief, or dismay, followed by anxiety or fear. It is extremely important during this phase for the social worker or volunteer to encourage her to talk about the assault. Often her relatives and friends try to dissuade her from thinking or talking about it, in the mistaken belief that she will become more emotionally distressed. However, if others refuse to listen, she may conclude that they are embarrassed and ashamed, and want to punish her for what has happened.

A rape victim's anxiety usually diminishes significantly after she has talked with a relative or friend about the assault; thus the worker should help her decide who will be told (parents, boyfriend, husband, friend, clergy) and how this will be accomplished. She should be assisted in these contacts if she desires to be, while being encouraged to handle as much herself as possible. Nothing should be done for her without her knowledge.

FALSE ADJUSTMENT

As the victim deals with practical problems, curious psychological mechanisms such as denial of affect, suppression, and rationalization are called into play. She resumes her normal activities and appears to be adjusting to the assault. Her interest in seeking help and talking about her experience wanes rapidly. This response is healthy and should be encouraged, despite the fact that it represents an interim period of false adjustment.

Sometimes a rape victim will seek help for the first time during this stage, usually because a friend or relative urged her to do so. However, women are generally reluctant to involve themselves in an intense relationship at this time and should not be criticized for their feelings. A counselor can help her gain perspective about this reaction by describing the whole process and can offer psychiatric services if requested.

In the third phase, two central issues must be worked through by the victim: her feelings about herself and her feelings about the assailant. Often she feels guilty, unclear, or damaged, and it is useless for a helper to reassure her until she has talked about these feelings. "The victim's anger is usually directed more towards self than towards the attacker," says Dr. Loiselle. Although the counselor may believe there was nothing the woman could have done to prevent the attack, he/she must be cautious about saying so. It is preferable for the victim to reach this conclusion on her own; some need to go through a period of guilt and self-punishment as a first step toward integrating the experience. If friends or a counselor challenge their guilt prematurely, victims may feel they are misunderstood and cannot be helped.

After several weeks most women have integrated the experience and it takes its appropriate place in the past. If a woman does not accomplish this within a reasonable period, the rape has created or rearoused feel-

ings that she cannot handle and psychotic or neurotic symptoms may result.

Fortunately, most women do adjust to the trauma of rape after a painful, but relatively brief, time. Unfortunately, what is usually the most anguishing experience still lies ahead.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE COUP IN PORTUGAL FOR THE AFRICAN LIBERATION MOVEMENT

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, an issue of great concern to me and the other members of the Congressional Black Caucus has been the ongoing struggle, in Mozambique, Angola, and Guinea-Bissau, between African liberation forces and Portugal. The recent coup d'etat in Portugal brings hope that these three countries will gain their independence and that Portugal will realize its potential for democracy.

We also realize, however, that the situation in southern Africa is a tenuous one and that South Africa may feel threatened by this new development. If their feelings of insecurity lead them to take aggressive action, the repercussions could be global in magnitude.

Still, the coup d'etat in Portugal by General Spínola is a course for optimism for now and, we hope, for the future.

To inform my colleagues of the implications of the coup in Portugal for the African liberation movement, I have entered for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a commentary written by Ovid Abrams for the Community News Service.

COMMENTARY: PORTUGAL'S COLONIES NEARER
LIBERATION AFTER OVERTHROW?

(By Ovid Abrams)

April 26.—The overthrow of Portugal's dictatorial regime of Dr. Marcello Caetano by a seven-man military junta, which claims it will reintroduce democracy to Portugal, may also signal the beginning of the end of over two decades of war between Portugal and her African colonies. The overthrow could also mean liberation for the people in a large chunk of Black Africa.

Liberal generals Antonio Sebastião Riberio del Spínola and Francisco da Costa Gomes who took over the country yesterday, are former heads of defense staffs who were dismissed last month for criticizing the wars in Angola, Mozambique, Portuguese Guinea and the Cape Verde Islands.

The wars for liberation have been repressively put down by Portugal with arms and funds from NATO and large grants from the United States in exchange for trade and American use of a strategic base in the Azores.

But despite the use of U.S.-made napalm and other genocidal weapons by Portuguese soldiers against African liberation movements, Guinea Bissau declared itself independent late last year.

Portugal—with an area less than the size of New York State and a population equal to that of New York City—has possessed over one million square miles of African territory since about 1575.

One of Black Africa's most notorious imperialist masters, Portugal has used expansionist policies toward Africa and ceased to

recognize her overseas possessions as colonies. The territories have been considered part of Portugal and have been called "overseas provinces."

It took over 142,000 Portuguese troops—over half of the country's armed forces of 218,000—to maintain a flimsy grasp on those "overseas provinces" in the past 10 years. Twenty-five per cent of the country's expenditures since 1971 have been on this effort.

During the 10 years there have been untold atrocities committed against civilians, many of which make the My Lai massacre in Vietnam look like a street brawl.

Along with mass extermination of the Black population in the colonies, Portugal practices a more subtle elimination of Blacks by having their soldiers rape Black women and let them give birth to children of mixed breed.

The neither-Black nor-White children have occupied a kind of associated White status. In the Portuguese territories this is known as "assimilado" status.

In addition, there is also discrimination and segregation in the African colonies similar to that practiced in neighboring South Africa and Rhodesia.

There is a vast supply of untapped resources in the colonies—resources which Portugal had neither the expertise nor the capacity to develop. Mozambique, which is more than twice the size of Nigeria, has large deposits of iron ore, petroleum and other minerals much in demand by the developed world.

Perhaps these resources explain why Portugal's major trading partners are the United States, Japan, Canada, the United Kingdom and West Germany. African goods were exchanged by Portugal for support by NATO of which these countries are members, and arms to subvert liberation movements and carry out further repression of Africans.

The prolonged Portuguese war, somewhat similar to our Vietnam war, demoralized the Portuguese people and eroded confidence in the Caetano regime. The coup was marked by jubilant demonstrations in the streets—the Portuguese people seem to have won their victory, the African people must still win theirs.

The coup could mark the end of an era of colonialism for over 20 million Africans. But if this hope fails to materialize it should not be too surprising, since Portugal's faithful NATO allies have always stood ready to come to her rescue against the forces of Black liberation.

The present situation could be the testing ground for General Spínola, who has spoken much liberal rhetoric and promised to restore the democracy Portugal lost when Dr. Salazar began his authoritarian rule over 40 years ago. Let us see how well the good General backs up his words.

POLISH WOMEN'S CLUB AT THREE RIVERS, MASS., CELEBRATES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1974

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 27, I had the great pleasure of attending the 50th anniversary celebration of the Polish Women's Club of Three Rivers, Mass. It was an inspiration to join with these spirited ladies at their gala dinner, which was highlighted by the presence of five of the club's charter

members: Agata Frydryk, Frances Bukowski, Frances Dymon, Agnes Zerdecki, and Helen Nowak.

The program began with a gracious welcoming address from President Helen B. Grzywna and was followed by an impressive performance by toastmistress Anna Kulig. The Polish and American anthems were sung by Hedi Kay, after which the Reverend Robert Ceckowski, pastor of St. Peter and Paul Church, Three Rivers, delivered the invocation.

After an introduction of the officers, past presidents, and guests, Mr. William J. Lemanski, chairman of the board of selectmen of the town of Palmer, extended the town's greetings to the club, as did Rose Corso, vice president of the District V, Massachusetts Federation of Polish Women's Clubs, and Beatrice Melody, president of the Massachusetts Federation of Polish Women's Clubs. State Senator Fredric W. Schlosstein, Jr., congratulated the ladies of the club along with State Representative Alexander Lolas.

The principal address was delivered by attorney Mary A. Socha on the theme of "Women's Organization in Today's World." Reverend Ceckowski then gave the benediction and Anna Kulig offered the closing remarks before the audience and Hedi Kay once again joined in the Polish and our national anthems.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the scene was an inspiring one. It was. However, the Polish Women's Club of Three Rivers is distinguished by what I feel is an equally inspiring history, a little of which I would like to share with you:

HISTORY OF POLISH WOMEN'S CLUB

Recognizing the need for assisting women of Polish ancestry to become citizens of this country, early in 1924 the Messrs. Stanley Zerdecki, Walter Dymon, Michael Boyko and Joseph Les spearheaded an organizational drive toward this end.

Records show that on February 24, 1924 these four organizers were successful in getting together a group of women for this purpose. A club was formed and named The Polish American Women Citizens Political Club of Three Rivers and Thorndike. On March 30, 1924 Miss Anna Rusek became the first president of this group of 59 charter members.

The purpose of the club was three-fold:

1. To encourage women to become citizens and assist them in procuring citizenship papers by teaching English and related subjects.
2. Take active part in politics and get proper recognition and positions on local, state and federal level.
3. Support businesses owned by people of Polish extraction.

With club members as volunteer teachers, and the financial backing of this club, numerous other men and women came forth to lend their assistance in whatever manner necessary. Thus was set in motion and accomplished the dream of the organizers—seeing women of Polish extraction becoming American citizens.

This service and assistance continued for the next 20 years, the main purpose of the club was fulfilled.

The second objective with regards to participation in politics was also seriously undertaken in 1926 when the club became affiliated with the United Polish American Citizens of Massachusetts on both county and state levels. For the next 40 years delegates were present whenever possible at the

annual conventions throughout the state to exchange ideas and get a better knowledge of the working of our government. Over the years these Polish women have sent innumerable letters and telegrams, made contact with state and federal legislators on behalf of qualified individuals seeking jobs, or in connection with expressing the favoring or opposition of bills or proposed legislation. On a town level their support has also been solicited and given to those who they felt merited such support, whether Democrats or Republicans or Independents. Almost every election brings requests from hopeful candidates asking to speak to the membership and soliciting their vote.

It is with pride that members note that at least one of the club's members, the first President, Miss Anna Rusek, was named Postmaster of the Three Rivers post office in 1944 and served the community faithfully until her retirement in 1968.

Through the years the club has actively commemorated historical events. As early as 1926 the July 4th parade included members as a unit; in 1932 note was made of the 200th Anniversary of George Washington's birth; for many years the May 3 observance of Polish Constitution Day included a delegation from the club.

In 1933 it was decided to join the Massachusetts Federation of Polish Women's Clubs, Inc. The affiliation with that group continues to the present. Much has been gained through this association particularly in fostering Polish culture. Several daughters of members have received scholarship grants from the Federation, thus permitting them to continue their education. In 1952 and again in 1969 the Annual Convention of the Federation was held in Three Rivers. Delegates from the entire state of Massachusetts have high praise for the cordiality and hospitality not only of the members of this club but of the entire citizenry of the Town of Palmer. Executive committee members and various committees have included the Three Rivers Polish Women's Club members.

Activities within the framework of the Federation also include the Fifth District which comprises the Western Massachusetts area. Here, also, members continuously hold office and direct the activities of this unit. Membership has also been held in the Polish American Congress as well as the Kosciuszko Foundation in New York.

Locally membership in the United Polish American Organization Council in the Town-

ship of Palmer is felt and appreciated. Since its inception in March of 1955, members have consistently and faithfully served in various offices and committees. They have been called upon to perform a variety of services at the functions sponsored by this group. It can be truly said that no other local club has contributed more towards the scholarships given annually to local Polish students. The \$1000 amounts contributed to date stand unmatched, especially when considering the fact that up to January 1, 1956 membership dues were 5¢ per month, and since that time remained at 10¢ per month.

May 8, 1949 marked the official observance of the club's 25th Anniversary. There was a Mass of Thanksgiving at S.S. Peter & Paul Church and a banquet was held at St. Stanislaus Hall in the evening. Local and state officials as well as the clergy participated in this affair. Messrs. Boyko, Dymon, and Les, three of the four original organizers were invited guests. Atty. Irene Dumas was the main speaker with Miss Lucy Wisniewski of the State Civil Service Commission, Stanley Wondolowski of Worcester, and Rev. Alfons Skonieczki also giving brief talks.

Active support of the parish during the past 50 years has been maintained. Since 1926 when a \$25 contribution was made for the church renovation, members have bought church vestments, chimes, contributed for organ, flowers for various occasions. Members services were always given at bazaars, banquets, jubilee observances, anniversaries, etc. The club has always worked harmoniously with the clergy, recognizing that spiritual well being is an integral part of life which affects club activity as well. All are grateful for being a part of S.S. Peter & Paul Parish.

The club has also cooperated with the Franciscan Sisters who staffed the parochial school until its closing in June of 1973. Their help was truly appreciated at times of need and all the ladies have high regard and praise for their invaluable assistance.

Children, locally and elsewhere, have been remembered. For many years annual contributions were made to the S.S. Peter & Paul School for their activities. Orphanages at Hyde Park, Brightside, the blind children in Poland, Youth Camp in Bondsville and Community Day Camp, to mention a few, have also been aided by the club.

Sizeable donations were made in the Wing Memorial Hospital Building Fund as well as the Expansion Fund. Records show that the

club's first contribution to the Wing Memorial Hospital was made in 1928. Members served as volunteers in staffing the Wing Gift Shop and cart. As early as 1930 a Community Chest donation was made and this was continued until recently. The Red Cross has also been remembered over the years.

World War II and its various activities brought requests for help with Bond Drives, Blood Banks, U.S.O., Air Raid Committee, National War Fund and Polish Relief. Clothes were sewn and sent to needy, soldiers from Westover were entertained, money and services were generously donated to the various causes.

The post-war period brought a renewal of activity among organizations. Each month brought invitations or requests from religious, civic, political and community groups for participation and donation.

Having outlived its original intent, in 1958 a committee was named to revise the constitution. On October 20, 1958 the name of the club was changed to "Polish Women's Club of Three Rivers." Fostering ethnic culture, encouraging higher education, exchange of cultural ideals, replace the original aim to help with citizenship papers. Integrating this culture with the cultures of other ethnic groups of the U.S.A. offers a new challenge.

Much is being done to implement new ideals. The club constantly sponsors, attends, or contributes toward attainment of these aims. The Pop Concert, 1966 observance of Poland's Millennium, attendance at various plays, Krakowiak Dance Group, Kosciuszko Foundation Presentation Ball, Poznan Boys Choir, Liberate, Kopernik Observance, exhibits, donation of books to schools and libraries dealing with accomplishments of Poles, support of Alliance College, Palmer High School Polish Cultural Club are but a few examples of what the members are striving to achieve.

It is impossible to give just credit to any one individual member. Truly the club's success has been a team effort for the past 50 years. All must, however, remember to include Miss Josephine Roman, the first volunteer teacher, Mrs. Nellie Motyka who served as President for 24 years, Mrs. Bernice Tenczar Treasurer for 20 years, Mrs. Sophie Jorczak, Secretary for 12 years, Mrs. Frances Frydryk, Miss Mary Jajuga, Mrs. Frances Dymon, and particularly those 59 valiant women whose desire to become American citizens started the club toward making possible this—its 50th Anniversary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, May 7, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rev. Edward E. Heydt, United Methodist Church, Mount Savage, Md., offered the following prayer:

Father, God of the Universe, we pause from our tasks to talk with You.

Father, we work hard and with sincere motive to create a just society for all. We strive to live at peace with all men. We are blessed to live in a nation where striving for these ideals has made possible a good life for many. But, we have deceived ourselves by what is thought to be the successes of self-initiative and satisfaction of personal pleasures.

As individuals and as a nation, we need to focus upon You. We need to reaffirm our trust in You. May we fulfill Your desires for us in the history of man.

Father, we have sinned. Forgive our self-centered ways and heal our land. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5759. An act for the relief of Morena Stolsmark; and

H.R. 6116. An act for the relief of Gloria Go; and

H. Con. Res. 485. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House to make a technical correction in the enrollment of H.R. 11793.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 239. An act for the relief of Loretto B. Fitzgerald;

S. 506. An act for the relief of Rosina C. Beltran;

S. 1357. An act for the relief of Mary Red Head;

S. 2220. An act to repeal the "cool trade" laws;

S. 2593. An act for the relief of Ioan Gheorghe Iacob;

S. 2594. An act for the relief of Jan Sejna;

S. 3124. An act to increase the size of the Executive Protective Service; and

S. 3331. An act to clarify the authority of the Small Business Administration, to in-