

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 503. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that John Adams should be honored as the Father of the U.S. Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H. Con. Res. 504. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the imprisonment in the Soviet Union of a Lithuanian seaman who unsuccessfully sought asylum aboard a U.S. Coast Guard ship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FAUNTROY (for himself and Mr. RANGEL):

H. Res. 1146. Resolution to condemn terrorist killings of schoolchildren in Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN:

H. Res. 1147. Resolution relative to post-

ing prices of gasoline and diesel products by retail marketers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEELMAN (for himself, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. MALLARY, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. ESCH, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. LENT):

H. Res. 1148. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Resolution 988; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DULSKI (by request):

H.R. 15013. A bill for the relief of Cecelia

Helen Tomczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 15014. A bill for the relief of Viola J. Stewart, Lois Souby, Jane Robertson, and Norma Jean Ridgeway; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 15015. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Panoutsopoulos, Angeliki Panoutsopoulos, and Georgios Panoutsopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

438. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Joseph P. Gerardi, Arlington, Va., relative to redress of grievances, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRESSMAN HAWKINS' FIGHT TO HELP DELINQUENTS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, Congressman Gus Hawkins, chairman of the Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities of the House Education and Labor Committee, is currently cosponsoring—with Congressman CARL PERKINS—a Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (H.R. 6265). Mr. HAWKINS' leadership in this area has been consistent and far-sighted. He believes juvenile delinquents must be helped before they become adult criminals.

The bill reflects Mr. HAWKINS' strong commitment to helping youthful delinquents. It provides Federal support for alternatives to prison and punishment for those young people in our society who, as Mr. HAWKINS has maintained for so long, need noninstitutionalized treatment. I place in the RECORD today an article by Mr. HAWKINS from the Sacramento Observer of May 9-15, 1974, which I urge my colleagues to read:

A NEW LOOK AT JUVENILE JUSTICE

(By Augustus Hawkins)

America's deep concern about juvenile neglect and juvenile delinquency led to the formation, in the late 19th century, of a series of juvenile courts, whose chief aim was to provide special protection to children needing society's care. Eventually, this movement spread throughout the country, and by 1925 all but two states had legislatively created a state juvenile court system.

Today, every state in the Union, has such a system; thus, there are 50 different governmental jurisdictions, not including the Federal system, legally empowered to handle juvenile problems.

Each juvenile court system hoped to go beyond detention and confinement of youthful offenders, and to broaden their system's responsibility to include treatment to offenders. Their intent was to totally reform and improve upon prior systems which were singularly punitive.

Proponents of this new way of providing a fair and just system of rehabilitation for youthful offenders (juvenile delinquents)

met with great success; they also experienced dismal failures. Each state system was (and still remains) so different in its approach.

An inherent part of the system necessitated a clear definition of the term "delinquency." No reasonably accepted definition has been developed, which would thus form the basis of a mutual, nationwide guide. Confusion rather than coordination continues to exist.

In some jurisdictions, youngsters who become wards of the state due to parental neglect, end up in juvenile facilities which also house youngsters who have been involved in adult crime.

Some courts handle 16-21 year olds; others handle only youngsters below the age of 18. In some states, if a "delinquent" youngster commits an offense punishable by death or life imprisonment, his case must be remanded to an adult court. A number of states, provide no exclusive rights to the juvenile courts, except in cases of children below the age of criminal capacity.

The officers and specialists within this system also have immense difficulties.

Court dockets are overcrowded, professional staffing has been insufficient in number and quality, investigative and casework supports function poorly because of overloading, treatment services are not available to the court, public and private treatment facilities are often too few in number and restricted as to use.

With current nationwide increase in juvenile violence and crime, there needs to be a fresh approach to this whole sensitive area.

I believe H.R. 6265, a Bill co-sponsored by Congressman Carl Perkins and me, will assist in moving the nation in the direction of a more comprehensive approach to resolving juvenile delinquency.

Costing approximately \$1 billion over a four-year period, H.R. 6265 proposes to establish programs and services which will divert juveniles from entering the traditional juvenile justice system.

States will be encouraged, through realistic Federal support, to develop community-based programs designed to create non-institutionalized diagnostic, treatment or rehabilitative services; to work with families, so that a juvenile can remain at home; to provide counseling, work, and recreational services, using youth, volunteer and paraprofessional role-models; to develop foster-care and shelter-care homes, group homes, and halfway houses as alternative facilities to traditional, lockup facilities.

The Bill also establishes a new National Office of Juvenile Delinquency Prevention; this office will provide direction, coordination, and review of all federally assisted juvenile delinquency programs.

Setting national standards and providing resources for upgrading our juvenile justice system, should be a top priority on this country's agenda for its youth.

I believe that H.R. 6265—Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act—moves us in this direction.

SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

HON. PAUL W. CRONIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1974

Mr. CRONIN. Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Administration celebrates its 20th anniversary this year, and this week is Small Business Week.

I think this would be an ideal time to acknowledge the many accomplishments of the SBA in its endeavors to preserve and protect the concept of small businesses.

The small businessman is the backbone of our Nation. In recent years it seemed as if the large corporations would dominate our labor market and squeeze out the small businessmen, but through its intensive efforts the SBA has kept alive the dream of many an aspiring individual.

The SBA provides today's small businessman with counseling in many areas and helps insure that he receives a fair share of Government purchases and contracts. It offers a wealth of information concerning advertising, competitive strategy, and selling procedures.

I have long been a staunch advocate of the SBA as it carries out the mandate of Congress, granted in 1953, to encourage, assist, and protect the interests of the small businessman, and to foster the research and development of information that would widen his opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief that everything possible should be done to aid the small businessman in the pursuit of his dream; for it is yesterday's dream that becomes today's reality. That reality can represent a vast improvement in our Nation's employment and economic picture.

CONGRESSMAN LENT ANNOUNCES QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1974

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I am in the process of sending a newsletter to all of the residents of the Fourth Congressional District. Included in the newsletter are the results of my recent questionnaire. I insert the text of my newsletter in the RECORD at this point:

CONGRESSMAN NORM LENT REPORTS FROM
WASHINGTON

RODINO PANEL TARGET NOW JUNE 30TH FOR
IMPEACHMENT REPORT

The House Judiciary Committee has now set June 30th as the latest target date for completion of the investigation and report on possible grounds for impeachment of the President.

The new target date represented a two-month postponement from the original deadline of April 30th set by Committee Chairman Rodino, and seemed to be a product of both White House requests for delays, as well as the Judiciary Committee's own slow pace in acting.

No matter what one's opinion on impeachment of the President (4th C.D. Poll Results appear on Page 2), it now appears likely that the impeachment process will be with us well into this Fall and perhaps longer, barring unforeseen circumstances.

This can only result in delays in acting on other important problems facing the Nation. In my opinion, the country cannot afford this, and the Congress must begin facing up to other pressing problems which cry out for legislative action.

INFLATION, HIGH PRICES, MUST RATE AS PUBLIC
ENEMY NO. 1 IN WASHINGTON

Amid the near blanket attention being given the ongoing controversy over Watergate developments, hardly a whisper was

heard when the Nation's three years experience with wage and price controls turned into a pumpkin at midnight on April 30th. The Senate engaged in a feeble effort to enact standby controls, but a concentrated lobbying effort by big labor and others killed any chance for passage of back-up controls. About the only consolation for Nassau County residents in the current inflationary race was the fact that beef had temporarily come down to less than mountaintop prices, but the promise of future gains still faces us.

RECENT LENT VOTES

Yes! on an amendment to increase funding for Nassau Schools under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

No! to an amendment to provide additional funding for U.S. Military aid to South Vietnam.

Yes! on a bill to increase Veteran's benefits, including tuition payments, 14%.

No! on a bill to grant an additional \$1.5 billion to the International Development Association whose business is to make low-cost loans to foreign nations.

CAMPAIGN REFORM DUE SOON

While nearly everyone in Congress agrees that overhaul of our campaign financing procedures is necessary, there is less than unanimity of what constitutes the ideal solution. The aim is to lessen special interest and big money influence while still allowing the average citizen his Constitutional prerogative of backing the candidate of his choice. The House will soon consider a campaign reform bill, and the Senate has already passed sweeping changes calling for public financing of all Federal campaigns, a solution many contend goes too far with the taxpayer's dollar.

I believe Congress needs to arrive at a compromise that will effectively prohibit unreasonably large contributions while keeping the small contributor, the backbone of most campaigns, in the picture. I will work for an effective bill in the upcoming weeks to see that the abuses of Watergate will never again be repeated in our political system.

BELIEVE IT OR NOT!!

Any consumer would be astonished to learn that gasoline and oil products are the one remaining commodity under price controls, particularly with the recent drastic increases in price at the pump. Nevertheless, gas and oil still come under price controls of the Federal Energy Office and did not end with the April death of the Cost of Living Council.

REP. LENT TAKES AIM AT EAST COAST PRICES

New Yorkers are being victimized by the fact that oil companies can pass through their increased costs of oil from the Mid-East, and the East Coast is being supplied largely with imported oil.

I intend to make an effort on the House Floor, during the upcoming consideration of the Energy Bill, to require oil firms to price gasoline based on an average cost of their oil, rather than taxing the East Coast with the entire burden of high foreign costs, while midwestern areas still enjoy modest gasoline costs. I'd welcome your support on this effort.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS ARE IN: 19,000-PLUS RESPOND TO FOURTH LENT POLL

Our fourth annual questionnaire was a huge success, as over 19,000 of you took the time to fill out and return the poll on some of the major issues of the day. My thanks go out to all of you who responded—you've shown that the notion of citizen apathy with government is overrated. I also appreciated the hundreds of individual letters and notes many of you sent me telling me your thoughts on these and other issues. I only wish I could have answered each of them personally, but the massive response prohibited that.

The questionnaire was just one of many ways I attempt to "stay in touch" with the District and will serve as an invaluable aid to me in determining my vote in the House on these important issues. I hope you won't hesitate to contact my Baldwin District Office at BA 3-1616 if you have any problems with the Federal Government or just want to express your views on an issue. Again, thanks for your cooperation. Your opinion does count!

	Totals				Totals		
	Yes	No	Undecided		Yes	No	Undecided
1. Amnesty—Do you favor some form of amnesty for those who evaded the draft and deserted during the Vietnam War? (Y!—17 percent; y—17 percent; u—5 percent; n—20 percent; N!—41 percent)	34	61	5	7. Impeachment—Which best describes your opinion about impeachment: (1) The President should definitely be impeached based on present evidence	30		
2. Campaign financing—Should campaigns for Federal office be financed with tax dollars rather than private contributions? (Y!—23 percent; y—25 percent; u—8 percent; n—16 percent; N!—28 percent)	48	44	8	(2) You, as my congressman, should weigh the legal evidence and cast your vote based on the facts at hand	40		
3. Energy—Do you believe we need a federally administered gasoline rationing program similar to that imposed during World War II? (Y!—3 percent; y—6 percent; u—7 percent; n—32 percent; N!—52 percent)	9	84	7	(3) The President should definitely not be impeached based on present evidence	30		
4. Energy—Do you favor retention of year-round Daylight Savings Time? (Y!—26 percent; y—29 percent; u—7 percent; n—18 percent; N!—20 percent)	55	38	7	8. Impeachment—Do you feel the Congress is spending too much time dealing with impeachment at the expense of other problems? (Y!—36 percent; y—26 percent; u—3 percent; n—14 percent; N!—21 percent)	62	35	3
5. Energy—Do you favor my bill to provide an all-out Federal effort to develop alternative sources of energy? (Y!—52 percent; y—38 percent; u—5 percent; n—2 percent; N!—3 percent)	90	5	5	9. Inflation—Do you favor greater restraint in Federal spending? (Y!—43 percent; y—36 percent; u—8 percent; n—8 percent; N!—5 percent)	79	13	8
6. Death penalty—Do you favor its restoration for the very worst crimes? (Y!—50 percent; y—30 percent; u—4 percent; n—6 percent; N!—10 percent)	80	16	4	10. Inflation—Do you favor extension of wage/price controls beyond their April 30th expiration date? (Y!—21 percent; y—26 percent; u—11 percent; n—18 percent; N!—24 percent)	47	42	11
				11. Neighborhood schools—Do you favor my proposed Constitutional amendment to prohibit involuntary busing of school pupils to achieve racial balance? (Y!—59 percent; y—27 percent; u—3 percent; n—4 percent; N!—7 percent)	86	11	3

AN ENDANGERED INDUSTRY: THE SMALL BREWERY

HON. THOMAS A. LUKEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1974

Mr. LUKEN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter I have sent to Chairman MILLS of the House Ways and

Means Committee regarding important legislation pending before the committee affecting the smaller brewing companies in our country.

The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 22, 1974.

Hon. WILBUR MILLS,
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing in regard to legislation pending before your Com-

mittee which would affect the smaller brewing companies in our country. There are less than sixty brewing companies in operation today and the announcements of closings are too frequent.

A number of bills have been introduced which would provide malt beverage excise tax relief to smaller brewing companies (brewers producing less than two million barrels per year). For many reasons, it is important that smaller brewers receive this relief to avoid unemployment of thousands of brewery workers, engineers, machine

operators, etc., as well as preventing the larger national breweries from monopolizing.

Cincinnati has a history of producing fine beers. There are two remaining breweries in Cincinnati, which carry on that tradition, which would qualify for reduction of Federal excise tax. Therefore it is of utmost concern to my District that such legislation protecting the smaller breweries be passed.

Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate any action your Committee might take on these measures in an effort to keep alive the small number of operating breweries we have now.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS A. LUKE,
Member of Congress.

DE ANZA BUILDS A REPUTATION

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1974

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, several years ago, a program to help "high risk" minority women return to the classroom was initiated at De Anza College in Cupertino, Calif. This program, known as the women's reentry education program (WREP), has been so successful that it has been duplicated with comparable results at other colleges in the Santa Clara Valley area. Recently, an article about this program appeared in "American Education," issued by the U.S. Department of Education. I believe this article will be of interest to readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and am, therefore, submitting it for inclusion at this time:

(By Dru Anderson)

"I went through the fourth grade, that's all," says a middle-aged mother of two, now turned college student. "In my 'old age,'" she smiles, knowing that age was far from taking its toll, "I decided I should have an education."

But this woman knew that she never would have made it without the support of other women who, like herself, are finding their way back to college through a novel enterprise called the Women's Re-Entry Education Program (WREP). Launched five years ago with funding support under Part F, Vocational Education Act of 1965 and Title I of the Higher Education Act, WREP has become one of the more noteworthy offerings of De Anza College in Cupertino, California, located in the agriculturally fertile but rapidly urbanizing Santa Clara Valley, just south of San Francisco Bay.

The program serves women who, in education's traditional sense, are "high risk." They come from low-income areas marked by a high incidence of unemployment. Most are from minority cultures—predominately Mexican-American, black, and Asian-American—and have had limited schooling. Perhaps for that very reason education figures large in their thinking.

Some of the women have a purely pragmatic interest; they may head up a household or have a disabled husband and are seeking ways to improve their support of their families. Others look upon education as a means of gaining a sense of self-worth. Whatever the attraction, all the women—even the few who had been in college before—felt paralyzed by a fear of college entry requirements. Characteristically they have been out of school for from ten to as many as 40 years, the result being such deep attrition of their confidence that they found it

almost impossible to take the first step toward returning to the classroom.

WREP answers their fears by inviting the women into the college environment without regard to high school diplomas, placement examinations, or the nerve-rattling experience of registration lines. Every effort is made to make them feel at ease in the college environment, to make it clear that they are not only welcome but wanted. Almost without exception that approach does wonders to enable the women to deal more realistically with their anxieties and to accept the opinion that low-income and low-educational backgrounds do not dictate low potential.

Enrollments in WREP have averaged 40 women per quarter ever since the program began. Of the 348 women who have entered the De Anza program so far, 47 percent identified themselves as being married and 30 percent divorced, with the others listing themselves as separated, widowed, or single. Financially, 40 percent were on welfare, 37 percent were low income, and 19 percent were of middle-class income. The program stresses academic excellence, and the women have maintained a grade point average well above the "B" level. Teachers, when discussing WREP students, are given to such terms as "terrific students," "highly motivated," "bring maturity and life experiences to the college classroom." Thus far 33 women have earned AA degrees and are in vocational careers, while many others have transferred to four-year colleges, and at least four are in graduate school.

Academic achievements aside, the De Anza staff is struck by the self-confidence and self-esteem the women achieve even after only one quarter in the program. "It's like seeing two different sets of students," says Curtis Baldwin, a sociology teacher who helped put the program together and now coordinates the effort to carry the concept to other colleges and community areas.

A spunky, grey-haired woman, good naturedly calling herself a representative of the "over 60s," illustrates Mr. Baldwin's point. "I never dropped into high school, let alone dropped out," she says. "But here I have a 3.52 grade average. The staff and my friends just wouldn't let me quit. I've learned that I don't need anything but courage."

She tells the story of chiding Mr. Baldwin for using big words that were hard to understand, then one day of thanking him for finally making his language simpler—except he told her that he was still talking the same way. "Why, it took him all semester to convince me I was not a stupid old woman. I finally realized it was I who had changed and that I could learn to understand those two-dollar words."

Another woman who also had failed to finish high school said the idea of returning seemed out of the question. "I felt there was no way I could feel comfortable," she says. "But with women of similar age with similar problems—children and husbands to care for—we could help one another, and after a while the idea of going back seemed less scary." Pausing, she adds softly, "Now we will never be the same. Having gone back to school has made us different people."

WREP's success at De Anza is such that the program has been initiated at several other colleges in the Santa Clara area: West Valley College in Saratoga, Gavilan College at Gilroy, and San Jose City College in urban San Jose. Enrollments amount to some 70 students each at West Valley and Gavilan, with retention rates topping 65 percent. Early indications are that the program at San Jose, which began last fall, is also going well.

In each case, Mr. Baldwin says, "The WREP focus is on support services and on peer counseling and tutoring." There is a one-year curriculum plan for the program, and the women entering each quarter remain together as a group in the WREP "block" of courses. This grouping, it was

found, eliminated initial competition with the regular college students and provided opportunity for the women to identify and support one another through, for example, tutoring. The arrangement also provided greater personalization in instruction.

During their first quarter, all students are required to take specially oriented courses in guidance, home economics (consumer education), sociology for women, and basic English and communication skills. Should they have preschool children in De Anza's companion Child Development Center, they are also required to take parent education courses each quarter to support their children's learning experience and to reinforce the idea of cooperation among home, school, and community.

All classes are scheduled between the hours of 9 a.m. and 1 p.m., five days a week, with the Child Development Center coordinated to the same hours. After the first quarter, students are assisted by counselors to select courses outside of the program block as well as within it. What the staff sees as the critical test of the program's effectiveness occurs when the women enter and cope with the regular college classes.

Beatrice Cossey, a mother as well as the full-time director of the De Anza WREP, became involved in the initial development of the program as a vitally interested volunteer from the community. By background a medical technologist, Ms. Cossey feels that the "only way you get things done is to get in the middle of them." She assisted Barbara Adams, who was then a home economics instructor at De Anza, to spread her idea of reaching women in low-income areas with a short course in consumer-homemaking. First offered on an experimental basis in late spring of 1970, the course developed into a broad effort by the college to meet the special needs of disadvantaged adult women.

Creating such a program—bringing adult women to college without regard to the traditional entry mechanism and requirements and doing so in a way that would enable them to stay there through a complex interaction of college departments and community service agencies—was not without its difficulties. Nor was it a simple matter to get such a program accepted once it had been blueprinted. "In many ways," says Richard Wright, Dean of Continuing Education at De Anza, "it was like trying to swim upstream."

Ultimately, however, the program was written, it was accepted, and after vigorously shaking up some college routines in registration, counseling, financial aid, tutoring, and instruction, it was solidly established. "Today," says Dr. Wright, "its need and value are well-recognized by the college administration and faculty."

Because initial exposure to instruction is crucial to the entering woman student, Ms. Cossey says, one of the more touchy processes is the selection of instructors to teach the WREP women. The goal, she says, is to find people who will be flexible with these special students and sympathetic with their needs and problems, but who will nevertheless insist on high academic standards. "Catering to them," Ms. Cossey stresses, "would only reinforce the feelings that they're trying to shed—that they 'can't do it.'"

Tutoring, another supporting pillar of the program, likewise calls for flexibility on the part of the college administration. The 18- and 19-year-old tutors in the college learning center were not available in the evenings when the women usually needed assistance. Also there were barriers and misunderstandings between the age groups. For these reasons peer counseling and tutoring were established and, once again, the concept of the women helping one another came into play. Bea Cossey has come to view such

terms as "support services" and "counseling" as being crucial.

One of the major WREP "support services" is its companion State Preschool Child Development Center (CDC) for youngsters of the women students. From the beginning, it was considered vital to a woman's educational progress to have her feel confident that her children were well taken care of while she went to school. Equally important was the consideration that her child receive not merely custodial child care but a learning experience.

Making sure they have one is the responsibility of CDC director Wanda Armstrong, whose talents include a dexterity with hammer and nail. Thanks to her good right arm as well as her training and experience, a good many attractive, as well as educationally useful, materials have been created for the 40 to 60 youngsters attending the center each quarter. Ms. Armstrong and Rose Crowder of the DeAnza home economics faculty, who is in charge of the center's curriculum designed for both youngsters and parents, plan and direct the work of the child development staff, which includes two men as teachers and some of the mothers themselves.

The CDC is where the concept of interdependence of home, school, and family comes to the forefront in the WREP. The philosophy on which the center was founded is termed "community-family guided education," and it was initiated by Thomasne Lightfoot Wilson, associate professor of elementary education at California State University at San Jose and an educational consultant to the Child Development Center. Dr. Wilson likens her philosophy to the "extended family" concept which prevails among many cultures, including Mexican-American and African, and in which, she explains, they somehow "get it altogether." Community-family guided education, she says, affirms the proposition that everyone is needed and important. "To be sure," she says, "there is a rough hewing out as we rub shoulders, sometimes abrasively. The important thing though is that here we value distinctiveness as opposed to sameness. In working with others, in this spirit, women gain the concept of not giving up; they acquire a sense of 'I can modify the conditions, and if I can't somebody else can.' This opposes the idea of 'It cannot be done.'"

Such a philosophy opens the possibilities and potential of self-direction to WREP women, Dr. Wilson says, with the result that they in turn take on responsibility to do something about conditions around them in the community. She notes that more and more of the WREP women are contributing to their communities by becoming involved in governmental affairs, in churches, and in various social agencies. One WREP woman serves on the school board in her community.

And communities not only receive benefits, they give them. For instance, St. Jude's Episcopal Church, located a few blocks away from the college, has made its Sunday school classrooms available during the week to the Child Development Center. "It's a mutual relationship," says St. Jude's pastor, the Reverend John Buenz. "We're receiving as much as we're giving. It provides us with an outreach to the community, and it's not the church telling people what to do. It's their program and we have the facilities to meet their need."

This functioning example of community-family guided education has led to a pulling together and helping of one another by the WREP students. As one woman put it, "I never realized before that you could love others as much as you could love your family."

The program's focus on women, members of the staff say, inevitably provokes the ques-

tion of whether it is an exercise in reverse chauvinism. "Not at all," says Bea Cossey. "Nor is it a woman's liberation thing. It is a program geared to community and family." Women who are raising children, she says, need to know what excellence in education consists of, so that they can take community responsibility to see that their children are indeed getting excellence. She adds: "It is consumer education in the broadest sense. It is important for people to understand that we are all 'consumers' not only of goods but of services, which must certainly include education. They must be made aware of what is available to them and encouraged to take responsibility to insure quality for themselves, their families, and their communities."

WREP is turning out a new breed of such consumers. One such is a woman from a migrant worker family whose mother had never been to school at all. She recalls picking fruit in the area where the suburban Cupertino college now stands.

As she walks along the shaded pathways of the campus she points with pride at the buildings her husband, a construction worker, had worked on. "He says he came to college before I did," she says with a smile, "because he helped build it. And now I'm here, and we're both part of the college—and it's part of both of us."

URBAN HOMESTEADING WORKS

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1974

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, there are many things wrong with our cities, and even the most cursory drive through many areas of our inner towns reveals the malaise that afflicts them. Perhaps the most ominous sign to me, as a lifelong big city dweller, is the large number of relatively livable structures which stand abandoned, in spite of the fact that they obviously could be rehabilitated and used by millions of Americans who do not know what decent housing is like.

Today, we are afflicted by a growing housing problem. Interest rates are above the ceiling, and rising. Never before have builders and buyers found it more difficult to obtain mortgage financing for homes. Further, costs of raw materials have risen apace with interest rates and other costs. For example, the cost of construction lumber has risen approximately \$2,500 on an average-size house in just the last year. Obviously, there is no easy answer.

However, in times of stress such as these, necessity emerges with some responses we have had under our noses, but have ignored. Such a response is urban homesteading, which is slowly but steadily spreading across the Nation, and which is having a very fine success in East New York.

First of all, let me note the Federal Government has insured a number of dwellings in our cities, and that FHA is finding its hands full of foreclosed properties which it can do nothing with. Yet many of these structures are the very same ones I have referred to as being abandoned but quite usable. The answer, then, is to find some way of making them

rehabilitatable and livable again. Urban homesteading is the answer.

Essentially, what it involves is taking an abandoned structure that has been dumped back into the hands or lap of the city, State or Federal agency and giving it for a nominal sum to someone who will rehabilitate it and live in it. In East New York, the East New York Development Corp. has taken the initiative in an area where there are at least 800 FHA foreclosures. Beginning with at least 50 buildings, this local organization has made significant strides in finding people to put their commitment into such homes and live in them. Many houses have already been fixed up and our hopes are high that more will be accomplished. As a long-time resident of East New York, I have a personal commitment to seeing to it that this area and this concept get off the ground successfully.

In many other metropolitan areas of the Nation, this concept is gaining rapid public acceptance and commitment. Many local authorities and civic organizations are coming to believe it to be a viable alternative to simply leaving the buildings abandoned and worthless in every sense of the word. In some areas, such as Wilmington and Chicago, these efforts have borne fruit.

I believe we can and must institutionalize a Federal commitment to this concept.

One such measure is the National Homestead Act, which takes its name from the concept of inner-city urban homesteading, which is what such rehabilitation efforts really amount to. The National Homestead Act, which I have joined in cosponsoring, would make available to low- and middle-income families those single-family homes owned by the Department of Housing and Urban Development for a nominal fee and an agreement to rehabilitate the dwelling. Homesteaders would be eligible for rehabilitation loans under the 312 program administered by HUD.

Most of all, this would act as an impetus to the urban homesteading movement, which desperately needs Federal impetus and example. Today that same impetus and example is missing, and in light of the national scandals breaking around so many HUD housing programs, this commitment would stand in stark and constructive contrast to what has gone before.

Local people are fascinated with this concept. It has shown that with some help and a commitment, inner city neighborhoods can be given a shot in the arm. It also has shown that local people living in the inner city can and will reach out and work hard to make a better home possible for themselves and their families. Already, in a number of communities, people are living better in rehabilitated and once abandoned houses because urban homesteading was found to work. It does not come easily, but it can be done. Now, therefore, in my view, is the time for the Federal Government to come to the aid of organizations like our own East New York Development Corp. and help them to help others.

TRAVELS WITH JANE

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1974

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, as promised some time ago, I am again today reporting yet another anti-United States appearance by Miss Jane Fonda, her husband Tom Hayden, and a new member of the troupe, Representative ASPIN, Democrat of Wisconsin.

My views regarding Miss Fonda and others of her ilk are well-known and a part of the RECORD, so I will not comment, only to say that I am somewhat embarrassed that this latest tirade took place in my State.

For the RECORD, I submit the following article from the May 20, 1974, edition of the Philadelphia Bulletin:

JANE FONDA, TOM HAYDEN URGE UNITED STATES TO CUT MILITARY AID TO INDOCHINA

NEWARK.—Peace activists Tom Hayden and Jane Fonda told a dinner here last night that "South Vietnam is a creation of the United States government, and we must pressure Congress to cut back spending" on military assistance to Indochina.

The Haydens and Rep. Les Aspin (D-Wis.), an antiwar Congressman, addressed 500 persons at the annual award dinner of N. P. SANE, a peace organization. The three were given awards by SANE.

Jane Fonda and her husband, Tom Hayden, are among several founders of the Indochina Peace Campaign which works in conjunction with SANE and other peace organizations.

TREATY VIOLATION

The actress said the U.S. has violated the 1973 Paris Peace Treaty, and argued that "we (the U.S. Government) chose (South Vietnam's president) Thieu as our ally, we fund 90 percent of the government, we supply the military and air force, and we train the men who run the prisons."

Hayden said American firms supply South Vietnam with prison equipment.

"The United States is continuing the war in South Vietnam and Cambodia. As long as there are three flags in Vietnam, there will be no peace," Ms. Fonda said.

Hayden estimated American military aid to South Vietnam at \$2 billion to \$3 billion and said this figure was "more than ten times the total American aid to India, Pakistan and Bangladesh."

BILL COMING UP

"The House Armed Services subcommittee has proposed a \$1.4-billion bill for aid to South Vietnam that comes before the full house on Tuesday," Rep. Aspin said.

"Our thinking about defense has not been progressive since the 1960s. We need some new ideas. Something that is coming from an entirely new perspective," he added.

Aspin said, "There are two forces that determine our defense budget."

NUCLEAR WARHEADS

"First, there are the strategic forces which comprise 20 percent of the budget." He said military experts asked for one-megaton nuclear warheads to absorb a first attack and launch a counterattack that could "destroy one-fourth of the population and one-half of the industry" of the enemy.

"But political judgments raised the number to 7,100 in case other countries attack simultaneously" and by 1977 nuclear warheads may number 10,000, Aspin said.

"Second," Aspin said, "there are general purpose forces which comprise 80 percent

of the budget" and supply weapons for conventional warfare.

Aspin said he wants to cut the military budget across the board, not just aid to the Saigon government.

CONDITIONS AT VA HOSPITALS
UNDER FIRE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Administration has come under increasing fire in recent months by those critics who feel that the VA is not responsive to all the needs of veterans today. As a result of these outcries, the present Veterans' Administrator, Donald Johnson, has announced his intention to resign, and the President has directed a thorough study of the operations of the VA.

As we approach this critical era in the VA, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a report entitled, "How the VA Is Running Its Hospital." This report was written by Mr. Joel Freedman, a social worker at the VA Hospital in Canandaigua, N.Y. Mr. Freedman has been involved in a year-long commitment to correct some of the more prevalent problems plaguing VA hospitals in this Nation. I recommend that my colleagues take the time to read this report, and I hope that the committee appointed by the President to look into the VA will also have the opportunity to look over this report.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I insert Mr. Freedman's article:

HOW THE VA IS RUNNING ITS HOSPITALS

(By Joel Freedman)

"I am ready to leave this place immediately if not sooner. This environment is not one I can tolerate. It leaves me with a feeling of isolation. I feel like I am in an asylum in preparation for the morgue or something."

"In deep earnest I request that I be discharged at once because I can't stand it here any longer."

This is a young Vietnam veteran writing about what it is like to be confined to a locked ward at the Canandaigua Veterans Administration Hospital.

By name and locale, the Veterans Administration Hospital in Canandaigua, New York, spread out on a large bucolic tract in the rolling Finger Lakes countryside, is a pleasant enough place. Canandaigua, one of 170 hospitals in the VA medical network, treats on any one day almost 1000 disabled veterans suffering from various mental disorders or neurological diseases.

One-third of the patients are elderly and infirm and require long term treatment on intermediate medical wards.

During the past year hospital officials have sponsored accelerated publicity in local newspapers, creating the impression that Canandaigua is a place where sick veterans receive high quality care and rehabilitative services.

AFFRONT TO DECENCY

Actually the conditions under which many disabled veterans at Canandaigua have been forced to live have been so brutal and degrading that the hospital is an affront to basic human decency. On some of the wards the atmosphere is so oppressively gloomy that

psychological withdrawal is the only escape from stark reality. Instances of physical maltreatment and malicious teasing of patients by some staff members have been frequent occurrences at the hospital. While regulations prohibit mistreatment, and while a new Director has begun to crack down on brutality, abuse continues at Canandaigua.

Dozens of patients have been crippled needlessly for life as the result of inadequate physical therapy programs and equipment on the wards. Many veterans have developed incurable and permanent contractures (shrinkage of muscles and tendons) because they never received the continuity of neuromuscular exercises necessary to prevent deformities. Bedsores, also preventable, torment many infirm and incontinent patients who live a bed-to-wheelchair-to-bed type of existence.

One of the most dehumanizing aspects of life for the ambulatory patients is the regimented structure which prohibits them from making decisions concerning their own lives. Much of a patient's time is spent waiting in long lines for meals, medications or whatever. Treatment planning conferences frequently exclude patient participation in decisions which affect them. Antiquated buildings, drab living areas and overcrowdedness also make rehabilitation a formidable task.

Tranquilizing drugs, notably the phenothiazines, are over-used to the point that their main function is to control rather than to help the patients. Prolonged use of these psychoactive agents have caused patients to develop marked neurological side effects, including body disequilibrium, distorted facial features and involuntary movements of the lips, tongue, feet and other muscles affecting posture.

Many of the community care homes, used by the hospital for the placement of long-term patients, are grim repositories where veterans are provided only laundry, lodging and meals and sometimes less than that. Veterans have complained of not getting enough to eat and of overcrowded conditions in several of the homes. In far too many homes, recreational therapies and social activities are totally lacking; the veterans do not even know their neighbors and are far removed from the mainstream of the community.

V.A. RESPONDS TO CRITICS

My employment as a social worker at Canandaigua has brought knowledge of inhumane conditions at the facility. Because of their past efforts on behalf of disabled veterans, I wrote a series of letters to Senator Alan Cranston, Chairman of the Veterans' Health Subcommittee, and to New York Congressman Mario Biaggi, which described the existing problems and which recommended specific means to upgrade patient care.

Once my complaints were forwarded to VA Central Headquarters, the VA promised a thorough investigation. Two investigators from Central Office Security Services spent most of the summer of 1973 at the hospital, probing numerous allegations and taking testimony from former and current employees, hospital officials, patients and outpatients. Once the probe was off and running, many employees, including some who used to look the other way when injustices prevailed, began to question and report practices they felt to be detrimental to the best interests of those under treatment.

Back in Washington, Veterans Administrator Donald E. Johnson was blasting at a House Subcommittee Report which charged deplorable conditions in VA hospitals. The House Report, claimed Mr. Johnson, was "deliberately designed to mislead the American people." The Administrator also chided the media for "producing headlines around the country declaring that VA hospital care was deteriorating and dangerous to patients."

He went on to assert that "this is utter nonsense. It is an untruth that is damaging to the morale of our dedicated hospital staffs and to present and prospective veteran-patients."

Last year, in the wake of several critical reports, including a project conducted by a Ralph Nader Task Force, Central Office issued directives to all hospitals and regional centers, asking staff members to refrain from delivering negative information to the news media or making any comments that could be embarrassing to the Veterans Administration.

SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM

Poor conditions in other VA hospitals, which have come to light in the past year, suggest that Canandaigua is a microcosm of the present methods of treating mentally disabled veterans in America. A systematic inquiry into the adequacy of care at the VA Hospital, Chillicothe, Ohio, revealed that patients had been abused and neglected. Deficiencies at the Perry Point, Maryland, VA Hospital resulted in the facility's failure to meet minimal accreditation standards. In testimony before Senator Cranston's subcommittee, the VA admitted that in several of its facilities, doctors were still performing brain operations "to control the behavior" of psychiatric patients.

Canandaigua's Director, Mr. Orden L. Collins, is the facility's first non-psychiatrist superintendent and is the most progressive administrator in the hospital's history. He has begun to improve overall conditions, but the hospital is faced with problems so great that it is difficult for any one administrator to deal with them effectively.

While the majority of employees are well-intentioned and give of themselves beyond their required duties, small factions of employees have run the hospital like a 15th century prison. Patient abuse has been tolerated because of complacency, a "don't rock the boat" attitude and a rigid set of institutional values which create apathy and docility and a widespread belief that it is useless to challenge the status quo.

Many of the problems are not really in Canandaigua but in Washington.

Periodic hiring freezes and budget cuts, which have been clamped on all VA hospitals, have contributed to the deteriorating quality of care in veterans' health facilities.

THE VA SYNDROME

Over the years, a creeping paralysis of bureaucratic inertia has been overcoming the entire Veterans Administration. Decision-making is often left to people who are out of touch with patients' needs and changing patterns of care. There is too much emphasis on public relations gimmickry, too much non-accountability and too many unclear lines of responsibility within the structure of the Veterans Administration.

There is an all powerful system which condones incompetence, encourages mediocrity and stifles creativity and innovation on the part of staff members.

While the investigators rigorously studied conditions at Canandaigua, even going so far as to visit the hospital in the middle of the night, there is also a need for unannounced visits to 810 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D.C. to see what is going on at VA Central Headquarters.

Whatever may be in store for Canandaigua and other VA hospitals, the war heroes of yesterday are being neglected today. Hopefully, meaningful reforms will be effected in the not too distant future. In the meantime the statement made by the young veteran keeps ringing in my mind: "In deep earnest I request that I be discharged at once because I can't stand it here any longer."

NIH APPROPRIATIONS, 1975

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1974

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Sidney Udenfriend, director of the Roche Institute of Molecular Biology and vice-president of Hoffman-LaRoche Inc., Nutley, N.J., recently testified before the HEW Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee.

Dr. Udenfriend spoke on the fiscal 1975 budget for the National Institutes of Health, a subject which he is uniquely qualified to address. In addition to his work at Roche, Dr. Udenfriend is adjunct professor of human genetics at Columbia University School of Medicine and a member of the National Academy of Sciences. Until 1968, he was head of the laboratory of clinical biochemistry at the National Heart Institute in Bethesda, Md.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend Dr. Udenfriend's testimony to all my colleagues:

STATEMENT ON 1975 APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH
(By Sidney Udenfriend, Ph.D.)

Mr. Flood, members of the Subcommittee, I am grateful for the opportunity to appear before you and present some of my thoughts about support of Biomedical Science and the NIH. I am a member of the American Society of Biological Chemists and appear before you at the request of the officers of the Society. However, I speak to you as an individual, not as a representative of the Society. I also wish to point out that the Institute, of which I am Director, receives no support from the NIH or from any other government source.

In 1950 I joined the staff at NIH as a young investigator. I was privileged to see at close hand the development of two important systems, the NIH Intramural Program at Bethesda and the development of the system of research grants and fellowships that provide NIH funds for support of research for universities and other institutions. I would like to discuss both of these systems which are distinct and yet interdependent.

The NIH Intramural Program at Bethesda, which represents less than 10 percent of the total NIH budget, is a most remarkable center for biomedical research. Since 1950 the NIH has become the major center for training of biomedical investigators in the entire world. From its inception the NIH has taken young people and trained them to become its own leaders. Unlike other institutions NIH was never in a position to hire established investigators. A very large number of the NIH trained people have, in turn, moved on to become leaders of other institutions, medical school, hospitals, and research centers. Intramural NIH scientists and alumni have of course made many outstanding contributions to the biomedical sciences.

The NIH has attracted young people of two different backgrounds, Ph.D.'s who want postdoctoral training and M.D.'s who are interested in biomedical research. The former group are supported by NIH stipends. The latter group are employed as Clinical Associates and Research Associates. Clinical Associates have clinical responsibilities at the Clinical Center as well as research programs. Research Associates devote their time entirely to research.

I would like to point out that delivery of the applications of medical research,

whether in the form of contracts or otherwise, requires a large number of skilled clinical investigators. It is very important that the production of highly qualified clinical investigators be continued. Intramural NIH has without a doubt been responsible for a large proportion of such training. It must therefore be encouraged in this role. To do so it will be necessary to encourage senior staff at NIH to stay on. It will also be necessary to make certain that the Clinical Associate and Research Associate Programs are continued.

I address myself to the intramural program because most witnesses who come before you consider the NIH only as a source of extramural grants and contracts. The intramural program has become our most important center for training in the biomedical sciences. I am afraid, however, that as a result of economies and shifting goals its role as a training center is endangered. A training center requires a staff of excellent scientists as well as a high turnover of young scientists to be trained and visiting senior scientists to instill new ideas.

Although many senior scientists have left Bethesda in recent years, it still has an outstanding staff. However, because of the decrease in funds available for visiting scientists, both at the trainee and advanced level, the senior staff finds its role as a training center decreasing. That and the diminution in other services, including even secretarial help and maintenance, is eroding this great center.

The stature of the NIH Intramural Program must be maintained because it is a prerequisite for the vital research grants program of the NIH. The scientific staff which administers these research grants is largely drawn from intramural scientists and also interacts with them in many ways. The Intramural Program sets the scientific tone of the entire Extramural Program and provides it with trained personnel for carrying out grant and contract supported research. Should the Intramural Program in Bethesda be allowed to deteriorate the whole NIH effort will suffer.

Let us now look at the Extramural Program of NIH. For almost 25 years the NIH has provided the bulk of support for biomedical research institutions and their staffs. It has also supported the training of most of our present biomedical scientists. Although the total NIH budget appears to increase year by year the amounts available for non-mission oriented research and for training do not increase and in many areas they have decreased substantially.

Let us first consider the area of training. I believe that scientists may have damaged their case by emphasizing the training aspects of predoctoral and postdoctoral scientists. I consider those young individuals the most important members of a research team. The most sterile scientific setting I can imagine is one composed only of senior scientists and technical assistants. As a head of a laboratory I consider the predoctoral and postdoctoral fellow vital to carrying out successful and imaginative research. The predoctoral fellow is uniquely suited to taking an assignment and exploring it, under supervision, in the depth which can only be achieved by such a scholarly approach. The postdoctoral fellow is one who adds his own expertise and interests to the team effort and thereby leads to new and unexpected findings. Looking over the products of my own research I can safely say that most of it would have never seen the light of day but for the trained and inquisitive eye of the predoctoral or postdoctoral fellows who worked with me. To the extent that these individuals participate in the overall research effort they must

be paid. The training they receive in the process is what any young professional obtains while engaged in his professional activities. Cutbacks in fellowship support are not only decreasing the number of trained scientists, they are also diminishing the quantity and quality of the research performed. In simple terms, the money spent on these predoctoral and postdoctoral fellows buys high quality research at a ridiculously low price.

The next point I would like to consider concerns mission oriented versus non-mission oriented research. In the case of the NIH we have recently seen a huge proportion of its funding going to cancer and heart research and much of it diverted to contracts rather than to research projects. A large proportion of the budget is thus earmarked for applying yesterday's knowledge to tomorrow's technology and medical treatment. These are undertakings which are hard to criticize except that they diminish the funds available to basic research. Many of my colleagues have said this, probably in a more elegant fashion, but we do not yet possess the information needed to apply meaningful technology to the cure or prevention of cancer, heart disease, mental disease or to many other chronic illnesses. The disproportionate use of NIH funds for the application of current knowledge should not be allowed to jeopardize the acquisition of essential new scientific findings without which these diseases cannot be conquered.

We should not be faced with an either-or situation. What is at stake is the possible prolongation of our ignorance and the concomitant expenditure of huge sums of money to treat diseases which we might, with new knowledge, prevent. Going back over two decades it is as though the Polio Foundation (March of Dimes) in the late forties had had to choose between funds for setting up the many centers for treating polio victims or for basic research in the biology of viruses. Had such a choice been necessary and had the Polio Foundation been forced to cut its support of basic viral research the country would have paid an enormous price in both expense and suffering. At the time no one knew that the studies of Dr. Enders and his colleagues at Harvard on viral biology would lead directly to the Salk and Sabin vaccines. Fortunately, the Polio Foundation did not make the wrong choice.

Today scientists are working at every frontier of biology, and information is being obtained much more rapidly than in the days of Dr. Enders. However, the chronic illnesses that head today's list of killers and debilitators require far more knowledge for their understanding than do the infectious diseases. We still have much to learn. What's more we cannot even tell people where to look or what to look for. We are fortunate in that we have thus far been able to train many scientists to do the looking. Each with his own peculiar training and thinking breaks new ground. The synthesis of all this work will assuredly lead to new significant developments.

I know that you have been told many times about what our investment in basic research has in the offing. Let me list some of its already recognized achievements. Before doing so I must point out that biomedical research is a continuum, from the investigator who studies the most esoteric natural phenomena, to the clinical investigators, and then to the qualified technological group that can translate these findings and deliver the diagnosis or therapy to the patient in a professionally acceptable form. In this country, except for surgery and psychoanalysis, the latter requires private enterprise such as diagnostic, pharmaceutical or instrument companies. Encouragement

of the interplay between basic and clinical investigation and private technology could speed up the translation process. In any event to measure the effectiveness of our past support of basic research we must also look at the achievements of biomedical industry.

Two major developments have taken place in somewhat different fields. In the field of hypertension most of the significant anti-hypertensive agents that were introduced in the late fifties were direct outgrowths of the vast amount of NIH supported research in catecholamines. This same research also led to the use of DOPA in Parkinsonism. While we do not yet understand either disease one can safely say that the dollars spent on the biochemistry and physiology of catecholamines have led to drugs which have resulted in great savings in and improvement of life. The savings in hospital costs alone are far greater than the original cost of the basic research.

The science of endocrinology has recently taken a great spurt. Many laboratories have been supported in elucidating the structures of hormones and in their biochemical pathways. This information will lead to many great advances in the future. However, we already have endocrine drugs for treating diseases, for birth control and for diagnosis.

Immunology has also been well-supported by NIH. One day the knowledge gained in this field will answer many questions concerning chronic disease. For the present it has made possible many new vaccines (measles, flu, hepatitis). It has revolutionized the field of diagnostics. Immunoassays have been introduced for measuring blood levels of insulin, other hormones and drugs and even for detecting cancer. With immunoassays we can detect many diseases at an earlier stage and even determine their cause. Diabetes is now known to arise in several different ways, as a result of immunoassay. Control and treatment will surely follow. A large number of diagnostic procedures are now commercially available. All of these have been a direct payoff of the very large investment in basic immunological research.

The argument that we have enough knowledge for the present and that we should now invest mainly in consolidating and applying this knowledge is based on fallacious reasoning. Applications are costly and, unless they are based on firm factual knowledge, can become obsolete with the next experiment. As I pointed out earlier we do not have adequate knowledge of the cause, prevention, or treatment of most chronic diseases. If applied research on these chronic diseases is supported at the expense of basic research this will surely delay the acquisition of new information which is needed for continued advances in the prevention and cure of disease. There is no substitute for the type of research which is carried out at centers of excellence by well trained independent professional investigators with the assistance of professional trainees (predoctoral and postdoctoral) and funded by a system that utilizes the peer review mechanism. If we curtail such activities or even make their funding uncertain and variable we shall prolong human suffering and the economic expense of chronic disease. We now have the same type of choice that the Polio Foundation had about 25 years ago. Do we want to learn how to prevent cancer or arthritis or mental disease or do we want to limit ourselves to setting up hundreds of cancer or other chronic disease clinics to diagnose, and care for millions of victims of these diseases each year and treat them with empirical and uncertain therapies. Obviously both approaches are needed, but only basic research offers the hope of eradicating these deadly diseases.

In conclusion, I recommend increases in

the budgets of the Institutes for the support of intramural research and for extramural research grants. Fundamental to this recommendation is the need for additional personnel, particularly in the intramural research activities.

HARTMAN SPEAKS BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 22, 1974

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the European Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee, under Mr. ROSENTHAL's direction, has been holding a series of timely hearings on the policy of détente with the Soviet Union. In a recent session, the subcommittee heard Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs Arthur Hartman and former Ambassador to the Soviet Union Foy Kohler. In a frank and open exchange between the two witnesses and members of the subcommittee, the conceptual basis for détente was clearly brought forth.

The record of this series of hearings will be printed in due course. In the meantime, I think many Members will be interested in having Assistant Secretary Hartman's opening statement immediately available because the subject is of such current interest.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ARTHUR A. HARTMAN

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Subcommittee on Europe: I welcome this opportunity to appear before the subcommittee because I am convinced that it is important for us to understand the circumstances that have led to the beginning of this new period in relationships between the United States and the Soviet Union and to ask ourselves hard questions about the meaning and durability of these relationships that we sum up in the word "détente". I also welcome the opportunity afforded by the Committee to hear the views of experts from outside the Government on these vital matters.

Before I begin discussing détente, let me attempt briefly to define it. Literally, détente means a relaxation of tensions. But it is frequently used as shorthand for a complex process of adjustment. It is not a static condition or a simple standard of conduct. It does not imply "entente."

I

I would like to devote my opening statement to the Administration's concept of détente, turning first to the global setting of US-Soviet relations, then to the Administration's approach to improving these relations, and finally to specific accomplishments that have been achieved and problems that remain.

Since World War II, the crucial issue of US-Soviet relations has been that of war and peace—crucial in these times because of the obvious fact that a nuclear war could mean vast destruction for mankind.

Thus, a central strand in US foreign policy for over twenty years has been the search for agreements and undertakings with the Soviet Union that could reduce the risk of war. In summit meetings and through patient diplomatic negotiations, successive

Administrations have sought to control the arms race and to relieve sources of tension.

At times, significant breakthroughs were achieved. For example, the signing of the limited test ban treaty in 1963—the first major arms control agreement of the nuclear age—ushered in a period of improved East-West relations. But as with the short-lived spirits of Geneva, Camp David and Glassboro, progress in isolated areas did not produce lasting changes in East-West relations.

When this administration took office in 1969, one of its first acts was to undertake a fundamental reassessment of our position in the world and of our relations with the Soviet Union. The assessment began with the premise that we were at the end of an era in foreign policy. The power configuration that had emerged at the end of the Second World War was gone. No single dramatic event had marked the end of what had come to be called the "postwar" era. It had come as a result of cumulative changes. Western Europe and Japan had regained their economic viability and political self-assurance. Newly-formed nations had found identity and self-confidence. Divisions within the Communist world had deepened and were reflected in the divergent policies of the major Communist powers. The overwhelming supremacy of the United States in strategic nuclear weapons had been replaced by a more nearly equal strategic balance with the USSR.

But, despite these changes, Soviet-American relations had remained frozen, a vestige of the cold war period. The differences between us were real and serious. Assertions of good will or transitory changes in climate could not erase the hard realities of ideological opposition, geo-political rivalry and military competition. It seemed essential to the new Administration to concentrate on the substance of the issues dividing us—rather than on the climate of our relationship—in order to move from confrontation to negotiation.

To construct a viable foundation for a new relationship with the Soviet Union, a step-by-step approach was adopted:

First, through concrete progress in relieving specific sources of tension, to clear the way for productive meetings at the highest level;

Then, by utilizing the impetus provided by Summit preparations, to accelerate negotiations on a broad range of bilateral matters engaging the interests of both sides, and

Finally, as our political relations improved, to address the economic aspect of our relationship and to seek the removal of longstanding barriers to expanded trade.

Negotiations on the problem of Berlin—the source of recurrent crises in Europe—began in 1969. So did SALT—the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. Only in 1971, after substantial progress had been achieved in both these negotiations, did the Administration consider it possible to look toward a Summit meeting between American and Soviet leaders.

II

Even a cursory review of what has been achieved in the last few years, shows, I believe, that there has been a substantial and perhaps fundamental alteration in relations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

In Berlin, the rights of the Western powers have been recognized and affirmed, and the city is not now a point of recurrent tensions and East-West confrontation.

In the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, we have, for the first time, placed limitations on the most central armament and are now continuing the process of moving the negotiations toward a permanent and even more far-reaching limitation on nuclear armament.

We have agreed on specific measures to prevent incidents at sea between our two navies in the first agreement since World War II between the military services of our two countries. Provocative actions at sea have diminished as a result, and technical experts meet periodically to review our experience with the agreement.

We have concluded agreements providing for joint cooperative endeavors in a number of important fields. Building on the experience of previous cultural, scientific and technical exchanges, these agreements now cover such diverse fields as space, peaceful uses of atomic energy, science and technology, environment, health and medicine, transportation, agriculture and oceanography.

The leaders of our two countries have pledged, in an agreement signed at the 1972 Summit, to govern their conduct in foreign affairs by agreed basic principles. Under this agreement, they undertook an obligation to exercise restraint in their mutual relations, to do their utmost to prevent situations that could lead to military confrontation and to refrain from efforts to obtain unilateral advantages at the expense of the other. Under a separate agreement, signed at the 1973 Summit, we agreed to develop our relations with each other, and with other countries, so as to exclude the outbreak of nuclear war.

The development and expansion of economic ties between the two countries form an integral part of this framework of cooperation. The political momentum developed at the 1972 Summit resulted in a formula to settle the stubborn problem of our lend-lease account which led, in turn, to the extension of Export-Import Bank credits and guarantees needed for sustained trade expansion with the USSR. We have concluded a Maritime Agreement under which forty ports in each country have been opened to prompt access by merchant and research vessels of the other. We have signed a carefully balanced trade agreement designed to take into account the structural asymmetries of trade between a market and a state trading economy. In 1973 we concluded a tax treaty and signed protocols opening commercial offices in our respective countries and establishing a Joint Trade and Economic Council to foster the development of US-Soviet trade.

A few concrete indicators demonstrate, I think, the progress that has been achieved over the last few years in diversifying our relations with the Soviet Union and in expanding contacts and communication between us.

Of the some 105 treaties and other international agreements that have been concluded between the United States and the Soviet Union since diplomatic relations were first established in 1933, fifty-eight have been concluded since the end of January 1969. Forty-one of these agreements were signed in the last two years alone.

Collectively the bilateral cooperative agreements, although not of crucial significance in themselves, have resulted in a substantial two-way flow of ideas, information and individuals between our two countries. Under the eight specialized agreements and the General Agreement on Exchanges, nearly 60 joint working groups, some with numerous sub-projects, have been established to pursue the range of activities foreseen in the agreements. In 1973 the total number of persons traveling back and forth under these agreements rose to over 4,000, an increase of nearly 2,500 over 1971, the last year before the Moscow Summit.

Let me review briefly some of the joint programs that are now underway in such fields as the peaceful uses of atomic energy, protection of the environment, and science

and technology—fields that are relevant to all Americans, not simply to the technicians and specialists from both sides who actually plan and implement these projects.

In the field of atomic energy, the resources that the United States and the Soviet Union can commit to nuclear research hold out the promise that bilateral cooperative programs can bring greater results, and bring them sooner, than would be the case were each country to proceed on its own. This week, for example, a US delegation is meeting with counterparts in Moscow to map out the search for a feasible thermonuclear technology that we hope will engage the leading nuclear scientists of both countries for much of the remainder of this century. In another program, a Soviet scientific team is mid-way through an experiment in high energy physics at the National Accelerator Laboratory at Batavia, Illinois, employing that unique facility in conjunction with an apparatus developed in the Soviet Union and shipped to the United States for the purpose of the experiment.

The Agreement on Environmental Protection signed at the 1972 Summit is now in its second full year of implementation. Exchanges of information and experience are developing into genuinely cooperative joint projects in 36 areas, ranging from protection of the urban environment to arctic and subarctic ecosystems. Since both countries have large land, lake, and inland sea areas, a variety of climates, and large urban-industrial concentrations, cooperative programs greatly extend the data base and theoretical framework for environmental research in each country. Techniques acquired through exchanges can often be directly applied to on-going theoretical studies. For example, in work now underway at the Lamont-Daherty Geological Observatory of Columbia University, an earthquake prediction technique is being employed which was developed in the Soviet Union.

Under the Agreement on Science and Technology, signed at the 1972 Summit, we are seeking to move beyond the exchanges of delegations that have taken place during the past 15 years to the development of cooperative projects. Consultations on standards and on patent and licensing procedures and regulations, for example, are of direct interest to many US corporations seeking to do business in the Soviet Union. In this area, Government and private commercial interests are closely interwoven. Many of the participants on our side are representatives of US firms and non-governmental organizations such as the Industrial Research Institute.

III

Clearly a great deal has been accomplished in modifying our relationship with the Soviet Union. But the basic question remains: What are the dimensions of detente as perceived by both sides?

We have consistently sought to make clear that our pursuit of a relaxation of tensions in US-Soviet relations is not based on any newly-discovered compatibility in our domestic systems. It is based on the premise that the two nuclear superpowers must do everything in their power to spare mankind the dangers of a nuclear holocaust. In the world as it is today—not as it has been, and not as we might wish it to be—the United States and the Soviet Union share a responsibility to minimize the danger of accident, miscalculation or misunderstanding; to work out rules of mutual conduct; to recognize the interconnection of our interests; and to enhance communication between us.

At the same time, Secretary Kissinger has emphasized other aspects of our conception of detente. We will oppose the attempt by any nation to achieve a position of pre-dominance, globally or regionally; we will

resist any attempt to exploit a policy of detente to weaken our alliances; and we will react if a relaxation of tensions is used as a cover to exacerbate conflicts in international trouble spots. I think that the events in the Middle East last October demonstrated that the last of these principles cannot be disregarded without endangering the entire US-Soviet relationship.

The Soviet Union, too, has made clear its perception of the limits to coexistence. Coexistence for the Soviets does not imply the right of others to seek to weaken what it calls the unity of the socialist camp. It must not be used to erode the ideological base of socialism or to otherwise interfere in its internal affairs. Nor does coexistence suggest to the Soviets any incompatibility between cooperation with the West, on the one hand, and what the Soviets see as the evolution of the class struggle between socialism and capitalism, on the other—particularly in the ideological sphere.

However the dimensions of detente are perceived, both sides, it seems, agree that detente is necessary because of the danger posed by the accumulation of nuclear weapons; that detente is necessary not because we do not have opposing interests in many parts of the world or that our systems are not totally different—but precisely because these conditions do prevail; and that while occasional conflicts of interest will occur, detente makes possible a more rapid settlement and insures a certain restraint. And finally, both sides seem to agree that detente is necessary because there simply is no other rational alternative.

Any appraisal of detente must frankly acknowledge from the outset that fundamental differences exist between us and that we and the Soviets remain adversaries in many ways and in many places. But, at the same time, the present improvement in relations appears to be judged by each side to serve its own national interests, thus providing an incentive for both countries to try to minimize and restrain the consequences of their differences, to persevere in the difficult process of negotiation and to avoid any deliberate return to hostility and confrontation.

iv

Our objective in the years ahead is to make the process of improving US-Soviet relations irreversible. But habits formed on both sides during twenty years of confrontation are not easily set aside.

We recognize, moreover, that there is not a uniform perception in this country, or in any country for that matter, of the meaning of detente. Some argue that cooperation with a country whose domestic system is incompatible in many respects with American traditions and values can only be pursued at the expense of our ideals and moral principles. Others contend that we should take advantage of the Soviet interest in trade and technology to attach political conditions requiring basic changes in Soviet domestic practices.

The Administration, as I have indicated does not agree. We sympathize with the natural tendency of Americans to want others to share the rights and freedoms we value so highly. But if the United States attempts to make increased freedom within the Soviet Union a rigid precondition for improved relations, we will risk obtaining neither improved relations nor an increased regard in the Soviet Union for human rights. We will, of course, not abandon our ideals in pursuing improved relations with the Soviet Union. But we are convinced that our foreign policy must be aimed principally at influencing the foreign policies of other governments and not their domestic structures.

Secretary Kissinger addressed this issue

in his testimony before the Senate Finance Committee on March 7 when he said:

"Since detente is rooted in a recognition of differences—and based on the prevention of disaster—there are sharp limits to what we can insist upon as part of this relationship. We have a right to demand responsible international behavior from the USSR; we did not hesitate to make this clear during the Middle East Crisis. We also have a right to demand that agreements we sign are observed in good faith.

But with respect to basic changes in the Soviet system, the issue is not whether we condone what the USSR does internally; it is whether and to what extent we can risk other objectives—and especially the building of a structure of peace—for these domestic changes . . ."

v

Trade is also an important component of our overall policy of detente with the Soviet Union. We have assumed that trade and commercial relations with the Soviet Union could not flourish if our political relations remained hostile. Thus, only after we had made progress in reducing sources of political tension with the USSR did we undertake explorations in the economic sphere. At the same time, we have preserved controls to prohibit export of items that could directly enhance Soviet military capabilities. But for us to continue to insist on conducting our commercial relations with the USSR on the same basis as during the worst years of the cold war would, in our opinion, deprive the Soviets of an important incentive for improving relations with the United States.

Nor does detente bear any relationship to appeasement. We are not dealing with the Soviet Union from a position of weakness. On the contrary, the preservation of our military strength is a prerequisite for detente, and military strength inferior to none is the only national defense posture which can ever be acceptable to the United States. We cannot expect Soviet leaders to exercise restraint in their relations with us out of good will but only because they respect our strength which is the underpinning of our diplomacy.

We are fully conscious of our responsibility to preserve an environment which enhances stability and encourages further efforts to limit nuclear arms. Our objective in the SALT negotiations is to obtain what we refer to as essential equivalence. In pursuit of this goal, we are prepared to reduce, stay level or if need be increase our level of strategic arms. That level will be influenced by the policies and decisions of the Soviet Union. We are not prepared to bargain away or compromise in any fashion the long-term strategic requirements of our security in seeking detente with the Soviet Union.

Nor can detente be pursued in isolation from our allies. To preserve an international military equilibrium, it is essential to maintain the strength, integrity and steadfastness of our free world alliances. Nowhere is this more important than in Europe. The Berlin Agreement, which we negotiated in concert with our British and French allies, not only constituted an important stepping stone in our own relations with the USSR. It also contributed to a general improvement of the climate in Europe where we and our Allies are now engaged in important multilateral East-West negotiations in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and on Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions.

As you know, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, or CSCE as it is called, began in July, 1973. We expect that it will conclude with a high-level meeting in the summer or early fall. Your subcommittee,

Mr. Chairman, held extensive hearings on CSCE in April and again in September 1972, when it heard the testimony of my predecessors, Assistant Secretaries Hillenbrand and Stoessel. It remains our belief that nothing will emerge from the conference that could replace the security arrangements embodied in NATO. Rather, the conference should be seen as one element in a much broader and on-going pattern of East-West negotiations that can reduce the risks of confrontation and open the way to more stable relationships in Europe. We hope, in particular, the CSCE can reach an understanding that will lower some of the barriers to the movement of people and information between East and West.

Five years after the Allies proposed mutual and balanced East-West force reductions in Central Europe, preparatory talks opened in Vienna in January 1973. Formal negotiations began in October and are continuing. Both sides are proceeding from the premise that the talks should result in undiminished security for all parties. Specifically, the Allies have proposed numerically larger Eastern than Western reductions in order to reach a common ceiling for overall ground force manpower in which the Warsaw Pact currently enjoys a 150,000 man advantage. The approach put forward by the Eastern side, in contrast, seeks to preserve the existing ratio between the force components of East and West.

At issue in MFBR is each side's perception of the crucial military balance in Central Europe. Thus difficult negotiations lie ahead. The cohesion of the Western Allies has been excellent. Both sides, moreover, are negotiating seriously, and the talks so far have clarified the basic issues at stake. We hope for further progress during the weeks ahead, leading ultimately to a more stable balance at lower force levels along the central front—an area vital to European and international peace.

Both of these important negotiations are concrete examples of our efforts to move from confrontation to negotiation. Both demonstrate that for detente to be meaningful, it must not lead to diminished security for either side.

In the long run, the stability of our relationship with Moscow will depend on the extent to which we both come to perceive the benefits of normalization as real and not illusory. This process is by no means an automatic one, given the deep differences in our ideological and political outlooks. These differences will limit the depth and quality of our communication and will obviously not lead to our mutual communication and will obviously not lead to the intimacy we would expect in relations with close friends and allies. But the changes that have occurred in US-Soviet relations in recent years have encouraged us to believe that we will be able to continue to move away from the rigid hostilities of the past into a new relationship characterized by mutual restraint and a greater degree of stability which is, after all, the goal of detente.

INDIA: DOES DEBT CANCELLATION EQUAL DEBT PREPAYMENT

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in February I wrote to Secretary of State Kissinger requesting information on a widely reported debt cancellation agree-

ment with India. I have received a reply to my queries from Assistant Secretary of State Linwood Holton.

For many years a number of foreign aid programs have been characterized as "loans." India has been a particularly large recipient of these, owing the United States \$3 billion in hard currency loans and another \$3.3 billion in loans repayable in nonconvertible Indian rupees. It is this latter debt that is being dealt with by our Government and the Government of India. In the words of Assistant Secretary Holton:

The rupee settlement should not be construed as debt cancellation, but as repayment of an entire debt by India and an accelerated program of grants by the United States to India as provided for in the original legislation.

What is being repaid? The State Department informs me that India would prepay all outstanding loan principal or \$3.3 billion equivalent. Of this amount we would give back to India \$2.2 billion for "mutually agreed economic development purposes." Thus, a prepayment of India on loans turns into a gift by the United States to India of \$2.2 billion. The other \$1.1 billion the United States will spend in India for expenses that our country has there. Any interest India owes the United States on these loans seems to have been lost in the shuffle.

The State Department also informs me that "proposed settlement is in the U.S. interest." One of the reasons put forward is that "a resolution of this longstanding irritant will be a major step in building a new relationship with India." It seems that the Indian Government views the repayment of debts owed as an "irritant."

Many foreign loan programs were sold to the Congress and to the American people as a step away from foreign giveaway programs. But this Indian "settlement" shows that this is only a subterfuge to give large sums of money to other countries. Loans are redefined to mean gifts as the American taxpayer picks up the bill.

Also, the words "building a new relationship with India" make me wonder if we are trying to build a new relationship or buy a new relationship. India has provided the Soviet Union with much assistance in its goals in the Indian Ocean area. The Indian Government has also supported a number of Soviet foreign policy moves. The State Department's reaction seems to be to give India more money. Dollar diplomacy—the attempt to buy India—has not worked before. I do not understand why the State Department thinks that it will work now.

I, for one, think that it is time for Government to be honest with the American people. When loans are gifts, they should be classified as such; and when cancellation of a debt is taking place, it should not be called a prepayment.

At this point I include in the RECORD the text of Assistant Secretary of State Linwood Holton's letter to me and the Department of State's description of the "Proposed Indian Rupee Settlement":

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, D.C., April 5, 1974.

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASHBROOK: Secretary Kissinger has asked me to reply to your letter dated February 27 regarding your concern about the Indian rupee settlement. I sincerely regret the delay in this reply.

I am enclosing a description of the Agreement on Public Law 480 and Other Funds which we and the Indians signed in New Delhi on February 18 and which has entered into force.

I would like to stress a number of points. The first is that this agreement does not deal with a dollar debt to the United States, but with nonconvertible local currency funds. As the enclosed fact sheet states, our rupee debt claims are wholly separate from India's \$3 billion hard currency debt to the United States. The rupee agreement does not affect this dollar debt to us, which India continues to honor faithfully with payments in excess of \$130 million annually.

The second point concerns our use of the rupees. The proposed agreement adds no new restrictions or limitations on such use. As the fact sheet notes, existing limitations arise from the original PL-480 sales and loan agreements with India. The rupee debt was specifically not to be convertible or repayable in dollars, but rather to be used for Indian development projects and to cover our own US Government rupee expenditures.

The rupee settlement should not be construed as debt cancellation, but as repayment of an entire debt by India and an accelerated program of grants by the United States to India as provided for in the original legislation. Because of the large claims placed on Indian financial resources by this rupee debt, the United States has accelerated the allocation process by which it has already been applying blocked rupees for development projects in India. Under the agreement the United States retains over \$1 billion worth of rupees for US expenditures in India—an amount which should cover foreseeable expenses for the next 20 years—while granting back to the Indians the remaining \$2.2 billion worth of rupees for Indian development programs.

This agreement conforms entirely to existing law. Authority for the grant is contained in Section 104 of Public Law 480. In accordance with this section, we transmitted to the Senate and House Agriculture Committees the terms of the agreement for review prior to signing it. Similarly, we transmitted the agreement to the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs Committees as directed by the Foreign Assistance Bill Conference Report. Finally, the Comptroller General reviewed the matter, including the statutory authority for concluding the agreement.

Furthermore, we had closely consulted with the Congress at all stages of our effort to resolve the rupee problem. In late September 1973, Ambassador Moynihan received the proposed agreement with two dozen Congressmen, including the Chairmen and members of the Agriculture, Foreign Affairs/Relations and Appropriations Committees. Since then, we have discussed the agreement with numerous other members.

No debt has been cancelled by Executive Order although direct cancellation has been authorized by Congress for loan programs to private companies which have gone bankrupt. The only cases of government guaranteed debt being cancelled were 1971-72 repayments of loans to the Weitzman Institute of Israel, the cancellation of which was authorized by Congress.

No negotiations concerning cancellation of debt are presently taking place. The US Gov-

ernment is clear in its position that the United States extends credits on the assumption that contracts entered into will be fully honored. The record of the US Government in obtaining payment for contractual loans is in fact a good one, comparing favorably with the record of private business in the United States. In cases where debt servicing problems arise, the United States, while willing to consider each country's special circumstances, negotiate debt rescheduling only if alternative courses of action are clearly less beneficial to US interests. Provision is made in the authorization legislation for each US Government lending program for such rescheduling. On the other hand, debt cancellation, particularly for loans under the Foreign Assistance Act (FAA), is expressly forbidden.

I hope the foregoing information and the enclosed material will be helpful to you.

Sincerely yours,

LINWOOD HOLTON,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional
Relations.

PROPOSED INDIAN RUPEE SETTLEMENT

BACKGROUND

We hold two types of financial assets in India: a dollar debt and a rupee debt.

The Indians owe us a dollar debt of about \$3 billion from hard currency development loans made by USAID, export loans from Exim Bank and dollar repayments of agricultural commodity purchases on credit.

The Indians continue to meet scrupulously their debt service obligations on these dollar loans which amount to \$130 million annually and will continue at this average level for the next five years.

The Indians also owe us about \$3.3 billion equivalent in non-convertible rupees. The proposed settlement deals only with rupees.

These rupee assets consist of about \$900 million equivalent in current deposits with India's central bank and \$2.4 billion in outstanding principal on rupee loans owed to us and repayable over the next 40 years. With interest, rupees come into our central bank account at over twice the annual rate at which we spend them.

The rupees come largely from PL-480 proceeds pursuant to agreements concluded in the 1960's and from rupee-repayable dollar loans from the 1950's.

The original aid agreements limited the use of our rupee assets, largely to covering US expenses in India and to grants or loans to India for Indian development. In sum, we can not use these rupees outside India and their use inside India is restricted.

THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT

We have now reached tentative agreement with the Indians on the outlines of a possible settlement.

India would prepay now all outstanding rupee loan principal, bringing US assets to \$3.3 billion equivalent.

We would retain \$1.1 billion equivalent held primarily in interest-free accounts in India's central bank for our exclusive use in India and Nepal.

We would retain control over our use of these rupees for the full range of purposes and programs we previously funded with rupees (i.e., all USG expenditures in India, including Congressional travel, agricultural market development, agricultural and other scientific research, etc.)

India would pay us \$64 million dollars (i.e., hard currency) over the next 10 years, rather than over 40 years as originally contemplated in the PL-480 loan agreements. These would cover obligations to convert Indian rupees for agricultural market development and educational exchange (Sections 104 (b) (1) and (b) (2) of PL-480) and for

tourists and foundations (Section 104(j) of PL-480 and the proviso in 104(b) (1) of that Act).

India would also provide other hard currency benefits worth about \$50 million.

We would grant the remaining \$2.2 billion equivalent to India for mutually agreed economic development purposes e.g., previously USG-aided projects such as agricultural universities, so as to extend for years to come a favorable image of US assistance to popular Indian institutions and programs. None of the grants would relate to military or defense activities.

U.S. INTEREST

The proposed settlement is in the U.S. interest.

The settlement follows the sense of the Government Accounting Office's 1971 Report which stated that "it appears highly unlikely that the U.S. will be able to convert more than a small portion of its total rupee holdings into real resources for its own use."

The settlement gives us access to local currency to pay for U.S. Government expenditures in India in rupees not dollars for about 20 years.

A resolution of this long-standing irritant will be a major step in building a new relationship with India.

LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

Authority to grant or loan excess US-owned foreign currencies to foreign governments is contained in Section 104 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (PL-480). The proposed grant of rupees provided for in the Agreement with India is authorized under subsection (f) of section 104 which states:

"Sec. 104. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may use or enter into agreements with foreign countries or international organizations to use the foreign currencies, including principal and interest from loan repayments, which accrue in connection with sales for foreign currencies under this title for one or more of the following purposes:"

"(f) To promote multilateral trade and agricultural and other economic development, under procedures, established by the President, by loans or by use in any other manner which the President may determine to be in the national interest of the United States, particularly to assist programs of recipient countries designed to promote, increase, or improve food production, processing, distribution, or marketing in food-deficit countries friendly to the United States for which purpose the President may utilize to the extent practicable the services of non-profit voluntary agencies registered with and approved by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid: Provided, that no such funds may be utilized to promote religious activities."

The agreement is being forwarded for review under the first proviso of section 104 of PL-480, paragraph (3) of which states:

"No agreement or proposal to grant any foreign currencies (except as provided in subsection (c) of this section) or to use (except pursuant to appropriation Act) any principal or interest from loan repayments under this section shall be entered into or carried out until the expiration of thirty days following the date on which such agreement or proposal is transmitted by the President to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and to the House Committee on Agriculture, if transmitted while Congress is in session, or sixty days following the date of transmittal if transmitted while Congress is not in session."

The Conference Report on the Foreign Assistance Act included the statement:

"It is the intent of the Committee of Conference, however, that the Administration report on the Committee on Foreign Relations

of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, as well as to the Senate and House Agriculture Committees, the terms of any proposed settlement with India, with the right to review, 30 days prior to entering into such settlement."

In addition to following the above procedure, we plan to continue our close consultations with other interested members of Congress.

Authority to release the Indian rupees set aside under section 104(b) (1) of PL-480 for market development in India is contained in that section. The applicable provision reads as follows:

"The Secretary of Agriculture may release such amounts of the foreign currencies to set aside as he determines cannot be effectively used for agricultural market development purposes under this section, except that no release shall be made until the expiration of thirty days following the date on which notice of such proposed release is transmitted by the President to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and to the House Committee on Agriculture, if transmitted while Congress is in session, or sixty days following the date of transmittal if transmitted while Congress is not in session."

The release of foreign currencies set aside for market development in India under Section 140(b) (1) of PL-480 is being made since there will remain available sufficient rupees generated under the Foreign Assistance Act for these and other purposes in India for the foreseeable future.

CANCELING THE POST CARDS

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post last evening ran a thoughtful editorial hailing the House decision to shelve the post card registration bill, and detailing some of its horrors.

The editorial ends with sound advice: The House should stand fast against efforts to revive this ill-considered scheme.

The editorial follows:

CANCELING THE POST CARDS

Amid all the sooty Watergate fallout, any sort of proposal to change the mechanics of politics is being portrayed as a cleansing reform—a necessary reaction to scandal and public disillusionment. Thank goodness the House has refused to be stampeded in a wrong direction by this compulsive line of thought in the case of the postcard voter registration bill.

Instead, the House voted, by a narrow margin, to shelve this Senate-passed legislation that envisions registration by mail of citizens everywhere. Such a system, in fact, would be fraught with the danger of a new scandal, not to speak of vast administrative chaos. A new federal bureaucracy would be created to handle it, sending out return postcards by the tons, to supply everyone in the country. Then a person could register simply by filling out a card and dropping it in the mail. But how could voting registrars adequately check against widespread election fraud, in a blizzard of late-arriving postcards? It might be practically impossible in many areas.

Moreover, the system could engender a great deal of voter confusion, for this would be registration only for federal elections, unless a state also chose to adopt it. Hence separate procedures could be in effect for qualifying to vote in federal elections on one hand, and local and state elections on the other. Many postcard registrants might be unpleasantly surprised to find themselves only partially qualified on election day. And apart from the possibility that the whole thing could prove unmanageable, it also would be very costly for the taxpayers—in the range of several hundred million dollars, we expect.

Nor do we think this is the answer to sharply declining voter turnout for elections, which was the main argument of proponents. The depreciation of public interest in voting stems from factors other than the minimal difficulty of registering. If Congress really gets at the roots of corruption in politics, through strong campaign reform legislation, it could very well see a marvelous resurgence of public participation.

Anyway, the modest task of registering, as things stand, seems a small enough requirement of citizenship. And the states do a fairly good job of signing up voters—certainly not so poor as to justify the first federal intrusion into this field. The House should stand fast against efforts to revive this ill-considered scheme.

SPACE AGE BENEFIT FOR ARTIFICIAL LIMBS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia Inquirer in the Sunday, May 12, 1974, edition carried a most informative article by Mr. Fraser Kent of the Knight News Service discussing the application of a technique used in the Apollo program to provide a new relay mechanism for artificial legs. This is an example among many of the important, direct, and continuing contributions of our national space effort to the quality of our lives. The article follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, May 12, 1974]

SPACE AGE BENEFIT FOR ARTIFICIAL LIMBS (By Fraser Kent)

CAPE CANAVERAL, FLA.—A new kind of fitting for artificial legs has been developed at the Kennedy Space Center, using a miniaturized version of the device that releases Saturn rockets at liftoff.

It replaces the bulky and cumbersome straps now used to hold prosthetic limbs in place, according to George A. Van Staden, director of administration at the NASA space center.

However, a limb with the new release mechanism has been fitted to only one patient at the Southern California Rehabilitation Center, "so this is a very preliminary report," he added.

The device originally was designed by NASA engineers to release the Saturn rocket after the control tower's gantry arm swung free and the engines' powerful thrust built up to lift-off.

A finger-sized version has been fitted on to a standard artificial leg. This fits into a pure carbon receptacle that has been inserted into the remaining leg bone. A push button can be depressed to release the leg instantly, Van Staden said.

The pure carbon insert is another NASA development in space research, he said. It is "completely compatible—chemically and physically—with the human body system, so it isn't rejected as a foreign body," he explained.

As such, it may have further applications in bone replacement or reinforcement.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS TOO SMALL

HON. WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to correct a blatantly unfair provision of the social security law—the earnings limitations imposed on persons receiving social security benefits.

Applying welfare-type concepts of earnings limitations to the social security program makes second-class citizens out of millions of retired Americans. At present, social security benefits are reduced \$1 for every \$2 earned by a recipient—except for those over age 72.

In my opinion, it is completely unfair to force senior citizens to live on below-average incomes. It is contrary to self-respect and the American tradition of individual initiative.

I base this legislation on three considerations:

First. The present limitation, which reduces social security benefits when the retired person earns in excess of \$2,400 per year, forces many senior citizens to live on below-average incomes. In a time of rampant inflation, it is virtually impossible for social security benefits to keep pace. So a lowering spiral of living standards is inevitable for these retired persons.

Second. The present limitation applies only to earned income, not to investment income. So those who are fortunate enough to have accumulated investments in stocks and bonds, savings accounts, rental properties and so on can have unlimited income from these sources. But those who have no such investments are precluded from supplementing their social security with any substantial amounts of earnings.

Third. The principle of an earnings limitation is wrong.

Social security is not and was never intended to be a form of welfare. It has been earned by American workers and their employers who have paid the cost of this program through payroll taxes. In most cases, workers pay far more in taxes during a lifetime of work than they can possibly draw in benefits. To deny them something they have paid for, at least a partial return on their payments, is completely unfair.

Many Americans have no need or wish to work beyond normal retirement age. But millions of others need the extra income and enjoy the activity which part or full-time work provides. Let us stop penalizing these people who deserve better treatment.

THE FUTURE OF PROFESSIONAL FOOTBALL

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, there is much talk these days about what is going on in pro football. Several of my colleagues have asked about the new World Football League and invited comments on recent developments in professional football generally.

I have definite views on certain of these developments. They are views based on what I consider to be the interest of the game—the players' best interests, the public's best interest, as well as respect for the game and its future.

First, there is no reason whatever for anyone to criticize efforts to form a second professional football league. New business initiatives and free market competition have been cornerstones of the United States for nearly 200 years.

Nor is there any reason why professional football players should be denied the opportunity to earn higher salaries in a market which includes two rather than one professional football leagues. In the last analysis, no professional football player owes any obligation to remain with his current team beyond the period when his contract expires.

I am, however, concerned with efforts now being made by World Football League clubs to sign players under contract to NFL teams while they still owe 1, 2, or more years of football obligations to their present teams. Similarly, I would be troubled if the NFL used such tactics to raid the WFL in retaliation. As a former professional football player, I know the difficulties such circumstances can create for the players involved, for their teammates, for the coaches of such teams, and for the fans of each team. The game of football is such that each player owes the last ounce of his commitment to his present teammates, his present coaches, and his present team. The fans of professional football expect this. They identify with the players who represent their home teams. I have grave doubts that the fans, the coaches, and the teammates of a professional football player can be guaranteed this type of commitment when he is simultaneously being compensated by teams of other leagues, when he is assisting in the promotion of a competing team and league, and when he is generally undertaking to advance the interest of teams other than that with which he is presently associated.

There is no question as to the availability of NFL players for signing with World Football League teams. NFL contracting procedures are such that large numbers of NFL players will become annually available for signing by WFL teams following the close of each season. In fact the AFL got its start in precisely this manner.

But there is all the difference in the world between the signings of players who had fully completed their contract

obligations to their NFL clubs and the signing of players who still owe one or more seasons of loyalty and commitment to their present teams, their present teammates, and to their local fans.

You can imagine the situation which would have been created in Buffalo if, during the period in which I was the quarterback of the AFL Buffalo Bills team, I had publicly announced that I was contractually obligated to play for the NFL New York Giants after I had completed the remaining 2 years of my contract with the Bills; had thereafter appeared on television with Giants owner, Wellington Mara; and had thereafter publicly announced that I would do whatever I could to advance the interests of the New York Giants and the National Football League.

In my opinion, the tactics currently being followed by the World Football League are not necessary for the development of sound football teams. Nor were they necessary for the development of AFL teams which demonstrated that they could hold their own with any NFL team in the midsixties.

Lastly, I am concerned with whether the popular interest in professional football, and the current public respect for professional football and its players, will long survive if any significant numbers of professional football players are placed in a potential conflict-of-interest position with respect to their personal interests and their loyalties to their home teams. "Lameduck" football players already committed to other teams may not be effective members of their current teams.

That is, in a nutshell, where the problem lies. Pro football in the last analysis depends upon the perception that pro football consumers have that the game has integrity, credibility, competition, and stability.

If this equation is ever upset, pro football and all that it means to fans, players, and owners alike could be seriously compromised.

HUDNUT OPPOSES DEBT LIMIT INCREASE

HON. WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, today I will vote against H.R. 14832, which provides a further increase of \$17 billion in the national debt ceiling. This brings our total national debt up to the astronomical figure of \$495 billion.

In my view we should restrict and vote down requests for increases in the debt limitation. By refusing to authorize such increases Federal spending would have to be brought under control.

As Federal spending rises it creates more inflation, which is reflected in higher prices families must pay for bread, meat, and other necessities of life. Furthermore, I feel every effort should be made to force the Federal Government

to live within its income limits just as families and individuals must do. While individuals may accumulate some debts, they must eventually pay them off. No one could live as the Government continues to do—piling debt on top of debt.

ON THE NEED FOR BETTER BILINGUAL EDUCATION, PART II

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the need for improved bilingual education program was effectively brought out in recent hearings conducted by the House General Subcommittee on Education, of which I am a member.

Another of the outstanding spokesmen on the subject of bilingual education was Stephen R. Aiello, special assistant to the president of the New York City Board of Education. Mr. Aiello describes in detail a comprehensive report filed by the New York State Board of Regents concerning bilingual education and its needs. It is a most informative report, and should provide my colleagues with some insights into the problems which bilingual education is facing today.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot stress enough the importance of bilingual education to the millions of non-English speaking children of our nations. Many of them hope to share in the great opportunities which this Nation affords its citizens. We should do everything in our power to provide them with these benefits.

Mr. Aiello's remarks follow:

REMARKS OF STEPHEN R. AIELLO

In a position paper entitled, "Bilingual Education, June 1973, the New York State Board of Regents described the plight of the non-English speaking student this way":

"Differences in language and culture effectively exclude approximately 300,000 children from meaningful participation in our educational system. Failure of schools to respond to the educational needs of these children results in academic failure, demonstrated sequentially by low reading scores, high dropout rate, and barriers to entry into meaningful employment." The paper calls for the "total involvement of our educational system" to help the non-English speaker become all that he is capable of becoming.

The Regents point out that a fundamental tenet of bilingual education is that a person living in a society whose language and culture differ from his own must be equipped to participate meaningfully in the mainstream of that society. "It should not be necessary for him to sacrifice his rich native language and culture to achieve such participation."

Of the estimated 300,000 non-English speaking students in the State, the majority speak Spanish and live in the five big cities—New York, Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, and Yonkers. However, other language groups in the total include Chinese, Italian, French, German, Arabic, and Portuguese. Furthermore, large numbers of these students also attend schools on Long Island and in several upstate communities.

I testify before you today as an advocate for Bilingual Education for all of the children who need and benefit from these programs; but especially for the Italo-American child whose bilingual needs have been shockingly neglected by the Federal Government.

Italians in the United States constitute numerically, culturally and politically, an important minority group, second only to the Spanish speaking communities (whose number has grown since the recent influx of Spanish speaking persons in New York). Smaller in size than any one of our western states, Italy has contributed a larger number of immigrants to America than any other country in the world with the single exception of Germany.

The Center for Migration Studies reports that approximately 25,000 Italians enter our country every year. A third of all new Italian arrivals settle in New York City. Therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that the number of Italian dominant children who enter New York City schools is approximately 2,000 a year. Since it takes two to three years for a child to learn sufficient English in order to function adequately in a total English program, the number of Italian children who have difficulty with the English language in New York City alone ranges from 5,000 to 6,000. The annual survey of pupils who have difficulty with the English language conducted by the Office of Educational Program Research and Statistics reflects a steady increase of Italian dominant children in the city schools since 1970.

Despite the fact that these Italian dominant children represent the third largest group of children with English difficulty, no Bilingual programs had been available to them in New York City until a year ago. The first Italian Bilingual classes to be instituted in the New York City schools began in February of 1973. These classes were made possible by the allocation of \$1 million dollars of tax levy money for Bilingual programs. As a result of these funds, three districts in New York City, namely Districts 11, 20 and 21, introduced Italian Bilingual classes. The Italian Bilingual classes were increased as a result of a greater commitment of tax levy money for bilingual programs during the current school year. Nevertheless, only 603 are serviced out of a total of over 5,000 students.

While the New York City Board of Education is to be commended for their initiative in introducing Italian Bilingual Programs, the Federal Government has shown indifference and even callousness in this area. Even under the \$35,130,000 provided by the Bilingual Act (Title VII), there is no Italian Bilingual program being funded in the entire United States.

I have been informed by the Office of Bilingual Education of the Board of Education that there will be approximately \$60,000,000 provided under Title VII for bilingual education in 1974-75. I strongly urge that a portion of those funds be used to meet the need of Italian speaking students in the public schools. The use of a portion of these funds becomes imperative when one realizes that there is no Italian bilingual program being funded under any other source, such as ESAA, Title I, Title III, State Urban or Chapter 720 of the New York State Laws. The inequity to the Italian population is quite obvious when one considers these facts. A great need exists in the area of Italian bilingual education, not only in terms of teaching personnel but also in the areas of supervision, curriculum development, relevant materials and teacher training at the college level.

Presently five districts have submitted Title VII ESEA Proposals that include Italian programs: they are Districts 11, 20, 21,

30 and 32. I would strongly urge that these proposals be funded. I am not suggesting that we eliminate programs from other groups to benefit this group. I do suggest that more funds be allocated by the Congress to properly meet the needs of all of our Bilingual children.

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare has practiced a blatant discrimination in the past against certain ethnic groups including Italians in the funding of federal bilingual programs. It is my hope that this Committee and the Congress will see to it that this discrimination is ended.

ABUSE OF POWER BY DEMOCRATS

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am wondering what those Members who secretly voted against the reform of the House committees were afraid of. Is this display of zeal against the package by those who like to be labeled as "reformers" a truer picture of their real views? Or is not the American public witnessing the abuses of power that have been held in the House by the Democrats for too long, almost 30 years.

The facts are clear, those Democrats who have accumulated power have successfully overwhelmed those other Members who still seek it. They had to use a secret vote to do it, certainly a reckless and dangerous device, but one which is understood by the public at large. The cloud of impeachment may overshadow this issue of House reform today but Members cannot take cover under it in November, I feel sure of that.

The bipartisan select committee had support from the leadership from both sides of the aisle, at the time it was created. It received new support from both sides of the aisle when the House's leadership endorsed the goal of taking the package to the floor so that the House could work its will.

Who has frustrated that will? What is at stake in it for them? Are the so-called Democratic reformers of the past becoming the backroom power brokers of the present? Do they think the American people can be fooled? Apparently so. Do they think that by endorsing only a needed improvement like early organization they can fool the people? Apparently so.

The reform package that the select committee reported was unanimously adopted. It represents the best compromise the committee could report out after study and hard work. The American public wants the Congress to work, for them. They know that when the special interests on both sides are against the reform package, and the people who have too much power are against the reform package that it must represent needed change. I do not think the American people will be fooled.

A PERSONAL REVIEW OF "GREEN THUMB"

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the program called "Green Thumb" funded under the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This program seeks to find jobs for our senior citizens—for those who might otherwise be cast off as unemployable or even as useless to society but who belie that notion again and again.

Seldom have I seen a more persuasive argument than a letter sent to me recently written by a Green Thumb enrollee in my district, Mrs. Annie Lee Whisenant, of Bastrop, Tex.

The letter speaks for itself, and I would like to reprint it in the RECORD at this time.

TEXAS FARMERS UNION,
GREEN THUMB, INC.,
Waco, Tex., April 15, 1974.

DEAR SIR: Mr. Phillips of Taylor Texas came by and ask me to write you a few things about myself and family, I will try to out line a few things to you.

I am 64 yrs of age this Sept 16. I enjoy working very much and am so Blessed by God with good Health and energy, I was raised by my dear Grand Mother from age 3 yrs old until age 17. I then went to my Mother and went to work in a laundry in Waco Texas. I worked in the fields from daylight until dark, then fed hogs, calves, cows and chickens and helped with housework at night and we washed our clothes and marketed on Saturdays and cooked all our Sunday foods on Saturdays and we went to church on Sundays and visited our friends and Kinfolks, I am still in that Habit and Raised our children to believe Sunday should be the Holy day and also our 47 Foster Children, these were children of towns we lived in who needed our help. 33 years we have helped any child who needs us and we still have one lovely 21 year old whom we have had with us for 12 years and have helped for 15 years. She doesn't want to leave us and we are letting her live her life as she sees fit to do.

We are happy she hasn't rushed into marriage and she doesn't date just to be dating she wants to be choosy and we welcome her being with us. She has learned the way we live a good life and we don't try to put on airs and live beyond our means. We don't ask for Welfare Help, we believe its good to FIRST try to do for your selves and don't Ask for help that you can do for yourself.

I crochet "Ponchos" and Pillows, Bedspreads and lots and lots of things I sell and Annas and I piece quilts and tack them and sell them and we also use others Ideas to make money to help out. I do old fashion quilting and Annas makes pot holders and we raise chickens and sell eggs, fryers and we raise Rabbits and we sold 56.00 worth of Fryers this Easter.

We plant a large garden and can food and freeze food. We get wild berries and plums and make jellies and we eat fresh vegetables almost the year around, we enjoy fresh food. We raise chicken fryers and baker hens. We raise fryer rabbits and baker rabbits, lots of good dishes can be made from them. Chicken hens can be cooked so many ways and we raise guineas and geese also. We are now working to get us a calf and hog and cow.

These 2 acres we now own is ours, paid for and our 8 room house is our own also. We

paid our first down payment June 23, 1968 and we paid our last payment and received our deeds Dec. 17, 1970. We cleared this like olden day people did theirs, we camped under these trees until we could get us a house built. My children and son-in-law and 2 daughters-in-law and grandbabies helped us and Annas also would come home from school in Austin Saturdays and holidays and help.

We have been blessed with 2 carpenters in our sons and my husband, so our labor on this home cost not a cent, our lumber total house cost us less than \$300.00. We got it from jobs and from my only brother who is a big construction contractor in Dallas, Texas. Oh, yes, we did haul it from there, on our pick-up truck. We visited there while we loaded up a load of lumber. Our windows and doors was our greatest cost and we have 16 windows and 9 doors. Our bath tub has a scratch on it but its useable and it was given to us and wash basins and double sinks in our kitchen also. So we have managed to get us a nice home. We have worked hard and long hours to get to where we are now, but I have always worked hard and enjoyed it.

I've been taught, "An idle mind is the devil's playground," so the devil is so busy I sure don't want him to have my mind. I love to see things grow—children, chickens, rabbits, trees, flowers are food. If I get blue and lonely, I can't stay that way long. God gave us weeds to watch grow and trees have a wonderful sound if you stop and listen to them. Flowers change shapes and color and chickens do lots of things to divert your mind. Rabbits also can be a joy to watch.

We have squirrels in our trees. I watch them so many times running from the can we put up and put old pecans and nuts in. They get them and hide them for a rainy day. Sure there are times we all miss our little ones around our feet and chattering little mouths, so I go walking or sit under these lovely trees and crochet or write letters.

I am never Idle until I go to bed at 10:30 p.m. and up at 5:30 a.m. each day. My husband has retired and he works at home building chicken pens and rabbit hutches and fencing pens for our animals and fowls to keep wild animals from getting them. I love my job at the Senior Cafeteria in Bastrop, Texas.

My husband receives so little amount each month. It's not enough for us to keep our selves up and yet help our daughter until she can help herself. And keep us from going on with our project to get enough together we won't ever have to ask for Charity help. We want to do for ourselves. So many more need help so much worse off than we are. They don't know how and haven't the chance to do what we are doing, you have to love and want to do these things to make a go of it.

My job has helped us to pay our debts and get things going for us. We eat and sleep so much better when we don't owe debts. Thanks so very much to Green Thumb and Mrs. Sansom for this job, from the depth of my heart we are grateful. We pray this project will go on for years and years, it's such a wonderful thing for people like us, so we can earn our way instead of asking help.

Sorry my letter has been so long, but Mr. Phillips talked to me and asked if I would write a few of the hobbies and things I do and told him about to you. We are so much happier with our lives today than we were 6 months ago. We are working and paying our own way.

God Bless this Program and every one who works with it to make us older people happy. I appreciate it very much.

"Ask and you shall receive." I asked God for this job and received it and I have not asked for anything more, we don't need anything else. We have God.

Thanks and a long successful future for all.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. ANNIE LEE (ANN) WHISENANT.

OIL FROM COAL: WE WOULD NOT RUN OUT

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the June issue of The Progressive contains an excellent article by Mr. Harlan Trott on the controversy over the development of oil from coal and shale. Of particular concern to Mr. Harlan is the influential role which the oil interests have played in the development of alternative sources of fuel and power. Believing the article will be of interest to my colleagues, I ask that it be reprinted in the RECORD.

The article follows:

OIL FROM COAL: WE WOULDN'T RUN OUT
(By Harlan Trott)

There is enough sound technical data on record to suggest the energy crisis is an artificial one, conceived by oil men and brought forth in government default. Some public speculation centers on the suspicion that domestic petroleum reserves generally are much larger than Big Oil cares to admit. Presumably, the majors conceal their true figures on untapped reserves, not altogether to avoid paying higher property taxes, but because it is industry policy—as studies pursuant to Senate Resolution 36 of the Seventy-ninth Congress reveal—to stabilize maximum gasoline prices by perpetually maintaining a hair's-breadth balance between "known" crude supplies and market demand.

But the notion that ours is an artificial energy crisis may be valid for another reason, if what industry and government archives tell us is true. The facts prove that if we were to adopt a national fuels policy based on the highest and best integrated use of all our natural energy resources—as worked out by pioneering government fuels technologists—we could immediately begin encouraging private investment capital to start making oil from coal cheaper than pumping it from wells.

As one long-stepped in the politics of our Federal synthetic liquid fuels posture, I am concerned but not surprised by the oil industry's silence on this subject, particularly on the idea of making oil from coal.

We keep hearing there are billions of miles of future freeway driving locked up in the vast oil shales of the Western United States—if only, industry spokesmen sigh, we knew how to extract it cheaply enough. The way crude oil prices are shooting up, we are likely any day to back into this promised economic breakthrough that will make shale oil competitive with petroleum—on the industry's terms. Early evidence of such a development came when the Interior Department opened the first bids by the oil companies for the right to exploit oil shale deposits in Federal lands in Colorado. The bids ran to a total of \$465 million, whereas the Department had expected a maximum of \$50 million. Yet back in President Coolidge's time, government fuels scientists found they could process oil from shale for about seventy cents a barrel.

But vastly more important, these early studies showed bituminous coals also could be processed to produce oils in similar plants at \$1.50 to \$2 a barrel—without any credit

for the sales value of the by-product gas and solid fuel residue. And if the solid smokeless fuel were sold wholesale at raw smoky coal prices, then the oil would cost nothing. You could give the oil away and still make money.

Early Bureau of Mines tests in commercial-scale plants at Rifle, Colorado, proved oil could be made from coal for nothing a barrel when processed in series with a steam-generated electric power plant using its off-peak steam to produce fuel gas, crude oil for cracking into gasoline, smokeless fuel, and liquid chemicals worth more than the cost of the raw coal itself—all in conjunction with its output of electricity.

This encouraging resource discovery prompted Pennsylvania's progressive Gifford Pinchot to warn: "The fuels trust will never permit the shale-oil and oil-from-coal projects to get developed unless they own them." George Otis Smith, Director of the U.S. Geological Survey, explained, "The shales of northwestern Colorado and Utah can produce ten times as much oil as has been removed from wells since the drilling of the first well in 1859. Shale oil will regulate the price of gasoline and assure an unlimited supply of that fuel."

The big oil firms apparently plan to start distilling oil from shale. But they will not touch coal, using the same process, because, in the handwritten words of a Justice Department lawyer: "The world oil cartel fears the cheap production of oil from coal might bring about a reduction in price."

But if the prospect of converting coal to oil is financially all that enticing, why has not private enterprise invested in an integrated multi-purpose energy operation of that magnitude? The oil companies and their allies in the government scientific agencies can't be all that powerful in blocking it, can they?

A few informed officials both in Federal scientific agencies and the Department of Justice say, unfortunately, yes. This oil-for-nothing-a-barrel prospect poses such a threat to what oil expert Harvey O'Connor calls *The Empire of Oil*, it may be holding back oil-from-coal development simply because Federal administrators are being misinformed by their "experts" or are themselves deliberately confusing and scaring away private venture capital by giving out wrong information about revolutionary new technological processes.

Professor S. W. Parr of the University of Illinois, one-time president of the American Chemical Society, was the fuels chemist of his day. Some fifty years ago Parr explained that distilling coal by low-temperature carbonization—which means removing the rich gas, oils, and chemicals—leaves a solid residue of superior burning properties that is absolutely clean to handle and burn; it is hard enough for metallurgical uses, and ideal for firing the boilers of steam-generated power plants.

Parr and his associates insisted that this way of processing coal would be a stepping stone toward the day when all cheap non-coking coals—enough to meet all the nation's energy needs for 2,000 years—would be gasified, and the oils, chemicals, and rich gas saved.

How promising these prospects are—and how real the obstructions being placed in their way—came into sharp focus one day when I was reporting on the energy crisis caused by the Korean War.

It is Friday, May 12, 1950, cold and rainy around the nation's Capitol. The scene: A hearing room in the old House Office Building. Only a handful of spectators, in dripping raincoats, are on hand to learn of the role the peat bogs of Minnesota can play in helping to meet the country's future energy needs. I have the press table to myself.

Representative Ken Regan of Texas, chairman of the Subcommittee on Mines and

Mining, taps his gavel, "Counsel will call the next witness."

An erect, professorial man in his sixties with owlish, nickel-rimmed spectacles begins testifying in a Rocky Mountain drawl:

"My name is Lewis C. Karrick. I am a mining and chemical engineer with thirty years' experience studying the coals, oil shales, peat, and other carbonaceous deposits of the United States and some foreign countries.

"My past work has been largely devoted to conducting researches for the U.S. Bureau of Mines, the Geological Survey, the Navy Department, and for the states of Utah, Colorado, and Ohio, and for eight years director of oil-from-coal research at the University of Utah.

"A number of important new processes were developed which are embraced in patents issued to me for the production of low-cost oils, fuel gases, smokeless fuels, low-cost electric power, and chemical by-products.

"In my opinion the oils obtainable from peat, by distillation with steam, should be recovered by these simple and relatively inexpensive processes. The treatment of peat simultaneously produces valuable fuel gas suited for domestic and industrial uses, and leaves a solid smokeless residue of carbon.

"This carbon residue is a much superior fuel for burning in power plants than raw peat, having two or three times the heating value, and will insure much higher fuel efficiency in power-plant use. Also, this solid carbon would be ideal for conversion into a low-cost fuel known as water gas. This water gas may then be purified and made by the Fischer-Tropsch or other processes into crude oil amounting to several times the twenty to twenty-five gallons of oil per ton which results from distilling the raw peat.

"These processes were designed for use as adjuncts to steam power plants, so as to use the off-peak steam or other steam available for the peat or coal-distilling operations. Thus oil, gas, and a superior solid fuel are made available. These credits will greatly reduce the cost of the power."

Representative WAYNE ASPINALL: "Do I understand you to say it is economically feasible at this time to reduce coal to oil?"

KARRICK: "Yes, sir."

ASPINALL: "Then, why isn't it done?"

KARRICK: "If you get me started on that I may have to use a few bad words."

ASPINALL: "Do you make the same contention that it is economically feasible to reduce oil shales today in competition with other fuels?"

KARRICK: "That is right. I was at Boulder two or three years when that city was the headquarters of the Bureau of Mines work. Utah and Colorado really started this work.

"Although we had to spend the government money on oil shales, we got your Governor Sweet, and Governor Shoup next, to put up state money, also our Governor Bamberger in Utah, and earmarked it for coal. We found those good bituminous coals would distill and give as much oil or more than the average oil shale. It is a better oil.

"Instead of worthless rock left, you have this smokeless fuel which is very much superior to the original coal. It will give from ten to thirty per cent more heating efficiency because there are no losses up the stack. There is no soot. Therefore it transmits more heat, and there is practically no unburned carbon in the ashes, so people would get this fuel at no increased cost. The revenue from it will pay off the mining and the processing.

"Now then, we found, too, in the case of oil shale that you distill it, preferably underground. We worked out the methods to do this when I was in the oil shale work and had the title of oil shale technologist for the Bureau.

"We estimated we could distill the oil

shales underground and produce oil for a good deal less than \$1 a barrel, or if we used either of the two commercial-scale plants we built at Rifle in 1920-1926, we could make oil for \$1.50 to \$2 a barrel. Those are the figures and we can prove it now.

"Since then I have directed research at the University of Utah to prove those things, to offset information that is being put out by the Bureau and others to the effect that you can't do it. I have those data here." Bureau of Mines spokesmen disagreed. Instead, they contended:

The process is "merely one of the least efficient and most obsolete."

Instead of oil, the major products are "char" and "tar."

To produce any significant quantity of liquid fuels by coal carbonization would "glut an already saturated solid-fuels market with fantastic quantities of unsaleable char."

If the "tar" is used as a source of gasoline and oil, it requires further processing, and the yield is less than a third that available from other methods now under development by the Bureau of Mines.

Ironically, far from being glutted with smokeless fuels, the country is now pleading with the coal miners—a quarter-century after this bureaucratic putdown of its own tax-supported technology—to accelerate their half-billion-ton yearly output of raw smoky coal.

Alarmed by the waves the Karrick controversy was making in Congress, the Bureau fired off a 5,000-word press release deriding Karrick and all his government-financed works. All this was pretty unsettling to the Bureau's coal staff, some thirty of whom were invited to supper at the Cosmos Club and a private talk by Eugene Ayers, director of the chemical division of Gulf Oil's research company, a scholar, and an outstanding fuels economist as prestigious throughout the profession as was Professor Parr in his time.

Ayers's private coal talk proceeded in all fundamental respects to refute the Bureau's public stance discrediting the discoveries of its pioneer coal scientists. He said, in effect, that the Government was chasing the wrong rabbit by backing a costly and wasteful technology Standard Oil of New Jersey had acquired from I. G. Farben prior to World War II. He said this coal hydrogenation process was not necessary "because of the existence of simple, low temperature carbonization techniques by which moderate yields of tar are accompanied by major yields of char."

Speaking of this cheaper and better method the Bureau was sidetracking, Ayers stressed that oil can be distilled quite simply from coal. He explained that "the tar can be converted to liquid fuels, while the char is an excellent fuel for steam boilers."

While what has come to be called the Karrick process may be regarded as "primitive," Ayers said it was an "interesting process" because the "ratio of national demands for liquid fuel for electric power and other essential coal users is not far away from the ratio of yields from low temperature carbonization and is expected to balance before 1980 because demand for electric energy is growing more rapidly than demand for liquid fuel."

This was how it looked to the chief research chemist of one of the oil majors more than twenty years ago. All the oil in the United States was made out of coal up to the time the first oil well was brought in in 1859. From coal were made lubricating oils, greases, lamp oil, and kerosene. There was then no use for gasoline. Karrick testified:

"We can crack this coal oil into good quality gasoline. It is a better shale oil than that extracted from oil shale itself. It yields as much oil per ton, plus valuable by-products,

which makes it cheaper than shale oil. But because the Bureau of Mines does not call it oil—which it is, if shale oil is oil—its development has been blocked.

"I aided in selecting the experimental plants built at Rifle prior to 1926. I was consulting engineer in oil shale, but knew we would make oil out of coal sooner. At that time, the grab for oil was on. It was the time of Teapot Dome, when many people thought that was the last big source of oil in the country. All of a sudden we found ourselves transferred out of the Rocky Mountains to Pittsburgh. The Bureau would not let us work on coal in Colorado or Utah any more.

"Thanks to Senator Reed Smoot, I got Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover's help (the Bureau of Mines was in Commerce then). I was made custodian of all the government research data that we had developed up to then on oil from Rocky Mountain coals, and I am still custodian of them.

"At that time George Otis Smith was head of the Geological Survey, and I served under him. He said to me: 'You men have proved something more valuable than any other researchers in the Federal Government. We now know we have enough cheap oils in our coals to last forever.'

The late E. V. Murphree, president of Standard Oil of New Jersey's development Company, filed a patent on the underground extraction of oil from shale shortly before his death in 1962. Yet the major oil firms still talk about "mining" oil shale just as though they never heard of underground distillation. Why?

The answer, I suspect, lies in the emphasis the Justice Department's chief oil investigator laid on the words "cheap production" in an unsigned note he sent me some twenty years ago explaining "the World Oil Cartel's" opposition to distilling oil from coal. They were appalled at the thought that it is possible to get oil out of shale without any mining cost, or without the expense of disposing of the spent shale.

The process we developed in 1926 is now the basis for a flourishing coal-distilling industry operating under the trade name Rexco in England and Scotland. Neither the technology nor the productive range of its four plants is an spectacular as the multipurpose Karriick approach. Rexco is using gas generated by the process to heat the coal charge in its forty-ton retorts.

In a special supplement of the *Edinburgh Scotsman*, January 14, 1964, an article on the opening of the Comrie plant observed: "The process itself is an American one, having been developed across the Atlantic in the 1920s. It was brought to this country by Coal Research Syndicate, a company which had seen possibilities in developing the American idea.

"Incidentally, the process was not followed up in the United States. Originally it had received encouragement from the U.S. Bureau of Mines and a pilot plant to carbonize coal at low temperature had been built in Colorado. With the discovery of oil in great quantities in the North American continent, however, interest in smokeless fuel waned."

In some ways it struck me that Rexco's conservative management policy was not much different from that expressed by Robert E. Wilson while he was still president of Standard Oil of Indiana.

"Look," he told Karriick after Standard had run tests on two barrels of oil distilled from Hocking Valley coal, "we're not in the coal business . . . we can't put more than \$2.50 a barrel on that oil, but your smokeless fuel is worth \$5 or \$6, so you see it's a coal man's problem, and we can't put a value on your Ohio coal oil above our midcontinent crude."

At the same time that Standard of Indiana was rating oil from Ohio coal on a par with a midcontinent crude, the Universal Oil Products Company—often described as a patent club for the majors—was singing an

even more cheerful tune. Universal's distinguished Gustav Egloff, onetime president of the American Institute of Chemists, wrote Karriick: "I am enclosing a complete report on cracking your low temperature coal tar. The motor fuel derived from your low temperature coal tar on a tar acid free basis was a sixty-five per cent benzol equivalent. This is one of the highest grade motor fuels obtainable and in reality is too good for the average present day motor. It would be suitable for blending purposes in a similar manner to benzol.

"Your process of low temperature carbonization of coal tied in with the Dubbs cracking process should provide a handsome profit," Egloff continued. "You have a situation almost ideal in that your process produces:

- "1. Smokeless fuel.
- "2. A tar suitable for cracking.
- "3. Gas for household fuel purposes.
- "4. Cracked gasoline which should yield a five cent premium.
- "5. Tar acids for flotation purposes.
- "6. Cracked coke high in B.T.U. value, ashless and a highgrade smokeless fuel.
- "7. Incondensable gas from cracking, having 1,300 B.T.U.'s per cubic foot."

There seems to be enough data lying around loose in Washington to suggest the energy crisis may be due to something more than natural causes. These data clearly indicate that when we get around to processing shale, it should be distilled underground, first to keep from littering the landscape with mountains of spent shale, and, second, because it is cheaper. The data also indicate that anything shale can do to fill the energy gap, coal can do better.

The appropriate Congressional committees should look into this oil-from-coal question at once with a view to repeating everything Karriick and his co-workers in the Bureau of Mines proved at Rifle, Colorado, prior to 1930, with respect to the highest and best use of our coal and oil shales.

Clearly, it would be foolish to go over all this ground again without heeding the warning voiced by former Senator Paul Douglas in his memoirs, *In the Fullness of Time*. Senator Douglas recalls:

"Once in a while a mountain-state Senator would whisper to me that the oil interests had closed down these government demonstration plants because they did not want new sources of supply to come on the market and thus threaten their control. The idea that the big oil companies could reach out to control alternative sources of fuel and power seemed too fantastic to believe. It is not too fantastic today."

After suffering the crunch of arrogant power the oil interests have brought to bear in the current crisis, the American people can well agree with Senator Douglas that such power is far from fantastic.

VOTE RECORD CORRECTED

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I wish to correct for the permanent RECORD my vote on roll No. 240.

While I am recorded as voting "nay" on this vote (the Leggett amendment to reduce military assistance funds for South Vietnam), I should have voted "aye." I voted in error.

My record on this issue, I think, is clear, as I have strongly supported amendments of this character in the

past. Indeed, I believe that military assistance to South Vietnam should be sharply reduced.

DO SIRICA AND WATERGATE METHODS REALLY HONOR OUR SYSTEM?

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in the May 12, 1974, edition of the Washington Sunday Star, an article appeared which had been adapted from an address delivered by the famous author and attorney, Mr. Louis Nizer, at the New York University Law School.

The article, entitled "Do Sirica and Watergate Methods Really Honor Our System?" may have escaped the attention of most of our colleagues and so I ask that it be placed in the RECORD for their perusal. The text of the article follows:

DO SIRICA AND WATERGATE METHODS REALLY HONOR OUR SYSTEM?

(By Louis Nizer)

Of all the people in Watergate who received universal acclamation, Judge Sirica is first. He has been praised by critics at the opposite ends of the spectrum. President Nixon has twice referred to him as that "courageous judge." Senator Ervin, Senator Baker and the other members of the Watergate Committee have heaped adulation upon him. If any editorial in the nation has contained an unkind word about Judge Sirica, I haven't found it.

I, for one, am loath to make the point I am about to make, but I feel it has to be made. The epigram, "The end does not justify the means," has a corollary: "The means does not justify the end." During the McCarthy terror, it was easy to detect the impropriety of the means, even if the objective—to stop Communism—was desirable. "You can't," we cried, "pillory people and destroy them by innuendo and hearsay." But when today we enjoy the discomfiture of those who are being accused, we are inclined to overlook the means by which they are exposed.

Judge Sirica's objective has been magnificent—the exposure of the Watergate scandal. But what have been his means?

Five defendants pleaded guilty to burglary. Two others stood trial and were convicted. Sirica told them that they knew more than they had told and he was sentencing them provisionally to 35-40 years. If they cooperated and confessed all, he would reconsider the punishment. After four weeks, one of the defendants cracked and wrote a letter saying he was ready to talk. Thus the objective was achieved.

But do we want judges—despite the result in this case—to use penalties to force people to surrender their right under the Fifth Amendment not to talk? Is this not a form of judicial duress? Is it very different, except in degree and kind, from other forms of duress to obtain confessions, which our Supreme Court has repeatedly condemned?

In one famous case, in which a murderer was forced to confess, giving objective evidence that left no doubt of his guilt, the Supreme Court set aside the conviction and freed him. Justice Douglas wrote the following sentence, which I have always admired for its forthrightness. He said that it was true that some murderers who now go free would be caught if third-degree methods were used to wring confessions from them. But "this is the price we pay for a civilized society." If

we resort to duress, sooner or later innocent men are going to be pounded and beaten.

There are many forms of duress. Some are subtle, not merely the rubber pipe applied below the face to leave no marks, but endless questioning that deprives the victim of sleep, and other psychological devices. Once we break down the constitutional guarantees, we set an evil precedent.

Let me give another illustration. Senator Ervin, a constitutional lawyer of standing, and Senator Baker, a very able lawyer, said on television during the hearings, not once but several times, "Ninety percent of this testimony would not be admitted in a court of law because it is hearsay. But this is not a court. We are a Senate committee seeking the truth. So we will accept this evidence."

Just reflect on that a minute. The truth is equated with hearsay evidence. For centuries, legal philosophers have considered hearsay evidence the worst way to get the truth. The reason, that hearsay evidence is eliminated from trials is not technical, but because in the scales of evidence it has no weight; it has no probative value. I could convict anyone in this country of any crime through hearsay evidence. You would be helpless. "A" takes the stand. He is a reputable and honest man who always tells the truth. He swears that he met "B," who told him that the defendant said he had stolen the money. You can't cross-examine "A" effectively. "B" is not available to be tested. It is by use of hearsay that tyrants convict those they wish to dispose of, no matter how innocent.

Does purging our political system justify such wrong means? Mind you, the hearsay in the Watergate hearings was not projected merely to 12 jurors, but to 20 million Americans. It was they who were drenched with accusations against individuals, who, guilty or not, had none of the safeguards provided by criminal law.

Let me consider a third proposition. A Senate committee is authorized to take testimony for one purpose only—to formulate legislation. It has no authority to decide the guilt or innocence of any individual. Only a court, which affords a defendant protective privileges, can do so. No other system of law is as zealous in its concern for one who may be deprived of his liberty as ours. Consider some of the safeguards our Constitution provides.

First, there is a presumption of innocence that continues to the last second of the trial. Second, the jury must be unanimous. If one out of the 12 has a doubt, the defendant is free. Third, the defendant can sit quietly by no matter how guilty and say, "You, Mr. District Attorney, must prove me guilty. I am not going to help you." Fourth, the judge charges the jury, "If you believe this man is guilty, you must, nevertheless, not find him so unless you find that he is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt." This is an extraordinary standard.

Justice Black was interviewed shortly before his death and was asked, "In view of the decisions you are handing down here, isn't it almost impossible to convict anybody?" He shocked the reporters by replying, "Of course—that's the purpose. Read the Constitution. The government has immense power—the FBI, police, prosecutors—and unlimited funds. The individual citizen stands alone. The very title of the action is enough to put terror into the heart of a citizen. 'The United States of America, against John Jones.' So we have built a cordon of rights around him to balance the situation, to protect the individual against the overwhelming power of the government. That's our purpose, to make things as tough for the prosecutor as we can."

Now, one final word. I, for one, and I hope you, too, are concerned but not discouraged by the revelations that have shocked. It is healthy that they have come out. Only in a democracy could this miracle of exposure

have occurred, despite the enormous powers vested at the top. Also, I believe it will result in legislation to control financing of elections and proper procedures for election processes. This will be a magnificent result.

Ours is a great and noble nation. We must not give vent to despondency or skepticism. There are fine people in government and out of government and in business and out of business, and our great nation couldn't have achieved its eminence in science, business and culture without a healthy core. The surrounding corrupting tissue will have to be removed.

SOCIAL SECURITY TAXATION

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I have always been concerned about the heavy burden that social security tax has placed upon employee and employer alike. The burden in many cases is too great to bear, especially for the low-income brackets. The Federal income tax provides a far more equitable formula.

In a recent column, Sylvia Porter elaborates on the social security taxation schedule and offers a meaningful alternative.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to provide that column for the Record. It follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY TAXATION

While Washington's vote-hunting politicians mumble about giving us a tax cut to make it easier for us to survive the murderous cost-of-living squeeze, the fact of the matter is that millions of workers earning more than \$13,200 a year are facing a certain tax increase in 1975—and so are their employers.

This tax increase will come in the form of another rise in the wage base on which Social Security taxes are paid. This year's record high of \$13,200 will rise to another peak of at least \$14,100 and it may be more.

The reason the law ties the Social Security tax wage base as well as Social Security payments to changes in the cost of living. The administration estimates that the rise in the Consumer Price Index will come to 7 percent in 1974. That rate of rise would put the wage base at \$14,100. If the rate of inflation for the full year is higher, so may be the increase in the wage base. In practical terms, this means:

If you earn \$14,100 or more, you'll pay a Social Security tax of \$824.85 as against \$772.20 this year and \$631.80 in 1973.

All of your employers must match that tax of \$824.85, so the combined tax on employee and employer will come to \$1,649.70, up \$386.10 or more than 30 percent in only two years.

If you are self-employed and earn \$14,100 or more, your Social Security tax will rise to \$1,113.90 in 1975, up from \$1,042.80 this year and \$864 in 1973.

Remember, this increase is taking place with the Social Security tax rate standing still at 5.8 percent. That rate won't remain there much longer; under the law, it will rise above 6 percent in 1978. And with the wage base going up in automatic leaps, the burden of this form of tax will become heavier and heavier.

For millions of workers in the middle income brackets, the Social Security tax is now almost as large as the federal income tax. For millions of workers in the low-middle-income brackets, the Social Security tax is higher than the federal income tax.

For instance, a married man with two children earning \$5,000 a year who uses the standard deduction pays about \$120 in federal income tax. This same man has \$292.50 deducted for Social Security taxes, more than twice as much.

And for millions in the low-income brackets, the Social Security tax is the big load, not the income tax. That married man earning \$5,000 a year who has five children owes no federal income tax if he uses the standard deduction. But he'll have \$292.50 deducted for Social Security.

As for employers, the load is particularly oppressive on those in industries in which wages are a major operating cost—such as restaurants, resorts, hospitals and health care in general.

And there is no end in sight. It is inconceivable that we, as a nation, would refuse to help our elderly and disabled stay alive. It is inconceivable that younger workers would simply refuse to pay the taxes that finance the benefits.

But again, and with increasing urgency, I say it is time for Congress to take up the entire question of financing some of Social Security's benefits out of the Treasury's general revenues so income taxes would bear more of a share. As recently as 1957, Social Security taxes represented less than 9 percent of all federal taxes we paid. Now they swallow about 25 percent. Isn't there a better formula than this? I think there is.

POLITICS: ANY NUMBER CAN PLAY

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 16 commented editorially on the current move among leaders of the majority party concerning their sudden interest in keeping the President in the White House. I recommend this to my colleagues as interesting reading, and as a trenchant commentary on the political scene today. Text of the editorial is as follows:

POLITICS: ANY NUMBER CAN PLAY

We suspect there is an element of truth in the assertion by Democratic National Chairman Robert Strauss that some of the Republicans in Congress calling for President Nixon's resignation are more concerned about their own political hides than anything else.

Facing re-election campaigns this year, they clearly do not relish the prospect of an up-or-down vote on Mr. Nixon's fate. Whatever they do, they're bound to alienate some voters. But neither can they look forward to running in November with Mr. Nixon still in the White House and still under fire for Watergate. His resignation would thus take them off the hook nicely.

That said, however, we are not overwhelmed by Mr. Strauss's praise for the "remarkable restraint" his fellow Democrats have shown in insisting that the President should not resign.

We do not doubt that some Democrats so expressing themselves are indeed convinced that resignation would be a decisive influence on the country and would set a bad precedent. But it is just possible that some of the Democrats are motivated less by statesmanship than by the same kind of politics Mr. Strauss assails the Republicans for.

From a strictly partisan standpoint, it is to their advantage to see the Republicans squirm, to keep the issue alive, to keep a beleaguered Richard Nixon in the White House,

and to avoid giving Gerald Ford a running start on 1976 by installing him in the Presidency now.

Well before any Republicans were calling for Mr. Nixon's resignation, that cry was sounded by the Democrats themselves—including such notables as House Democratic Leader Thomas P. O'Neill. But now, he says, he's changed his mind. Forgive us, then, if we view with some skepticism that "above the battle" pose the Democrats are striking as they lecture their Republican colleagues.

THE LEGAL SERVICES CONFERENCE REPORT

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, much misinformation has been circulated in the Congress—including being printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—concerning the net effect of the Legal Services Conference Report on both the original legislation introduced for the administration and the bill as passed by the House on June 21, 1973. A great deal of this misinformation is to support the argument that the conference report "guts" the restrictions found in both the original administration legislation and in the House-passed bill.

I insert in the RECORD three charts prepared by my staff that indicate that such conclusions are essentially erroneous and that in fact the conference report largely still contains in strong form most of the restrictions in both of the other bills.

The insertion is simply made to correct the misinformation.

The charts are as follows:

SCHEDULE OF CONFERENCE ACTIONS ON HOUSE AMENDMENTS TO LEGAL SERVICES LEGISLATION

Amendment	Sponsor	Page	Result
1. 5-year limitation.....	Green.....	H5091	—
2. Strikes, boycotts, etc., prohibition; rioting, etc.	Quie.....	5094	+
3. Prohibition on aid to political parties, etc. pursuant to Act.	Quie.....	5096	+
4. Prohibition on aid to ballot measures, etc.	Quie.....	5096	+
5. Elimination of contract back-up centers.	Green.....	5096	(—)
6. Corporation pay cost and fees when loses.	Green.....	5102	(—)
7. Local attorney hiring preference.	Perkins.....	5112	+
8. Sec. 7 intro on Attorneys professional responsibilities—elimination.	Quie.....	5114	+
9. Education, etc. out of client qualifications.	Quie.....	5114	+
10. Prohibit all ott-time law practice.	Quie.....	5115	—
11. Prohibition on legislative representation.	Quie.....	5115	(—)
12. Off-time political activities.	Quie.....	5120	+
13. Funding prohibition limitation: 75 percent of firm's time on public interest issues.	Quie.....	5121	+
14. Two-third's of recipient's board must be attorneys.	Quie.....	5121	(+)
15. Restrict minors' representation.	Podell-Roberts...	5122	((+))
16. Prohibit school desegregation cases.	Mizell.....	H5125	+

SCHEDULE OF CONFERENCE ACTIONS ON HOUSE AMENDMENTS TO LEGAL SERVICES LEGISLATION—Continued

Amendment	Sponsor	Page	Result
17. Eliminate required expenditure of 10 percent of funds on non-staff attorney matters.	Green.....	5127	+
18. 2-year prohibition on private representation.	White.....	5129	+
19. Anti-abortion amendment.	Hogan-Froehlich.	5129	+
20. Prohibition on selective service cases.	Waggonner.....	5131	+
21. Prohibit college desegregation cases.	Mizell.....	5132	—
22. Prohibition on use of non-Federal funds.	Quie.....	5132	(+)
23. Prohibition on funding indigent Watergate defendants.	Hays.....	5133	—
24. Eliminate 3-yr. appropriation.	Green.....	5133	—

Totals:		
Total amendments.....	24	
House provision.....	13	
Senate provision.....	5	
House tendency.....	3	
Senate tendency.....	3	

Key:
 + = All or substantially House provision.
 — = All or substantially Senate provision.
 () = Compromised with inside symbol indicating tendency.

SCHEDULE OF RESTRICTIONS ADDITIONAL TO ORIGINAL ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL CONTAINED IN CONFERENCE REPORT

PROVISION AND REFERENCE

- Governors to solicit state bar recommendations for state advisory council appointments, Sec. 1003(f).
- No political test or qualification to be used in hiring or making grants, 1005(b)(2).
- Freedom of Information Act to apply to Corporation, 1005(g).
- Limitation of State or local government funding (to minimize interest conflicts, etc.) 1006(a)(1)(A)(ii).
- Limitation on class action suits, appeals and *amicus* briefs, 1006(d)(5).
- Prohibition of corporation identification with political activities, 1006(e)(1).
- Application of Hatch Act to Corporation employees, 1006(e)(2).
- On finding of harassment or abuse of process, corporation liable for legal fees, 1006(f).
- Poorer persons receive preference in assistance, 1007(a)(2)(C).
- Grants and contracts to ensure most effective and economical delivery of legal assistance, 1007(a)(3).
- Local attorney hiring preference, 1007(a)(8).
- Prohibition on persistent incitement of litigation or other violations of Canons or Code, 1007(a)(10).
- Prohibition on private, fee representation on cases first taken as program attorneys, 1007(a)(10).
- Limitation and regulation of taking fee-generating cases, 1007(b)(1).
- Prohibition on school desegregation cases, 1007(b)(7).
- Prohibition on certain abortion cases, 1007(b)(8).
- Prohibition on selective service cases, 1007(b)(9).
- Raise recipient board lawyer member requirement from half to 60%, 1007(c).
- Remove requirement to spend at least 10% of funds on research, etc. activities, (See Sec. 7(g) of Admin. bill).
- Funds authorized to be appropriated for only three years, Sec. 1010(a).
- Limitation on use of non-federal funds, 1010(c).

SENATE PROVISIONS MORE RESTRICTIVE THAN HOUSE AND ADOPTED BY CONFERENCE

PROVISION AND REFERENCE: (TO SENATE AMEND.)

- Use of political test or qualification to hire employees or make grants, 1005(b)(2).
- Limitations on class action suits, appeals and *amicus* activities, 1006(d)(5).
- Intentional identification of the Corporation with political activities, 1006(e)(1).
- Employees of Corporation subject to Hatch Act, 1006(e)(2).
- Consult state governors on establishing client qualifications, 1007(a)(2).
- Establish guidelines to avoid frivolous appeals, 1007(a)(7).

LAURA GASKINS INSTALLED AS PRESIDENT OF MINNESOTA SOCIAL SERVICE ASSOCIATION

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, Mrs. Laura Gaskins was installed as the president of the Minnesota Social Service Association—MSSA. Mrs. Gaskins is the third woman and the first black person to serve as president of the Association in its 81-year history.

The Twin Cities Courier reported on this event March 29. The Courier article gives Mrs. Gaskins' background and that newspaper story will be reprinted at the conclusion of my statement. I would simply like to add my congratulations to those Mrs. Gaskins has already received. She will give the MSSA the leadership it needs to achieve its goals.

The article follows:

[From the Twin Cities Courier, Mar. 29, 1974]

WOMAN NAMED ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT

When the 81st Annual Minnesota Welfare Conference meets in session March 31 to April 3 at Hotel Radisson, president-elect Laura Gaskins will be officially installed in office.

Mrs. Gaskins will be formally introduced to the convention at the closing conference session on Wednesday morning, April 3, by Dr. Richard Broeker, president of the Minnesota Social Service Association. The Association is sponsoring the annual conference. She is the third woman and first black person to serve as president in the Association's 81-year history.

The new MSSA president has many "firsts" to her credit, including that of the first black social worker to hold office in the Louisville (Ky.) Association of Social Workers. She was also among the first in her field to work for adoption of black and other minority children by white families. Since then, trans-racial adoptions have become prevalent in several states, including Minnesota.

A supervisor in the Family Service Division of the Hennepin County Welfare Department, Mrs. Gaskins has continued to emphasize the importance of high quality of delivery of services to families and children. Many of her proposals, particularly concerning training of professional staff to provide post-placement service to families adopting across racial lines, have been recognized nationally by professional organizations.

Mrs. Gaskins received her BA degree in education from Kentucky State College in Frankfort, and continued graduate work at the Atlanta School of Social Work in Atlanta, Ga. Further graduate courses were taken at the University of Minnesota.

She is noted for many outstanding contributions in her field where she conducts workshops, delivers lectures and serves in many official capacities. She has received several awards for outstanding civic organizational and professional work. In addition to her supervisory position in Hennepin County Mrs. Gaskins is a part-time Associate Professor in the Graduate School of Social Work at the University of Minnesota.

LAND USE PLANNING ACT AMENDMENTS

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, soon the House will be considering H.R. 10294, the Land Use Planning Act of 1974. This is a very important piece of legislation as it provides States and local governments with a major tool to help them control the growth patterns which have been in part responsible for a depletion of our Nation's energy resources and also for the environmental degradation of much of our land.

The Interior Committee reported this bill by more than a 2-to-1 vote, recommending passage after extensive hearings and very deliberative markup, indicating their strong support for this bill's approach to land use planning.

Some people have expressed fears that passage of this piece of legislation will mean a significant slowdown in development as the States and local governments set up their planning processes. The intent of this bill is to help assure that growth is handled in an orderly and planned manner and not to put up roadblocks to growth. In order to make this clear I plan to introduce an amendment which would express the Congress desire to see States and local governments carry out the processes of this act in a "fair and reasonably uniform and expeditious manner." The amendment will read as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 10294, AS REPORTED,
OFFERED BY MR. DELLENBACK

Page 37, following line 16 add a new subsection (1) to read as follows:

(1) assure that all administrative processes, by the State and by local governments, for the consideration of proposals for development, shall be conducted and decisions shall be arrived at in a fair and reasonably uniform and expeditious manner, and shall include requirements to assure—

(1) the establishment of rules of procedure and practice to promote fair hearings and the disclosure of the precise reasons for decisions based on the record made only at such hearings or upon other public records,

(2) the maintenance of records sufficient to provide complete public information on the policies and procedures governing land use development, and

(3) the establishment of a system designed to

(A) avoid, to the maximum extent feasible, multiple or duplicative hearings by, and/or multiple or duplicative permits from, state and local agencies on a single proposal for developments;

(B) assure that deadlines imposed by such agencies for the preparation and submission of permit applications and related materials are reasonable; and

(C) assure that decisions are rendered by such agencies as promptly as possible consistent with an adequate review of the record.

AIR POLLUTION—A FORM OF MASS MURDER

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, over the years, millions of people living in urban areas have suffered and continue to suffer from flagrant and inexcusable polluted air which pours out of the avalanche of industrial smoke stacks and fumes exhaust outlets.

It is indeed unfortunate that Federal, State, and municipal governments refuse to take effective action to protect the health of 70 percent of the population of this Nation living in urban areas from this scourge of poisonous air which they daily breathe into their lungs and bloodstreams. Our Federal Government can spend billions of dollars to explore space, visit the moon, and so forth, but it is almost impossible to get the same concentration on protecting the health of approximately three-quarters of the population of this country.

Representing the Calumet region of Indiana for 32 years in Congress, I have at times held high hopes that public opinion and the exposing of this terrible condition by the news media—press, radio, and television—would stimulate our Federal and State Governments to affirmative action toward making a real project out of cleaning the air and preserving the health of many millions of our citizens.

I fully realize that out in the Middle and Far West, and in some of the rural areas of our Nation, this situation of contaminated air and water is not nearly as catastrophic as in our urban areas.

Members of Congress from urban areas have cooperated on legislation to help the rural areas, not only on agricultural production and farm subsidies. For some reason, it is difficult to get the Members from rural areas to come to the aid of millions in our cities in the fight to preserve the health of all segments of our population.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to incorporate with my remarks a letter which I received this morning from Harry P. Garrard of Griffith, Ind., a city located in the great industrial Calumet region of Indiana. I and other Congressmen from urban cities have received thousands of similar letters over the years.

The letter follows:

GRIFFITH, IND.,
May 20, 1974.

HON. RAY MADDEN,
U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on
Rules, Washington, D.C.

DEAR RAY: A few short years ago I wrote you asking for assistance in helping to clear up our water and air pollution problems with American Chemical Service. With your devoted concern over this matter the problem was corrected. Many, many Griffith residents were so appreciative of your help. I made public your many letters to me along with your letters to the American Chemical Service and the State Pollution Board.

Now we in Griffith (along with Merrillville, Highland, Ross Township and Gary, of course) are faced with another Pollution Problem far worse than the one mentioned above.

This is the Air Pollution from the local steel mills.

I have lived at this same residence for 34 years, so I know from which I speak. In most of these 34 years we were never bothered with the steel mill pollution. It has only been in the last five years or so that this situation has become unbearable.

Whenever a north or northeast wind prevails we are zonked in with smog so dense it looks like fog. At times this covers all the communities. When approaching this area from the south on I-65 or I-57 in Illinois, one can see this smog line 100 miles away leading them to believe we are having a dust storm.

This condition causes residents to close their homes and keep air conditioners running when the outside temperatures are not warm enough to warrant air conditioning. Needless to say, this does not help the Energy Crisis.

I am sure many complaints have been registered about this situation. I have neglected to complain because I knew the Government was working on the problem. But the situation continues to get worse.

One question keeps popping up in my mind. Why—when people, industries and the Government had very few, if any, thoughts of anti-pollution did we not have this dense choking smog? And now with all concerned, with new modern mills replacing outdated ones and with all the modern anti-pollution systems that are said to have been installed, are we getting so much smog? I cannot seem to arrive at an answer to this.

This situation affects many thousands of people with heart and lung conditions and is especially hard on elderly people. It will also have an adverse effect on the health of all the young growing up in this area.

This complaint will be brought before our Town Government also.

Please give our region your help. Congratulations to you on your recent Primary Nomination. As usual, since I started voting in 1934, I support you, along with 10 members of my family.

Very sincerely,

HARRY P. GARRARD.

REPRESENTATIVE JACK KEMP SA-
LUTES VFW PVT. LEONARD POST,
JR., POST NO. 3251, OF CHEEKTOW-
AGA, N.Y.

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, we in western New York are particularly proud of VFW Pvt. Leonard Post, Jr., Post No.

6251, of Cheektowaga, N.Y. The post has been recognized as the No. 1 New York State VFW post in the category of community service, and last year finished ninth in national competition.

This year, under the able leadership of Comdr. John Sienicki, Pvt. Leonard Post, Post No. 6251, is actively on its way to becoming the No. 1 VFW post in community service in the Nation. The post over the years has contributed to many fine charitable causes, and its members unselfishly give of their time to participate in patriotic, civic, and community affairs. The post's "Care Program" entertains the retarded, the mentally ill, the homeless and the aged, and has helped residents at institutions such as the Buffalo State Hospital, West Seneca State School for the Retarded, the Erie County Home, and Infirmary, the Erie County Rehabilitation Center, St. Anthony's Home, and the United Church Homes for the Aged.

The post, which was organized in 1946 has grown from 32 members to more than 1,030 members, each of whom is deeply committed to public service and community participation. The continuing efforts of Pvt. Leonard Post VFW Post of Cheektowaga are appreciated by all western New Yorkers.

I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues just some of the accomplishments and initiatives undertaken by the post. On behalf of all of western New York, I commend the post for their contributions to the community and thus the country, and wish them well in this year's competition.

"MISSION IMPOSSIBLE"

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues on the Judiciary Committee, in the course of their current investigation, seem to be discovering more and more incredible conversations almost every day now as they listen to the famous tapes. It is almost mind-boggling, when one considers the fact that they are listening only to the tapes which Mr. Nixon has seen fit to release, to imagine what must be on the tapes which he apparently is unwilling to give up under any circumstances.

While contemplating this situation during a recent plane trip from my district in California to Washington, a scenario came into my mind—perhaps some of our colleagues may find it of interest.

We now go to an undisclosed location, where a group of men are listening to a tape recording. The time is late spring of 1972:

The photograph you are looking at shows Larry O'Brien, leader of the forces seeking to overthrow the occupant of the office of the Presidency and to radically change our form of government by electing a different President. O'Brien operates from a secret headquarters deep within the bowels of the Wa-

tergate Hotel, shown in the next photograph. We have just learned that O'Brien has acquired a secret weapon, which we suspect is a powerful new political missile, which he will release at the most opportune time. If he succeeds in launching this missile the office of the Presidency will be destroyed.

Your mission, should you decide to accept it, is to penetrate the Watergate Headquarters, locate the secret weapon, and remove or destroy it.

Should you, or any of your Group of Plumbers, be captured or indicted, the President will, of course, disavow any knowledge of your action. This tape will self-destruct in five seconds; and any other tapes relating to this matter will be erased by a demonic influence, or disappear into thin air, if threatened with subpoena.

WASHINGTON SPOTLIGHT

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will shortly be sending my constituents a newsletter. I am including the contents of that newsletter in the RECORD at this point:

WASHINGTON SPOTLIGHT

(By Ed Eshleman)

IMPOUNDMENT MYTH

Impoundment of legislatively approved spending is a means that Presidents have used to keep irresponsible expenditures under control ever since Jefferson's administration. However, to hear and see news media accounts over the last couple of years, you would think that it's only recently that this power has been "abused."

Abused? Some statistics prepared by the Library of Congress on the impoundment policies of the last three Presidents give cause for question.

In terms of the percentage of money impounded out of the total amount of money spent, the present administration has never gone beyond 5.8%. In other words, in any one budget, this administration has never impounded more than 5.8% of the total money it spent.

On the other hand, the Kennedy administration impounded 7.5% of its outlays in 1961 and 6.1% in 1962.

The Johnson administration reached 6.5% in 1966 and 6.7% in 1967.

If impoundment is unsound policy, as many congressmen are now saying, their shouting should have started at least 12 years ago.

PROTECTING PRIVACY

There is some movement underway in Congress to assure the privacy of personal files and information from government snoopers. Action in this area will not come any too soon because the problem of being watched by "Big Brother" may not be so far away.

It has been estimated that the Federal Government now has the capacity to secure about twenty pages on any American simply by feeding his or her Social Security number into its computers.

In a land that stresses individual liberty, that kind of potential for using technology to intrude on the private life of the individual is disturbing to say the least. Congress does seem to be starting to take stock of the situation, and we can only hope that legislative action to protect each of us will not be too little too late.

FOOD STAMP-EDS

In 1961 when the food stamp program got underway, 50,000 people received stamps. In

fiscal 1975, 15.8 million will be receiving stamps valued at \$7.2 billion. And, not only do we pay for that expansion with more tax dollars, but officials say that the stamps, by adding to the demand for food, may also increase food prices. But what's to be expected when Congress makes the program liberal enough to extend beyond just the deserving needy and reach strikers and students as well?

RADIO REPORT

While my weekly series of radio reports gets pretty wide play in the 16th district, I don't know how many of you get a chance to listen in. In these reports I generally discuss issues of current national concern on items that are of immediate interest in Congress.

Several radio stations carry the series and I thought you might be interested in the broadcast times.

WDAC (Lancaster) 12:30 pm Saturdays.

WGSA (Ephrata) 11:05 am Saturdays.

WCOJ (Coatesville) 6:25 pm Saturdays.

WLAN (Lancaster) on regular news reports.

WHEX (Columbia) Sundays between 7:30 & 8:15 pm.

WPDC (Elizabethtown) 12:25 pm Sundays.

WAHT (Lebanon) 9:35 am Saturdays.

WGAL (Lancaster) on regular news reports.

BUDGET INTEREST

Just to pay the interest on the national debt will cost the taxpayer \$26.9 billion this year. That's \$50,000 a minute, 60 minutes an hour, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year.

And just in case, with all of the talk about spending billions of dollars, you don't have any concept what a billion really is, I ran across this description the other day: If you take thousand dollar bills and stack them on top of one another as high as the Washington Monument, that would be about one billion dollars.

Maybe we ought to have every Congressman go to the bottom of the Washington Monument and look up before voting on any Federal budget item.

RATINGS RIP-OFF

It has been becoming more and more popular for various groups to issue ratings of congressmen on how they voted on specific issues or along ideological lines. For example, there are ratings to measure each member of congress as a conservative, a liberal, an environmentalist, a national security supporter, and the list goes on and on.

Most all groups that issue these ratings label themselves non-partisan, and, in fact, most of those organizations with long-standing reputations for issuing legislation scorecards have done so without any partisan goal. But as these voting records have become more popular, distorted data is beginning to emerge that is aimed at making political points.

One group, for example, has been criticizing members for "anti-environment" votes based on their score-card, but that score-card included things like a vote against federal aid for abortions as anti-environment.

In other words, just because some rating shows a congressman has voted right or wrong does not mean that the rating has not twisted voting information to arrive at a predetermined political position. The funds for the rating may have come from organized labor, or a special interest group that is more interested in partisanship than public information.

AUTO COST

According to a report done by the Department of Transportation, it costs 13.6 cents to operate a full-size car, 10.8 cents to operate a compact, and 9.4 cents for a subcompact. Those expenses are based on suburban-type driving and include items such as depreciation, maintenance, parts, gas and oil (excluding tax), parking fees, insurance and taxes.

SOME THINGS I'VE BEEN SAYING

ABOUT TAX REFORM

"I could support a \$5 billion tax cut if it is accompanied by a responsible \$5 billion cut in Federal spending. I could support a \$10 billion tax cut if it is accompanied by a responsible \$10 billion spending cut. And until someone is willing to show me that they're serious enough about this business to come up with that kind of proposal, I'm going to have to guess they're playing politics."—Radio broadcast—April 27, 1974.

ABOUT IMPEACHMENT

"The Constitution provides that the House of Representatives sits basically as a grand jury in an impeachment proceeding. As we all know, any grand juror or petit juror under our judicial system who already had come to a conclusion as to the guilt or innocence of a defendant would be disqualified immediately. I intend to preserve my vote."—Letter to a constituent—May 14, 1974.

ABOUT JUSTICE

"The Mitchell-Stans verdict shows that indictment does not necessarily mean guilt. It shows that all of the adverse publicity in the world may not add up to a strong legal case in the courtroom. And it shows that no final judgments can be made until all of the facts are in and have been examined and cross-examined."—Newspaper column—May 8, 1974.

ABOUT INTERNATIONAL ECONOMICS

"A longer range prospect with regard to Europe was the one hinted at by the President. If these nations are going to be our competitors—friendly competitors, but competitors nevertheless—then we must take steps to protect our own treasures as best as we can."—Radio broadcast—March 23, 1974.

ABOUT GASOLINE SHORTAGES

"Our national gasoline problem is not over. We remain too dependent on foreign oil. Domestic energy production is not growing fast enough. Our refinery capacity is still short and new construction is progressing slowly. But everything does look better than most of us could have imagined a few short weeks ago, and in this era of too much bad news, partially solving a problem is indeed a welcome break."—Newspaper column—April 10, 1974.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF
JAMES G. O'HARA

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the finding of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation that the President of the United States substantially underpaid his Federal income taxes for certain years during his Presidency, following the revelation that he has paid no State income taxes on his income, has renewed the interest of many citizens in the sources and amounts of income received by elected public officials and in the amounts of tax paid by them to State and Federal Governments.

I believe that information of this sort ought to be available to constituents concerned about the welfare of their country and the integrity of their Government. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, it is my intention at this time to make public information with respect to my income during 1973 and taxes paid by me to the Federal Government and to State and local governments.

My principal source of income during 1973 was my congressional salary of \$42,500. In addition, I received interest income of \$539.29; net rents on real estate held by myself and my wife of \$920.04; and income from speaking fees of \$5,800. I received no income whatsoever from any law practice or association.

After adjustments arising out of business-related office and travel expenses, and allowances, my adjusted gross income was \$48,035. My taxable income, after exemptions for myself, my wife, and our seven children, and itemized deductions of medical expenses, State and local taxes, interest expense, charitable contributions, et cetera, amounted to \$32,754.54. Mrs. O'Hara and I paid a Federal income tax of \$9,502.77 and a Michigan State income tax of \$1,260.82 on 1973 income.

In addition, my wife and I paid real estate taxes in the amount of \$1,965.73. We also paid, of course, the usual sales and excise taxes to which all of us are subject.

IMMUNITY—A TWO-EDGED SWORD

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced legislation to amend the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970 to mandate that Federal prosecutors' request for immunity for a prosecutorial witness shall be deemed improper where evidentiary material does not indicate at least a minimum credibility of such a witness.

I supported the passage of the Organized Crime Control Act, which was developed as part of the administration's effort to control organized crime and was aimed at the drug pusher, the criminal underworld, and the violence-prone, radical elements within our society.

Unfortunately, it is becoming increasingly evident that the liberalized use of immunity granted under that act is being used in ways never contemplated by Congress at the time of the enactment of the original legislation.

It now seems clear that overzealous prosecutors are using that liberalized statute against political dissenters, elements within the organized labor movement, and other individuals.

For example, it has lately come to my attention that four union officials of a small furrier's union in my State were convicted recently, largely on the strength of testimony by a chief Government witness who, although admitting to criminal acts, received immunity and got off free.

It is also my information that new evidence in this case, previously overlooked by the prosecution, now indicates this witness may never have passed on alleged payoffs to the men he accused, but pocketed the money himself, and then falsely accused the defendants to cover his tracks.

Mr. Speaker, I feel this tighter control over the granting of immunity is necessary to insure that no one, whether he be a Member of Congress or a private citizen, can be subject to the unfair abuse of the present immunity statute.

SETTLEMENT REFORM OR
RETREAT?

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to learn that the Chief Justice of the United States agrees with me on the need for reform of real estate settlement procedures.

We both feel that the homeselling and homebuying public is being needlessly victimized by obsolete and inequitable requirements, fees and commissions that those who sell and buy homes are made to endure in the name of tradition, if not profit.

As I do, Chief Justice Burger thinks that the time is long overdue for overhauling the requirements of real estate settlement transactions in the name of equity and fairness to the consumers of the Nation.

His remarks on this subject, made last Tuesday, May 21, in a welcoming address at the opening session of the American Law Institute in Washington, D.C., come at an opportune time. Within the next several weeks, the Banking and Currency Committee is expected to consider real estate settlement reform legislation. Whether the outcome will constitute reform or retreat remains to be seen.

Mr. Speaker, the battle over settlement reform in the House is represented by two bills, H.R. 12066, which I have introduced, and H.R. 9989, introduced by Congressman STEPHENS of Georgia. Mr. STEPHENS has unhesitatingly labeled his bill as reform legislation, but it, in fact, is a giant step backward for the homebuying public.

Far from providing a method to regulate or otherwise reduce the high cost of real estate settlement transactions, the Stephens bill is a disguised effort to eliminate this prospect and keep home-sellers and homebuyers behind the eightball manipulated by real estate lawyers, real estate brokers, title insurance companies, lenders and others involved in residential property transactions.

It would do this through a provision that would eliminate the existing authority given in the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970 to the Department of Housing and Urban Development to regulate real estate settlement fees and charges in transactions involving FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed mortgage loans.

It is true that HUD has as yet not exercised this authority, but existence of this authority nevertheless has begun to produce benefits for the homebuying public.

In effect, real estate developers, lawyers, residential mortgage lenders, title insurance companies and others have been placed on notice that settlement transactions for federally insured and guaranteed residential mortgages, one-third of all real estate transactions, could be regulated by a simple administrative decision to do so. This fact, when added to the growing awareness of dishonest, to say nothing of inequitable settlement charges and fees homebuyers and sellers are forced to pay, has prompted significant action by a growing number of State legislatures.

Settlement reform measures have been approved by the Legislatures of New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maryland, and North Carolina during sessions held this year. Similar measures are being considered by the legislatures and by bar associations in a number of other States.

The Stephens bill, far from achieving reform, would eliminate HUD's regulatory authority—the main item that is now motivating State action. To say the least, this is an ironic situation inasmuch as Mr. STEPHENS has often, almost habitually, said over the past 2 years that settlement reform is a subject best left to the States. What he really means is that settlement reform is a subject best left alone—by everybody.

Mr. Speaker, the essential difference between Mr. STEPHENS' bill and the one I have introduced is that in my measure, the authority which has been granted to HUD to regulate FHA and VA residential real estate mortgage loan transactions would be extended to cover virtually all home purchase transactions, conventional as well as those which are federally insured and guaranteed. It is the reverse of the STEPHENS' bill. It is designed to extend consumer protection provisions to at least 95 percent of all residential real estate transactions.

However, I am not now asking that the measure which I have introduced be adopted at this time. I am convinced that the wisest course to follow is to give the States a reasonable opportunity to achieve real estate settlement reform. In this sense I am in agreement with those who advocate State's rights regarding this subject. At an appropriate time during the next year or two the Banking and Currency Committee can evaluate State action and determine what if any additional Federal legislation is needed.

Certainly the Congress has on innumerable occasions found it easy to adopt a wait-and-see approach on many issues. Unlike some other instances, I am convinced that it is imperative to do so now.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I insert the portion of Chief Justice Burger's remarks concerning real estate settlement reform to be printed in the RECORD at this point.

EXCERPTS FROM CHIEF JUSTICE BURGER'S
REMARKS

Another important area of law that sooner or later touches the lives of almost every American is the purchase of a home. One can hardly imagine an American who does not wish to own his own home. With our tradi-

tion of upward mobility a family may repeat this process several times. The Commission on Uniform State Laws has been at work on a Land Transaction Code that would eventually cover many of the complex procedures that are now involved in the purchase of a home.

When I began to practice law the newest associate in the firm was assigned the task of examining titles and closing real estate purchases, and he continued in that role until another new man came along. In that apprenticeship I examined many hundreds of land titles and closed an almost equal number of purchase and financing transactions. The cost at that time ranged from \$15 to \$30 for the purchase of the typical family home. There is a growing practice of using title insurance either as a substitute for or in addition to the lawyer's title opinion. Today we know that in many states the incidental costs of acquiring a new home, even in the \$40,000 category, can run into a very large sum. We know that, in common with others, the operating costs of lawyers have skyrocketed in recent years, but the very cost of the procedure today dictates that we examine the whole business closely.

The point I seek to make is that the basic system of real estate titles and transfers and the related matters concerning financing and purchase of homes cries out for reexamination and simplification. In a country that transfers not only expensive automobiles but multi-million dollar airplanes with a few relatively simple pieces of paper covering liens and all, I believe if American lawyers will put their ingenuity and inventiveness to work on this subject they will be able to devise simpler methods than we now have.

I suggest that it is a very high priority in terms of the public obligations of our profession to press for a comprehensive reexamination of the entire process of land titles and transfers, title insurance, the financing of real estate transactions, closing procedures and, of course, the cost of all these steps. They are unduly complex and therefore unduly expensive today. Here, again, the cost standard should be the reasonable value of the services based on the time required and the degree of responsibility involved.

"MR. MAC"

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, next Saturday, June 1, the city of Havre de Grace, Md., will honor a very special citizen, a man known to everyone there as "Mr. Mac."

Walter McLhinney is a lifelong resident of Havre de Grace, having been born there on March 5, 1897. Following service in the U.S. Army during World War I, he established McLhinney's News Depot, which has now been a feature of everyday life in the city for more than 51 years.

Mr. Mac and his wife, Agnes, have been married for 50 years, and they have a daughter and two sons who live in Havre de Grace. He is the oldest living life member of the Havre de Grace Knights of Columbus Council No. 2002,

having held membership for over 50 years.

Mr. Mac's long history of dedication to community service is particularly impressive. For 24 years, he served in the Havre de Grace city government, as a city councilman for 16 years, and as mayor for 8 years. He was a member of the Hartford County Liquor Control Board until he was elected mayor of the city in 1951.

For 28 years, Walter McLhinney was an active volunteer fireman in the Susquehanna Hose Company, and served the last 9 years as assistant fire chief.

Men like Mr. Mac are the staff of which the greatness of America is made, and I take great pleasure in joining the citizens of Havre de Grace in expressing appreciation and affection for one who has contributed so much of his life for the benefit of his fellow citizens and his community.

SURVEY FINDS BEEF PRICES STILL
LOWER

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, in these days of shortages, it is always comforting to hear of the price of anything going down. Beef is one item where the price is dropping and the reason is that supplies of beef are good and production is running ahead of last year. As the wholesale price dropped, the American Cattlemen's Association checked to see if the retail prices had begun to fall and they have. This is reassuring news to all that our free enterprise system can and does work when the Federal Government stays out of the picture. The article from the Washington Star-News of May 22, 1974, follows:

SURVEY FINDS BEEF PRICES STILL
LOWER

Members of the American Cattlemen's Association (ANCA) are not faring too well economically. The wholesale price of beef has dropped drastically.

And the Cattlemen's Association wants to be sure that if beef is going for so much less wholesale, it better be selling for a lot less at retail.

Last month the ANCA began running its own retail beef price survey of 19 cities, including Washington. They were so pleased with their findings that they conducted the same survey on May 9.

According to Gordon Van Vleck, ANCA president, the second survey was undertaken to see if beef prices had dropped any further. And they have.

For all cities and the five cuts of beef covered, the average decline was 1¢ per pound. This followed an average decline of 24.5¢ between February and April.

In the May survey average prices for all the cuts were down in 10 cities, up in seven cities, and unchanged in two cities. In the April survey, average prices were down in all but one city.

Washington was one of the cities showing a decline since April. Its average price was \$1.46.

Portland, Oreg., had the highest average price, \$1.61, for the five cuts which are

ground beef, round steak, sirloin steak, T-bone steak, chuck roast. Denver had the lowest average price, \$1.17.

Beef production is running 6% ahead of a year ago, according to Van Vleck.

City and date	Ground beef	Round steak	Sirloin steak	T-bone steak	Chuck roast	Average, 5 cuts
Washington, D.C.:						
Feb. 11	1.09	1.99	1.82	2.26	1.42	1.72
Apr. 11	.92	1.72	1.79	1.92	1.02	1.47
May 9	.89	1.56	1.79	2.09	.99	1.46

11500 BANANAS ON PIKE'S PEAK

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11500, the bill to make surface coal mining a thing of the past, displays some odd ideas of justice.

For example, its Jones amendment imposes a tax of 1.23 cents per million Btu on all coal mined in the United States. Its ostensible purpose is to raise money to abandon land which was mined and never thereafter put back into a decent condition.

That is a good and noble idea. That land should be reclaimed. The only real question is who should pay for it. Let us see how that would work out under H.R. 11500. Here is an example:

The Washington Irrigation and Development Co. operates a surface mine at Centralia, Wash. It is a new mine. The reclamation work there is good. This company never operated a surface mine any place before. It has no past neglect to account for. Yet, under the Jones amendment, this mine will be taxed—fined is a better word—\$645,832 a year on the basis of last year's production. That is what 1.23 cents per million Btu will add up to in its case.

So who pays this \$645,000?

The company's coal goes to a power plant whose output is shared by Pacific Power & Light Co., Washington Water Power Co., the city of Seattle, the city of Tacoma, Public Utility District No. 1 of Snohomish County, Pudget Sound Power & Light Co., Public Utility No. 1 of Gray's Harbor County, and Portland General Electric Co.

Thus, the consumers of electricity in a great expanse of the Pacific Northwest will pay for it. They will be taxed more than \$645,000 a year to reclaim land in places like Kentucky and West Virginia.

These people did not despoil Appalachia. They should not be singled out to pay for restoring Appalachia. Any obligation to do that is a national one. It should be shared by all the country, not just the users of electricity from utilities burning strip-mined coal in parts of it.

It will be interesting to see how the Senators from Washington explain this discriminating tax to their constituents. One of them will be a conferee if the House approves this oddball bill.

The simple fact is that it can not be

explained. H.R. 11500 is as goofy as trying to raise bananas on Pike's Peak. It ought to be replaced by a fair bill which requires that mined land be carefully restored to environmental acceptability.

WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT ESSENTIAL FOR OUR NATION

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in recent days there has been throughout the Nation discussion about the importance or lack of importance of public works projects, and also the impact upon the environment upon these types of development.

In northern California, which I represent, we have a major public works development program which I am proud to have supported throughout my career here in the House of Representatives. Basically I am convinced that the water resources which we are conserving through these developments are essential to the welfare of northern California. They can and should be used for irrigation, domestic water supply, fish and wildlife enhancement, recreation, flood control and generation of the cleanest electrical power available—hydro.

Serving the great central valleys of California are the McClatchy newspapers. In the past few days the Sacramento Bee has editorialized on three of these projects. These editorials individually and collectively express extremely well the importance of public works projects upon our communities and our State. I would like to share with my colleagues in the House of Representatives these editorials published May 2, May 6, and May 10 in the Sacramento Bee.

The editorials follow:

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, May 2, 1974]

COURT RULINGS SUBSTANTIATE SOUNDNESS OF NEW MELONES DESPITE COSTLY DELAY

The United States Supreme Court's decision raises a green flag for full speed ahead on the construction of the New Melones Dam on the Stanislaus River.

The decision to uphold the 1973 ruling favorable to the project by the US 9th Circuit Court of Appeal in San Francisco is a welcome one. It substantiates the need for this well planned multipurpose water, power and recreation project. It also gives well de-

served and final legal recognition to the sound and thorough environmental planning by the US Army Corps of Engineers for this model undertaking.

It exhausts the long and costly legal effort of the Environmental Defense Fund and the national Sierra Club to block construction of the dam.

Not to be overlooked, however, is the tremendous cost in time and money which has been extracted by this lengthy litigation. The contract for construction of the main dam alone went from \$83.2 million to \$109.7 million—an increase of \$26.5 million—during the 15 months in which the project was idled pending the appeal court review.

This increase is attributable almost wholly to inflationary pressures. It buys nothing new. It adds no benefits. It pays only the high price for the passage of time—\$1.76 million per month. There were, of course, other costs to the government in time and money attributable directly to the litigation and the resulting delay in construction.

In the final reckoning, these increased costs are a high price to pay for a suit which was not really concerned with the total environmental considerations of the project.

The avowed purpose of the suit was to block construction of the dam without regard for the unprecedented features for environmental enhancement which have been incorporated into the project.

This sacrifice was to be made for one narrow recreational interest—the preservation of a nine-mile white water run on the upper river, a feature which is to be placed in part on the lower river.

And into this bargain would go all the other benefits of New Melones—water storage, flood control, increased river flows, enough clean hydroelectric power to serve 200,000 persons and recreation features for the annual enjoyment of millions.

There is really no question of the need for this kind of conservation, particularly of the water and power. Future generations of Californians will be grateful for it—even at these prices.

Full speed ahead on New Melones!

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, May 6, 1974]

AUBURN DAM SHOULD GET CLEAR SAILING

The recent U.S. Supreme Court ruling in favor of the go-ahead of the important New Melones Dam project on the Stanislaus River is the best news beleaguered California water development has had in years.

The near-unanimous decision sets the record straight: The New Melones project was planned on an environmentally sound basis and the suit against it at best was frivolous.

What this portends in the future is that flimsy cases sent up to the high court on such narrow contentions as that which marked the New Melones instance could get nowhere.

This is all to the good for all residents of the great Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys of California who have derived so many benefits from federal, state, local and private water projects, too numerous to mention.

Specifically, the decision heralds the prospect the Auburn Dam Project underway on the American River can go forward without more harassment from "all dams-be-damned" environmentalists.

The Auburn project is similar to New Melones. It is designed for widespread benefits of water conservation, clean electricity, flood control and recreation and has had most exhaustive environmental studies.

Yet those who would block dams just for the sake of blocking dams no matter what their merit are attempting to stop Auburn.

Surely the US top court's ruling in New Melones should clear the air and prove single-minded opposition to multipurpose projects is not sufficient nor in the wide public interest.

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, May 10, 1974]

A COSTLY STORY OF STOP AND GO

The Tehama-Colusa Canal unit of the Central Valleys Project was authorized by Congress 24 years ago but it is still only half completed. Not a single drop of water has been delivered to a parched area of prime agricultural land.

The planned 122-mile system to water the mostly dry-farmed area of the Sacramento Valley's West Side has been the unfortunate victim of stop-and-go funding by Washington and of inflation.

The delay has proved to be poor business, indeed. Construction costs almost have doubled. Instead of earning income if the project had been wrapped up on schedule in 1970, the federal government eventually will have to put up an extra \$100 million or more to finish it.

President Richard Nixon's proposed budget for 1974-75 sets aside a bare \$2.39 million for the canal. Project supporters are seeking an additional \$2.8 million but even the combined amount is considered inadequate.

Any further holdback of appropriations will come at a time when Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz says "we need more food and fiber." One sure way of getting it is by going ahead with such projects as the Tehama-Colusa Canal.

Studies indicate the canal would triple farm production in its service area. That would be enough to feed 272,000 people a full year at a rate of 2,500 calories daily.

That the canal is no boondoggle is evident, too, in word from the construction engineer, William Hart, that "we could sell all the water we can run through the canal."

Congress couldn't find a better investment than the funds it can vote to assure speedy completion of this worthwhile undertaking.

TRIBUTE TO OUR NATION'S SMALL BUSINESSMEN

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, this week has been set aside to honor the Nation's small businesses. As a former small businessman, it is a privilege for me to join in this justly deserved tribute.

The theme this week is "small business energizes the economy." This is not just a catchy phrase or rhetoric; small business today provides 35 million jobs and contributes more than \$476 billion annually to the gross national product. Nineteen out of twenty businesses in the country fall under the category of small business. So anyone who would say that the day of the small businessman in America is gone or that the role of the small businessman has been pre-empted has not looked at the facts.

Since the earliest days of our history, small business has energized the economy. Those early merchants and traders laid the foundation for what was to become the strongest and most prosperous economy in the world. Today's small

businessman continues in the tradition of his predecessors. His ability to deal with the energy crisis and the crimp it has put on our economy illustrates the importance of small business to our Nation. Such resiliency is the trademark of our economy and no other sector of our free market system so aptly symbolizes this fortitude.

During the coming months, we will look forward to seeing the growth of our economy in the recovery of the small businessman. For his achievements will signal the recuperation and well-being of economic conditions in the United States.

MORE MONEY FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

HON. ALAN STEELMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a steadily growing and intensifying concern over the lack of progress we seem to be making in the acquisition and development of park and open space lands across our Nation. At the Federal level, the acquisition backlog of already authorized areas, along with projected new area authorizations, seem to be pulling ahead of the funds available to purchase the needed lands. The demands at the State and local level are of much the same pattern. The Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund was designed in 1964, with subsequent reshaping, to solve this problem, but it has been beset with problems through the decade of its existence. Clearly, some strong measures are needed to get this program back on track.

The following article, written by widely known conservation columnist, Michael Frome, appeared in the April 1974 issue of Field and Stream magazine. I commend it to my colleagues as a vivid revelation as to some of the problems the Land and Water Conservation Fund has encountered through its first decade. This is clearly an area where renewed congressional attention is warranted.

A GIANT STEP BACKWARD

(By Michael Frome)

The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, adopted by Congress ten years ago, undoubtedly represents one of the decisive pieces of American legislation in the field of natural resources. Few programs have enjoyed such universal public support as has this Fund. It has enabled Federal, state, and local agencies to protect, preserve, and conserve some of the nation's most valuable natural heritage for use and enjoyment by the people.

It grieves me, therefore, to report on its tenth anniversary that the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) appears to be in serious trouble during a time of continuing critical need. Without a change in course, national parks, recreation areas, seashores, lakeshores, wild and scenic rivers, and historical areas all will suffer.

"We were shocked and disappointed when the administration impounded much of the funds appropriated by Congress in 1973 and by the 1974 budget request—a giant step backward," Representative Roy A. Taylor, of

North Carolina, told me during a recent interview in Washington. As chairman of the Parks and Recreation Subcommittee of the House Interior Committee (as well as second-ranking member of the full Committee), Representative Taylor has been intimately, and expertly, involved.

In one respect, the news is encouraging: the proposed budget for 1975 provides for spending 300 million dollars from the fund, including 97.5 million dollars for Federal land acquisition. Nevertheless, as Representative Taylor notes, that still leaves a large unobligated sum that could be put to good use in acquiring recently authorized outdoor recreation areas and national parks.

Moreover, conservationists both inside and outside of government fear the effects of the Administration's proposal to divert LWCF monies in order to finance "indoor" types of recreation activities—swimming pools, tennis courts, playgrounds, and the like—not anticipated when the legislation was enacted. Yes, there is a place for such developments, as once provided under the open space program of the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs. But the Administration wiped that one out and has been trying to substitute the LWCF for the job. "These urban-oriented projects hardly lend themselves to the concept of providing high-quality outdoor experiences in a natural setting," Representative Taylor has protested.

The LWCF crisis became evident last year when the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), an all-powerful, faceless bureaucracy appended to the President's office, put the clamp on spending for purchase of recreation lands. Supposedly, this was part of the government effort to fight inflation and balance the budget. In addition, Administration policy makers alleged that resource agencies could not spend available funds fast enough, that they needed time to allow their obligations to catch up with appropriations.

The Administration has stood virtually alone on this position, without the slightest trace of support from anyone in the conservation movement. Receipts from the Fund now total \$300 million annually. The money is derived, as stipulated by law, from several sources: sale of surplus Federal property, motorboat fuel taxes, and revenue from sales and leases on the Outer Continental Shelf. This is trust-funded money specifically earmarked—it cannot be applied to balance the budget, or for any other purpose. If not budgeted and appropriated, it must remain in the Fund to be appropriated later.

Of the \$300 million total, 60 percent is designed for use by states (and through them by local communities), with the remaining 40 percent for use by three Federal agencies: the National Park Service, the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife (for endangered-species habitat). Thus far a total of \$1.7 billion has been spent for acquisition of lands having key recreation values, approximately \$1 billion by the states, and \$700 million by the Federal agencies.

According to Dwight Rietz, holding back funds has caused "a major crisis in the park and recreation field." As executive director of the National Recreation and Parks Association, Rietz has his finger on state programs, goals, and needs. Here is how he analyzed the picture several months ago:

"The Interior Department does not consider Land and Water Conservation Funds 'obligated' until a project has completed all levels of review and has been given official Federal approval. . . . Our survey shows that an overwhelming majority of the states will have committed all or nearly all of their apportionment by the end of the fiscal year and will have either no funds or a very minimal level of carryover to begin fiscal year 1974. In short, the great majority of the states are being penalized because of unused balances reflected in a bookkeeping procedure. The states being penalized, in fact, are

those operating efficient and effective programs." I was intrigued.

I conducted my own survey of the Federal programs. As I learned, the National Park Service in 1973 had available \$132,934,000 for purchase of recreation land, but was given an "obligational ceiling" by the Administration of \$53,460,000. Could the agency have put a greater amount to good use? In response to my specific question on this point, the Park Service advised that it is geared to operate at a purchasing level of \$90 million per year. "Since 1968 we have been successful in spending virtually the full amount for land acquisition from the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The only unbudgeted carryover in recent years has resulted from fiscal restraints (in other words, impoundments) placed on the appropriation."

Where would this money be spent? Priorities would be given to land acquisition in the Big Cypress, bordering the Florida Everglades, and the Big Thicket in Texas, two critical areas which Congress is expected to authorize in this session; recently established areas such as the Buffalo National River, the Delaware Water Gap, and the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and, finally older national parks, where private "inholdings" are sprouting into commercial subdivisions and causing serious problems of pollution and limited access.

The Park Service actually could proceed to acquire all inholdings inside park boundaries for \$97,557,000 without any additional legislation, but funds have been withheld rather than primed into the pump. Meanwhile, land values are skyrocketing. As Representative Taylor warns:

"It can hardly be a savings to the taxpayer if Federal lands are not managed in a prudent fashion and for the good of all the people. The authorization of parks and recreation areas is meaningless if funds are not available to convert them into reality. It is not fair to the landowners to cloud their titles with authorizations that are not going to be funded. It is not fair to communities to hamper their plans for orderly growth. It is not fair to the American people who rely on Congress and the President to protect and preserve our nation's national assets once they are authorized.

"Every delay means the American people will get less land for the same dollars. What is more important, irreversible adverse developments tend to encroach on these lands and to destroy the very values Congress is trying to protect."

The Forest Service has employed LWCF as the cornerstone of an intensive and constructive program to solidify its holdings in wilderness areas, national recreation areas, wild and scenic rivers, and national trails. My files show that five years ago, as of June 21, 1968, the Forest Service had already purchased or contracted for purchase a total of 256,479 acres through the LWCF, with an additional 50,000 acres under option to acquire. Approximately 90 percent were in the Eastern United States, within three hours' driving time of at least one major population center of 50,000 or larger.

From then to March 16, 1973, total acquisition by the Forest Service has risen to 670,872 acres. The agency was geared to spend \$50 million per year until the Administration imposed the ceiling. It is hurting already; as the Service advised me: "In all areas where recreation lands are being acquired, prices are escalating and land is rapidly being developed for other purposes."

Rep. Taylor has been an eyewitness to this process in his own Congressional district of western North Carolina, where the Appalachian Trail, the noted "footpath in the wilderness," follows the high crest through the Pisgah and Nantahala National Forests (as well as the Great Smoky Moun-

tains National Park). He has been quoted as saying:

"I have never seen anything like it. Developers are moving in as never before, purchasing large tracts high in the mountains. They are thinking of ski runs and various types of subdivisions. Strong conflicts with the AT are inevitable. We must proceed as rapidly as possible in obtaining rights-of-way."

I wish someone in the Administration had said that. I wish those in high places would demonstrate in deed, as well as word, that conservation and recreation on public lands have been given a high priority. Policy decisions in such issues should not be left to the OMB, an agency divorced from resource husbandry and insulated from public concerns.

It is not yet too late to chart a new course. I may be critical of yesterday's actions, but am hopeful of more positive happenings for tomorrow.

For example, there is now a new and promising Endangered Species Act. To some species, land acquisition is absolutely essential if they are to survive. Unless funds are made available at the right time, in the right place, and in the right amount, critically endangered species are apt to face extinction. For other threatened species, continued existence will remain precarious until new habitat can be acquired and repopulated. As the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife advised me, "A delay in funding also means sharply inflated costs, further intrusion and deterioration of endangered-species habitat, and greater stress on already beleaguered species."

Why not make the most of the new Endangered Species Act in a manner that outdoorsmen and all Americans will cheer? Until now the BSWF has made the most of its modest acquisition funds. Now, as the causes and remedies for endangerment become more clearly known, the need for acquisition money is likely to increase. The new legislation also carries the prospect of permitting acquisition of habitat for rare species before they are pointed downhill on that final road to extinction.

There is also considerable promise implicit in the new Nationwide Outdoor Recreation Plan, issued by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation as a guide to Federal, state, and local governments, and to private interests as well. Some experts have found reasons for criticism, and perhaps rightly so. Nevertheless, I found a lot of good ideas in it.

For example, the Plan advocates special protection for "areas of critical concern," such as coastal zones and estuaries, shorelines and flood plains of rivers, streams, islands, rare and valuable natural areas, and scenic and historic areas. It supports LWCF funding to enlarge the range of state and local projects. It discusses the need to study carrying capacity of natural and scenic areas in order to protect and perpetuate their basic character and recreation quality.

The nationwide plan is detailed in a rather slick publication titled *Outdoor Recreation—A Legacy for America* (available from the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, at \$3.45 per copy). In due course, the plan must be presented to Congress for review and acceptance, with or without serious revision or overhaul. All I will say, for the present, is that it deserves close scrutiny. Maybe it needs it, too.

The same should be said for the whole Land and Water Conservation Fund process. Conservationists thought the increase of the Fund to \$300 million annually was a landmark victory. Then the victory was lost, at least for awhile, in the backrooms. Government is no better than the people who watch it. And the more watchers at the grassroots, the better it will be.

EXPERIMENTAL NEW TOWNS AROUND THE WORLD

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, a particularly perceptive and interesting article by Mr. Leon B. Sager on experimental new towns appeared in the February issue of *PHP-International*. Because of the continuing and necessary interest in the history of cities, and the recognized need for the development of new cities in the United States which accommodate both nature and man, I would like to recommend this article to my colleagues.

The article follows:

EXPERIMENTAL NEW TOWNS AROUND THE WORLD

(By Leon B. Sager)

Since the beginning of time nature has presented man with his greatest challenges. He has built his civilization by mastering nature and drawing on its vast resources. But in his devotion to human progress he has often destroyed nature. Lately he has awakened to the realization that nature, too, is essential to his well-being. Contamination of the air and water and other forms of "progress" now threaten the very environment on which he depends for life.

Ours is an age of urbanization and motorization for which older cities are simply not prepared. Higher density and narrow streets have been on a collision course. Pollution alone has reached the stage where in Los Angeles physicians are telling some of their patients to move away. In Tokyo traffic policemen are often required to wear gas masks. Gas masks were also recently ordered for 50,000 workers employed in the petrochemical plants in the vicinity of Venice, Italy.

Evidence is accumulating that, at least in part, pollution as well as unplanned and excessive urban concentration can be avoided; that it is possible to achieve a healthier environment for living. With the development of technology, transportation, and communication, governments can now guide growth in a more enlightened and beneficial way.

The controlled growth movement started at the turn of the century when Ebenezer Howard laid out the original greenbelt around London. The first satellite new towns were created. Not only has England continued to expand in this direction; the whole Western world has followed and the movement has spread to Asia as well. Spectacular evidence of the shift from conventional urbanization to the planned community is provided by New Delhi and Chandigarh in India, Petaling Jaya, in Malaysia, and the satellite towns surrounding Singapore, in Indonesia.

New communities limit private automobile usage. In its place paths for walking and bicycling as well as public transportation are provided. Many European cities have set up streets exclusively for walkers: for example, Amsterdam, Cologne, Copenhagen, The Hague, Stockholm, and Barcelona. New York City, Philadelphia, Chicago, and Los Angeles are experimenting with the idea, and the movement is growing.

One example of the new towns is Stevenage in Britain. Stevenage is a planned community 30 miles north of London. Six large neighborhoods of 10,000 persons each were built in a semicircle around the town center, and each of them is provided with its own shopping center of four to 12 shops. The main shopping center is reached for the most part by bus, bicycle, or pedestrian walkway. By

1972, more than 18,000 industrial workers were employed in the 400 acres devoted to industry on the west side of town. Of all employed residents of Stevenage, 85 per cent work inside the town.

But even in Britain, which has the longest history of new town building, vast changes have been found necessary. Perhaps the most important change has been in size: Harlow and Stevenage have doubled their original population while Milton Keynes, the most recent new town, is planned for 250,000 residents.

Citizens of satellite cities also require efficient, rapid transit to central cities. The movement to meet this problem coupled with the effort to solve congestion, pollution, discomfort, and loss of time is worldwide. It takes the form of the greatest construction of subways in history, greatly expanded provision of buses including exclusive bus lanes, and a variety of new people-moving devices such as guided-rail lines, monorails, and a dial-a-bus service. Massive efforts are underway to find new solutions by employment of science and technology.

There are many European examples of comprehensive community planning. In Belgrade, for example, the response to central city congestion was to move across the Danube and erect a whole new city on 10,000 acres of agricultural land, of which 40 per cent is in parklands with broad open spaces along the river-front for museums, exhibition halls, and public buildings. Another planned community immediately adjacent to an established city is Esposizione Roma (E. U. R.) which is only 15 to 20 minutes ride by rapid transit from the center of Rome and close to the airport and the Mediterranean. An attractive city of 100,000 has arisen. At the center, an artificial lake is surrounded by promenades and gardens. The subway station opens onto the lake front.

France has designated eight growth centers in a nationwide regional urbanization plan to counter the attraction of Paris. Ten new communities are planned or have been started in less congested parts of the country. Sweden provides an example of metropolitan development that encompasses both the old city and the suburbs. In Stockholm, it has been public policy since the early part of the century to buy property outside its borders in anticipation of long-term growth. A series of small suburbs of 10,000 to 15,000 people, and an occasional main center of 50,000 to 100,000 people were created, all with easy access to Stockholm.

The new town movement is about to come of age in America. Powerful forces—public and private, natural and directed—are converging all over the U.S. The decade of the Seventies will see scores, if not hundreds, of new developments spring up, transforming not just the physical landscape, inside and outside of cities, but the human affairs of millions of Americans as well.

Many of the new cities are being built entirely by private entrepreneurs, among them Columbia, Maryland and Reston, Virginia, both near Washington, D.C. The federal government began sponsoring a movement to aid in the development of new communities and to guide further urban growth in 1968. Legislation under the direction of the Department of Housing and Urban Development provided loan guarantees totaling \$250 million, enlarged two years later to \$500 million. Individual new communities may apply for loan guarantees as high as \$50 million. Fifteen new communities have been approved; 20 more are in the process of final application.

One such community is The Woodlands, Texas, a 17,000 acre forest tract 28 miles north of Houston, Texas. More than one million dollars was invested privately in master planning the new town. One of every four acres will be preserved as open space or developed as recreation areas. Land use, sewage treatment systems, storm drainage, roadways

and paths have been designed to assure minimum air, ground and water pollution. Seven villages and a town center are planned, the residential areas to contain 49,000 dwelling units on 6,200 acres. They will provide a mix of income and ethnic groups in both homeowner and rental dwellings. The Woodlands, which anticipates a population of 150,000 people, has received a \$50 million loan guarantee.

The sudden worldwide environmental concern is culminating for many in a new interest and involvement in their communities. Life enrichment, if not sheer survival, requires that all individuals learn to give part of their time to social planning. Though, ultimately, this must extend to the region, the state, the nation, and the world, a good place to start is one's own community.

A good example is Santa Barbara, California. Internationally known for its beauty, the city's quality of life has become endangered by a dramatic increase in population, mostly new residents. The expansion rate between 1960 and 1970 was twice that of the state and four times that of the nation. Confronted with the conversion of pleasant orchards and open land to drab unplanned housing and commercial units, Santa Barbara faces the question: Can rapid growth and poorly planned urbanization be stopped?

Fortunately, there is among the citizenry a strong motivated group of capable and concerned individuals willing to devote a large amount of time to civic affairs. Recognizing that the basic problem was land usage, citizen groups developed a movement to create coordinated country and city general plans. Many thousands of citizens belong to such organizations as the Citizens Planning Association, the Committee for Santa Barbara, and the Community Environmental Council, to name a few. Their efforts to control growth are beginning to show results.

Concerned citizens groups have found that even political bodies cannot necessarily be relied upon. Politicians must be persuaded and sometimes threatened with loss of political position to act for the overall community interest. When politicians fail to provide desired legislation, Californians have developed an effective technique, the Initiative. To accomplish their ends, the state legislature and local governments can be forced to put measures the people demand on the ballot. An example is the Coastal Zone Conservation Act, passed in November 1972, to preserve the ocean front from excessive development.

Highly motivated citizens must create planning organizations for both specific objectives and city and regional planning in general. They are almost certain to find many other citizens equally concerned and willing to join with them. All are likely to feel the satisfaction of achievements which they can see before them. This is in contrast with wider efforts over which they have less influence or which take a long time in accomplishment.

Local citizenship groups must enlarge to regional, state and national organizations. An example is the New York State Urban Development Corporation. Empowered to issue one billion dollars of bonds, UDC is engaged in the construction of four new cities as well as the modernization and expansion of over 50 presently existing cities. The basic procedure is to prepare the plans, then engage private industry for the building.

In the United States several national citizen groups have been created, one by a former member of the President's Cabinet. *Common Cause* was developed by John W. Gardner, previously Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Perhaps equal in status is *Public Citizen, Inc.*, created by the remarkable young consumer advocate, Ralph Nader.

Improving the living environment is no easy task. Inevitably disagreements on goals and methods arise; desired objectives, even after seemingly endless efforts, are not achieved. Similarly difficult is the task of building new towns and cities. But the rewards are great and the countless instances of significant achievement account for the acceleration of the movement worldwide. It is a means by which organized effort can enhance, rather than diminish, the quality of life.

CUBA AND THE SOVIET UNION

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on May 14 the Heritage Foundation sponsored a Capitol Hill seminar dealing with critical problems in Latin America. Particularly interesting was the statement on Cuba by Dr. Leon Goure, director of Soviet studies at the Center for Advanced International Studies at the University of Miami.

Dr. Goure's presentation—which sets forth the great extent Cuba is tied economically, militarily, and politically to the Soviet Union—undercuts the view that a resumption of United States-Cuban relations will significantly shift Cuba's alignment with Moscow.

According to Dr. Goure, the Kremlin is subsidizing the Cuban economy to the tune of \$1.5 to \$2 million per day. Cuba's total indebtedness to Moscow is now estimated at \$5 billion, which Cuba will begin to repay in 1986 over a 25-year period.

The Soviet aid program does not stop here, however. Since Castro seized power, the Soviet Union has provided the Cuban armed forces with some \$2.5 to \$3 billion in equipment. Most of this was provided free of charge.

In the political arena, Cuba's foreign policy is little more than a carbon copy of the Moscow line. In 1968, Castro endorsed the invasion of Czechoslovakia. In 1973, at a conference of nonaligned nations, Castro was a staunch supporter of the Soviet Union and its foreign policy.

Such strong ties make any significant break between Cuba and the Soviet Union highly unlikely. Following is the text of Dr. Goure's May 14 statement.

SOVIET-CUBAN RELATIONS

(By Dr. Leon Goure)

During his visit to Cuba in January-February 1974 Brezhnev hailed Cuba not only as being a constituent part of the world socialist system, but also as becoming increasingly integrated into the "socialist community" led by Moscow. As on a number of previous occasions he again stressed that the Cuban revolution has become "irreversible," and that "revolutionary Cuba has never been and will never be alone," but could count on continuous Soviet support to ensure its interests and safeguard its security. By his visit and in his speeches in January 1974 Brezhnev once more gave the Soviet seal of approval to the Castro regime and its domestic as well as foreign policies, and reflected Soviet satisfaction with the process of Cuba's integration into the Soviet bloc.

Cuba holds a special place in that bloc and over the past 15 years has posed particu-

lar problems for the Soviet Union which differ in important respects from those posed for Soviet relations with other friendly communist countries. In particular, Cuba has been a unique test for Soviet ability to support, protect, control and integrate a communist country which is not only geographically remote from the Soviet Union and non-contiguous to other communist states, but which is also on the doorstep of the Soviet Union's main competitor, the United States, and in a region generally believed to be of primary US interest and influence. These peculiarities have made Soviet control over Castro's regime and the integration of Cuba into the Soviet-led communist bloc more complex, difficult and expensive than had been the case with the Eastern European communist states.

Nevertheless, the process of Cuba's integration has been unrelenting and has become accelerated since 1968, so that at the present time Brezhnev can truthfully assert that Cuba has become an integral part of the socialist community, anchored to it by increasingly strong political, economic and security ties. In recent years Cuba's political alignment with the Soviet Union and its support for Moscow's foreign policy have become increasingly consistent and firm. In 1968 Castro endorsed the invasion of Czechoslovakia, and thereafter he has supported the Soviet line in the Middle East, vis-a-vis China and in Latin America. At the September 1973 conference of non-aligned nations Castro proved to be a staunch spokesman for the Soviet Union and its foreign policy.

At the same time, with Soviet prodding, the Castro regime has taken a more orthodox political line in domestic policies, the government has been reorganized to permit a more stable management of Cuba's economy and stronger centralized planning. The role of the Cuban Communist Party has been enhanced and it is now preparing to hold its first congress in 1975. These internal changes were publicly lauded by Brezhnev in January, when he stressed that Cuba now has entered a phase of positive economic and social construction which will be carried out on a "tried and tested socialist basis."

The joint communique issued in February expressed Soviet approval of the work done in improving the organizational structure of the party, in strengthening its role in Cuban society and economic planning and in educating the people in the spirit of orthodox Marxism-Leninism. It also pointed out that this process would be reinforced by increasingly close contacts between the Soviet and Cuban communist parties. The Soviet interest in a strong Cuban Communist Party runs along orthodox Soviet lines, reflects Moscow's efforts to ensure that its influence in Cuba would persist regardless of whether Castro heads the regime or not.

The strongest factor ensuring Soviet influence in and control over Cuba has been and continues to be economic. It is in this area that growing Cuban integration into the Soviet bloc and Cuba's dependence on Soviet support are most clearly reflected. Since Castro came to power Soviet aid has been the mainstay of the Cuban economy and of its development, so that today the major part of Cuba's industry has been built or re-equipped with Soviet machinery. Cuba's dependence on the Soviet Union and other communist countries is reflected in its trade. In 1972 Cuba's trade with the Soviet Union amounted to \$992.5 million, or 47.9 percent out of Cuba's total foreign trade of an approximate total of \$2.1 billion while the share of all communist countries' total Cuban trade amounted to 69.2 percent (\$1.451 billion). In 1973 Cuba's volume of trade with the Soviet Union reached some \$1.4 billion and in 1974, according to agreements, it is expected to amount to some \$1.6 billion.

Since 1960 Soviet exports to Cuba have

steadily grown, reaching some \$743 million in 1972, or 57.5 percent of Cuba's imports. Cuba is especially dependent on the Soviet Union for oil, with deliveries amounting to nearly 7 million tons per year in 1972 sold at below world market price (a total of 62.9 million tons since 1960), as well as machinery, rolled ferrous metals, non-ferrous metals, fertilizer, lumber, grain and flour and other foods. The Cuban trade program with the Soviet Union is specifically tied to the Soviet Five Year Plan. Because Cuba's sugar production has never reached planned output targets, Cuba's balance of trade with the Soviet Union has been consistently unfavorable to Cuba. At the present time, Cuba's balance of trade deficit with the Soviet Union exceeds \$3 billion.

In 1972 Moscow agreed to defer repayments on this deficit until 1986 and granted Cuba a new credit of some \$350 million for industrial development, notably for the construction of a new nickel complex to help Cuba's nickel production from 36,000 tons to 90,000 tons by 1980. To achieve this goal Cuba will require eventually an investment of some \$600 million. Cuba's total indebtedness to the Soviet Union, including credits, grants, loans and the cost of Soviet advisers and technicians is estimated at \$5 billion, which Cuba will begin to repay in 1986 over a 25-year period. It should be noted that this debt would have been even larger had not Moscow subsidized Cuba's sugar prices at above the world market price as well as agreed to pay \$5,000 per ton for nickel.

In brief, the Soviet Union subsidizes the Cuban economy at the rate of \$1.5-\$2 million per day. In addition, Cuba has also an unfavorable balance of trade with other communist countries which furthermore have granted it various credits and loans and provided a substantial number of technicians. Despite the economic burden of supporting Cuba, it is fairly evident that from the Soviet point of view the political and strategic advantages of maintaining a communist Cuba outweigh the economic costs.

In July 1972 Cuba became a full member of the Eastern European Council for Mutual Economic Assistance or CEMA (COMECON). As a result, the 27th CEMA session pointed out that "Cuba will take an active part in the implementation of the comprehensive program of socialist integration" and participate in the economic program of the 9-countries-bloc according to the "international division of socialist labor." Concerning this development Brezhnev noted in his speech in January that Cuba's "cooperation with the fraternal countries keeps growing. . . . All this . . . makes Cuba still stronger, all this facilitates further success of the world socialist system."

As against the communist bloc, Cuba's trade with non-communist developed countries constitutes only 25.1 percent of the total Cuban trade (\$526 million). Havana's main trading partners are Japan with a total trade in 1972 of \$187.3 million, Canada with \$72.37 million, Spain with \$65.67 million, Great Britain with \$58 million and France with \$39.8 million. Cuba's trade with Latin America in 1972 amounted to \$9.6 million. The balance of trade in 1972 was favorable to Cuba only in its trade with Japan and Spain.

It should be noted that except for Cuba's international sugar quota of some 2.4 million tons, all the rest of its sugar production is committed to the communist countries in repayment for imports from them. The same is also true of Cuba's nickel export, with the Soviet share showing a sharp increase since the early 1970's. The point is that Cuba is heavily in debt to communist countries, has at present no surpluses to generate significant additional earnings of hard currency, and consequently remains dependent on foreign credits, especially credits

from communist countries. Even so, its ability to repay these credits is limited and would be altogether impossible if the Soviet Union had not agreed to defer repayments until 1986. Furthermore, Cuba is heavily dependent on the Soviet Union and other communist countries for critical materials which it cannot obtain elsewhere, especially in view of its lack of foreign exchange. This applies in particular to oil, non-ferrous metals, fertilizer, lumber, wheat and flour.

The Soviet support has been also essential to assure Cuba's security, although the Soviet Union has no formal defense treaty with Cuba. Over the years, the Soviet Union has equipped and reequipped the Cuban armed forces, mostly free of charge, to the tune of some \$2.5 to \$3 billion. In his speech on January 30 Brezhnev said that "as is known, the Soviet Union is helping Cuba in strengthening her defenses." Cuba is not only militarily one of the strongest countries in Latin America, but remains a potential base for the Soviet armed forces, as is evident from the Soviet effort in 1970 to establish a nuclear submarine base at Cienfuegos, the staging of Soviet long-range reconnaissance aircraft through Cuba, the frequent visits to the island by Soviet naval units and so on.

Although Moscow has generally come out in favor of the recognition of Cuba by the US, such a development would be, in the stated Soviet views, an admission by the US of the irreversibility of communism in Cuba and a forced change in US policy resulting from the increased readiness of Latin America to deal with Castro as a gesture of defiance of and independence from Washington. Thus, while the recognition of Cuba by the US is pictured in advance as a victory for Castro and world communism, and as giving a further impetus to the "anti-imperialist national liberation struggle in Latin America, Soviet spokesmen at the same time take pains to deny that there has been any change in Cuba's attitude to relations with the US or that the resumption of US-Cuban relations would entail such a change.

Essentially, Moscow endorses the Cuban demands that:

1. The embargo on trade be lifted as a pre-condition for the initiation of negotiations on the resumption of US-Cuban relations;
2. Guantanamo be returned to Cuba and the US cease all anti-Cuban "subversion," and
3. The negotiations include not only the narrow issue of US-Cuban relations, but as Castro has promised, the issue of the US "imperialist" role and its "criminal" policies in Latin America. The joint statement issued on February 4, 1974, in connection with Brezhnev's visit to Cuba states:

"The Soviet Union resolutely demands an end to the economic and political and other hostile actions taken against socialist Cuba. It reiterates that it considers the demand of the Republic of Cuba for the unconditional removal of the American Guantanamo naval base on its territory as lawful and just, and fully supports this demand."

Moscow has also publicly endorsed Castro's insistence that the Latin American countries form their own association which would exclude the US and his view that the OAS is an instrument of Yankee "imperialism." The Soviet position is that such purely Latin American states organizations can serve as an effective instrument for the region's "anti-imperialist" struggle against the US. Of course, Moscow hopes that a resumption of US-Cuban relations would stampede the majority of the OAS members, who at present oppose the resumption of relations, to follow suit.

While the Soviet Union asserts that the lifting of the embargo on trade with Cuba is in accord with the desire for detente, it must be kept in mind that according to

the explicitly stated Soviet interpretation of detente or as Moscow calls it—"peaceful co-existence"—the "anti-imperialist national liberation struggle in the Third World, including Latin America, which is identified as being the "strategic rear" of the US, is specifically excluded from its provisions and rules of inter-state relations. On the contrary, Soviet leaders persist in asserting that detente does not serve to preserve international stability but rather facilitates the upsurge of the revolutionary and national liberation struggle. Soviet spokesmen persist in asserting that Cuba must play an important role in that struggle. Furthermore, it appears from current Soviet assessment of Cuba that the Soviet leaders do not fear that Castro may become another Tito or Sadat, i.e., they believe Soviet-Cuban ties to be sufficiently firm as to make unlikely any significant shift in Cuba's alignment with the Soviet Union as a result of a resumption of US-Cuban relations.

SENIOR CITIZENS AND OUR FLAG

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, last week-end I had the opportunity to present a 13 star Betsy Ross flag to residents of the Cheshire Rehabilitation Convalescent Center in Cheshire, Conn.

The residents of the center gave me a warm welcome which I deeply appreciated. The presentation of the flag had been made at the request of the citizens last winter under the able guidance of the recreation director, Mrs. J. A. Shay. Therefore, when I arrived at the center, I already had the feeling that their individuals were indeed fine and outgoing citizens who love their country.

The owners of the center, Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Barth were most hospitable. I enjoyed the guided tour of this beautiful and well-run facility by its administrator, Andrew Barth, Jr. However, the highlight of my day was when one of the residents, Robert Currie, presented me with a wooden plaque on which he decoupage his original poem. This gesture, as well as the inspiring poem itself, made me realize how fortunate we are that we do live under the Stars and Stripes. I would like to share with you Mr. Currie's poem, as I think it will reinforce the feeling of patriotism that all of us have:

FLAG DEDICATION

(Written for this occasion by Robert A. Currie, May 1974)

Looking from my window in dawn's early light
I see the new flag, what a glorious sight
As it whips and flutters in the morning breeze,
Its bright stars and stripes among the leafy trees,
Enhancing the scenery one hundred fold,
Uplifts the heart, and gives strong feelings untold;
The beauty enraptures the soul, and you think
That those colors so radiant do strongly link
Your life here on earth to do nobly and good,
Upholding all laws, as true citizens should.

May we, while honoring this new flag today
Be greatly heartened, and uplifted, and pray
That this greatest emblem of our beloved land
May not be in disarray, and we may stand
Before the world, a land of honor and truth
Dedicated to life, liberty and youth,
The pursuit of happiness, and all things good;
All this should be whole heartedly understood.
Let us not be boastful of our many deeds,
But feel proud to belong to a nation that leads.
Remember to salute this noble emblem,
The Stars and Stripes, let there be no dissembling;
Oh: glorious banner of great and noble land
Honored are thou, now, forever may you stand
Fluttering in the breezes,—both high or low
Putting on an excellent, colorful show.
The Stars and Stripes, also, the Red, White, and Blue
Adorned as they are, just need no other hue
We stand or fall as we hear the magic call,
My country, right or wrong, what e'er may befall.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, over 100 years ago, Alexis de Tocqueville wrote of a young America:

What most astonishes me is not so much the marvelous grandeur of some undertaking as the innumerable multitude of small ones.

These words are especially appropriate this week as the country pays a deserved tribute to America's 8.8 million small business enterprises by observing National Small Business Week.

The independent and innovative spirit which built this Nation is alive and well today in the form of almost 9 million neighborhood markets, stores, and services. This vital sector of our national life is responsible for an annual contribution of over \$476 billion to the gross national product and approximately 35 million jobs.

In this age of conglomerates and multinational cartels, it is well to remember that 95 percent of American firms are small businesses. As the Exxons and the ITT's seek and too often receive special favors from government, we cannot forget that the backbone of our prosperity is constituted by the many small businessmen who ask very little and, without legions of lobbyists, often receive far less.

As we confront the great issues of our time, perhaps we in the Congress should remember to "think little," as a poet said. Americans who have sought a free means of achievement to contribute something in their own way deserve more from their Government than just a National Small Business Week.

NAHB RESOLUTION ON EMERGENCY ECONOMIC AND HOUSING POLICY

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Home Builders is one of the Nation's better known and more respected organizations. Its membership reaches into every congressional district and into most of the cities of the land.

During the week, many of us in Congress were privileged to meet with members of NAHB from our home districts. The Florida delegation in Congress joined the Florida members of NAHB at a luncheon in the speaker's dining room on Tuesday. During the course of the luncheon, we exchanged viewpoints and we were impressed with the grasp which NAHB members have on the problems of the American economy.

Of particular interest to our delegation was a resolution from the executive and resolutions committees of NAHB entitled "Emergency Economic and Housing Policy." I feel that it should be called to the attention of the membership of Congress and I am glad to submit it for printing in the RECORD:

EMERGENCY ECONOMIC AND HOUSING POLICY

America's economy is in imminent danger. It is distorted, unbalanced, and gripped in a wave of damaging inflation.

In this extraordinarily critical period of combined recession and inflation, we find a lack of fiscal responsibility, high and unnecessary government spending, and unrealistic reliance upon tight money policies.

Such sole reliance upon monetary policy to stem inflation has failed in the past. It is failing now. Inflation is feeding on inflationary expectations. Business loan demand and government deficit borrowing are not restrained. Interest rates rise unchecked to record-breaking and inevitably ruinous levels.

Housing, a major segment of the economy is being disproportionately depressed by the inequities and inequalities of these policies.

To reduce inflation and to restore a healthy, stable economy, all segments of our society must be prepared and willing to accept an equitable share of the measures necessary to accomplish this. We, therefore, urge these immediate actions:

Establishment of a system of priorities of allocation of financial resources, and holding the line on unnecessary government spending—Federal, state, and local alike—which would lead toward balanced budgets.

Institution of a system of credit allocation to create a more equitable flow to those sectors of the economy hardest hit.

Creation of a Capital Issues Committee which would govern, regulate, and moderate the flow of borrowing demands in the market place.

Reinstitution of some form of economic controls to the end that there would be firm monitoring, at least, of wage and price adjustments.

A less restrictive money policy than that now being followed.

Of all the major sectors of the economy hit by the unbridled surge of inflation, housing—singled out by the President as one of those rare areas where the Government must be of assistance—is being throttled the most. As an interim measure, therefore,

in the battle to contain inflation, we again urge passage of emergency mortgage credit legislation containing more realistic mortgage limits to avoid irreparable damage to this vital element of the economy, damage which can only in turn affect all other elements.

STUDENT BUILDS SOLAR OVEN

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, although he has not yet attempted a quiche or a roast, a young Texan has produced a loaf of solar-baked bread, and he has produced it from an oven he spent 3 weeks building in a junior high industrial arts class.

The message is clear—the age of solar energy is coming and its practical applications are boundless.

The student is 14 year old Robert Defoe of Austin, Tex. His efforts have already won him first place in the Texas State Industrial Arts Fair. I send to him my highest congratulations as well, and I know that the many of us here interested in the prospects of solar energy can join in the praise this young man deserves.

I am pleased the first energy bill recently passed by the House was the landmark solar research and demonstration bill now pending in the Senate. I am pleased to have been a cosponsor of that legislation. And I am pleased to see young Mr. Defoe stepping out on his own in this field.

A recent article in the Austin American-Statesman explains more about Robert Defoe's solar oven, and I would like to reprint it at this time.

PUPIL EXTRACTS ENERGY, PRIZES BY SOLAR OVEN

A 14-year-old Porter Junior High School student has taken metal, glass, insulation and a little work, put them together, and gotten something free—usable heat from sunlight.

Robert Defoe's project is an award-winning solar oven that heats from 60 degrees Fahrenheit to 350 degrees in 15 minutes using only sunlight.

Temperatures in the oven are regulated by moving the panels in and out. Although those temperatures are not exact, the heat can be approximated—so much that Defoe added another creation to his oven—a loaf of solar-baked bread.

The oven heats up just like a car parked in the sun with rolled-up windows, he explained. "The sunlight goes through the glass," he said, "but the heat is reflected back inside." Because it depends on sun, Defoe has used the oven outside only, but theorizes it might be used by a sunlit window.

Defoe built the oven as a project in his industrial arts class, taught by R. K. Wimberly. "It took about three weeks to build it," he said, using only class time.

After he had completed it and tried it out, he said, he entered it in the regional industrial arts fair. It won first place. Next it was entered in the state arts fair, and again it won first place.

Speaking of Defoe, industrial arts teacher Wimberly said he is "one of the finest kids I've ever taught in my life. They just don't

make 'em like that." Wimberly has been teaching industrial arts for 27 years.

Defoe is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph G. Defoe, 3707 Wilson Drive. He is in the eighth grade.

SYRIA ROLLS OUT WELCOME MAT

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday afternoon, May 1, President Hafez Asad of Syria told me—

You have my mandate to invite Members of the United States Congress—House and Senate—to visit Syria as soon as possible. They will be most welcome.

We want those who are critical as well as those who are friends to come. We feel this is a way to understand each other and our mutual problems.

President Asad made the comments at the conclusion of a 30-minute interview in the reception room of his office in Damascus.

His invitation had significance because official communication between the Governments of the United States and Syria had only recently been resumed after a 7-year break—and then on a limited basis.

Mine was the first visit to Syria by a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives since the June 1967 war. The only occasion when a U.S. Senator entered Syria was several months ago when Senator JAMES ABOUREZK visited Damascus.

I made the visit en route to Aden, and despite the brevity of my stay, had the privilege of a lengthy discussion with the Foreign Minister of Syria, 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam; a meeting with the Syrian Parliament's Foreign Affairs Committee; a tour of the Parliament building; and a luncheon hosted by the committee chairman, Muhammad Adnan Kilami; in addition to the meeting with the President.

The group attending the luncheon included the senior U.S. diplomat in Syria, Thomas J. Scotes, head of the U.S. interest section in the Italian Embassy; Anis Khattab, assistant director of the U.S. desk in the Syria Foreign Office; Wajed Ahdab, personal secretary to Speaker Muhammad al-Halabi of the Syrian Parliament; and these parliamentarians: Dr. Subhi Tahe, Dr. Badr al-Din Khoja, and M. Said Satli.

I traveled the bumpy road from Beirut to Damascus by car the afternoon of April 30, arriving in the Syrian capital at dusk. The ride enabled me to see the Golan Heights for the first time from the Syrian side—and the Syrian perspective, hear the steady thud of aerial bombardment around Mount Hermon, enjoy the spectacular scenery of both Lebanon and Syria, and experience the bureaucracy and paperwork of crossing the border in both directions. The driver of the car, who had crossed the border several times in recent weeks, said the Syrian security officers gave him a noticeably warmer welcome than on previ-

ous crossings—doubtless a sign of the new warmth engendered by the shuttles between Damascus and Tel Aviv by U.S. Secretary of State Kissinger which were to commence the following Sunday.

The day also gave me a glimpse of high spirit and optimism in the small U.S. diplomatic staff ably led by Mr. Scotes and several glimpses of the high spirit and optimism of the Syrian people—notably the May Day parade which included impressive groups of Boy Scouts, girls in uniform, bands, and military units.

Although engaged in daily conflict with Israeli forces in the Golan area, the nation impressed me as one expecting an early and fair settlement.

President Asad is a tall, thickset man with a warm, gentle manner. He is very soft-spoken.

At the outset of my interview, I told him that I appreciated his willingness to meet with me on such short notice for several reasons—the military problems with Israel undoubtedly put heavy demands on his time, and the fact of military support to Israel by the U.S. Congress must be a source of great pain and bitterness. At no point was there even the slightest touch of harshness, sarcasm, or resentment in his remarks.

I opened the discussion by declaring that good relations between the United States and Syria can be established and sustained only if Syrian policies are understood and supported broadly in the Congress and throughout America.

Two factors, I added, recently caused U.S. citizens to be aware of the Middle East, including Syria. One was the oil embargo which hit home in the form of a gasoline shortage and long lines at gas stations. The other was the alert of U.S. forces during the October war, which raised the very unwelcome possibility in the minds of many that the United States might become directly involved in the fighting. Both factors made improved relations with Syria important.

I said that misconceptions about Syria are still widely held in the United States, including Congress. Many of my colleagues regard Syria as hostile to the United States and unwelcome to American visitors. I said:

When a Foreign Affairs subcommittee last December discussed a trip to the Middle East, several Congressmen expressed doubt that they would be welcome in Damascus.

Visitors must be made to feel welcome, even in the absence of formal diplomatic relations.

President Nixon and Secretary Kissinger can only do so much in establishing foreign policy. Broad understanding and support in the Congress is essential. If it is absent, Congress may not support what Mr. Nixon and Dr. Kissinger propose. In fact, Congress has the capacity to oppose and prevent policy the Administration wants.

In discussions with the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Syrian Parliament, I learned that there is no disagreement between you and the Parliament over foreign policy. That is not the case in Washington. Differences often occur and deadlocks sometimes develop.

That is why the broadest possible exchange of visitors—officials, educators, students and private citizens—is essential.

May I suggest some ways to establish a

foundation for enduring goodwill? Syria should establish scholarships, exchange professors, induce Congressmen and Senators to visit Syria and learn firsthand of your country and its problems.

Seek out those who are prominent in U.S. public life—especially those who aspire to the presidency. Make it appealing for them to visit Syria.

You have an excellent spokesman in Washington, Special Representative Sabah Kabbani. But you need dozens of Kabbanis.

President Asad replied:

As soon as the Foreign Office called, I immediately said I would see you. I am glad to be with you. You are welcome.

We are bitter about the guns and ammunition you provide to Israel, and why not? But bitterness is not hostility. In fact, we have very warm feelings about the American people. Despite the war, the Syrian people like Americans and have for years.

Perhaps we have made some mistakes. Perhaps we should have better public relations. I agree with what you say and recommend, and we can now start to do better.

I assured President Asad:

The American people have a sense of justice and fair play. All they need is information and understanding. At present many of them see Middle East problems as viewed from Israel.

He responded,

Come back again. Your visit this time is too short. Your next visit will be welcome.

My discussion with Foreign Minister Khaddam lasted over an hour. I presented to him the same basic points as I did later to President Asad.

The Foreign Minister, young, nattily dressed, and soft spoken—presented a thorough review of Syrian-Israeli relations since World War II.

He told me that he personally has a warm feeling for Americans. Most Syrians share that feeling. Americans must realize that Syria is fighting to recover its own territory. In that fight, Syria faces guns and ammunition supplied by the United States.

I told him that in one way the Arabs are their own worst enemies. They need to project a better public image in the United States. More Arab spokesmen need to come to the United States to explain their views on the Middle East problem.

When I left Syria for Beirut and Aden that afternoon, I felt privileged to have met some truly good friends of the American people.

PRESIDENT AGAIN REGISTERS OPPOSITION TO BUSING AND CALLS FOR REFORM OF IMPACT AID

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, very shortly we in the House will be faced with the prospect of a conference on extending the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The President recently called attention to two objectionable items in the legislation as it now stands. The first, of

course, is the matter of forced busing. The Senate amendment, as we all know, is too weak and the President concurred in this. The second item he mentioned is reform of impact aid. Some of the Members may recall that even the mild reform I attempted on the floor was voted down. I invite the Members to note the material I presented yesterday, which is found on page 16202 providing additional evidence of strange gaps in the reporting of the disbursement and receipt of funds in this program. I was pleased to see the President raise these matters and I commend the article from the Washington Star-News of May 22, 1974, to the attention of my colleagues. The news story follows:

NIXON RENEWS ANTI-BUSING PUSH

(By John Mathews)

President Nixon today renewed his support for tough anti-busing limits already passed by the House but rejected by the Senate.

"The experience of the past five years across America shows that we can dismantle dual school systems without resorting to massive forced busing," Nixon said.

In a statement, the President stopped short of saying he would veto the federal education bill if it does not contain stringent limits on federal court powers to order desegregation plans with busing.

If the bill includes some of the milder Senate-approved restrictions he previously has opposed, the President said he would veto it.

"The Senate, far from cutting bureaucratic red tape, would create 16 new bureaucratic structures, prohibit decentralization of decision-making and add cumbersome, time-consuming and restrictive administrative procedures," Nixon said.

Last week, the Senate—by one vote—rejected House busing limits that would restrict busing to the school next closest to a child's home and allow the re-opening of existing court orders requiring more extensive busing.

Instead, the Senate approved—also by one vote—a compromise worked out by Republican leader Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania and the Majority Leader Mike Mansfield of Montana.

The compromise omits the re-opener clause and restricts busing to the next closest school, but it would allow courts to order more extensive busing if it is needed to guarantee constitutional rights of minority children.

Busing foes voted for the compromise, but they say it will not stop court-ordered busing.

Conferees from the Senate and House will meet early next month to try to resolve differences between the two versions of the bill.

Nixon today also said the \$25 billion Senate bill, which received final approval on an 81-5 vote Monday, does not go as far as the House bill in merging education programs. Neither measure, he said, deals with the complete reform of the politically popular impact aid program.

his society. Every man needs to have a secure sense of accomplishment in life: a feeling that he has done something personally to remedy some of the many ills of the world. Carl Durham was a man who could have said with great satisfaction that he had many accomplishments to his credit—not in a boastful statement, but a statement of pride—but it would not have been his way to say it of himself. He was wise enough to know that a man should never be overcontented with what he or his society has.

Mr. Durham was not a "spectacular politician." He was not one of those who went in for the "press the flesh" and "kiss the babies" type of political campaigning. Rather he was a simple, dedicated man who went about his profession in an honest way. Carl Durham was the epitome of honesty. In his entire 22 years in public service there was never once a hint of scandal connected with him or his office. He was a man of very high character and dignity. The people of his North Carolina district trusted him to the utmost and that is perhaps the best claim to fame that a man may have. The residents of his area of North Carolina knew beyond any question that when it came to politics he would do what he saw as being the right thing to do and not the convenient thing to do or the popular thing to do. His term of 22 years in office points out that most of the people of his district believed in him and in his power to make decisions that affected them both directly and indirectly. He was a man to be listened to and trusted when he spoke.

Carl Durham was a worker in Congress. He was a leader. Even though the part of North Carolina that was served by Mr. Durham was one of the, if not the most, demanding areas of the State, Mr. Durham served it with grace and dignity. He did not spread his energy and ability all over the place. Rather he chose to concentrate on major areas that concerned him personally. He was twice chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, serving on the committee from the time it was first set up, and he worked to keep atomic energy and its power and use in the hands of civilians.

He considered this to be his most important contribution while he served in the Halls of Congress. He worked for the development of atomic energy and its use for peaceful purposes. His accomplishment, then, was to further the attempts of those who tried to make the world a safe place for those of all nations to live. The Bible has a verse which says "Blessed are the peacemakers," and this would seem to apply to Mr. Durham and his attempts to promote peace and also to promote the exchange of information between the various nations of the world. Also in the long list of his accomplishments was his reformation of the U.S. Army court-martial system. His attempts were to bring it into line with those used by the civilian court authorities. Prior to Mr. Durham's reformation the court had no counsel for the defendant. Mr. Durham reformed the court so that a counsel for the defendant was named. The right of appeal was also established as well as the right to have an enlisted

CARL T. DURHAM

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 16, 1974

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, the life that Carl Durham led was the personification of what every man seeks to achieve for both himself, his family, and

man on the jury if he so desires. Thus the Constitution of the United States was strengthened by the presence of Mr. Durham in the U.S. Congress.

To put this in its final analysis it could be said that Mr. Durham was not a man who promised those whom he served the sky. He simply did for them what he believed was the right and proper thing to do and, in most cases, his constituents agreed with the decisions he made. Carl Durham was not a flashy politician. His was a simple style of life. But Mr. Durham made a contribution to world peace and individual liberty in a very real and in a very distinct way. It is very hard, if not impossible, to measure the success of one man or the failure of one man. But a simple look at the duties and actions of Mr. Durham should serve to convince everyone that here was a man who loved his country, dedicated a major part of his life to its service, served it with grace and integrity, graced the Congress of the United States with dignity, and made several lasting contributions that still affect both the United States and the rest of the world in which we live. Mr. Durham lived a full and useful life. The record he left in Congress was one of remarkable achievements.

In 1959 Durham announced that he was retiring to "enjoy himself," and in view of all that he had stood for and accomplished in Congress, it was a well-deserved retirement, indeed.

North Carolina can be proud to call him one of her own, as can the United States, for Carl Durham was a man who had the ability to transcend State boundaries and to reach out to all society.

THE HARD ROAD TO WORLD ORDER—PART I

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the world today, there are many devastating reminders of the current lack of effective international cooperation. The need for such cooperation is frighteningly apparent, but little progress seems to be made in achieving it.

In the April issue of *Foreign Affairs*, Richard N. Gardner, Henry L. Moses Professor of Law and International Organization at Columbia University, has made a stimulating and profound analysis of the need for some form of world order and of the difficulties in the way of achieving it, and has proposed some concrete steps toward achieving the goal. He argues that there is now good reason for "cautious optimism."

I include herewith the first of five parts of Professor Gardner's article:

THE HARD ROAD TO WORLD ORDER

(By Richard N. Gardner)

"It was the best of times, it was the worst of times." What Dickens wrote of the last quarter of the 18th century fits the present period all too well. The quest for a world structure that secures peace, advances hu-

man rights and provides the conditions for economic progress—for what is loosely called world order—has never seemed more frustrating but at the same time strangely hopeful.

Certainly the gap has never loomed larger between the objectives and the capacities of the international organizations that were supposed to get mankind on the road to world order. We are witnessing an outbreak of shortsighted nationalism that seems oblivious to the economic, political and moral implications of interdependence. Yet never has there been such widespread recognition by the world's intellectual leadership of the necessity for cooperation and planning on a truly global basis, beyond country, beyond region, especially beyond social system. Never has there been such an extraordinary growth in the constructive potential of transnational private organizations—not just multinational corporations but international associations of every kind in which like-minded persons around the world weave effective patterns of global action. And never have we seen such an impressive array of ongoing negotiations aimed at the cooperative management of global problems. To familiar phrases like the "population explosion" and the "communications explosion" we should now add the "negotiation" explosion.

What is "worst" about our times for those who wish for rapid progress toward world order is clear enough. The United Nations is very far from being able to discharge the responsibilities assigned by its Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security. The willingness of U.N. members to risk their short-term interests for the good of the community seems at the level of the frontier town in *High Noon*, where the citizens abandoned their lawman as soon as the outlaw was released from jail. If a clear and unambiguous case of aggression came before the Security Council or General Assembly today, there would be little confidence that a majority of members would treat it as such or come to the aid of the victim. The Charter concept of collective security is obviously dead; even for consent-type "peacekeeping," little progress has been made in devising agreed constitutional and financial arrangements. Nor are the world's principal economic forums in much better shape. In contrast to the accomplishments of happier days, nobody now takes a major issue to ECOSOC, UNCTAD, GATT, IMF or OECD¹ with much hope for a constructive result. Even the European Community threatens to unravel under current economic and political pressures.

In this unhappy state of affairs, few people retain much confidence in the more ambitious strategies for world order that had wide backing a generation ago—"world federalism," "charter review," and "world peace through world law." The consensus on basic values and willingness to entrust vital interests to community judgment clearly do not exist. One need only picture a world constitutional convention including Messrs. Nixon, Brezhnev, Mao, Brandt, Pompidou, Castro, Perón, and Qaddafi, not to mention Mmes. Golda Meir and Indra Gandhi. What rules or procedures for world government could they agree on?

The same considerations suggest the doubtful utility of holding a Charter review conference. To amend the U.N. Charter requires the approval of two-thirds of the

¹ Respectively, to give their full names, the Economic and Social Council, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the International Monetary Fund, and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.

membership, including all of the five Permanent Members. If one examines carefully the attitude of U.N. members to specific proposals, one quickly discovers that the most likely consequence of wholesale revision of the Charter would be to diminish rather than enhance the strength of the organization. As in the case of the U.S. Constitution, we are more likely to make progress by pressing the existing instrument to the outer limits of its potentialities through creative use, seeking amendments only on carefully selected matters where they seem both necessary and capable of adoption by the constitutionally required majority.

Just as world federalism and charter review now seem bankrupt of possibilities, so does the old-fashioned idea of achieving "world peace through world law" by means of a greatly strengthened International Court of Justice. The members of the United Nations seem less willing than ever to entrust vital interests for decision to the 15 men at The Hague, as may be seen from the very few countries that are willing to accept the Court's compulsory jurisdiction without crippling reservations. In the two cases now before the Court—one involving the "cod war" between Iceland and the United Kingdom, the other the French nuclear tests in the Pacific—the "defendant" countries, Iceland and France, have even refused to appear. In part, this reluctance to accept the Court's jurisdiction reflects lack of confidence in the competence and independence of some of its judges, but even if all of them had the intellectual and moral qualities of Solon of Athens the deeper problem would still remain. Nations are reluctant to risk adverse judgments at the hands of third parties they cannot control; moreover, they are reluctant to commit themselves to have their controversies decided according to rules of international law that may be of doubtful legitimacy, incapable of alteration as circumstances change, and uncertain of general enforcement.

If instant world government, Charter review, and a greatly strengthened International Court do not provide the answers, what hope for progress is there? The answer will not satisfy those who seek simple solutions to complex problems, but it comes down essentially to this: The hope for the foreseeable future lies, not in building up a few ambitious central institutions of universal membership and general jurisdiction as was envisaged at the end of the last war, but rather in the much more decentralized, disorderly and pragmatic process of inventing or adapting institutions of limited jurisdiction and selected membership to deal with specific problems on a case-by-case basis, as the necessity for cooperation is perceived by the relevant nations. Such institutions of limited jurisdiction will have a better chance of doing what must be done to make a "rule of law" possible among nations—providing methods for changing the law and enforcing it as changed and developing the perception of common interests that is the prerequisite for successful cooperation.

In short, the "house of world order" will have to be built from the bottom up rather than from the top down. It will look like a great "booming, buzzing confusion," to use William James' famous description of reality, but an end run around national sovereignty, eroding it piece by piece, will accomplish much more than the old-fashioned frontal assault. Of course, for political as well as administrative reasons, some of these specialized arrangements should be brought into an appropriate relationship with the central institutions of the U.N. system, but the main thing is that the essential functions be performed.

The question is whether this more modest approach can do the job. Can it really bring mankind into the twenty-first century with reasonable prospects for peace, welfare and

human dignity? The argument thus far suggests it better had, for there seems to be no alternative. But the evidence also suggests some grounds for cautious optimism.

LAND-USE PLANNING ACT

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, in the near future, my colleagues will be asked to consider H.R. 10294, the Land-Use Planning Act. This bill passed the House Interior Committee with substantial criticism. The House Rules Committee last month refused to move this bill to the floor for consideration, protesting that field hearings had been insufficient. More recently, following 3 additional days of hearings here in Washington, D.C., the Land-Use Planning Act squeezed through Rules on a margin of one vote, reversing what I had felt to be an excellent decision.

By now, it should be clear to my colleagues that efforts within the Congress to resolve the questions of Federal involvement in land-use planning have not been enlightening so much as they have been an exercise in ramrodding through an explosive legislative package. We lack sufficient input from across the country. We have failed to avail this Congress of the experiences in those few States which already have legislative plans in effect. In those hearings which followed the defeat of the rule last month, 55 of our 72 witnesses testified against passage of a land-use bill in this Congress. Nearly every dissenting witness based arguments largely on the lack of opportunity across the country for input into this landmark legislation. They begged for field hearings, but that plea is being ignored by this Congress.

I urge my colleagues to read again the dissenting views of members of the House Interior Committee, which I shall place in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. While my own personal views opposing any form of Federal land-use legislation are well known, I believe that even those members who favor some form of Federal involvement are well advised to withhold their support of H.R. 10294 for the time being.

This Congress must give consideration and full hearing to the views and experiences of our States and the people who hold such a grave stake in the direction of land-use planning in America.

The text of the dissenting views contained in House Report No. 93-798 follows:

DISSENTING VIEWS

In his message to Congress on September 17, 1973, President Nixon stated that "land use control is perhaps the most pressing environmental issue before the nation," and on January 30, 1974, the President called passage of national land use policy legislation a "high priority" of his administration. Mr. Nixon is probably correct in referring to this bill as one of the most important before the Congress—regrettably for all of the wrong reasons.

Its importance stems from the fact that the use of land is basic to almost every type of human activity. From farming and timber supplies to homesites in urban and suburban areas, from the space a worker occupies in the factory or office building to the production of energy—everything man does requires land in one way or another.

The dangers arise, because, as we are beginning to realize in the case of air and water pollution laws, the effects of such laws go far beyond cleaning the air and water. Similarly, land-use regulatory legislation goes far beyond finding better ways to use land.

Because the authority to control land use rests with the States and their subdivisions, and because the right to own and use property is an integral part of that bundle of rights that make the term "individual liberty" meaningful in this country, the Land Use Planning Act of 1973 will have a truly momentous impact on the freedom of action of State and local governments and on our liberties.

Few people would probably disagree with the intent of H.R. 10294—to encourage and assist the States to plan for the wise and balanced use of its land resources. However, we believe that the actual provisions of this measure bear little relation to its professed intent.

The sponsors of H.R. 10294 claim that it encourages and assists the States to shoulder their responsibilities for land-use planning. In fact, it goes far beyond encouragement and assistance. Title I of the bill contains line-after-line of requirements the States must meet before the Secretary of Interior can judge their plan "adequate."

The requirements of Title I, in effect, establish a national land-use policy to be imposed upon the States under threat not only of withdrawing Federal funds for land-use planning, but also the threat of other economic sanctions. It is a fiction to speak of encouraging and assisting the States with a bill that is filled with criteria, guidelines, and suggestions for defining an "adequate" comprehensive land use planning process. In addition, should the sanctions amendment of the gentleman from Arizona (Rep. Udall) be adopted, the States would then be threatened with economic clubs should they not comply with the bill's requirements.

Importance

In order to understand the importance of this proposal, one must understand that the legislation before us is merely the first step on the road toward more public control over the use of private property. Whatever the final disposition of this legislation, the most vocal elements on the issue of land use are calling for more public control over private property.

One force being heard is the Task Force on Land Use and Urban Growth which issued its report "The Use of Land" to the Council on Environmental Quality last year.

In its report to the Council, the Task Force included several recommendations relating to property rights. The report recommended *an end to the landowner's traditionally presumed right to develop his property regardless of environmental and social costs* (a right presently restricted by local zoning laws). The right to property, according to the report, should not include the right to develop it and tough restrictions should be placed on the use of privately owned land. It added that restrictions will be little more than delaying actions if the courts do not uphold them as reasonable measures to protect the public interest.

The report also stated that landowners *should be required to bear the restrictions without compensation by government*—that the courts should interpret the "taking clause" of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution to mean that property must be physically taken before compensation is considered. Simply stated, this means that any gov-

ernmental restriction placed on the use of privately owned land should be upheld by the courts as a valid exercise of the police powers and, therefore, noncompensable. For example, if a community desires open space in a particular area and the land in question is privately owned, the landowner should bear the cost of the open space and not the community.

The Task Force report also stated that the courts should presume that any change in the physical environment is likely to have adverse consequences that are difficult to foresee, and that those desiring the change should be required to describe the effects of the change.

The report stated that the Supreme Court should "re-examine its earlier precedents that seem to require a balancing of public interest against land value loss in every case, and declare that when protection of natural, cultural or esthetic resources or the assurances of orderly development are involved, a mere loss in land value will never be justification for invalidating the regulation of land use."

It is against this background that H.R. 10294 requires that states designate and control land and land uses which are of more than local concern or which are of critical concern. The control and regulation of these areas, as designated by the state, could, in some cases, entail restriction of use of private land to the point that no use or no economic use would be allowed. This would, of course, diminish the market value of the property in question.

The trend is, we believe, clearly toward more public control over the use of private property—a sort of social contract, if you will, inherent in the purchase of land. If we are to move in this direction, as the Task Force report and others suggest, it is essential that the people be fully informed with balanced accurate information in order to bring about a moderate evolution in public policy in the area of land use that balances economic, social, and environmental considerations, that achieves public goals, and that allows for the maintenance of a healthy private property institution which constitutes the cornerstone of our liberties and our system of government.

The right to property and the value of property ownership consist mainly of the right to develop it. Thus the Land Use Planning Act and its Senate companion affect the traditional meaning of private property beyond abstract arguments over the use, non-use, and misuse of land. The true ramifications of this measure go to the essence of our free enterprise system and individual liberties.

Property rights/State police powers

H.R. 10294 is keyed to the exercise of the police powers of the various States to implement the provisions of the State land-use planning process. Traditionally, diminution of use of private property occasioned by a State's exercise of its police powers for the general welfare—as in the case of zoning—has been treated by the courts as not giving rise to a right to compensation on the part of the landowner. Although one use may be prohibited, the owner can utilize the land in another manner so as to attempt to justify his investment.

H.R. 10294 gives rise to a novel situation—in which two important provisions of the bill play roles. One is the definition of "areas of critical environmental concern," and the other is the requirement that the State have authority to regulate the use of land in such areas, as well as in other areas if the proposed use is inconsistent with the land-use plan. The Senate bill (S. 268) requires that the States be able to prohibit the use of such land. The term "areas of critical environmental concern" carries the connotation that no use is allowed in such areas. Moreover, the definition of these areas is opened so

that any type land area could be so designated.

The proposal, however, does not specify that the State in prohibiting the use of land in certain areas should utilize its powers of eminent domain—with compensation to the owners. It is conceivable that a State lacking adequate funds for compensation might proceed (to avoid sanctions should they be adopted) to implement the provisions in the bill which may require a partial or total denial of use for the land owner under its police powers—its zoning powers. This tactic would circumvent the issue of compensation, because zoning is not normally a compensable land use control mechanism. It would place upon the property owner the burden of instituting an inverse condemnation proceeding in order to gain a judgment that the State's action was an invalid exercise of its police powers requiring just compensation.

The whole point of the "taking" clause is to prevent the government from confiscating the property rights of the individual. It places the government in the same status as any stranger to the property, and after all, government consists of a great many strangers. It is a prohibition against theft by government in a sense comparable to innumerable other laws that prohibit theft by any of its citizens.

Certainly, over the years the courts have upheld as legal many laws which deprive owners of valuable property rights. Still the "taking" clause has tended to prevent the outright confiscation of property and many zoning and other regulatory laws have been invalidated.

There is no doubt but that it costs more money to buy property than to take it, and this obvious fact has been a cause of concern to those who believe that government can use property more wisely than its private owner. The recent report distributed by the Task Force on Land Use and Urban Growth expressed concern that the taking clause would make excessively expensive the land use policies they would like adopted and consider in the public interest. They propose that more land be restricted for open space and for other purposes they deem desirable and find the taking clause to be a serious obstacle to these objectives. In like manner, this Bill should present the same concerns since the government is mandating that some properties will be undevelopable and will have to be retained in their present state. Yet the Bill cavalierly states that the owner's rights have not been diminished nor is there any Federal money for compensating him. Thus, the state is under the mandate to prohibit development and presumably must bear the cost unless we are to reconsider the Fifth Amendment and rule that henceforth development rights for private property rest with the community, rather than with the property owners.

The inevitable result of increasing the number and amount of controls on land use is to terminate the freedom of the individual to acquire and own property—in all likelihood, the freedom considered most important by most of the people. Nor is it fair that the burden for providing the presumed welfare of others should be borne by the owners of only those properties used for public purposes. The accident of ownership and location would select those persons in society to carry the burden of paying for benefits that will accrue to others. It amounts to a rather crude way of redistributing wealth on a most unfair and irrational basis.

In addition, if private land is to be taken without compensation, there will be no limitation upon its acquisition. Thus, for whatever reason the state or Federal government should deem appropriate, if there is no cost involved, they can restrict its use thereby removing a great deal of land from development or production to the detriment of busi-

ness, employment, industry, agriculture, housing, etc. America, the land of parks and open space, would also be America, the land of worse housing and higher rents. When the government must pay for the land which it in effect condemns, its insatiable appetite is curbed, thereby creating a more appropriate and equitable allocation of our resources.

Obviously, the incentive for owners and developers to own and use land for productive purposes would also be destroyed. Why own land or contemplate using it if it is subject to confiscation at the whim of government? Or, if one does own land zoned for certain purposes, he should rush to use it before the law is changed. Such actions will result in a more chaotic market.

Notwithstanding the taking problems, the designation of particular uses for land will effectively remove that land from the marketplace. Historically, the marketplace has defined the highest and best use for a particular piece of land; H.R. 10294 undermines this tradition and consequently stifles private ownership.

EFFECT OF H.R. 10294 UPON OUR QUALITY OF LIFE

Air, water, and land are integral parts of man's existence. It is becoming increasingly clear, especially in light of our current energy shortfall, that our laws designed to prevent air and water pollution may be damaging our total environment because their substantial social and economic side-effects were ignored when these measures were drafted.

The dangers inherent in H.R. 10294 are even greater. It places the physical environment in the dominant position in the land use decision-making process. The proposal is lopsided in its concern for the physical environment while almost ignoring the needs of our citizens for economic development, for meeting our energy demands, for developing our natural resources, for feeding our people, and for housing.

H.R. 10294 even goes so far as to require the states to draw up their land use plans so as to implement the dictates of the Environmental Protection Agency relative to transportation control plans, indirect sources, and non-degradation.

If the federal government is to indirectly tell the States what their land use plans are to be, those requirements should at least provide for a balance between differing land uses, values, and needs. We do not believe that H.R. 10294 provides for such a balance.

The State in drawing up its statewide plan and the Department of the Interior in formulating national land use policies is each given a number of factors to consider. Most of these relate to preserving the physical environment such as insuring the protection of the quality of the environment, encouraging the preservation of ecosystems, protecting open space for public use or appreciation, etc. Very little is said about giving consideration to the economic and social implications which will follow such decisions. This basic underlying problem is further complicated by the whole problem of what land use planning is or should be.

Land use planning generally implies an orderly, rational arrangement of or for the use of land for the present or the future directed or controlled by detached experts in planning. The assumption is that there is something measurable about planning or that there are some standards which are to be followed. However, this assumption is exceedingly difficult to substantiate and few of even its most ardent proponents make the effort. Is there some precise measurement available to determine the "best" use of some or all of the land, of whether a certain parcel is better suited for trees, lagoons, recreation, or the housing of persons? By now, after fifty years of zoning experience in this country, it should be clear that there are respectable, distinguished and knowledgeable

planners who would disagree about any or all of a particular set of possible uses for a particular piece of land. Planning is unquestionably highly subjective, lacking those standards and measurements that are the requisites of a scientific discipline. Accordingly what goes under the name of planning is an opinion by someone who has studied and is learned in the creation, growth, and development of cities. The country's zoning experience raises serious doubts that such training and knowledge provide any special insights either in evaluating the present or in predicting the future.

Planners confront serious problems in fulfilling their responsibilities. Theory and education alone cannot substitute for the actual experience of making practical decisions and being euphoric about or suffering through their consequences. Unfortunately, in lieu of hard information, planners in most instances have to rely on their own experience and background including, whether conscious or unconscious, their political, social, and economic biases. Thus, although the biases of the planners selected to work at the state and national levels to draw up the land use plans will more than likely reflect the environmental orientation of this Bill, the drafters have largely overlooked the economic and social aspects of the environment which are of more concern to more persons.

This last statement is perhaps most dramatically illustrated by the recent events in our own country. When this Bill was being drafted, great concern was being voiced by well-known groups about the deterioration of the physical environment. In response at the national level, the National Environmental Policy Act was enacted, strict pollution regulations were set out by the Environmental Protection Agency which will result in great hardships for those of our citizens who live in areas which are dependent on the car for transportation.

In California, the electorate passed a coastal conservation act which recently was the basis for blocking the construction of two nuclear facilities that would provide a substantial portion of the future electrical needs for Southern California. Bluffs, water-carved canyons and some marine life have been saved, if the decision is not overturned, but thousands of barrels of oil will have to be burned annually—if it is available, that is—to obtain the same amount of energy, a solution scarcely compatible with clean air objectives. Alternatively, these nuclear reactors will have to be located at another site, a costly delay which will delay construction for many years. Once again, there will be a confrontation with environmentalists, since almost anywhere such construction takes place, it will have to be at what some group of persons somewhere will feel to be the expense of nature, wildlife, scenic view, or unusual terrain, etc. These are all commendable objectives. However, they do not remotely compare in any society's priorities to employment, business, and health, all of which may be seriously threatened if only the physical environment is considered in making land use decisions. What conceivably can be more important than providing sufficient food, clothing, and shelter for human beings?

THE EFFECT OF H.R. 10294 ON CONTROL AND REGULATION OF LAND USE

The effect of H.R. 10294 is to begin a gradual movement of planning and regulation from the local to the state level. The notion that land use within an entire state can be successfully planned should be one repugnant to the intelligence. In most states, hundreds of thousands of square miles are involved, and a state agency is bound to have less knowledge and information about individual parcels than one at the local level. Countless decisions would be made without adequate information. Just evaluating po-

tential uses and demands for a fraction of a mile within a metropolitan area may cost thousands of dollars and many hours and might still leave many uncertainties.

In addition, it is questionable whether this Bill is designed merely to encourage and enable the States to adopt land use regulations. Each state in order to qualify for Federal grants is to establish a comprehensive land use planning process and to develop explicit substantive policies to guide land use. However, whether a particular state is eligible for the Federal grants involved is determined by the Department of the Interior pursuant to guidelines and regulations to be set out by them. Thus, by retaining the power of the purse, the Federal government has in effect reserved the power to direct and affect the state planning process and its implementation. This is, of course, directly antithetical to our traditional concept that the responsibility for land use decisions should rest at the local level.

What is wrong with land use control at the state or Federal level? The whole philosophy behind putting this responsibility at the local level is that those at the local level are more knowledgeable and more interested in the fate of the land in their area than those who are located at a greater distance. Who has more interest in how a particular area is developed and who is better able to make the decisions regarding that development than the persons who actually live there? Rather than have planners from the state or Federal agency dictate from without what the future of a certain area will be, the persons actually involved have made the decision whether their locality, recognizing the advantages and disadvantages, should have a narrow economic base or whether a particular lagoon should be used for recreation, bird watching, or housing. To remove these decisions to the state or Federal level precludes taking into consideration the special problems, wishes, and concerns of the persons who know the area best—the local citizens and their elected officials.

Summary

Although this legislation does not call for national land use policies per se, it does exert very strong federal controls over how this country will develop its urban, suburban, and rural lands. We believe that federal advice on these matters will inevitably evolve into federal dictates. Once the Congress opens the door by conditioning the receipt of federal dollars upon submission of "adequate" state land use plans, we believe that the Constitutional responsibility and guarantee to the states that they deal with their own internal affairs will be but a fiction in this most critical area—the use of land.

The proponents of this legislation argue that changing land use requirements and public needs necessitate changes in present land use decisionmaking procedures and institutions; and that to avoid shaping the nation's future by incremental, ad hoc decisionmaking on the uses to which land resources are to be dedicated, there must be guidance by wise planning and management at all levels of government.

Some proponents believe that "the land use planning and management institutions of the past have left a legacy of uncoordinated, haphazard, and inefficient land use patterns. We contend that while our land use patterns, to be sure, are not perfect and do not conform to the planner's rulebook, they may be one price of democratic government.

We believe that this proposal will eventually result in the demise of private property rights and increase federal encroachment on state sovereignty.

Senators Hansen, Fannin, and Bartlett state in their minority views on S. 263 that it "would effectively preempt state and local rights to plan and regulate land uses. It would shift the traditional responsibilities

from the local and state governments to the federal government." They believe that the critical issue in the revolution of land use planning is how far the use of property can be restricted without compensating the property owner for diminution of value; or in other words, when does a restriction become a taking?

Those Senators who led the fight against this legislation in both the committee and on the floor conclude their remarks by saying: "... we are not prepared to agree with those who believe that only 'Washington' possesses brainpower and capability to cure the ills of our nation. We have long relied on our states for purpose and strength and we will continue to believe our system of government works best when local prerogatives are preserved." We concur.

SAM STEIGER.

STEVE SYMMES.

JOHN N. HAPPY CAMP.

DON YOUNG.

HAROLD RUNNELS.

DAVID TOWELL.

BOB BAUMAN.

WILLIAM M. KETCHUM.

PENNY SHORTAGE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the penny shortage is currently being felt in many parts of the country, including Haddad's Supermarket in Peoria, Ill., despite the fact that the U.S. Mint turns out some 35 million pennies a day.

My colleagues might be interested in how some merchants are dealing with this problem, as described in the following article from the National Observer, week ending May 25, 1974:

WE ARE HIDING 30 BILLION PENNIES

At Haddad's Supermarket in Peoria, Ill., your change might be rounded off to the nearest nickel, which means you might get a cent or two more—or less—than what's due you.

And at a Burger King in Birmingham, Ala., you can get a dollar bill and a soft drink for every 100 pennies you bring in.

These are just a couple of ways that retailers are scrambling for pennies or simply doing without because of spot shortages of pennies across the land. Banking officials generally suspect that the coins are being hoarded by consumers who see copper prices rising and hear rumors that the Government is about to begin making pennies out of aluminum.

PENNIES APLENTY

There are pennies aplenty, say Government officials, and some were said to be considering a nationwide get-out-the-pennies campaign.

About 30 billion pennies are thought to be lying in dresser drawers, piggy banks, and pickle jars around the nation according to Mary T. Brooks, director of the Bureau of the Mint. The Mint turns out some 35 million pennies a day, and it now costs the Government about a penny to make a penny, using stockpiled copper that cost 75 cents a pound. Mrs. Brooks told The Observer. Yet even if copper prices rose to \$1.50 a pound, she says, it would take 240,000 pennies to yield enough copper to realize a profit—after smelting expenses—of \$100. And it would be illegal. A person convicted of melting the coins for their content faces a five-year prison sentence and a \$10,000 fine.

SPECULATORS BLAMED

Though the Mint's daily penny output has doubled in the past year, penny shortages

continue. "There is a critical shortage for financial institutions and especially for retailers," says Mike Schor, assistant vice president of Exchange Security Bank in Birmingham. "We (the bank) have an obligation to accommodate our business (retail) customers," he says, but the Federal Reserve Bank has reduced the supply. "And we've had businessmen asking us for pennies who we've never seen before."

A spokesman for the Federal Reserve Bank in Birmingham confirmed that it had begun rationing pennies to commercial banks, attributing the shortage to speculators and hoarders.

Supermarket-industry spokesmen said last week that some chains might give scrip instead of pennies in change.

Some merchants have begun substituting gum sticks, matchbooks, or other penny items for pennies in change. But one of the most successful strategies so far for prying out pennies is Fred Haddad's. He manages his family's supermarket in Peoria. As soon as he posted a sign saying customers' change might be rounded off to the nearest nickel, meaning customers might come up a couple cents short, the pennies started pouring in by the hundreds. Haddad weighs them and buys them, figuring a pound of pennies is 146 pennies.

THE AMERICAN "HARVEST"

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, the House was honored to have Rev. R. Joseph Dooley, the president of the International Conference of Police Chaplains, offer the opening prayer.

I recently read an article by Reverend Dooley which I recommend to all of our colleagues. I would like to insert the article in the RECORD at this point:

THE AMERICAN "HARVEST"

(By Rev. R. Joseph Dooley, President, The International Conference of Police Chaplains)

As America initiates its preparations for the bi-centennial celebration of its birth as a Nation, Watergate (which includes the original break-in and all its ramifications now hanging over the national political scene like an ominous cloud) should just about fill out the political history of our 200 years.

It will be interesting to see what the historians and political analysts have to say about this period of history from the vantage point of 10, 15 or 20 years. Right now, nothing has stirred the American people to such unity of reaction for many a day.

Hopefully, the present situation will cause some real soul searching on the part of all of us. Shouldn't we all question how we as a nation got to the position where graft, cheating, fraud, abuse of power, moral corruption and injustice became the 'accepted' hallmark of national leadership?

It almost appears that we have come full-circle in our near 200 year history.

Offering the apathy of the American people, as consent and acceptance, we are reaping a 'harvest' of the crop that we have sown.

Whatever happened to guilt? One of the most distressing signs of contemporary times is the denial of guilt. Guilt has practically disappeared from our culture. How many times have you, as police officers, witnessed this—either on the street or in the courtroom? Psychology, sociology and legalities are sweeping guilt away.

The popular leaning is away from notions

of guilt and morality. Disease and treatment have been the watchwords of the day and little is said about selfishness and guilt. And certainly no one talks about sin.

Psychology tells people "we're no longer penitents, but patients," and sociology says that the environment, not the person, is responsible for behavior. Even in the Church, we no longer have penance—we have "sensitivity" sessions. You go sometimes to a psychoanalyst—not to have your sins forgiven, but to have them explained away.

To show how legalities are being used to excuse moral guilt recently there was a union-management battle over a cashier caught taking money from the cash register.

For three months the union fought the dismissal of the cashier, on the grounds that management did not tell her it was wrong to steal. Finally, to avert a strike, management agreed to re-instate the cashier and pay her three months back pay.

Now she knows that it is wrong to steal!

A law enforcement officer's badge is a symbol of public trust. There is no substitute for high principles!

Compromise, personal feelings, animosities and prejudices have no place in police service. Free handouts, cut-rate prices, gratuities, and preferential treatment are luxuries an officer can no longer accept if he or she is to keep his professional dignity. Absolute integrity is the only answer!

During 1974, let us make certain that the ethics which our work reflects; the ethics which we have pledged to uphold; and the ethics in which we believe are one and the same—the ethics of good police service. Then we can say that we, in law enforcement, have tried to make the best possible contribution to the American "Harvest."

A TRIBUTE TO RT. REV. MARIO J. PONSIGLIONE, PASTOR OF ST. THERESA OF THE INFANT JESUS CHURCH

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to join with thousands of my friends and neighbors in the Bronx who have and will pay tribute to the Right Reverend Mario J. Ponsiglione, who is retiring after almost 50 years of dedicated service to our Lord. It is only fitting that as Father Ponsiglione reaches this final milestone in his long and illustrious career, that his many friends and parishioners take time to acknowledge numerous accomplishments of this fine man and spiritual leader.

Father Ponsiglione, although born in Naples, Italy, always considered the Bronx to be home, for it was here that he spent the majority of his years. He was schooled at the Bronx's finest schools including Fordham Prep and University. Ironically, Father Ponsiglione had originally intended to become a doctor, but was dissuaded, and then chose the priesthood for his vocation, a decision which thousands of Bronxites are most grateful for and a decision which Father Ponsiglione himself considered to be the most important he had to make.

After serving our Nation with distinc-

tion in World War I, Father Ponsiglione obtained his bachelors of arts degree and began his study for the priesthood. A mere 4 years later, in 1925, he took the sacred vows for the priesthood in the Eternal City of Rome. His first mass was a moving experience, celebrated at a crude stone altar in the ancient catacombs of Saint Domitilla under the city of Rome.

Upon his return to the United States, he was assigned as curate to the Church of Our Lady of Loretto in Manhattan where he served for 2 years. Shortly thereafter, and at an unusually young age, he was appointed pastor of the Church of St. Rita in Staten Island, where he spent 9 fruitful years. It was here that he acquired the pastoral experience and maturity which were to be invaluable assets to him in the years ahead. Two more pastorates, at the Church of the Holy Family in New York, and the Church of Our Lady of Mt. Carmel in Yonkers deepened his pastoral wisdoms and skills.

The date May 3, 1946, might not signify much to many people but to those of us in the Bronx, it represented a very important date, for this was when Father Ponsiglione received from His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman the appointment as pastor of the Church of St. Theresa of the Infant Jesus.

He immediately plunged into his new job with the same verve and dedication which had marked his previous pastoral positions. He immediately turned his attention to the most urgent problem that the young parish was facing, namely providing the children of the parish with a Christian education. He skillfully raised the funds and acquired the workers which in less than 10 years made this dream a reality. Despite a series of uncontrollable adversities, on September 12, 1955, the new school was officially opened to the delight of the parishioners. As a result of this achievement and others, Father Ponsiglione was awarded the distinguished honor of being named Domestic Prelate in the Household of His Holiness, Pope Pius XII.

Not content to rest on his laurels, the new Right Reverend Ponsiglione continued his work on behalf of St. Theresa's Church. In rapid succession, a new convent for the teaching sisters, a new rectory, and a complete renovation of the church were accomplished under his expert guidance.

Yet being a pastor of a congregation as large as St. Theresa's in the 1960's meant a great deal more than fund raising and making external improvements. The 1960's represented one of the most dramatic eras in the history of the Catholic Church. The most significant developments were the major revisions in the centuries old customs of celebrating masses. These changes mandated in the first session of the Vatican Council were profound, as they affected the most basic part of the mass, the sacred liturgy. Father Ponsiglione seized the opportunity and made the transition from Latin to English masses, as well as the more confusing changes, easy for his parishioners. Soon thereafter, the members of St. Theresa's Church were par-

ticipating as fully in the "new masses" as they had in the old.

Unfortunately, Father Ponsiglione's tenure as pastor was not without its tragic moments. On February 7, 1965, a spectacular fire gutted the entire St. Theresa's Church to which Father Ponsiglione had dedicated so much of his life. Despair and anguish filled the hearts of the parishioners. Strong leadership and determination were needed and expertly provided by their pastor. Through hard work and a great deal of community effort, the church was soon restored into the important house of worship it once was. Father Ponsiglione had been committed to restoring the former beauty of the church and today the beautiful Church of St. Theresa of the Infant Jesus stands as a living tribute to Father Ponsiglione.

To be a spiritual leader of the caliber of Father Ponsiglione, one must have the personal characteristics which inspire others. Father Ponsiglione possesses these qualities and more. His love of his fellow man, his patience and understanding, his deep personal sympathy for all in need of help, and his sense of involvement with the community, has endeared him an eternal place in the hearts of the thousands who have come in contact with him.

Father Ponsiglione through the years has blended a sense of tradition with a keen knowledge of the needs of the present. He recognizes that the role of a priest in today's world requires far more than merely celebrating masses. He seeks to transmit the word of God to all, not just those who attend church. The love of God which he transcended to his servants in the priesthood, is an active love. It requires the personal strength and unyielding faith in men which has made Father Ponsiglione such an outstanding and beloved priest.

Mr. Speaker, there are many more words and praises which could be dedicated to Father Ponsiglione, yet he for one would feel uncomfortable receiving them. Actions do speak louder than words, and it would be far more appropriate if we were to carry on our lives in the same tradition of Christian love and brotherhood which characterized the life of this great servant of God, Father Mario Ponsiglione.

I would like to close with a tribute paid to Father Ponsiglione by a parishioner, and which is shared by all of us who know Father Ponsiglione:

May God reward his family who have given him to us. May God continue to bless his brother-priests with the guidance and comradeship which he provided. May God continue to bless us, his unworthy flock, with the grace of his presence in our midst. Grant it O Lord, we humbly pray.

THE THREAT TO MARINE MAMMALS

HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this morning's edition of the Washington

Post carries an excellent article by Mr. Lewis Regenstein, who is executive vice president of the Fund for Animals and, more importantly, a native of Atlanta, Ga.

"The Threat to Marine Mammals" should be a matter of serious concern to every one of my colleagues and, with permission, I insert the article as follows:

THE THREAT TO MARINE MAMMALS

A recently-enacted U.S. law, designed to protect whales, seals, dolphins, porpoises, sea otters, polar bears, sea lions, walrus, manatees, and dugongs, is in serious danger of being dismantled; and conservationists are now involved in a major struggle to prevent the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 from being crippled beyond repair.

The Marine Mammal Protection Act provides, with a few exceptions, for a general moratorium on the "taking" (killing, capture, wounding, harassing) by U.S. citizens of almost all species of ocean mammals. It also prohibits the import into the U.S. of any furs or other products from these creatures, thus removing much of the economic incentive for other nations to kill them.

However, one of the major flaws in the Marine Mammal Protection Act is that it gives the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior wide discretion to issue individual permits for the taking of sea mammals; and under certain conditions, they can even lift the moratorium completely and allow the resumption of commercial exploitation on any and all of these species.

A major threat to the law is posed by the Fouke (fur) Company, of Greenville, South Carolina, the only large American processor of sealskins.

Fouke is now pressuring the Commerce Department to lift the moratorium on foreign seal imports to allow it to bring in up to 70 thousand sealskins from South Africa each year for the next 10 years. The South African seal kill takes place from June to October, when tens of thousands of baby seals are clubbed on the head, and then stabbed to death with stiletto knives. The baby seals are then slit down the front and the pelt is peeled off.

The law makes it unmistakably clear that its intention is to put a halt to U.S. involvement in the killing of baby seals. Section 102 of the Act states unequivocally that "it is unlawful to import into the United States any marine mammal if such mammal was nursing at the time of taking, or less than eight months old, whichever occurs later."

Nevertheless, the Commerce Department now seems to be moving towards granting Fouke's current request to abolish the "moratorium" for 10 years on the import of South African cape seals, even though many of these seals are nursing when they are killed. The Commerce Department's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and its agency, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), have already prepared a biased and totally unnecessary draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the effect of allowing the import of these sealskins. (However, the statement, curiously, does not point out the ecological dangers of killing off vast numbers of seals each year. This is not surprising in light of the fact that the EIS was drafted largely by several NMFS biologists, who are or have been involved in running NMFS' own seal kill in Alaska, which netted the U.S. Government a profit of \$1.8 million in 1973.)

Another complicating factor is that much of the seal kill takes place in South-West Africa (Namibia), which the United States, the United Nations, and the International Court of Justice consider South Africa to be illegally occupying in violation of international law. This makes it even more difficult

for the Secretary of Commerce Frederick Dent, to endorse and approve the South African seal hunt, as the law requires if the moratorium is to be lifted.

In addition to Fouke's permit application, attacks on the Marine Mammal Protection Act are being made from other quarters as well. The state of Alaska is attempting to have the moratorium lifted for that state (which contains most of the resident sea mammals found in the U.S.) to allow the resumption of commercial and "sport" killing of whales, seals, and sea lions (now under the jurisdiction of the Commerce Department) and sea otters, walrus, and even polar bears (now under Interior Department authority).

And the U.S. tuna industry is pushing Commerce to allow it to continue killing over one hundred thousand dolphins (or "porpoises") each year.

If the above applications are granted, it will be the beginning of the end of the law's effectiveness; and the door will be opened to removing protection to additional vulnerable species, such as whales and sea otters, which are of interest to commercial exploiters and other vested interests. At the present time, the decision as to if and when to lift the moratorium for most of the species involved is being made by two Commerce Department officials: Dr. Robert M. White, Administrator of NOAA, and Robert W. Schoning, Director of NMFS. Their decision could well determine, the fate of several hundred species of wildlife, whose survival may ultimately hinge on whether or not the Marine Mammal Protection Act remains intact.

SEATBELT-INTERLOCK NIGHTMARE

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many of my colleagues have had a nightmare experience with the buzzer system. Whoever dreamed up this plan must have visualized it in his padded cell at the asylum.

There have been instances where the system works. But to those of you who have experienced the frustration of its confused electronics, I give my warmest sympathy.

We must pass a law making this equipment optional. If a person wants it, let him have it. But for those of us, who still admire the American tradition of freedom of choice, let us not have this starter seatbelt gismo forced onto our automobiles.

I read an interesting reprint in the May 10, 1974, issue of National Review. This is from the manual and is an exact excerpt from the "Seat Belt System Owner's Guide."

THAT SEATBELT IGNITION/INTERLOCK SYSTEM

A safety system designed to reduce injuries and save lives. Mandatory on all 1974 cars. (Unless air bag equipped.)

1. Get in your car.

2. Fasten your lap/shoulder harness.

A. If you have a front seat passenger, his seatbelts must be fastened also, or the car will not start.

B. If you have a package, handbag, briefcase, etc., weighing 25 lbs. or more, and have space only in the front seat, place the object on the front seat, and then buckle the passenger-side belt.

C. If you have a dog weighing 25 lbs. or more occupying the passenger seat buckle the passenger-side belt before attempting to start car.

D. If the passenger-side belt is already buckled when you add the package, dog, or passenger, unbuckle, then rebuckle the belt before attempting to start car.

3. Start your car.

A. If your car won't start, try unbuckling and rebuckling your belt (and your passenger's) to be sure the buckle was fully fastened.

B. If that fails, turn the ignition key to "ON," then get out of your car and raise the hood. Press the bypass switch mounted on the fire wall to "START." Close the hood, get back in your car, buckle up, and turn your ignition all the way in normal starting.

C. If your car stalls, do not turn the ignition to "OFF" position. That way you can keep trying to start your car as often as necessary without leaving the car.

D. If you accidentally turn the ignition key to "OFF," turn it back to "ON," unbuckle, get out of the car, open the hood, press the bypass switch again for another "free" start. (Incidentally, if the bypass switch is taped down, the action will be detected in the switch and canceled.)

4. Drive your car.

A. If your dog is on the floor when you begin driving the car, and then jumps on the seat and the passenger-side belt is unbuckled, a buzzer will sound. Stop the car and buckle the belt.

B. In a somewhat rare situation when driving over a very rough road, you may be bounced about in your seat. Should your engine be stopped, remain buckled in your seat and restart your car. A "bounce-time" delay (designed primarily to allow you to straighten your clothing after buckling up) also allows a restart in this situation.

SOLAR HEAT

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, when my Subcommittee on Energy began consideration of legislation to encourage use of solar energy for heating and cooling of homes and other buildings, one of our first activities was to visit the home of Dr. and Mrs. Harry Thomason, in District Heights, Md. This home is primarily heated by solar energy, which means that the Thomasons' use of other fuels for home heating has been cut by more than three-quarters.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Thomason has demonstrated that one individual can construct a solar heated home with simple, inexpensive materials. His solar home has been operating well for several years.

Dr. Thomason and other expert witnesses before my subcommittee testified that the technology for combined solar heating and cooling is now at hand. In fact 10 years from now, one out of every 10 new homes built in this country can be partially heated and cooled using solar energy. Moreover, if 15 years from today, only 5 percent of our homes and buildings receive 80 percent of their energy for heating and air-conditioning from solar energy, this will represent a savings of fuel equivalent to about 600,000 barrels of oil per day. At \$10 a bar-

rel, this would constitute a savings of \$6 million a day or about \$2 billion a year for the people of this Nation.

But none of this will be possible unless we begin immediately—with a program to demonstrate the technological and economic feasibility of solar heating and cooling—so that government, the utility manufacturing industry, the building construction industry, and the mortgage industry all organize their planning to include processes conducive to the development of solar heating and cooling on a significant scale. Research and development is no longer needed for this step forward.

On February 13, the House of Representatives passed H. R. 11864, the Solar Heating and Cooling Demonstration Act of 1974 which was unanimously reported by the House Science and Astronautics Committee. The chairman of the committee, OLIN E. TEAGUE of Texas, provided dynamic leadership in assuring the overwhelming majority by which the bill passed.

In addition, on April 30 the House passed energy research appropriations bill, H.R. 14434. This legislation included appropriations for our Solar Heating and Cooling Demonstration Act which, having passed the House, is now awaiting Senate action. I am hopeful that the other body will act in the very near future both to pass this legislation as well as the necessary appropriations for it.

Much of the credit for our success is due to the inspiration of Harry Thomason and his demonstration solar home. Now, an article describing the Thomason home has appeared in the May Reader's Digest.

In order that Members of both Houses of Congress may know in detail about how solar heating actually works, I include this article, "A House that Runs on the Sun," in the RECORD at this point:

A HOUSE THAT RUNS ON THE SUN
(By Blake Clark)

If you had a house like Harry Thomason's, you would feel a lot easier about the fuel shortage. A four-bedroom rambler with full basement and a small indoor swimming pool, in District Heights, Md.—a suburb of Washington—it is heated chiefly by solar energy. Harnessing the sun cuts Thomason's use of other fuels by more than three fourths.

A joint report by experts at the National Science Foundation and NASA says that we have all the technology we need to heat and cool houses by solar energy. But costs of the sophisticated materials are high, and general use will come only when costs come down or fuel prices go even higher.

Thomason built his first house and heating system 15 years ago, utilizing simple, inexpensive items, all assembled on the spot. Savings on oil paid for the solar equipment in seven years, so for the past eight years most of the heat has been a gift, pollution-free, from the sun. He has constructed three solar-heated houses in all. Two are rented, and have paid for themselves.

How did he do it? A patent attorney and engineer, Thomason had been fascinated by the age-old dream of capturing power from the sun—which radiates more energy in one second than man has used since the beginning of civilization.

In 1956, during a hot, sunny afternoon at his wife's home in North Carolina, a sudden thunderstorm blew up. As he dashed into a barn for shelter, drops of warm water dribbling off the rusty sheet-metal roof pelted

his bare head. Like lightning from a cloud came the concept: a dark-colored metal roof is a heat collector. Just run water down its sun-baked surface into a container, he told himself, and you've captured solar energy.

When the sun reappeared, Thomason held a thermometer under the hot metal roof. *Ping!* It broke as the mercury passed 140 degrees.

Thomason, at 35, was supporting his wife and five children with a full-time job in the U.S. Patent Office, going to law school five nights a week, and in the summer building houses to rent. Patent Office employees aren't permitted to apply for a patent, and he wanted one. So he eventually quit his job, became a patent adviser at the Pentagon, and spent evenings and weekends building a house to be heated by solar energy. Everyone in the family, even the six-year-old twins, pitched in.

To collect the sun's heat, he fashioned a roof of corrugated aluminum, facing south and a little west—insulated underneath, painted black to absorb the sun's rays, and covered with plastic and glass to keep the heat in. In the basement he set a 1600-gallon tank and, next to it, a small pump to send water from the tank up to a pipe running the length of the roof ridge. Perforations along the pipe let the water flow down the sun-warmed roof to a gutter. From the gutter, the heated water traveled back to the tank. Harry then surrounded the tank with three truckloads of fist-size rocks, to absorb its heat. Next, he installed a small blower to send air around the warm rocks and on through ducts into the house's various rooms. Finally, he added an auxiliary furnace to back up the solar heater when necessary.

On a sunny October day in 1959, the Thomasons moved in. The next two months were moderately cloudy and chilly, but all their heat came from the sun. Not until December 21, in the middle of the night, did the auxiliary furnace kick on for the first time. It ran 15 minutes, using one quart of oil. The next night, it ran 30 minutes.

Thomason's application for a patent on the heat collector was still pending. On the day appointed for the patent examiner, his boss and the chief building inspector of Prince George's County to come see the system, the weather was so cloudy that Thomason wanted to postpone the meeting. He couldn't. So, while the three officials watched, he turned on the water. It went onto the roof at 70 degrees—and seconds later came down eight degrees hotter. Even the inventor was surprised that his heat trap proved so efficient on such a day.

"Shake the thermometer and try it again," commanded the inspector. The measurement was confirmed.

Through that entire winter, which brought near-zero temperatures and 25 inches of snow, the auxiliary heating system registered only 31 hours of operation, using 31 gallons of oil. Thomason's total fuel bill for the winter (oil then cost 15 cents a gallon) was \$4.65. In the two houses built since—with a smaller solar collector, and single glass cover—the sun has provided about 75 percent of the heat.

During the following summer, Thomason adapted his system to air conditioning. Instead of running water over the south roof during the day, he ran it over the north roof at night, after the surface had cooled. That lowered the temperature of the water in the tank and cooled the surrounding stones. The blower then sent chilled air through the house. When he built his second house, in 1960, he substituted an electric compressor for the roof-top cooling method, to cool the tank and store up cold even on hot nights—the hours that involve the least energy drain. In his third house, he incorporated a dehumidification system for even greater comfort.

Maintenance? Thomason's system has proved reasonably trouble-free, repair costs

running about the same as for ordinary oil heating systems. A few panes of glass, broken by stones or high winds, have had to be replaced. A water leak, on the first solar-heat collector, was fixed by substituting a corrugated aluminum of a slightly different pattern. And when the plastic cover started deteriorating, Thomason removed it, leaving just the glass cover. Maintenance of these solar houses is simplified by the fact that virtually everything used is "off the shelf": ordinary window glass, and corrugated barn-type roofing; fiber glass insulation; a plain steel tank, a 1/6-horsepower blower, standard thermostatic control unit; stones from the field.

Until the beginning of the energy crunch, few people took notice of Thomason's achievement. This is no longer true. Harvard physicist William A. Shurcliff has pronounced his system "irritatingly simple and strikingly successful." Chairman Mike McCormack and other members of the House subcommittee on energy visited Thomason's house one snowy day in 1973 and found it a comfortable 72 degrees, with no dependence on auxiliary fuel. McCormack and 187 cosponsors introduced a bill calling for a \$50-million outlay over the next five years to provide for further research and the eventual development of solar heating and cooling units for mass commercial use. The bill has passed in the House and is pending in the Senate.

Figuring costs over the life of a house, Thomason says his system is cheaper than oil or electricity. He estimates that, at present prices, it adds about \$2000 to the construction cost of a four-bedroom house. But, in a climate like that of Washington, D.C., it reduces energy cost by some \$200 per year compared with oil, or \$400 a year compared with electricity. (His current heating-and-cooling bill, in house No. 3, is about \$10 a month.) At this rate, the system is paid for in at most ten years. Rising fuel costs will speed the payoff date.

Can solar heating ease the fuel shortage? Arthur D. Little, Inc., the think tank and consulting firm, reckons that if solar energy provided one percent of the nation's energy needs by 1983, approximately 100 million barrels of oil per year would be conserved. The National Association of Home Builders estimates that we will construct 1.6 million new houses in the United States in 1974. If ten percent were to obtain three fourths of their heat from the sun, we would save the equivalent of 180 million gallons of oil a year on them alone.

Not everybody would want a solar-heated house. In some areas—the Washington and Oregon coastline, for example, where the weather is frequently cloudy—solar heating might not be an economy. Because Thomason's system requires a south-facing roof with a tilt of 10 to 20 degrees more than the latitude of the house, and basement space for tons of stones, conversion of existing houses to his system is likely to be impractical. Otherwise, builders and architects in many parts of the country can erect a successful solar-heated dwelling.

Harry Thomason's solar-home design will not unhinge the pincers of the energy crunch. It may not become the Model T of the solar-home industry. But it is a bright little light at the end of a long, dark tunnel.

PERPETUAL MOTION HANDICAPS

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday's New York Times

carried a column by the perceptive and intelligent observer of current events James Reston.

His observations are in my view worth careful consideration by all Members. The spectacle of the U.S. Secretary of State shuttling back and forth in but one part of the world distresses me greatly.

No matter how laudable and important is the effort to achieve a disengagement on the Golan Heights there are increasing stresses and strains elsewhere to which proper attention is not being paid and I would hope Dr. Kissinger will return immediately to attend to those matters more fully.

The article follows:

PERPETUAL MOTION HANDICAPS

(By James Reston)

In the last three weeks, while Secretary of State Kissinger has been trying to arrange a cease-fire between Syria and Israel, India has set off a nuclear explosion, France has elected a new president, West Germany has a new chancellor, and some kind of political transition or upheaval is going on in China.

These are merely the symbols of new forces, new alignments, and powerful new personalities moving in the world, and while it is easy to admire Kissinger's achievements in the Middle East, the result of his restless diplomacy is that he unavoidably neglects other critical developments.

The control of nuclear arms, the avoidance of war between China and the Soviet Union, the battle against inflation, hunger, and soaring raw materials prices, and the stability and unity of new governments in Europe and the rest of the Free World all rank along with peace in the Middle East as the principal questions of world politics today. And in all of them, Washington has a critical role to play.

Washington cannot play that role, however, under present circumstances. President Nixon is determined to give the impression that he is running the government, but obviously he is trying to save his political life.

Meanwhile, operating the government here depends on members of the Cabinet and the civil service. And the reorganization and revival of confidence at the Department of State depends on Kissinger, who took over there last Sept. 22.

Since then, he has been out of the country 3 days in October, 11 in November, 14 in December, 10 in January, 14 in February, 5 in March, and forgetting time out for a honeymoon in Mexico, he has been away since late April and all of May, and will probably have to spend most of June in Europe and Moscow, preparing for the President's visit to the Soviet Union in the last week of next month.

Kissinger hasn't had time to organize the State Department to deal with all these critical worldwide developments while he's away in the Middle East; he delegates authority grudgingly to acting Secretary of State Rush; and he's not available to testify in Congress on vital legislation such as the defense appropriations and the foreign assistance bills.

This does not mean that he's out of touch on his shuttle plane between Damascus and Tel Aviv. The art of communication has advanced since Dulles was flying around the world. He gets between 5 and 10 messages from the State Department every day—and between 15 and 20 from other departments on pressing matters. And he can get back from his flying communications center within hours, but this is a substitute and not an answer.

The strength of the Kissinger system in the Middle East is its weakness elsewhere.

Where he concentrates—whether on Chou En-lai in China, on Brezhnev in the Soviet Union, on Sadat or Faisal or President Hafez Assad of Syria, on the political leaders in Israel or the political leaders here on Capitol Hill—he has a remarkable gift of persuasion.

But strong as he is, physically and mentally, he cannot deal effectively with all this by himself, without organizing his department, unless he can invent the 48-hour day. The way things are going, he is trying to do everything.

He can't go on doing all these things together. Maybe his new wife will have to tell him. Somebody is going to have to get him off that merry-go-round and bring him home to deal with the whole world as Secretary of State.

WHY I OPPOSE ABORTION

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, recently, the chief resident for obstetrics and gynecology at Boston City Hospital was indicted for causing the death of a 24-week old fetus.

A frequent pro-life author, David Brudnoy, published an article in *Human Events* on May 18 which discusses the Boston tragedy. I wish to have the article inserted in the *RECORD* at this point and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

WHY I OPPOSE ABORTION

(By David Brudnoy)

During the past few weeks we have been confronted in Boston by startling revelations of fetal manslaughter and what is technically called "grave robbing." First brought to light over the Easter weekend, the disclosure may well serve to help turn the tide of public opinion against the contemporary abortion rage.

Dr. Kenneth Edelin, chief resident for obstetrics and gynecology at Boston City Hospital, stands indicted for causing the death—actual procedure of the act of killing as yet unpublished—of a 24-week-old fetus, called a "viable baby boy," by the prosecutor District Attorney Garrett H. Byrne. Rumors have circulated, unfounded as yet, that the manner of death was live dissection.

In addition to the Edelin indictment, four other physicians, all currently or formerly with Boston City Hospital, have been charged with violating an old Massachusetts law forbidding the carrying away of human bodies or remains for dissection purposes: in this instance, for medical research on fetal tissue, research the purpose of which is surely benign, however bizarre the means.

As is well known, the so-called "strict constructionist" Supreme Court now under the near-domination of Nixon appointees ruled a year ago that states could not legislate against abortions in the first several months of pregnancy.

This has led states such as Massachusetts to rush headlong into a wholesale traffic in legal abortions. Not content to let New York serve as abortion capital of the nation, the Bay State abortion lobby has been vying of late for that honor.

There are few issues so horrifying to those who respect human life, and few so exciting and conducive to outright viciousness in the minds of those who put the alleged convenience of the mother ahead of the rights of the unborn child in its fetal state, as abor-

tion. Part and parcel of contemporary radical-chic is the cry: "It's a woman's right to do as she wishes with her body," as if the fetus were of no other nature than, say, a hangnail or a tonsil.

Moreover, liberals tend strongly to join their radical friends in favoring some variant of an abortion-on-demand position, and conservatives divide into the familiar libertarian and traditionalist camps on this issue. Increasingly, however, some libertarian conservatives have come to see feticide (or, more fashionably, abortion) as violative of just those individuals rights about which libertarians constantly speak in such glowing terms.

In Boston, Dr. Mildred Jefferson, a professor of surgery and an avowed "individualist," argues persuasively that the rights of the fetus do not in fact violate the legitimate rights of the woman who temporarily carries the fetus within her. WBUR-FM radio talk show host Douglas W. Cooper, another libertarian-conservative, makes a similar case so successfully that he long ago convinced me (previously a pro-abortion advocate) of his position.

The argument has not abated since the Supreme Court ruling. In fact, it has grown more intense. Those who champion abortion must stand adamant in their insistence that a fetus is not a human being. They must, that is, deny the building evidence within the biological sciences that all sorts of human functions have their inception in the earliest weeks of gestation. They must blind themselves both to fact and to considerations of humanity. If, that is, they wish to convince the general civilian population of their position.

Thus far, the pro-feticide lobby has been quite successful. Those who oppose abortions are considered fanatics—"right-wing reactionaries" is a favorite epithet—and our insistence that fetuses are human beings is pooh-poohed constantly.

If one believes that it is all right to abort fetuses at will, it is likewise all right to assume that the aborted "thing" is not human. That is the logic, for want of a better word, employed by the abortion proponents.

But once one admits that a fetus can emerge alive from the abortion procedure—and this happens with alarming regularity—must it not also be admitted that the fetus is a human being? To the abortion lobby the answer, obviously, is no.

The abortionists and their supporters make an absolute distinction between fetal life and infantile life, and manifest a (to me) amazing tender-mindedness about little children who are allowed to come to term while simultaneously denying to fetuses any of that compassion. Somehow, seven to nine months in the womb makes the fetus a human being, but less than seven months makes the fetus merely an object, to be dealt with as one would with one's appendix.

The question arises: how does one properly decide the cut-off point between humanity and thing-ness? At the moment, those pushing for abortion on demand seem content to leave it at the Supreme Court's addled decision (26 weeks or less and the fetus can be aborted with no fuss from the law; 27 weeks and after, and the states can legislate as they wish); they insist on aborting as many fetuses as they can get their hands on.

But in accepting that cut-off point, if it is not wholly tactical and something which in due course they will tidy up by pushing for an extension of the gestation period in which abortions are legal, are they not admitting that, say, a seven-month-old fetus is quite likely to become viable if aborted at that stage?

And once they have acknowledged that a fetus is a human life *sometime* before its full nine-month gestation period, where does their case for abortion go?

It goes, no pun intended, to seed. They

would of course be happier if they could perfect their abortion devices so that no fetus emerged live from the operation. There would then be no messy problems to confront, given the Supreme Court's carte blanche for legalized killing of fetuses. But even medical science, supposedly devoted to preserving life, not to destroying life, has yet to work out a sure-fire way to obliterate every fetus's life while he is being aborted.

And so we return to Dr. Edelin and his colleagues—Doctors Leon Sabath, Leonard Berman, David Charles and Agneta Philipson—who must now find some way to justify what they are doing. Dr. Edelin will face a rather tough go of it should he be brought before a jury of his peers: The incontrovertible evidence is that the fetus in question was born live and that Dr. Edelin snuffed out that life in some manner.

Doctors Sabath, Berman, Charles and Philipson may get out of it by pleading that the obscure Massachusetts law really doesn't apply to medical researchers fiddling with fetal tissue. And they will likely have an easier time of it than will Dr. Edelin.

Yet however gruesome and saddening are the incidents, they do focus attention on the mass killing of hundreds of thousands of human beings under cover of law, that Supreme Court ruling which will likely go down in history as this tribunal's most infamous decision in modern times.

The problem for those who oppose this type of mass killing is compounded by the matter raised earlier, the division in conservative ranks. However reasonable the traditionalist-conservative position on abortion, it cannot carry the day against the liberal-radical alliance without the additional support of libertarians and disaffected liberals.

Passivity plays into the hands of the pro-abortionists: many people oppose abortion but do nothing about it, whereas the feticide lobby is constantly at work stressing the "humaneness" of abortion, insisting upon the woman's alleged rights to do anything she pleases with her body, even including destroying other human beings temporarily residing within her body.

Somehow, the liberal, however uneasy he may be about what he can easily learn about the proliferation of abortions even in the twilight zone between automatic death to an aborted fetus and possible viability after abortion, feels "liberation" and modernity require assent to the feticide position.

So it is as well with many, probably most, of the libertarians within conservatism. The same unwillingness to accept the clear-cut evidence of biology infusing the liberal mind on this matter, occasions in the libertarian an obduracy masquerading as respect for individual rights.

I would insist to my libertarian-conservative brethren that abortion is a special case, not easily absorbed into the general case for individual freedom. Quite simply put it is this: As all libertarians insist, one has no right to initiate aggressive behavior against innocents; fetuses, even though they must (at present) develop for some months in another person's womb, are the most innocent of all human beings, having committed no acts whatsoever except living; therefore, to kill a fetus is to commit precisely the most unjustified form of killing.

It is this that must be brought home to the libertarians within our ranks, else they will, in their enthusiasm for a maximization of the realm of individual decision-making, commit the absolutist error and refuse to make the critical distinction that separates feticide from other forms of activities which libertarians (such as this writer) believe an individual should be free to commit—on himself or herself.

The Boston incidents bring these issues immediately to the fore. They direct attention to the difficulty of creating some arbitrary cut-off point before which one can

slaughter innocent fetuses: the Edelin case involves, and this deserves stress, a fetus born live, then subsequently killed. Dr. Edelin is charged with manslaughter, technically not "murder," but to the layman a form of murder nonetheless.

To bring more people around to the pro-life position, publicity must be given to the Boston scandals. Encouragement also must go to those congressmen supporting various proposed constitutional amendments forbidding abortions. Sen. James Buckley (C.-R. N.Y.), Rep. Lawrence Hogan (R.-Md.) and others are currently championing amendments along this line, and they will surely work for them more vigorously if they know that their constituents are willing to fight for such a change.

At bottom, the issue boils down to this: Is a fetus a human being or is he not? If he is a human being at any stage along the way from implantation to emergence from the womb, then biology insists that he is a human being from the earliest point, however odd or "non-human" he looks.

It is a national disgrace, this legal tolerance of the murder of innocents. There are Right to Life chapters in many cities and states and they need the support of citizens outraged at this situation. Publicists such as Arizona Right to Life officer Dexter Dugan, a libertarian and another of those who in recent years have helped inform this once pro-abortion writer of the error of his ways, work diligently to make information available to the general public.

The push will not be easy, nor is it assured of victory. Although the Supreme Court could in future rule contrary to its 1973 decision, this is unlikely so long as the present court sits. The ruling was seven to two, and it is unlikely that either Richard Nixon or any likely liberal successor will be appointing anti-abortion justices to the Supreme Court.

The amendment process is difficult and long in most cases. The concurrence of three-fourths of the states, following upon either initiative from several state legislatures or a two-thirds vote of Congress, is necessary for passage of any constitutional amendment.

The issue is still in doubt. Opinion polls indicate that the nation is at present nearly evenly divided on the matter. Much more educational work is needed, and there are pro-life groups and individuals everywhere doing it. What has surfaced in Boston in the past weeks is likely to generate more support for the anti-abortion position.

BIG MEDIA

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the terms, "big government", "big business" and "big labor." An editorial from the May 20, 1974, edition of the Peoria Journal Star discusses some of the problems confronting "big media" and I include the text of the editorial in the RECORD:

BIG MEDIA IS TRAPPED

The big newspapers that swept into the "resignation" camp after the transcripts came out were welcomed with open arms by the TV newscasters—and rightly so.

But their falling like a row of dominoes rather completes a scenario which has yet to be presented to the American people—and may be presented with devastating effect one day.

It is as simple as this.

Big Media has blindly got itself into a position as dangerous as that which the Democratic party perceived and wisely backed away from.

It isn't a happy long-term spot.

In the light of the whole chain of events, capped by these "resignation" pitches, Big Media stands at the point where if anything DOES happen to Richard Nixon, Big media is going to loom as a larger threat in the public mind than Big Business or Big Government ever did.

If Nixon is somehow removed, now, and becomes the first President in the history of the Republic to be cast out in good health, without assassination, in mid-term, Big Media will get the credit.

Some people will be angry. Some people will cheer—for a while. But almost all will feel that Big Media took charge of this country during this period.

This will be due partly to the Democrats coming out against resignation and partly to the full-tilt slandering of Big Media over irrelevant and prejudicial tid-bits of information, capped by the blitz of "resignation" editorials.

If the President is impeached, it will look as if Big Media chivvied the Democrats and frightened some Republicans into doing it. Only some spectacular and decisive piece of incriminating evidence (for which apparently all and sundry are still desperately searching) can make impeachment appear otherwise.

With a President tumbled from office in that fashion, suddenly Big Government and Big Business, alike, would shrink drastically in their apparent size, power and menace.

Alone in the monster field would stand Big Media, the biggest giant of all, and every little man would seem a pygmy alongside it—including Presidents.

At that point, of course, Big Media inherits the "hot seat" formerly occupied by Big Government and Big Business alternately.

What we need to understand is that Big Media did not and could not manipulate this affair, and does not have the capacity some think they have to manipulate such a future problem, either.

It was the frame of reference, not network gimmickry, that permitted some of the activities of the past year and more. The blossoming of an attitude of basic distrust of too much power is the real thing that placed Richard Nixon in a spot where he could not do anything right.

Big Media may have a chance to find out how that goes. For once the whole focus of this kind of power centers there—nothing THEY do can be "right." When everything is interpreted to suit hatred and that fear, you cannot win.

If the big TV networks try to simply silence revelations of how they handled Watergate, they will find that "covering up" only makes matters worse.

You'd think they would learn that from Watergate, but the selectivity of news and of words in which they now describe it shows otherwise.

STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS

HON. PAUL W. CRONIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. CRONIN. Mr. Speaker, the strength of democracy lies with the people's confidence in their government, and I firmly believe that toward this end elected officials must maintain the high-

est standards of honesty and integrity. One way for the American people to evaluate and judge the openness and honesty of the Congressmen they elect is through the public disclosure of every official's sources of income. At this point, I would like to disclose such information for the constituents of the Fifth Congressional District of Massachusetts by making it part of the public record of Congress.

STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS

Income: My 1973 income was derived totally from my congressional salary and \$1,200 from honoraria. I had no other sources of income.

Personal Holdings: I own a 1970 Buick Le Sabre with a present market value of \$1,800; a 1972 Buick Riviera, with a value of \$3,100 and a note of \$2,807.75; and a 1964 Beech Baron aircraft with a value of \$35,000 and a note of \$28,333.21.

Business Affiliations: I do not serve as a director, officer, owner, or partner of any business entity.

I would also like to have included in the RECORD a copy of the form on file with the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

The form follows:

Part A: U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

STATEMENT OF CERTAIN FINANCIAL INTERESTS AND ASSOCIATIONS AS OF DATE OF FILING AND CERTAIN OTHER FINANCIAL DATA, COVERING CALENDAR YEAR 1973

Committee on Standards of Official Conduct

Member's named, Paul W. Cronin.

District, 5.

State, Massachusetts.

Part A: (See instructions and text of House Rule XLIV on reverse side).

The interest of a spouse or any other party, if constructively controlled by the person reporting, shall be considered to be the same as the interest of the person reporting.

1. List the name, instrument of ownership, and any position of management held in any business entity doing a substantial business with the Federal Government or subject to Federal regulatory agencies in which the ownership is in excess of \$5,080 fair market value as of the date of filing, or from which income of \$1,000 or more was derived during the preceding calendar year. Do not list any time or demand deposit in a financial institution or any debt instrument having a fixed yield unless it is convertible to an equity instrument.

Business entity, instrument of ownership, position of management, member has no ownership position in any business entity doing substantial business with the Federal government or subject to Federal regulatory agencies.

2. List the name, address and type of practice of any professional organization in which the person reporting, or his spouse, is an officer, director, or partner, or serves in any advisory capacity, from which income of \$1,000 or more was derived during the preceding calendar year: Member and his spouse derived no income from a professional organization.

3. List the source of each of the following items received during the preceding calendar year:

(a) Any income from a single source for services rendered (other than from the U.S. Government) exceeding \$5,000 and not reported in section 2 above: None.

(b) Any capital gain from a single source exceeding \$5,000, other than from the sale of residence occupied by the person reporting. (As reportable to IRS): None.

(c) Reimbursement for expenditures (other than from the U.S. Government) exceeding \$1,000 in each instance: None.

(d) Source of honoraria aggregating \$300 or more from a single source (Name the original source, not a speakers' bureau): None.

4. List each creditor to whom the person reporting was indebted for a period of 90 consecutive days or more in the preceding calendar year in an aggregate amount in excess of \$10,000 excluding any indebtedness specifically secured by the pledge of assets of the person reporting of appropriate value: Member reporting was contingently liable for indebtedness secured by real estate held in trust created as of January 3, 1973.

Campaign moneys are not to be taken into account in this report.

NEWINGTON, CONN., FIFE AND DRUM CORPS AND COLOR GUARDS WINS ALL-AMERICAN CHAMPION HONORS

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to learn that the Newington Fife and Drum Corps and Color Guard, from the town of Newington, Conn., in my district, has won the National All-American Championship for Fife and Drum Corps held at Myrtle Beach, S.C., in early May. Groups from many such corps throughout the country competed in the 3 day convention. Newington's practice paid off, as the group won the majority of awards presented at the championship competition.

In addition to the national championship, the entire Newington Fife and Drum Corps won the convention's music award. Numerous individual awards were also garnered in the musical categories. Kathy Malloy took first place in the individual fife contest; Karen Hanse, Nancy Lovell, and Denise Imbert were second, third, and fourth place finishers, respectively, in the same contest. Newington's Erin Barry and Sandy Baranski finished in the top position in duet competition; while the Corps' quartet of Robin Gallagher, Erin Barry, Sandy Baranski, and Kathy Malloy copped first place also.

Newington's Color Guard was equally successful in its field of competition. In competition against some very good drill teams, the Newington squad took the championship in fancy drill. Joann Yan-nas completed the Color Guard's honors by winning third place in the Individual Flag competition.

The young people of the Newington Fife and Drum Corps and Color Guard should be very proud of their fine achievements. They have demonstrated a winning combination of talent, practice and dedication. The Corps members deserve recognition, not only for these achievements, but also for the hardwork they put into raising funds for the 5-day trip to the national competition. For over a year they worked at raising the needed money, and they succeeded on their own.

I am sure the Corps members would want me to mention their sponsor and instructors. The sponsor of the Newington Corps is their town's Park and Recreation Department. The Corps' director is Mrs. William Addis and their instructors include Patricia DeSilva, James Plaut, and William Addis. The department and these people deserve credit for their role in this successful competition.

I am sure all my fellow colleagues will join me in saluting the young people from Newington Fife and Drum Corps and Color Guard on their very successful year.

RAIL SERVICE FOR THUMB AREA

HON. J. ROBERT TRAXLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, rail service for the Saginaw Valley-Thumb area of Michigan was the subject of hearings held in Saginaw, Mich., last week by the Interstate Commerce Commission under the authority of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973.

I testified on behalf of the many people of the Eighth District who have expressed their concern to me about the possible loss of rail service to many rural communities. The Department of Transportation has designated as "potentially excess" over 300 miles of track in Huron, Sanilac, Tuscola, Lapeer, Bay, and Saginaw counties—nearly 60 percent of the total existing lines. If all of these lines were permitted to be abandoned under the final system plan, many communities would suffer irreparable economic damage.

In my statement, I point out that the DOT plan has come under heavy criticism by many citizens' groups and also by the Rail Services Planning Office of the ICC. The DOT analysis was simplistic, and ignored the economic and social impact that such wholesale abandonments might have upon the affected communities. I urged the U.S. Railway Association to reject the methodologies of the DOT report and to consider the recommendations of the Rail Services Planning Office's May 2, 1974, report.

Mr. Speaker, since this rail reorganization plan affects 17 States in the Northeast, many other congressional districts are facing the same prospects as Michigan's Eighth District. For that reason, I include my testimony at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF HON. BOB TRAXLER

My name is Bob Traxler, and I am the United States Congressman from the Eighth District of Michigan. I welcome this opportunity to speak on behalf of the people of the Saginaw Valley-Thumb area on the vital issue of continued rail service in this region.

On February 1, 1974, the Secretary of Transportation issued a plan which would permit the abandonment of over 300 miles, or nearly 60%, of the railroad lines in the Eighth District of Michigan. As the elected representative of the people of this area, I totally oppose the amputation of these rail

lines which are so vital to the economy of this region.

I pledge to use the full resources of my office to prevent any rail service cutbacks that would adversely affect jobs and the economic well-being of the people of this area. I intend to keep in close touch with members of the Rail Services Planning Office and the United States Railway Association throughout the planning process, so that their Preliminary and Final System Plans will reflect more rational and equitable treatment of the rail service needs of the people of the Saginaw Valley-Thumb area.

The DOT Report, which was prepared hastily, used over-simplified profit-per-mile formulas to designate "excess" lines. These formulas ignored the mandate of Congress to consider the economic impact of proposed cutbacks on the areas served. In an effort to save certain railroads from bankruptcy, the DOT would plunge entire communities into bankruptcy. Furthermore, the assumptions, criteria, data, and methods used in the DOT analysis have come under heavy attack by a variety of citizen's groups and railroad experts, including the Rail Services Planning Office of the Interstate Commerce Commission. One thing is clear: the people of this area will not permit this ill-conceived plan to be foisted upon them by Washington. Rather than perform major surgery upon our railroads, we need to strengthen and improve this vital part of our national transportation system. A modernized railroad system is essential to ensure employment, provide for economic growth, conserve scarce energy resources, and protect our environment.

As a Member of the United States Congress, I charge that the Secretary of Transportation has violated the mandate given him in the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973. In Section 206(a) of that Act, Congress stated that any plan for railroad reorganization should have among its goals:

Creation of a rail system "adequate to meet the rail transportation needs and service requirements of the region;"

The preservation of "existing patterns of service by railroads" and the use of modes of transportation which require "the smallest amount of scarce energy resources;"

The attainment and maintenance of environmental standards; and

"The minimization of job losses and associated increases in unemployment and community benefit costs in areas in the region presently served by rail service."

Despite these clear criteria, the Secretary conceded that his recommendations which would permit abandoning all of these rail lines were based upon simple statistical formulas and ignored these other statutory goals. I call upon the Railway Association to reject the Secretary's methods and consider the mandate of the Congress as it frames the Preliminary and Final Systems Plans this year.

In addition, the DOT plan has included the designation as "potentially excess" the rail lines of several solvent, profitable railroads in this area. Nowhere in the Rail Reorganization Act does Congress intend that profitable lines of profitable railroads be allowed to be abandoned. The Secretary's proposal clearly exceeds the authorization of the statute.

Fortunately, the Transportation Department's proposal was only the first step in a lengthier, more comprehensive planning process set up by Congress in the Act. The DOT Report, along with criticisms of that report by the I.C.C. and the public, will be forwarded to the United States Railway Association, a non-profit public corporation which will frame the ultimate plan later this year. Congress has reserved the right to approve the final plan before it takes effect. Hopefully, as this planning process goes forward, cooler heads will prevail, and the final

plan will strengthen and improve our rail system, not butcher it.

An important factor that Congress built into the process was a provision for significant citizen input. If there was one thing I learned while campaigning for Congress, it is that people are tired of government directing their lives. They want to participate in the decision-making that affects them so much. To the surprise of many government officials, the public interest and participation in this railroad issue has been overwhelming. Hearings were originally held in Detroit in March, and over two hundred witnesses offered testimony. Many others have sent in written statements and letters voicing their opinions. Today's hearings in Saginaw, and the ones to follow in Grand Rapids, Traverse City, and Marquette offer another opportunity to the many people who want their voices heard to speak out on this issue.

Because the public response to this issue has been so overwhelming, it is clear that more time is needed for public comment. More time is also needed for the government planners to analyze the data in order to put together an intelligent and fair system plan. Therefore, I am announcing today that I am co-sponsoring legislation in the House of Representatives to extend the period for public comment on the Preliminary System Plan, to be issued on October 29, 1974, from two months to five months. This added time is necessary in light of the complexity of the subject, the public response to the hearings held on the initial DOT report, and the economic and ecological impact on the communities and industries of this region.

Unfortunately, one group that has been strangely silent during these hearings have been the railroads themselves. The C & O Railroad, for example, is a solvent railroad. Its lines servicing Huron, Tuscola, and Sanilac counties in the Thumb have been apparently over-all profitable. The DOT plan would permit abandoning almost all of these lines, cutting off many communities from rail service altogether. Yet, as of this date, we have not heard from the C & O Railroad. Do they favor or oppose this plan? I call upon the railroads affected by the DOT proposals to state publicly, and not behind closed doors in Washington, their views on continued rail service in this area. I challenge these railroads to make their positions known.

The Interstate Commerce Commission recently issued a report analyzing the Transportation Department's plan. The May 2, 1974, Report severely criticized the DOT plan, stating that its conclusions were based upon questionable assumptions, criteria, data, and methods. My own investigation confirms these criticisms. The DOT plan began with the assumption that the way to construct an efficient, profitable railroad system was merely to eliminate all currently "unprofitable" lines. This assumption ignores the fact that after such wholesale amputation of rail lines, what is left may not even be a "system" at all. Rather, it seems evident that we need to examine why profits are low on certain lines. It may be that, rather than a lack of demand for rail services, the low use of such lines is due to the poor quality of service, including shortages of rail cars when needed, deteriorating facilities, and poor management. In many areas of the Thumb, for example, we have ample evidence that many, many more tons of goods would have been shipped on railroads last year if there had been enough railroad cars available.

The Department of Transportation plan applied a simple profit-and-loss test to each mile of track in the region, rather than considering such segments as part of an overall transportation system in a given area. Thus, the DOT criteria for determining the economic viability of many rural lines ignores the greater question of the economic viability

of the geographical region if the lines were to be abandoned. The DOT Report assumes that any industry or community which loses rail service can easily and automatically switch to other modes of transportation. This simply is not true. There is evidence of a shortage of trucking capacity in certain areas. In some parts of the Thumb, there are no class A roads that could bear the additional truck traffic. Local communities simply could not afford to build new roads. Moreover, even when switching to truck transportation would be technically possible, the additional costs would cut the competitive advantage of many producers, forcing some of them out of business.

Apart from the assumptions and criteria used, the DOT study also based its conclusions on questionable data. "Excess" lines were designated on the basis of 1972 carload origin and destination data supplied by the railroads. The use of a single year's data alone failed to take into account historical trends and future projections of demand for rail service. Moreover, it was found that billing points, rather than actual origin and termination points, were used. This caused inaccuracies and distortions in the data. Finally, there has been some evidence that 1972 data is particularly unreliable because that year was quite atypical.

I maintain that the only acceptable means of determining branch line viability is a detailed cost and revenue analysis, taking into account not only what is actually transported on a specific line, but what *could* be transported on a well-maintained and efficiently operated railroad. Data should be collected not only from the railroads themselves, but from actual and potential users as well.

Beyond the use of faulty data, the DOT also used a questionable formula for applying the data. The profitability of branch lines was evaluated using a formula created by R. L. Banks Associates. The Banks formula, however, is a theoretical one, and the Banks Report itself cautions that the results "cannot be fully endorsed as buttressed on sound statistical theory."

The overall application of these hastily drawn, questionable techniques resulted in a plan that could cause the wholesale abandonment of over 300 miles of rail line, or nearly 60% of the total trackage, in the Eighth Congressional District. This shabby analysis should not be allowed to result in the implementation of such a wholesale cutback of rail services.

As the May 2 Report of the Rail Services Planning Office says, the Secretary of Transportation's analysis ignores the overall economic implications on the communities which would be affected by these rail service cutbacks. The results in this region would be disastrous. The May 2 Report states that—

"The direct impact of the DOT's proposal will be an increase in the cost of doing business at locations along deficit branch lines. Higher freight rates on potentially excess branch lines will have to be absorbed by local manufacturers and their employees or passed on to consumers. . . . In agricultural areas, farmers may absorb the higher freight rates, capitalized value of farm land may decline, and prices of farm products may increase."

The minimum impact of the DOT proposal on the Thumb area, then, could be that higher transportation costs would result in higher prices for everyone involved, including the consumer.

But we have evidence that the impact would even be more severe than that. In the hearings that took place in Detroit in March, there was testimony that the lack of rail service would put some producers at such a competitive disadvantage that they could no longer compete in national markets with their products. Some concerns would have to

close, throwing hundreds of working people out of jobs and plunging many small communities into near bankruptcy. These results cannot be tolerated; nor are they allowed by the mandate of Congress in the Rail Reorganization Act.

In the Saginaw Valley-Thumb area, for example, rail service to 44 communities, in which 52 individual bean elevators are located, could be terminated under the DOT plan. Since nearly one third of the navy bean production of this area is now moved to domestic markets in bulk hopper railroad cars, the effects of abandoning these rail lines would be devastating. These fifty-two elevators would not have the opportunity to bid on shipments to the major canning points in the U.S. Customers of these producers have made the capital expenditures to convert their receiving lines over to bulk deliveries. Secondary trucking to points that are still slated to have rail service would be an additional expense that would probably result in a lower quality product at greatly increased prices.

In addition to beans, this region produces a significant sugar crop. Yet, in the C & O line running through the Thumb countries is abandoned, the Michigan Sugar Company plant at Croswell would probably have to close, according to testimony at the Detroit hearings. Likewise, a firm producing mobile homes in Marlette would probably have to cease operations because the I-beams needed to construct the larger mobile homes could not be brought in by truck. Over 425 employees in this community of 1700 would be thrown out of work.

This plan could be an economic disaster to the Eighth District. The people, and their elected representatives, will not accept any plan resulting in massive abandonment of rail service while ignoring the social, economic, and environmental costs of such an action.

One thing should be clear from these hearings. The people of the Eighth District want more and better rail service, not less of it. In a time of environmental and energy crises, railroads can provide the answer to many of our transportation problems. Railroads are four times more efficient than trucks in the use of energy. Exhaust emissions per net ton mile of freight moved are 3.76 for trucks and 1.03 for railroads. Railroad lines can be constructed 100 times cheaper per mile than highways, and such lines are more efficient users of land, occupying about seven percent as much land as highway rights-of-way. It is evident that our national transportation system of the future should and will include significant amounts of rail transportation. We need to improve, strengthen, and modernize rail facilities. I urge the I.C.C. and the United States Railway Association to follow the mandate of Congress in fashioning a plan that will produce an improved, efficient rail system that will service the needs of all regions of the country, including the Eighth District of Michigan. I pledge to make continued railroad service one of my top priorities and will keep close to the planning process to ensure that the needs of the people of this area are met by any reorganization plans. Thank you.

PUBLIC ATTITUDE ON IMPEACHMENT

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, a constituent recently wrote me, briefly

summarizing with his own feelings what millions feel about the impeachment of President Nixon and the recently released "Watergate tapes."

I would like to insert the text of this letter in the Record at this time for the attention of my colleagues. It should remind them more strongly than my words alone of the seriousness of the situation as our constituents see it.

The text follows:

Representative MICHAEL HARRINGTON,
Washington, D.C.:

Have been listening to WGBH reading Nixon's tape transcription all weekend, and am nauseated.

Impeach the (expletive deleted).

DISTRICT 15, USWA, HONORS I. W. ABEL

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I. W. Abel, international president of the United Steelworkers of America and one of our Nation's most respected citizens, was honored recently at a testimonial dinner sponsored by the Legislative Committee of District 15, USWA.

District 15 comprises approximately 70,000 steelworkers in southwest Pennsylvania and is led by another outstanding figure in the Nation's labor movement, Mr. Joseph Odorcich, district director. The organization cited Mr. Abel for his dedication and leadership in securing legislation to better the lives of America's 1.4 million steelworkers and other members of the country's labor force.

Among the major pieces of legislation credited to Mr. Abel's personal efforts were the Occupational Safety and Health Act, the Civil Rights and Clean Air Acts and one of the most important bills to come out of Congress in many years, one which effects everyone who works for a living, the Federal reinsurance and protection of an individual's pension rights and benefits.

Nearly 1,000 people attended District 15's testimonial dinner to this quiet, dignified but "no-nonsense" leader steelworkers have come to know as "Abe." Included were a number of prominent personalities outside the labor field: Gov. Milton Shapp of Pennsylvania; our esteemed colleague in the House, the Hon. THOMAS E. MORGAN, and the chairman of the Allegheny County Board of Commissioners, Leonard C. Staisey.

It is common knowledge that Mr. Abel's ties with labor are deep rooted. His father was a blacksmith; relatives on his mother's side of the family worked in the coal mines of Wales. After graduation from high school, Mr. Abel, himself, began learning a trade at the American Sheet and Tin Mill Works in Canton, Ohio.

Steelworkers know that to be good, steel must be tempered. The same is true of their leaders. Mr. Abel was "tempered" during the depression of the

1930's. He lost one job but was fortunate to find another—firing kilns in a brickyard for 16 cents an hour, 12 hours a day, 7 days a week. That experience taught him that a strong labor movement was imperative if working men and women were to have any measure of dignity and security in their jobs and their lives.

Mr. Abel's union career began in 1936 when he helped organize Local 1123 at the Timken Roller Bearing Co. He served as an officer of the local for many years, including the presidency, and still retains his membership there. In 1937 the late Philip Murray appointed him to a staff position with the USWA and in 1942 Mr. Murray selected him to head the newly created District 27, USWA, in Ohio. Ten years later, Mr. Abel was the unanimous choice for secretary-treasurer of the International and in 1965 he climaxed his career by being elected president of the International, the office he now holds.

The accolades accorded Mr. Abel for his labor leadership are matched by those presented him for humanitarian efforts in other fields. He has unselfishly given of his time and talent to many civic affairs and functions. He has served on numerous public, private and governmental boards and commissions. Two presidents, President Johnson and President Nixon, have named him to special task forces set up to serve the Nation.

Honorary doctor degrees have been bestowed on him by educational institutions; the National Council of Senior Citizens have recognized his contributions on their behalf and the State of Israel has praised his "exemplary leadership." In 1966 he was the only labor official to address the first International Conference on Urban Transportation in Pittsburgh and is believed to be the first labor leader to address the National Governors' Conference, when he appeared before them in Los Angeles.

Mr. Speaker, despite these impressive credentials and accomplishments, I. W. Abel likes nothing better than a shirt-sleeved session with his rank-and-file steelworkers. He has never lost the common touch.

THE DOD SUBVERTS CULEBRA AGREEMENT

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I was very distressed to read in the Washington Post this morning that, once again, the Department of Defense has attempted to abrogate an agreement reached with the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico whereby the activities conducted at the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Range on the island of Culebra were to be transferred to two uninhabited island, Desecheo and Mo-nito.

For a number of years the people of Culebra and the Commonwealth govern-

ment have attempted to negotiate with DOD officials over the removal of the Navy training activity and the cessation of the naval and aerial bombardment of the island. Throughout almost the entire period of negotiation there has been great reluctance and outright opposition by the military to any transfer of its training functions. Finally, in January 1971, an agreement was reached between the Secretary of the Navy, officials of the Puerto Rican government and the citizens of Culebra. This accord—the Culebra agreement—terminated an 18-month-long cold war which was continually marked by intimidation, deceit, and indifference on the part of the Navy and Defense Departments. Nevertheless, the Culebra agreement was almost universally interpreted as a commitment on the part of the Navy to find suitable alternatives to the Culebra test facility and to end its firing and training operations on and about the island.

On April 1, 1971, then Secretary of Defense Laird announced the start of a new DOD study aimed at relocating the range after June 1975. There was a clear implication that the Defense Secretary had concluded from an earlier study of the situation, and in consultation with the President and others, that the Navy could and should transfer its training operations away from Culebra by June 1975 and that he would be making a final decision at the end of the year as to exactly where such naval training activities would be transferred. However, in late December 1972, in a clearly political move taken after the incumbent administration in Puerto Rico had been defeated, Mr. Laird reversed his earlier decision and recommended to the Congress that the Navy retain its Culebra training targets and indicated that the Navy would not further study the matter until the early 1980's.

Fortunately, Mr. Laird's successor—Elliot Richardson—took a more enlightened and reasonable attitude on the Culebra issue and reassessed the DOD's position. In May 1973 Mr. Richardson reported to the House and Senate Armed Services Committees that he had decided "it would be in the long-range interest of the various parties to move the current Navy training activities by July 1, 1975 from the Culebra complex... to the uninhabited islands of Desecheo and Monito."

This determination was greeted with encouragement and hope by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the people of Culebra and by many others who had endeavored to have the Navy cease its bombing of an area inhabited by over 800 American citizens and which had suffered serious economic and ecological consequences of the continued naval presence. It was assumed that the DOD would abide by and fully honor this commitment.

However, we now learn that the Deputy Secretary of Defense has unilaterally decided to suspend the negotiations conducted pursuant to Mr. Richardson's report and subsequent legislative actions. This ill-conceived and unconscionable move can only be interpreted as another attempt to negate the com-

mitment of the Defense Department and to thwart the will of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this state of affairs cannot be tolerated and the Defense Department must understand that it cannot simply dismiss or ignore obligations which it has undertaken. The DOD is not an entity unto itself and it must abide by the agreements to which it is a party and which have been affirmed by this body.

I have expressed by very deep personal concern over this whole issue to Secretary Schlesinger and insert, herewith, for inclusion in the RECORD, a copy of my letter to him. I am also inserting the article from this morning's Washington Post:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 23, 1974.

HON. JAMES R. SCHLESINGER,
Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to express my deep, personal consternation and concern over reports that negotiations between the Department of the Navy and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico concerning the relocation of the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Range from the Island of Culebra to other sites have broken down. I am especially troubled because of reports that these negotiations were unilaterally suspended by your deputy, Mr. Clements.

Just over one year ago your predecessor clearly stated that:

"I have decided it would be in the long-range interest of the various parties to move the current Navy training activities by July 1, 1975 from the Culebra complex east of Puerto Rico to the uninhabited islands of Desecheo and Monito..." (Italics added.)

Now, it would seem, Mr. Clements has taken upon himself the responsibility to negate this commitment. This ill-conceived move was apparently made because of certain considerations in connection with the forthcoming international conference on the Law of the Sea. However, whatever implications the transfer of the Navy training activities from Culebra to Desecheo and Monito may have on this parley were fully considered by Mr. Richardson and, presumably, other appropriate DoD officials. Thus there can just be no justification for Mr. Clements or anyone else in the DoD to renege on the promise made to the people and government of Puerto Rico and to thwart the clear intent of the Congress that such Navy training and testing activities should be transferred.

For over 37 years Culebra has been subjected to continued naval and aerial bombardment and the explosion of various types of mines, missiles and other armaments. Not only have the 850 residents of this island been in constant fear of their lives and property but they have suffered economically from the continued Naval presence. Further, these activities have posed a continual threat to the island's environment and to its unique and, in some cases, incomparable ecological features.

Mr. Clements appears to be preoccupied with the potential affect of the transfer on our international relations, at least as they may pertain to the issue of territorial waters. I submit that he would be better concerned with the affect his action has had on inter-American relations. As I've previously observed, the attitude displayed by our government toward the whole Culebra issue has seriously exacerbated already existing tensions in our hemispheric relations. Developing peoples in the Americas, as well as many island and mainland Puerto Ricans, see this as an issue of colonialism. The ineptitude which has marked much of the DoD's deal-

ing with the matter has made Culebra a clear symbol of this administration's basic indifference toward the needs and aspirations of Spanish-speaking people, both American citizens and in our sister republic in the Western Hemisphere.

In light of the above I urge in the strongest possible terms that you take prompt and affirmative steps to honor the commitment previously made by the DoD and to permit the negotiations with the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to proceed without further interruption or delay.

Your cooperation and assistance will be appreciated and I will look forward to your response shortly.

Sincerely,

HERMAN BADILLO,
Member of Congress.

NAVY SHELLING TURTLES—CULEBRA TALKS HALTED BY UNITED STATES?

(By George C. Wilson)

The tortuous negotiations between the Navy and Puerto Rico over the American shelling of the island of Culebra have broken down again—this time by order of the Pentagon.

Following this latest setback, the lawyer for the Puerto Rican government here said he may file suit under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to force the Navy to stop using Culebra for target practice.

"Unfortunately," said Richard D. Copaken, counsel to the municipality of Culebra and special counsel to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, "there is no federal law to protect the people of Puerto Rico from the Navy shelling of the island—but there is a law to protect the endangered species there, like the hawksbill turtle which nests on the beaches of Culebra."

Copaken said his Puerto Rico clients are considering trying to stop the Navy under that act if the Navy does not carry out plans to transfer its shelling to two other uninhabited islands.

"We're serious," he said, "No one appreciates how strong that law is. And the Navy shelling certainly endangers the turtles that come under the Endangered Species Act."

Chairman Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.) of the Senate Interior Committee also is upset about the breakdown in Navy negotiations with Culebra. He has protested the Pentagon's suspension of negotiations in letters to William P. Clements Jr., deputy secretary of defense and Kenneth Rush, deputy secretary of state.

Jackson wrote them that former Secretary of Defense Elliot L. Richardson on May 24, 1973, had ordered the Navy to map plans to move its gunnery range from Culebra to the islands of Desecheo and Monito off the west coast of Puerto Rico by July 1, 1975. Congress put \$12 million for the move in the Pentagon's fiscal 1974 budget.

"Given the strong desires of the people of Puerto Rico, the clearly expressed will of the Congress and the repeated commitments of the government of the United States to cease operations on Culebra, any impediment to the transfer must be viewed as a matter of grave concern," Jackson wrote Clements in asking why negotiations have been broken off by the Navy.

Clements ordered the Culebra negotiations suspended on May 8. The reason, a Pentagon official said last night, is to examine what impact the planned move would have on the American negotiating position at the Law of the Sea conference opening in Caracas next month.

At that conference, called by the United Nations, participants will discuss the advisability of moving territorial waters out to 12 miles instead of the three miles the United States recognizes for itself and other coastal countries.

But, if 12 miles does become the standard

distance, the United States wants the right of "transit" through that widened belt. The Pentagon official said putting a firing range in the straits off Puerto Rico might look provocative to the developing countries of the world as they weigh the American plea for right of transit.

The impact of a move from Culebra to the uninhabited islands on the Law of the Sea conference will be evaluated by under secretaries of the various government departments between now and May 31 when a report on the question is due, according to the Pentagon.

Copaken rejected the argument that the Navy's moving from Culebra to Desecho and Monito would have any impact on the U.S. position regarding a 12-mile limit.

Former Defense Secretary Richardson, Copaken said, fully considered that question before directing the Navy to prepare to move off Culebra.

Besides that, the lawyer asserted, the straits between the islands are so wide that an international corridor would remain even if 12-mile territorial limits are agreed upon.

Negotiations between the Navy and Gov. Rafael Hernandez-Colon of Puerto Rico over Culebra appeared to be going well until now.

In March the governor wrote then-Navy Secretary John W. Warner that it was his "firm decision" that "the best alternative is that all naval gunfire support training and air-to-ground weapons training be transferred" from Culebra to the uninhabited islands.

Copaken claimed that even though the Navy is firing so called "puff rounds" rather than live ammunition in its gunnery practice, the shells fired off Culebra endanger people and wildlife—including the hawks-bill turtle.

RESCUE IN ADEN

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, just 3 weeks ago, I was pacing the terrace waiting for the phone to ring at Guest House No. 2 overlooking the harbor at Aden, the capital of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen.

The call would be the signal that Salim Rubay'i Ali, President of the Republic, was ready to receive me. It would be the final interview of my 3-day stay in Aden, the last and most important chance I would have to plead for the release of Ed Franklin of Nebo, Ill., my constituent who had been a prisoner there for the last 16 months, serving a 5-year sentence on a spy charge.

At 6 a.m. the next day, I would board a flight to Beirut, there to connect with flights that would return me to Washington in time for legislative business Tuesday on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives.

At that moment, Congress seemed far away, and chances for Franklin's immediate release almost as remote.

I had come to Aden expressly to plead his case. I was convinced he was not a spy. Although I had never before met him, I had known his family for years and learned from them the mixup that put him in prison.

In fact, Ed would never have been in Aden at all except for canceled airline flights. Returning from Ethiopia to his teaching post in Kuwait, he was re-routed through Aden. During a delay caused by cancellation of his departing flight, he pursued his hobby taking photos near the harbor. Not realizing local restrictions, he photographed a prohibited area.

Kept in an interrogation center for months, he was finally brought to trial, found guilty by a jury and sentenced after more than 10 months of captivity.

Franklin was a creature of circumstance. The government was then just emerging from a period of internal disorder. After 130 years of rule by British governors and local sheiks, a long revolution culminated in the establishment, in 1967, of a republic. A coup d'etat in 1969 moved the regime to the left.

The closing of the Suez Canal—life-blood of Aden—and removal of the big British military base eliminated 15,000 local jobs and deepened tension and anxiety. When Franklin arrived, the government still had internal security problems and was plagued along its borders by subversion promoted by banished sheiks. Clearly, the regime was still edgy and in Franklin's case over-reacted.

The atmosphere in Aden has now improved. The government looks forward to an early reopening of the canal. Except for sporadic battles along the border with Saudi Arabia—for which Aden blames both the Saudis and the United States—the government has established firm control of its territory.

It has begun to tackle the massive problem of illiteracy—unofficially estimated at 95 percent—and economic stagnation. Unlike most Arab States, it has no known mineral reserves. Rainfall is less than 3 inches a year.

Its great harbor had only three ships at anchor the day I was there, and the shops along the broad main avenue were dingy, many of them closed—with hardly a customer in sight.

Had Franklin snapped his picture that Saturday instead of 16 months earlier, chances are he would have gotten off with a rebuke and a fine. As it was, he still had 44 months to serve. His family's and my appeals for clemency had so far had no effect.

I had been there 3 days. The schedule of interviews in his behalf for which I had journeyed a third of the way around the world was nearly at an end.

Remaining were the interview with the President scheduled at 7 p.m., then a dinner hosted by Foreign Minister Mohammad Motie at 8 p.m.

Behind me were eventful but, insofar as Franklin was concerned, inconclusive days. These included: a 4-hour discussion with Abdallah al-Khamiri, Minister of State for Cabinet Affairs, who had been selected to deal with me by the Presidential Council, which consists of the President, the Prime Minister, and the Secretary General of the National Front; a 3-hour discussion with Foreign

Minister Motie, whom I had first met 3 weeks earlier in New York where he was attending United Nations deliberations; and interviews on two separate days with Franklin.

My schedule also included a view of Aden at play. Along with 25,000 others, I had been a spectator at a football game in which the national soccer football team defeated Iraq 2 to 0. I had also visited the National Military Museum, where my guide, Fareeda Daair, who next year will begin to study pharmacy, showed me U.S. military equipment captured in skirmishes along the Saudi border and reported proudly that in the Republic women have rights equal with men.

My year-long effort to secure Franklin's release for the most part had been lonely. Because our Government has no diplomatic relations with Aden, the State Department could do nothing directly. Its best channel was the British Embassy in Aden. I had asked a friend in the Egyptian Government to seek President Sadat's intervention. The request was made. I had asked a friend in the Soviet Government, which has provided aid to South Yemen, to express interest in Franklin. The Franklin family sent a request to President Ali for executive clemency. There was no response to any of these initiatives.

In December, I telephoned Aden's ambassador to the United Nations, Abdallah Ashtal, to ask if I could go personally to Aden and make a plea for Franklin's release. A message came back 2 weeks later that I would be welcome. At the time I had hoped to be in the Middle East on a Foreign Affairs Committee trip, but due to the fuel crisis the trip was canceled.

Then came word from the British Foreign Office that the Yemen authorities would not take up the Franklin case until I arrived in Aden. Plainly, for whatever reason, the government wanted me to come. In March, I flew to New York for a meeting with Ambassador Ashtal. I was assured that if I went to Aden I could see Franklin, also the Prime Minister, and possibly the President. However, the Ambassador urged that I delay my trip until I could meet Foreign Minister Motie when he was in New York for an April United Nations meeting. Would my trip help Franklin? The only response by the Ambassador was that my visit would be welcome.

I returned to New York several weeks later to meet the Foreign Minister. The meeting with Motie was further proof that Aden's is a young man's government. Ashtal is 32, Motie 28, al-Khamiri 34, President Ali 40.

Although cordial, Motie gave me no encouragement that Franklin would be released.

He said:

While you are in Aden you will have the opportunity to discuss the Franklin case.

He said that before leaving Aden he had inquired and learned that Franklin was in good health, that he had recently been visited by the Red Cross and that he was receiving preferential treatment:

You will be able to see him. You will be able to talk with authorities about him.

Should I make hotel reservations? No, the government will make the reservations. So it was settled. I would arrive in Aden early in the morning of Thursday, May 2, and leave early Sunday morning, May 5.

I would travel alone, the first Congressman—House or Senate—to visit Aden since the Republic was established in 1967 and the first U.S. official to visit there since diplomatic relations were severed in 1969. Although an exciting prospect, it was not without foreboding. The government was regarded by the State Department as the most radical of the Arab States. It had been the scene in recent years of a revolution, then a counter-coup d'etat. It seemed to have close relations with no other government. It was often described as the Cuba of the Arab world. I could find no one who had had personal interviews with any of the leading personalities of the government. How would I be received? Would I be stuck in a hotel most of the time and come home with little to show for an arduous trip?

Indeed, would I get out? After all, the government had sentenced Franklin to 5 years on what seemed to me a flimsy charge. When I discussed my trip with Alfred L. Atherton, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State for Near East and South Asia Affairs, I asked, "If they lock me up, what will you do first?" He smiled and said, "Look for another Congressman to come get you out."

But, there was no turning back. I was about the only one who might be able to help Franklin. The Aden Government would do nothing about clemency until I arrived. And, taking the larger view, perhaps this was an opportunity to help open the door to better relations with a vital but little-known part of the world.

Two years ago, I must admit, I did not know there was one Yemen, much less two. I had been in Egypt and while there visited Suez City and the banks of the canal, but I did not notice that Aden controlled the south approach to the Suez Canal as effectively as Egypt controlled the North.

With the opening of the canal in prospect, good relations with Aden could be important to U.S. interests in the Indian Ocean. Secretary of State Kissinger's negotiations had kept the Soviets from controlling the canal from the North. But if the Soviets, already present with aid missions and military advisers, succeeded in dominating the Aden Government, they could effectively control traffic through the canal by controlling the straits leading to the Red Sea on the South. In addition to having the only large deepwater harbor in that area, South Yemen owns the island in the center of the straits. It was obvious that the United States needed good relations with Aden for purposes beyond the release of Franklin.

Although House Foreign Affairs Committee members rarely travel alone on Government trips, Chairman THOMAS E. MORGAN recognized the exceptional nature of this mission and approved it.

I began my preparations. My objective was goodwill. I knew from talking with Ashtal and Motie that Secretary Kissinger was held in high esteem in Aden. Only days before my scheduled departure, the Secretary was to leave for shuttle-negotiations in the Middle East. Although I doubted that he could possibly give even a passing moment to my trip, I stated my desire to have a letter I could take with me. Three days before I left, it arrived:

DEAR PAUL: Prior to your departure for Aden, I would like to take the opportunity to wish you success in your efforts to gain the release of your constituent jailed in Aden, Thomas Edward Franklin. As you know, we have not had diplomatic relations with Aden since 1969, and no American diplomatic or consular officers are stationed there. This, of course, has made it very difficult to deal with protection and welfare/whereabouts cases resulting from American travel to the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen.

I welcome your humanitarian mission. I know that you are making it in the spirit of your longstanding interest in promoting Arab-American understanding, an interest which I very much share. As you know, we have for some time been working actively to achieve a just and durable peace in the Middle East. We have no illusions about the difficulties involved, but we are encouraged by the achievement of Egyptian-Israeli disengagement and the fact that talks are under way aimed at Syrian-Israeli disengagement. Should the occasion arise, you may wish to inform those officials whom you meet of our continuing commitment to work for an equitable and lasting Middle East peace and of our desire to strengthen our ties with the Arab world.

Best regards,

HENRY A. KISSINGER.

The day before, I had received another boost, a letter from Secretary Atherton, responding to my direct question about the United States' desire for diplomatic relations with Aden:

DEAR MR. FINDLEY: I would like to confirm what I said to you this morning in response to your question about the U.S. position on diplomatic relations. Basically, we do not feel that the existence of differences in national ideologies or political structure, or divergent views on many international issues should necessarily pose an obstacle to our having diplomatic relations with a given country. Generally, we favor having diplomatic relations as a means of conducting normal communications and business with foreign countries. As you know, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen (at the time the People's Republic of Southern Yemen) broke diplomatic relations with the United States in October of 1969. Both before and since that time our policy has been to work for friendly relations with all countries of the Middle East. As a matter of policy, we are prepared to reestablish diplomatic relations with countries which have broken relations with us when such countries wish to do so.

Sincerely,

ALFRED L. ATHERTON, JR.,
Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs.

Although directed to me, not to the Aden Government, these letters would, I felt, convince any officials I met that the United States wanted to establish normal relations. I was especially pleased with Secretary Kissinger's comment:

You may wish to inform those officials whom you meet of our continuing commitment to work for an equitable and lasting Middle East peace and of our desire to strengthen our ties with the Arab world.

In my bag of goodwill items, this letter was the most important.

At the suggestion of an Egyptian friend, I secured three scholarships to present to South Yemen students, one each from Illinois College in Jacksonville, Sangamon State University in Springfield, and the Southern Illinois University Dental School in Alton.

I telephoned Ashtal to let him know in advance about the letters and the scholarships. He said he felt they would be well-received. I said I would like to present the Kissinger letter directly to the Presidential Council. He responded by saying he would cable Aden with information about the letter and my desire to see the President.

I also located, and had specially bound, two copies of Carl Sandburg's "Prairie Years," Lincoln's biography, printed in Arabic. And, I took two small busts of Lincoln. Abraham Lincoln is my most important constituent. I was hopeful he would be well known even in Aden.

Armed with letters, scholarships and other gifts, and with high hopes, at 8:30 the night of May 2, I climbed aboard the plane in Beirut which would take me to Aden.

To my surprise, one of the first to board the plane was Foreign Minister Motie. He beamed and after takeoff came and sat with me for dinner. He was cordial and said with enthusiasm he really hoped I would like Aden. I told him of the Kissinger letter and he expressed great interest.

He asked about the type of industry in my district. He wondered about the possibility of receiving help in drilling for oil. He said the BP refinery in Aden is the best in the Middle East. He said he felt economic and commercial cooperation could help pave the way to diplomatic relations. I said I was sure public law prohibits most kinds of aid unless diplomatic relations exist. He said he had heard that Algeria, with whom the United States had no relations, nevertheless has received aid. I said I would check on that.

He was interested to know that in my overnight stay in Damascus, I had talked with President Asad of Syria. What did I think about relations with Cuba? I said I was optimistic that relations would soon be opened despite a recent negative statement by Secretary Kissinger. Motie said Kissinger had just been quoted positively on the Cuba question while he was in Geneva.

I mentioned my efforts to prevent publicity about my trip and my embarrassment when a reporter in Damascus asked about my trip to Aden. He shrugged. Before we arrived in Aden, he gave me his home and office phone numbers. That was reassuring. I felt I would have a friend in the country.

To my surprise and pleasure, I was met by a delegation consisting of al-Khamiri Saleh Abdulla, Chief of Protocol, Ahmed

Salem, Administrative Director of the Foreign Office, and Mahmoud Medhe, who at 31 had just recently been named governor of the Republic's National Bank.

The whole group had stayed up until 2 a.m. to meet the plane—another reassuring sign of welcome.

Al-Khamiri, Abdulla, and Medhe rode with me from the airport. When the car stopped after driving several miles through deserted streets and up a steep hill, I had further reason for reassurance. I was to be the guest of the Government—not stuck off in a hotel room. I was to occupy a guest house. An Impala Chevrolet with driver was to be available and delicious full-course meals were to be served whenever I wished. A refrigerator was well stocked with an assortment of beverages. A large living room overlooking the harbor was to be the main center for conferences. My bedroom and a small adjoining private living room were air-conditioned. Ceiling fans kept the rest of the space comfortable. Could a visiting chief of state be received with greater hospitality?

Al-Khamiri said the Presidential Council had designated him to discuss all matters with me and that he would report the discussions to the council. He said he would see me at 11 a.m. By then it was nearly 4 a.m.

Sleep that night, as the remaining three nights, was anything but long and deep. I had breakfast alone about 9 a.m.

With the exception of the final dinner Saturday night, all meals were served in the guest house. It was a large, rambling, comfortable building which years ago was the residence of the British air commander. It had four bedrooms with servant quarters behind and below. A tree-shaded terrace looked over the great harbor. Even in the heat of the day—spring is 100° and humid—it was pleasant. In the daytime, blackbirds kept up a noisy chatter, but in the evening only the rustle of the leaves broke the silence.

I admired the view of the harbor and the large terrace. A TV set was in the living room. I later learned that a local station broadcast during evening hours only.

At 10 a.m. Abdulla, who had slept in an adjoining bedroom, brought me a typed sheet, "Proposed Programme for the Visit":

Thursday, February 5, 1974:
11:00 a.m.—Meeting with Minister of State for Premier Council.
1:30 p.m.—Lunch.
7:00 p.m.—Visit to the prisoner.
8:00 p.m.—Dinner.
Friday, March 5, 1974:
10:30 a.m.—Visit to the Military Museum.
5:00 p.m.—Sight-seeing.
8:00 p.m.—Dinner party given by the Minister for Foreign Affairs.
Saturday, April 5, 1974:
10:30 a.m.—Meeting with Minister of Foreign Affairs.
7:00 p.m.—Meeting with H. E. The President.
Sunday, May 5, 1974:
5:00 a.m.—Arrival at Airport for departure.

I noted with great satisfaction that I would have the privilege of meeting with the President the eve of my departure,

thus assured the opportunity to request Franklin's release directly of the man able to grant it.

Examining the program, it was obvious that the President, the Foreign Minister, and al-Khamiri would be the personages with whom I would deal. I decided to present my Lincoln books in Arabic to the President and al-Khamiri, and the Lincoln busts to the President and Motie. I wished I had three of each item instead of just two.

Waiting for al-Khamiri, I wrote this inscription in the flyleaf of the book I would present to the President:

With appreciation for his (the President's) hospitality and compassion on the occasion of my visit to Aden, I present this special edition of the biography of my most famous constituent, Abraham Lincoln, who did so much to give reality and substance to the idealism which inspired the revolution in America.

When al-Khamiri arrived at 11 a.m., he was accompanied by Medhe. Unlike the night before when they were casually dressed, this time each wore a western business suit. Medhe, a graduate of the London School of Economics, was to be interpreter in each of my principal interviews. Although al-Khamiri and Motie understood English very well, each felt more at ease using Arabic. Thus, my words were not translated. When I met with the President, Medhe translated my words, as well as the President's. Only when I was with the President did a shorthand reporter take notes. Fortunately, however, the slow pace of discussion caused by translation enabled me to take notes myself.

Al-Khamiri began by saying he was surprised when I got off the plane the night before. He expected a Congressman to be old and perhaps feeble.

Then he described the Saudi Arabia Government as "unlike any other in the world—backward." By supporting it, he said the United States prolongs its backward character. He said Britain brought about some good changes in Kuwait, but Saudi Arabia stays the same. The United States has not influenced the Saudis for the better.

He said the U.S. military equipment in the hands of the Saudis has damaged the image of the United States. Because of this there is open anti-American feeling in Aden.

I asked what specific complaints against the United States he would make. He replied that Secretary of State Rogers, while visiting San'a, North Yemen, made a speech several years ago in which he forecast that the Aden regime would not last 2 years. He said spokesmen for a nation like the United States should be more careful. I replied I had not heard of it, but that it was significant that Rogers was gone, but the Aden Government remained.

He said the U.S. Secretary of Defense had made some "unfortunate" statements about the Perim Islands, located in the straits leading to the Red Sea. These statements supported an Israeli position.

I said I was unaware of this, too, and asked if South Yemen supports the doctrine of innocent passage for such straits. He said Aden does observe the doctrine

and permits all ships to pass through the straits.

He said 3 months earlier five vessels of the U.S. 7th Fleet came within the 12-mile territorial limits of Socotra. This, too, was news to me, and I told him it supports my argument that Aden and Washington should have greater communication.

He said under the previous Aden Government, a U.S. military attaché had interfered in the uprising of March 1968.

I said it was important that Washington and the Congress know whenever such incidents occur. He replied:

If other incidents occur, I will notify you by telephone, telex or cable.

I said, "I will be your personal Ambassador in Washington."

I handed him a set of statements I have made over the past few years on Middle East policy. I said it reminded me of the man who gave his son a book on penguins for Christmas. Later he asked how he liked the book, and the boy replied, "I learned more about penguins than I wanted to know." I said he would probably learn more of my views than he wanted to know.

He laughed and said that if I was not too tired he would explain the internal policies of the government. He said their problems were caused in part by friends who did not understand:

Our people are sensitive to western influence and bases. Aden wishes to avoid all international conflicts. We wish good relations with all. After independence we began to search for our life blood. Our economy was weak. Resources were limited and means primitive. Only a small parcel of the land was growing cotton.

Most of the business activity was in the hands of seven companies which were the agents of foreign parent companies. In industry, there was little worth mentioning except the BP Refinery which, because of the low level of bunkering business in the harbor, was operating at only one-third capacity. Reduction was the policy of the British company.

The Aden government had to take economic measures. It nationalized the seven principal trading companies. Not that it wished to nationalize. Rather, there was no other alternative at that time. Reforms were made in agriculture and trading. The situation after independence was very difficult. Disease, poverty, illiteracy at about 95 percent. The country had a huge deficit in trade.

Two incidents hit the economy hard. Closing of the British military base eliminated 10,000 jobs for local people. Closing of the Suez Canal cost another 5,000 jobs.

Britain has refused to pay financial assistance it had promised at the time of independence. All this made difficulty for the government, but policies were followed that had Yemen origin. Yemen was determined to have its own modern experience, and the government was and is ready to establish diplomatic relations based on mutual respect.

The Democratic Republic had external questions and problems to answer. Either it had to join the Arab alliance or be isolated. It stayed out of the Arab alliance at first. It tried to avoid links with any international bloc. It made policy decisions on the merits of each particular case. It has not permitted any foreign government to establish a military base on its territory. It believes in the right of self-determination and therefore supports the Palestinian cause. It feels that the people of Oman should have the right of self-determination. It has given political and

moral support to the people of Oman, and material support, too, within our limited means.

He said the government is making an attack on illiteracy and has recently decreed that a year hence no person can work for the government who is illiterate. And another decree requires everyone within 5 years to become literate.

I mentioned the Lincoln heritage, which is a part of my district, and said Abraham Lincoln's compassion for human rights and his revolutionary spirit had much in common with the ideals al-Khamiri had expressed. I then summarized my case for Franklin's release.

Al-Khamiri, Medhe, and Abdulla joined me for lunch—vegetable soup, cold lobster, chicken, papaya, melon. After a brief rest, I attended the soccer-football game. The audience of about 25,000 was almost entirely male. I had an excellent center seat in a section reserved for government officials, such as the Foreign Minister, who also attended. Abdulla proved to be not only the Republic's chief protocol officer, but surely its chief football cheerleader as well. When the second and clinching goal was made, he seemed to bound at least 10 feet in the air.

I was impressed with the effectiveness of the powerful Aden trainer in resetting dislocated hips. Three such injuries occurred and—despite obvious pain during the resetting process—in each case the player was quickly back on his feet.

At 7:15 that first night, I received clearance to visit Franklin. Having traveled a third of the way around the world for the visit, I put on a suit, clean shirt, and tie for the occasion. I had never met him before. I wondered how he would react, what he would say, how he would look after 16 months of confinement.

I asked Abdulla how long it would take to drive to the prison. He said: "He's not in the prison. He's in a flat."

I assumed that, for the purpose of my visit, he had been transferred to a nearby point. Or perhaps, I thought, was it to keep me from seeing the prison environment? It was near dusk, and we drove the short distance from the guest house to the flat in about 5 minutes. Abdulla and I were in the Impala. We followed a Volkswagen police escort.

Franklin was quartered in an apartment on the second floor of a small building—a fairly modern one. About four guards were in conversation on a small balcony as we walked up. Franklin was in the living room, standing by a couch. He said:

I presume you are Congressman FINDLEY.

I smiled. It was like Dr. Livingston in darkest Africa, complete with salutation. He was very thin, almost gaunt. His trousers were at least six sizes too big, but his clothing was neat, his hair neatly combed, his face cleanly shaved and, surprisingly he was heavily tanned.

I said I had come part way around the world for this moment and hoped he was in good health. He replied he had been in good health for the most part, although he had lost about 30 pounds. Two days earlier, for the first time in 16 months, he had looked into a mirror and

he acknowledged that he was shocked at what he saw. The tan, he explained, resulted from daily exercise out-of-doors. It made him look healthy.

He said he had been transferred to the flat 2 days ago and did not like the change. In the flat he was kept locked in a small bedroom and only permitted out twice a day to visit the bathroom.

I handed him a box of food items his family had put together for me to deliver. His face, which had been surprisingly free of emotion until then, fell:

I guess this means I am not going home with you.

I responded that I did not know. I had not given up hope but frankly, I told him, I had received an estimate from several sources before I left that I could not expect him to return with me. But I said I was being given great hospitality and I believed my visit would result in a substantial reduction in sentence. I told him I felt sure he would be released within a few months after my departure.

He was dejected and said:

I've seen a different kind of hospitality here. Twice before I was told I would be leaving soon, but nothing happened. When I was transferred to this flat, I had no time to gather up my things. My camera is at the prison, and other things. My Bible. I've been reading the Bible each day—not a great deal, but some each day.

I told him many people had been praying for him. He said:

I knew at once about the prayers, even before I got word from home. I could feel it.

I said:

While I fear I will be unable to take you with me when I leave, I am confident you will be free soon. I can't know how I would feel if I were in your circumstances, but I want you to think about the influence you can possibly exert on U.S.-Arab relations. I wouldn't blame you if you speak resentfully and with outrage about your imprisonment, but where you can do so I hope you will be generous and affirmative.

He replied:

I've thought a lot about that. I've thought about picketing the Aden mission at the United Nations in New York, but I've had other thoughts too. I like the Arab world. I have not been physically abused here. Some policies bothered me. I am not permitted to have a pen and paper. I like to write. I once wrote poetry on a sack, but then my pencil was discovered and taken from me. But I like the Arab world. I want to come back. Maybe someday when the American embassy is reopened here in Aden, I could even get a job here.

I am not a spy, and the government here knows it. I've lost a lot of time. This has cost my family a lot of money. They're not rich. I think Aden owes me at least \$10,000 for time lost. When I get out, I won't have a job. The teaching job at Kuwait was my first job after graduating from Illinois State University at the age of thirty. I'm thirty-four. Getting a job won't be easy.

During this time, we were left alone. Of course, I realized the room may have been bugged, but the chatter of guards just beyond our door was noisy, and this made me feel our conversation was private. Abdulla had asked me if 30 minutes would be enough.

After 40 minutes, I rose to leave. I asked if there was anything specific I could request that would make life easier.

He said most of all he would like pen and paper to use. I assured him I would make the request. I said that I did not believe I would be informed until Saturday night as to clemency or reduction in sentence and, therefore, I might not see him again until after he was released. He said:

I can wait. I'm used to disappointments. I would suggest that you take what they tell you with a grain of salt. I say that from my own experience. Thanks for coming.

Back, in a cloud of dust, to the guest house and to a quiet dinner with Abdulla.

Later that evening, I decided to present one of the Lincoln books to al-Khamiri, whom I had come to admire. I had been impressed with the thoughts he had expressed to me earlier in the day. In the flyleaf I wrote:

To my good friend Abdallah al-Khamiri, Minister of State for Cabinet Affairs for the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, whom I have known but twenty-four hours and yet who I have confidence has within him the same spark of compassion and idealism for human rights and dignity that inspired Abraham Lincoln. With high hopes for the success of the government in which he provides prominent leadership. With warm regards, Paul Findley, your new ambassador in Washington.

Friday, a Moslem holiday, was light from the standpoint of official business but eventful nevertheless. In the morning, Abdulla took me to the National Military Museum. Built recently and still not complete, it depicts the progression of events from British protectorate to republic. In one of the halls I visited were displayed captured military equipment, most of it of U.S. manufacture—mortars, grenades, and heavier pieces, also several photographs showing U.S. equipment and supplies carrying the U.S. handshake symbol. It was impressive evidence that U.S. military gear may have figured prominently in border conflicts with Saudi Arabia.

My tour guide was Fareeda Daair, 18, a graduate of secondary school, who was spending a postgraduate year working for the government as a guide. A year's government service is a requirement of young people who wish higher education. Fareeda said she will study pharmacy. After the tour, I was invited to the museum director's office for a soft drink and an opportunity to "write my impressions" in the guest book.

Fareeda was an enthusiastic guide and expressed pride in her country.

After the tour, I handed al-Khamiri the Lincoln book. I asked him if I would be able to take Franklin when I left. He said:

Personally, I hope so, but that is out of my hands. I have reported fully to the Presidential Council what you said about Franklin and other questions, and you will have the government's decision when you meet the President Saturday night.

We drove for an hour along shorelines. Then back for a lunch and rest during the greatest heat of the day. Abdulla asked if I would like to see Franklin again. I said I would indeed and he said this would be arranged sometime Saturday afternoon. He explained that the Foreign Minister had called to say cir-

cumstances required that he postpone until Saturday night the dinner he had scheduled for me that night. That meant Saturday would indeed be a busy day—a visit to Franklin, interview with the President, then a dinner hosted by the Foreign Minister.

As events occurred, I tried to read each in terms of Franklin's release. I could find no clear hint of what was ahead. Was the dinner date shifted to give me a nice sendoff even though empty-handed?

Abdulla surprised me by asking if I would like to invite guests for dinner Friday night. I asked that the British Minister, William Buckley, who had been especially kind to Franklin, and his wife be invited. I had wanted to thank him for his kindness and also to ask for suggestions on how I should approach the Foreign Minister and the President. This would be a fine opportunity. They readily accepted.

Before their arrival, I had the pleasure of a tennis game with three officers in the foreign ministry. Although I was on the losing end, it was great fun. Once when a tennis ball bounded over the wall into the street, an empty quart-size oil container came bounding back. I took this as a rebuke to the tennis ball instead of an anti-American expression.

Then a tour of the great ancient water tanks and adjoining museum. My guide was a young man who wishes to study chemical engineering. The water collection system, built perhaps a thousand years ago, could easily become a major tourist attraction. We drove to a couple of beach clubs near Aden, and I decided that during the winter months when weather is uniformly spring-like, Aden could become a tourist area much like Miami Beach.

The dinner proved to be a treat for the Buckleys, as well as myself. It was their first visit to a government guest house.

After dinner that evening, Abdulla left us alone on the terrace where we talked frankly and freely about Franklin, his prospects for release, what further could be done in his behalf, the problems of the Aden Government, and ways to improve Aden's relations with the United States. Buckley believed that my chances of actually taking Franklin with me were slim indeed. But he did believe my visit would cause the government to reduce the sentence substantially.

He had taken a personal interest in Franklin and was impressed with his deep religious faith. He said he knew it had helped to sustain him. He felt this had a lot to do with his family and boyhood community. He asked, "His home is in what is often called the Bible belt, isn't it?" It is indeed.

He said he hoped that during the remainder of Franklin's confinement the government would permit him occasionally to take the prisoner out for a drive or a visit to his home. The Buckleys departed about 11 p.m. As they drove down the winding road to the city, I was more convinced than ever that I would return home alone, but impressed also with the humanity of the men in the British foreign service.

Saturday I was up early and received

word from Abdulla that the Foreign Minister would come to the guest house for the interview. That was the Minister's preference, he said. The news was a disappointment. I had hoped to see some of the government spaces, including a chance to meet Abdulla's bride of 5 months, who was first secretary to the Foreign Minister.

At 10:40 a.m., Foreign Minister Motie and Medhe arrived. This time they were in matching tunics and trousers—no business suits and ties. Motie explained:

This is what we wear when it's hot.

I had written an outline of points I wished to make and started, by presenting the Lincoln bust, and copies of the letters from Kissinger and Atherton. I said these letters, to me, say clearly that the United States wants to establish diplomatic relations with Aden. Kissinger is only one part of the U.S. Government, however. He and the President can do in foreign policy only as much as the Congress will support. Aden should do a better job of informing the Congress and the American people about its problems and complaints, I told the Foreign Minister. Until talking with al-Khamiri the day before, I was totally unaware of most of the complaints Aden has had about U.S. policies.

I said diplomatic relations would be a good start and hopefully open ways the United States through both public and private institutions, can help Aden master its problems and strengthen its economy.

I also said that release of Franklin could help. Because of Franklin's experience, the U.S. State Department was warning tourists against visiting Aden. An act of compassion would help change this and bring tourist dollars.

Motie said he was glad I had come to Aden, but he hoped that Franklin's release was not the primary reason for my visit. That comment was sobering, but I reaffirmed that Franklin was my primary reason for coming. I added that being there, I wanted to learn as much as possible so as to create as much goodwill as I could for South Yemen in the United States.

He talked at length about diplomatic relations. He said it was necessary to view the question in context of the whole Arab world. The reason for severance was the Israeli attack on the Beirut airport. Without U.S. support, he said, the attack could not have occurred. Nor could the Israeli occupation of Arab lands and denial of Palestinian rights to their lands. He said Palestinians are not against the Jews. Instead, they want only a democratic Palestine state where they can live where each will have the same full rights as others.

Motie repeated al-Khamiri's charge that in 1968 a U.S. military attaché had a hand in resisting an attempted change in the Aden Government. This led to a feeling of the people against America. Regarding border fighting, he said he believed camps were organized with the support of the United States:

We have information and proof that the American Embassy in San'a supports the subversive acts against Democratic Yemen.

You have seen the military equipment in the museum. Still, we're not against diplomatic relations with the U.S. We favor diplomatic relations with all governments which respect our sovereignty.

He said Saudi Arabia gives support and encouragement to all ex-sultans and ex-sheiks:

Why would Saudi want U.S. equipment except to use against the Republic?

While the past is not good, he said, the present looks better. We are looking ahead. We have diplomatic ties with Britain. We hope the U.S. changes its attitude.

He said economic, trade, and cultural relations would help toward establishing diplomatic relations in the future:

This approach is not new. Much the same has occurred or is occurring between the U.S. and Algeria, Syria, and Egypt.

He said some say Aden is closer to the Soviet Union and China:

That is true. They have given us assistance, instead of supporting subversive acts against our government.

Before any kind of diplomatic representation can be established, he cautioned, the United States must first cease support of any antirevolutionary movement:

Our people are fully mobilized against such U.S. policies, and it is not easy or possible to change their attitudes quickly. A beginning can occur when the U.S. stops giving any kind of assistance for subversions and starts promoting economic relations.

I repeated my understanding that no U.S. concessional sales or grants can occur in advance of diplomatic relations. He again mentioned Algeria, and I said I would gladly cable Washington to try to clarify whether Algeria is now getting economic assistance in any form. He said:

Cables are all right, but it will be more effective for you to go back and talk.

I told him the United States naturally needs oil from Saudi Arabia and is in no position to control what the Saudis do with arms the United States has sold.

He said the question of changed diplomatic relations would need to be cleared through the people's supreme council, the party central committee, and the political bureau of the central committee. These elements would consider steps the United States has taken to justify a change:

The change would have to be apparent in the actions and messages of American officials. It would take a period of a few months for the change to be apparent, but Aden would know when it happened. We know what San'a is doing. We know what is being said in San'a. We know what elements in Saudi Arabia are doing. We would feel a change in policy over a period of time, once U.S. support of subversion stops.

He said this is the first change that must occur as a pre-condition to improved relations—an end to support of subversion over a period of time:

Second is the need for something positive between friends, not so much as between governments. Some help in our problems in health, education, agriculture, agricultural equipment, some wheat. Our people would feel aid in this form tangible, physical proof of friendship. They could see something before their eyes of a friendly nature—instead

of seeing only the exhibits of the U.S. military equipment as you have seen in the museum.

Maybe elements in Aden would object to a change in relations. We must put something before them they can see. Then we can start convincing them. In our view, this would, in time, lead to diplomatic relations.

He said Syria and Egypt had felt a change in American policy before diplomatic relations were resumed. Now the United States and Aden have nothing, neither diplomatic, cultural nor economic relations.

If a speedup in improved relations is to occur, he felt there must be something visible, concrete.

He asked for my comments on what he had said, together with any suggestions I wished to make.

Although I had neither instruction nor authority from our Government, I pointed out that both Egypt and Syria had found it possible to establish official communication well in advance of formal diplomatic relations. Over the years I had met socially and for policy discussions with the Egyptian representative long before full relations were reestablished. Before stopping in Syria on the way to Aden, I had met with the Syrian representative in Washington.

Why not establish similar missions between Aden and Washington? The United States could function through an interests section of an established embassy, such as the British. Aden could function as an interests section of another Arab Embassy. Another possible form would be a consular office in each capital, a form which is not considered to be diplomatic relations in the formal sense, but would make possible regular communication. Another possibility would be the exchange of trade missions.

He said he would study my proposal, and the study might take a period of time. Meanwhile, it would be desirable to have some form of aid.

I told him that on my return I would explore what forms of aid are possible in the absence of diplomatic relations. I knew, for example, that throughout the period when the United States had no diplomatic relations with Egypt, our Navy nevertheless kept operating a medical research center in Cairo. He nodded his awareness of this. I said private foundations like Ford and Rockefeller, university scholarships and endowments are often a source of assistance. As a small token of this, I cited the three scholarships I brought with me.

He responded:

First we'll have to feel a change on subversion, then we will need a second step—some aid, perhaps for health, in the form of wheat, agricultural equipment.

I said I would get facts and explore possibilities. Did he wish me to communicate through Ambassador Ashtal in New York? Yes, "but if on some things you think it better to write directly, then do so, but keep Ashtal informed."

He concluded by saying:

On our part, the fact that you have been invited here, that you are received as our guest shows goodwill. When you can return again, you will be most welcome. And I hope next time your family can come too. I hope

you will excuse any deficiencies. Any faults in our hospitality will have to be excused.

He said he had recently spent part of a day in Washington, and before that had visited a Yemen settlement in a Chicago suburb and another settlement in San Francisco. I rebuked him for not calling me when he was in Washington, and he promised next time to call.

We returned briefly to the form of new relations. I suggested trade missions be established in each capital, and these offices could facilitate cultural exchange. I noted that ping pong had helped to open relations with China. Perhaps football, known in the United States as soccer, could help. I told him that Quincy College in my district recently had the national championship soccer team. Perhaps that team could visit Aden, and vice versa.

He said:

We have no objections to informal practical arrangements, and added, it would be satisfactory for representatives of the U.S. government to meet with Ashtal in New York, and agreeable also for Ashtal to meet in Washington with U.S. officials on an informal basis.

It was then well past lunchtime and the Foreign Minister left, stating that he would be present when I saw the President that evening.

I said I hoped the decision of the President would be to release Franklin to me, and Motie rejoined:

I hope you will be able to come through for us in Washington.

I had done no shopping, but had previously told Abdulla of things I wanted to find: a gambia, a traditional Yemen cased dagger; a sample of luban wood from which frankincense is made; a sample of distinctive Yemen coffee called yafa; a sample of local textiles; a small Yemen flag; cigarettes for my wife; and photographs of local scenes. Abdulla made careful note of these and mid-afternoon Saturday was the time for shopping. The heat was intense, and frankly my mind was not on shopping. The shops we visited had little to offer, and I returned to the guest house empty handed.

With the final visit with Franklin, the interview with the President and the dinner still ahead—souvenirs seemed unimportant.

To my amazement, I was greeted in the guest house by all the items I had requested—all gift-wrapped and from the President. Also included was a large water pipe. The gambia was handsome in a beautiful presentation case, the sheath intricate silver and the handle studded with gold. In the case was a printed card presenting it "with the compliments of the President."

Were these gifts to take the place of Franklin, or were they a harbinger of success? I dared not believe the latter. In fact, I was by then absolutely sure I would leave the next morning alone. After all, only a few hours remained before takeoff time.

But the message of the gifts was plain—goodwill from Aden to Washington.

The second visit to Franklin was more

relaxed than the first. He accepted the paper and pens I brought with the comment, "I hope I won't need them except tonight." I told him I was confident he would not leave with me, but judging by the royal treatment I was receiving, I was convinced he would be released soon after I left.

I put on what I will always call my President Ali suit, a dark blue. I wanted to look serious, dignified, if that was possible. The appointment was for 7 p.m. Judging by the few experiences I had had meeting with heads of state, punctuality was vital. So, I paced the terrace, trying to keep from wilting my last white shirt, going over in my mind the outline of points I wanted to make.

Finally at 7:15 p.m. the phone rang, and Abdulla and I ran to the car. Swiftly he drove down the hairpin turns to the bottom of the hill and into the heavily guarded compound where the President lived and had his offices, past two barriers which had to be lifted, down a long winding road and then to the spacious entrance. I was ushered into a long beautiful reception hall, covered with blue flowered carpet, gold drapes down three sides, and part of the fourth side—open air. Two long rows of ceiling fans whirled overhead. In the center of this vast hall was a group of gold upholstered sofas and chairs.

By the time I reached the furniture, President Ali, the Foreign Minister and the interpreter, Medhe, were walking through the same door I had entered. I needed no introduction. I had seen his picture many places around Aden, but frankly they did not do him justice. He is a tall well-built man of forty, black hair with a touch of gray, dark skin. He has a dignified bearing, and is soft-spoken. Except for a brief whispered consultation with Motie on one occasion, he and I did all the talking. I asked if he minded if I took notes. He did not. I opened my note pad with my list of points to be made on one side, and blank paper on the other. A male stenographer took shorthand notes in Arabic between us. Medhe translated all comments. The President spoke only in Arabic.

I thanked him for his hospitality, for the gifts I had received, and then launched into the first part of my presentation. First, the Lincoln book and bust, then the scholarships, then the originals of the letters from Kissinger and Atherton.

I said the letters presented informally the desire of the United States to reestablish diplomatic relations. I explained the importance of communications so the Congress can understand Aden's policies and problems. I said the President of the United States and the Secretary of State are limited in foreign policy to whatever the Congress will support.

The President then spoke at length. He said Aden is the "shining example" of the Republic:

Other areas are quite different. The people are much poorer. I am therefore surprised, considering all the problems, including poverty, that beset my country, that other problems are created for my country from outside. Possibly some of our acts and steps have made neighbors hostile.

All policies in my government are aimed at dealing with the extreme poverty we find among our people. There is no high income. What we have done is to redistribute part of the income of those who are better off to those who are so poor, to the poverty-stricken.

I interjected that such a redistribution is not unknown in the United States. Redistribution of some income to poverty-stricken people is accomplished through the graduated income tax.

He said it was nice to hear that this was not new. Still, he said, Aden's resources and, therefore, its accomplishments were not up to other Arab countries.

He said:

I can find no justification for direct interference in internal affairs of my country from the outside. I have no objection to diplomatic relations with those who respect our sovereignty and integrity. But in Yemen the people are sensitive about interference. Any attempt, any interference results in a very natural reaction. As is known to all, in past years, Yemen suffered under two regimes, both equally bad. Under the new regime, the people have recently begun to feel freedom, and they are sensitive to any attempts to limit freedom.

Even if the people would seem to succumb to such limitation, it would be only temporary.

He added:

Despite what I have said, I am quick to respond with steps which are equitable, so long as the steps are taken between equals dealing as equals. As soon as the people see dealings built on mutual respect, there will certainly be a new feeling.

Now, the belief is held by the people of my country that all suffering, all damage caused by subversives is the work of the U.S. government. There is much hostility to the U.S. government. They believe all subversive acts are due to U.S. support of the subversion. All military equipment we capture is U.S. equipment, and this makes the people feel the U.S. is behind the attack.

We have tried to look for a justification for the policy of subversion we believe the U.S. carries forward. Was the military equipment sold without the prior intention that it be used against Yemen? The U.S. could have advised Saudi Arabia that the equipment was not to be used against Yemen. But it did not.

I know that your visit does not mean that the acts of subversion will stop immediately. Subversion undoubtedly will continue. We know they will continue for some time. I know of a recent meeting that occurred in Saudi Arabia on this subject, and from news of this meeting we look for hostilities to continue for some time.

Even last month I visited a military post in the Fourth Gouvernate, shortly after hostilities inside the border. After the attacks, our soldiers gave me presents—U.S. military equipment which had been captured there less than a month ago. It is stacked outside this building if you wish to see it.

I do not believe the individual citizens of America would wish to support aggression against us. Instead of hurting us, considering our poverty, they would surely wish to give us assistance.

I interjected that this information was not known in the United States. In fact, I doubted that many people in our Government knew the facts. I said this underscored the importance of diplomatic relations, better communications so that this sort of injury would be stopped. He nodded agreement.

He said:

Ours is a small country. I am putting a question to you as a friend to Arabs. We have less than two million people. This is a poor country. Is it your view that the U.S. wishes to interfere in minute internal affairs of other countries like ours?

I said that my view was that support of subversion was wrong, and that I would do my best on my return to get facts about U.S. support clarified and any subversive support stopped. I said I would also explore all possibilities for aid with and without diplomatic relations. I said I would encourage the U.S. Government to make a specific proposal to establish a trade mission, U.S. interest section, or consular office.

He responded that he favored relations between the United States and Yemen, but they must relate to grievances now perceived by his people. Aden does not wish to be isolated from the United States, and he believed that a role could be played by Ambassador Ashtal in reaching common solutions.

He said—quite plainly winding up the interview—that he thanked me for the gifts. He said he was sure the students who use the scholarships will contribute to better relations.

At this point, I was ready to launch into an appeal for Franklin's release, feeling this would be my last chance.

It was not needed. He said simply:

Regarding the prisoner. As soon as I heard of your interest in him, I saw to it that he received preferential treatment. I have carefully considered your request and your desire that he be released, and I have decided to grant your request. When you want him, you may have him.

As I listened to the translation of these words, I could scarcely believe my ears. I blurted out:

Do you mean that he can return to the United States with me when I leave tomorrow morning?

Through the Arabic came back the answer:

If that is your wish.

He said something more, but I cannot recall the exact words. I was not at this point focusing very well. It was some sort of a greeting to people in Congress who "understand our needs." He encouraged the exchange of official visitors.

I had one final request. I said:

Mr. President, I am overwhelmed with joy at your generosity. This is a great act of compassion which I know will be appreciated by many people in the United States. I have observed the request of Ambassador Ashtal not to publicize this trip in any way. But I feel it would contribute to better relations and the elimination of the policies to which you rightly object if I could discuss fully the experiences I have had here. I will not do so unless you give me your permission. May I describe fully to the Congress and to the American people the experiences I have had here?

He answered:

You may, as you wish.

At Guest House No. 1—formerly the British governor's residence—where the Foreign Minister hosted the final dinner, it was several minutes before I could express myself and tell the guests, including Buckley, what happened. During

the meal, I received a message that Franklin by then had been transferred to my quarters and had received the news.

I excused myself early in order to join Franklin, but not before the Foreign Minister presented me with a unique gift—a Yemen lobster beautifully mounted for display on a wall. The other guests followed me to see Franklin. Buckley, who had been his link with the outside world, was there to share the rejoicing. The others, Abdulla, al-Khamiri, Medhe had never met him. As they took turns introducing themselves, shaking hands and wishing him well, this struck me as an exceptional gesture of goodwill to a man their government an hour earlier had held in prison for espionage.

My friend, al-Khamiri, touched me deeply by bringing me that night a lovely oil painting of a desert scene near Aden, product of a famous local artist of years ago. I carried it and the lobster carefully by hand every inch of the way back to Washington. The Presidential gifts fit in the suitcase. And to cap the hospitality, al-Khamiri, Abdulla, and Medhe were at the airport at 5 a.m. to see us off. So was Buckley.

Luckily the 6 a.m. morning flight had an empty seat for Franklin. Or was it luck? Had my hosts, who seemed to delight in suspense, planned ahead with a reservation?

Either way, it was a storybook ending to a week as exciting as I expect ever to experience.

Franklin was free. Nothing had been required in return. My appearance in Aden proved to be the only condition that had to be met to secure his release.

Why? I am convinced the main reason was the decision by the government to probe ever so cautiously for better relations with the United States.

Ed Franklin and I provided the opportunity for the probe.

THE CLAMOR FOR RESIGNATION

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, since we are all a very important part of the impeachment process and since this issue becomes more and more pertinent every day, I wish to insert the following articles for the benefit and interest of my colleagues:

THE CLAMOR FOR RESIGNATION

The clamor for President Nixon's resignation is growing, notably among conservative Republicans shocked with the tape transcript revelations and convinced that he cannot govern successfully through the remaining years of his term.

We don't doubt that the nation would heave a massive sigh of relief if Mr. Nixon complied with the suggestions, and certain obvious gains would surely result. For one thing, it would be possible for his successor, Vice President Ford, to devote adequate attention to vital affairs that have had short shrift while the White House has been immersed in Watergate. And needless to say,

a lot of Republican candidates would face November election day with a lot more confidence.

But the President is entirely credible (for once, at least) when he vows that under no circumstances will he take the option of resigning.

As he well knows, as a private citizen he would promptly lose the immunities he enjoyed as President, and would become liable for arrest and trial on whatever criminal charges might arise out of the Watergate and other investigations.

Conceivably he might try for a deal to win immunity from prosecution in exchange for his resignation. But that would require the courts to finessé their lawful duty in a manner that might violate the Constitution.

Still another possibility that has been mentioned is that the President would somehow utilize provisions of the 25th Amendment to declare himself out of commission until the impeachment issue is resolved, retaining his title but permitting the vice president to take over the reins of government as acting President. But this, too, is hardly in the character of Mr. Nixon.

The straightest, clearest road remains the impeachment process, which is now under way. While it is a dim-lit course in terms of precedent, its authorization and procedures are spelled out in the Constitution, and it affords the most effective way of reaching a legal determination of the President's fitness to go on serving.

The House of Representatives, which holds the impeachment power, is the body in most intimate touch with the electorate and its views. The Senate, which would try the President if the House impeaches, consists in the main of men of intelligence and moral responsibility. If two-thirds of the Senate voted the President guilty, it would be possible to bring criminal charges against him, but such vindictiveness seems unlikely. If the Senate failed to convict, the law would uphold the President's right to serve out his term. If the impeachment process runs its course, the ordeal will be cruel on the nation and on the President. But justice is seldom less than a stern master to serve, and this nation has many times met agonizing tests of spirit, and survived them.

[From the Washington Post, May 10, 1974]

THE PERILS OF PRESIDENTIAL RESIGNATION

(By William S. White)

Those who are joining in the rising clamor that the President should simply resign forthwith, thereby saving everybody a lot of pain and trouble, are proposing the worst possible resolution to one of the gravest issues in our history.

"Let's get it over with" has an appealing ring; the only trouble is that it is dangerously simplistic. In the first place, everybody knows that in the current circumstances "resignation" is an euphemism for morally firing the President. In the second place, ugly as indeed are the White House transcripts dealing with Watergate, there is at this point a respectable doubt as to whether Mr. Nixon has committed impeachable offenses as distinguished from acts that were shockingly bad in themselves.

But there is a third point that dwarfs all others, and it is this, offered in ABC form: The United States has something called a Constitution. This Constitution stipulates that in one place and one alone a President of the United States be rightly tried for such as high crimes and misdemeanors and there cleared or convicted.

This place, of course, is the Congress of the United States. The somber search for truth and justice must begin in the House, which must first determine whether to impeach (indict) the President. The somber search for truth and justice must then, in the event of an impeachment, go to the Sen-

ate, whose members would try the President as jurors presided over by the Chief Justice of the United States, Warren Burger.

This is the high and the true way to try this case. "Resignation" would avoid or evade the true way. If the President has not in fact committed an impeachable offense—and it must be remembered that we do not yet know the answer to that crucial question—"resignation" would become the most massive injustice we ever knew.

If, on the other hand, the President has in fact committed an impeachable offense, "resignation" would defraud justice and cheat the right and proper demands of history that this affair be explored with due process, and due process alone, to its very end.

The politicians can do what they like; the "media" can do what they like. For my part, I am not about to put my private judgments, hunches or feelings above the magnificent constitutional processes of this nation. Nor am I about to remain silent while others demand the easy way out. It seems to me that they have not thought through the possible consequences of a "resignation" that would in common truth be a booting out of a President of the United States.

It is an inescapable fact that any ouster of this particular President, even if accomplished in the most scrupulous of due process, would have the effect of overturning an immense popular mandate given to that President less than two years ago.

Millions of Americans are going to believe that he was unfairly hounded from office if he leaves it, no matter how. Bitter divisions we don't need in this country—and most poignantly we don't need them if the President is compelled to leave office by whatever method. Let us therefore rely upon the constitutional method and only on the constitutional method to hold divisiveness to its minimum. "Hurry up" are words that don't belong anywhere in this tragic business.

IMPEACHMENT: POLITICAL OR CRIMINAL PROCESS?

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, all of us have heard, and many of us have participated in, the extensive debate over the past few months as to what exactly are the correct legal procedures that must be followed in the course of the current impeachment proceedings. During these discussions we have many times seen individuals on both sides of the issue accuse their opponents of "playing politics" with the impeachment issue.

John Roche makes some interesting observations on this subject in the most recent issue of the AFL-CIO News. I will insert the article, Mr. Roche's "A Word Edgewise" column from the May 18 issue of the News, in the RECORD at this time, for those of our colleagues who might want to consider what I believe is an uncommon interpretation of what impeachment is all about.

The article follows:

A WORD EDGEWISE: IMPEACHMENT BATTLE SHAPES UP AS A PUBLIC OPINION CONTEST

(By John P. Roche)

A number of Democrats have criticized President Nixon for his active defense against

impeachment. On the other side of the battlefield, Republican spokesmen have attacked the President's critics for unfairly influencing the jury; that is, in this context, putting pressure on the House and Senate. Actually, both sets of complaints are off the mark.

Impeachment and conviction constitute political punishment for political sins. What is developing is in no sense a criminal process. Conviction by the Senate, even for treason (which, of course, is not at issue now), can only result in deprivation of office and the right to hold office. The Constitution explicitly states that conviction does not bar separate legal action; impeachment does not constitute jeopardy.

What this adds up to is a contest for public opinion. In our original system, where senators were chosen by state legislatures, impeachment and conviction were in the hands of separate constituencies. The theory was that if the House, popularly elected, and the Senate by a two-thirds vote agreed, it would be an indication of massive national consensus.

This is still valid despite the popular election of senators. In essence, this clumsy technique was the ancestor of recall, the system used in some states which makes it possible for the electorate, in a special referendum, to deprive a governor or other state official of office.

Once you eliminate the fiction that impeachment is a state trial conducted with the full protection the Constitution requires in a criminal action, you realize that both sides are free to influence the House, the Senate and, ultimately, the American people. (Perhaps, given some of the activities that have surfaced, it is necessary to note that the line is drawn this side of bribing senators!) If, for instance, Mr. Nixon uses half an hour on television defending himself, equal time should be granted the prosecution. Moreover, the whole affair should be televised so the real jurors, the people, can make up their minds and notify their elected representatives and senators.

In reply to this view, some will argue that such a spectacle undermines the standing of some mysterious entity called the "Presidency." This, I submit, is part of the problem: Mr. Nixon obviously believed that there was some sort of halo that went with the job. For two years I sat in an office three minutes away from President Johnson and had ample opportunity to discover whether there were some magic rays in the Oval Office that turned a man into an institution. I can report authoritatively there are not.

The "Presidency," in short, rises or falls with the behavior of its occupant. The fact that Calvin Coolidge did virtually nothing (except sleep) for five years did not destroy the "Presidency." Every President starts from square one. The fact that Franklin D. Roosevelt successfully seized various industries was no help to Harry Truman when, in 1952, he took over steel. And the decision against Truman in the Youngstown Case established no firm precedent for the future. It was a ticket good for one day on one plane. Various presidents have let Congress walk all over them; others have reclaimed lost turf and added to it.

What the Constitution did was establish a legislature, an executive and a Supreme Court, and then turn them loose to carve out their jurisdictions. The battle has now been raging for almost two centuries.

Congress, infuriated at the Supreme Court, has on one occasion specifically curbed the latter's jurisdiction. This did not destroy "The Judiciary" any more than the court's declaration that basic New Deal legislation was unconstitutional destroyed "The Legislature."

We do not, in other words, live in a political universe populated by Platonic forms or essences; we live in one where nine judges, 100 senators, 435 representatives and one

president—all human beings—compete for political power, which is defined as the support of a majority of the American people.

Thus when Congress invokes its ultimate political weapon against the chief executive, it is launching a campaign for the support of the population. The President has the right to fight back with every legitimate technique at his disposal. All in all, it's going to be a noisy summer, but noise is essential background music for the exercise of democratic government.

VETERANS' EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS BILL STALLED

HON. DAVID W. DENNIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, May 31 marks the expiration date for GI educational assistance benefits for approximately 300,000 veterans. I have requested this time today to bring to the attention of my colleagues an unfortunate deadlock between the House and Senate involving the extension of veterans educational assistance, and to discuss the actions taken which have resulted in the present stalemate.

On February 19 of this year the House unanimously passed H.R. 12628, highlighted by a 13.6-percent increase in the educational assistance allowance. A second important feature of the bill was a provision for a 2-year extension of eligibility under the program. Under present law all training must be completed within an 8-year period following separation from service. H.R. 12628 extended the existing 8-year delimiting period to 10 years.

The House-passed bill was subsequently referred to the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee on February 21, where it languished for over 3 months only to be rejected in favor of S. 3398, a bill providing for a straight 2-year extension without any increase in the educational assistance allowance. The Senate passed S. 3398 on May 13 and forwarded it to the House, where we thereupon took the Senate bill and so amended it as to insert the language of the original House bill in lieu of the Senate text, thereby reaffirming our commitment to provide increased assistance to veterans faced with rising education costs.

We are now embroiled in a dispute with the Senate over the issue of payments, which I feel confident will ultimately be resolved. But in the meantime, those thousands of veterans whose benefits are scheduled to expire on May 31 have been placed in jeopardy and will be totally without financial assistance pending the resolution of this controversy.

The real, and in my judgment only, issue here is not whether the House or Senate will prevail, but whether the veterans' education program will continue uninterrupted. And to this end, I find it unconscionable that the fate of these men and women, for whom I have a deep and abiding respect, should be held hostage to the interchamber disputes of this Congress, and I respectfully urge

the Senate to respond favorably to the House position and to forward the bill to the President for enactment.

Meantime, impending this action, I am very glad that the House, as of today, has passed a bill which will no doubt also be passed by the Senate, extending the period of eligibility under present benefits for an additional 30 days, or until June 30, 1974. It is important that before that date permanent legislation should be enacted and one would hope at the House figures.

HON. JAMES A. ROGERS' TRIBUTE TO DR. BENJAMIN MAYS

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Hon. James A. Rogers, member and former chairman of the South Carolina State College Board of Trustees and editor of the Florence Morning News, paid special tribute to Dr. Benjamin E. Mays on the occasion of Dr. Mays' receiving his 34th honorary degree from Lander College of Greenwood, S.C.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following introduction and tribute to Dr. Mays.

INTRODUCTION AND TRIBUTE

(By James Rogers)

The problem I face in introducing Dr. Benjamin E. Mays is the temptation to preempt his role as speaker for this occasion and address myself to the times in which he has lived and how mightily and effectually he has worked to gain public acceptance of new concepts of excellence and dignity across the entire human equation.

Indeed, one feels compelled to range more widely than the mere citation of his biographical data—though taken alone they tell a story of such rare achievements that few anywhere having humble or even auspicious beginnings can lay claim to.

On the occasion when to his 33 honorary doctorates awarded him by institutions in this country and abroad has been added a 34th by Lander College, it would seem less than appropriate not to give greater depth and scope than can be drawn from saying that he was graduated from the high school department of South Carolina State College, is an honor graduate of Bates College, Lewiston, Maine; holds Master of Arts and Doctor of Philosophy degrees from the University of Chicago; has distinguished himself in the fields of education and religion since the early 1920's; was for 29 years President of Morehouse College of Atlanta, Georgia, now President Emeritus; has authored seven books, and chapters and sections in 15 more, also many articles for national and international journals; and is the recipient of more than 100 awards and honors for distinguished service.

I speak as one who has never known him at close range. Until this day, the only time our paths have crossed has been by long distance telephone when I, then chairman of the Board of Trustees for South Carolina State College in Orangeburg, sought his advice when we were seeking a president for that institution—a call which I have no reason to believe he remembers. But knowledge of a man is not limited to face-to-face encounters. In that nonvisual sense, my acquaintance with him covers a time span of long duration, and at a distance, I have

come to know and admire him as a towering figure whose influence has helped to make the South of today something radically different from euphemistic New South of an earlier culture.

As the title of his autobiography indicates, he was "Born to Rebel,"—not as a violent revolutionary, but as one whose sensitivity to injustice placed him in the vanguard of the black encounter long before the civil rights movement began to generate midway this 20th Century.

His odyssey has been from the eighth child of a Negro cotton farmer who had been born into slavery, through a struggle to obtain an education and learn how to become and remain a man of pride, dignity and integrity in a society whose mores were rigidly shaped by a segregationist tradition with all its disciplinary restrictions, and into the clearer light of today when he walks among the tallest and freest of men.

In the introduction of "Born to Rebel," Dr. Samuel DuBoise Cook, professor of political science at Duke University, speaks of Dr. Mays in terms of "strength of character, gifts of mind, vision, ability to grow and courage to change, creative restlessness and zest for life, stubborn moral courage, prophetic imagination, deep commitment to social justice, boundless energy and eagerness to tackle new tasks, devotion to academic excellence, capacity for independent thought and critical judgment, single-minded commitment to the most precious and enduring values of the human enterprise, and life-long romance with the world of higher possibilities." That, I believe, sums it up.

Today, Dr. Mays must sense that his life has come full circle. Many years ago he left from here the son of a slave-born cotton farmer in search of an education, and, to use his own words, on a quest for recognition first as a human being, and only incidentally as a Negro. This he has realized and much, much more. His achievements in religion, higher education, writing, speaking, public life, and in the struggle for social justice would bring credit to any man. Considering the environment of his childhood and formative years, they are both astonishing and incredible.

Today he has returned to the place of his beginning—here to be honored as one of the country's truly distinguished and exceptional men.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am honored and humbled to present Dr. Benjamin E. Mays.

SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, during this Small Business Week, I would like to commend the small and independent business community of our Nation and especially those of the Seventh Ohio District, which I have the privilege of representing. Independent business employs over 50 percent of the work force in the United States and accounts for more than 40 percent of our gross national product. The small business community is a large and vital part of our economy.

The National Federation of Independent Business, with more than 373,000 members nationwide, has 15,000 members in Ohio and more than 800 members in the Seventh Congressional District. The small business community in

the Seventh District provides jobs for 6,000 people and contributes in excess of \$71 million to the prosperity of the district.

All of the residents of not only the Seventh District, but also Ohio and the country, are indebted to the small businessmen who play such a vital role in our economy and assume positions of leadership in our cities and towns. America needs small business enterprise and I am pleased to salute this segment of our economy during Small Business Week.

LEASING POLICIES OF FEDERAL COAL LANDS

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, occasionally a bit of wisdom is recited that merits attention of all. I feel this way about a recent statement of David H. Olson of Casper, Wyo., delivered before a recent hearing regarding the rate of growth in my State of Wyoming and regarding leasing policies of Federal coal lands. This article, and the one to follow, are must reading for anyone who still cares about America and what is happening to it these days in the West.

The articles follow:

WYOMING COAL

(By David H. Olson)

Most of the projections for future consumption of Wyoming coal are based on the assumption that electric utilities will continue to increase their production at a compound rate of growth of 6-7% per year. If this continues we will double production in 12 years and quadruple production in 24 years, using a 6% compound rate. It is my contention that this is absurd, when our population only grows at a 1% rate. Why should we increase per capita consumption at a time when we are already wasting electric power on a massive scale?

If we could slow down the rate of growth so that electric power and population grow at the same rate, we would greatly reduce the demand for coal. By so doing we could prevent the boom type growth we are seeing in Rock Springs and Gillette.

We are told by the electric power industry that our survival and the quality of our lives depend upon the production of more and more electric power. There is a direct correlation throughout the world between rapid industrial growth and the breakdown of family life, increase in crime, and the use of drugs and alcohol. Utility spokesmen assume that luxury connotes quality. I would remind them in the words of Gibson that "luxury comes in the door as a guest and stays to become the master". The escape from physical drudgery has degenerated into contempt for physical work. Senator Hansen could testify as to how difficult it is to hire ranch hands. He could also tell you that ranch work is a better quality life than living in Washington.

It is widely assumed by people in the investment business that growth in gross national product leads to growth in net profits. This assumption is false. From 1966 through 1972 the gross national product increased 57% but corporate profits increased only 6%. Much of the growth in profits in 1973 was canceled out by inflation.

The typical annual report of an electric utility speaks glowingly of their past and future growth. The grim fact is that the average electric utility stock is selling under its low for each year since 1960.

This brings me to my next conclusion. The electric utility industry will find it very difficult to finance the growth they have projected. Spending on plant in 1965 was \$4 billion dollars. In 1972 it was \$14 billion—a 20% annual rate of gain. Capital expenditures are projected to total \$90 billion during the next five years. \$22 billion of this must come from the sale of common and preferred stock. Who will want to buy these stocks with a yield of 7 to 8% which matches the rate of inflation? Who will believe that a stock will go up in value when recent history shows the reverse? \$36 billion of this capital must come from the sale of bonds.

The interest rate on AA bonds is about 8 3/4%. The return on net plant in 1972 was 6.4%. Only a fool would borrow money at 8 3/4% and invest it at 6.4%, but this is what inflation and blind confidence in growth has forced the utility industry to do. There is a strong possibility that government subsidies will be proposed. If this happens it will lead to government ownership eventually. Government inefficiency would make the total cost of power even greater.

If we are to avoid a government takeover of the utility industry we must do the following:

1. Slow the growth of electric power production to the same rate as our population growth.
2. Grant rate increases so that the public will be reluctant to waste power and the industry can maintain its financial health.
3. Penalize wasteful users of power by imposing a surcharge on excessive usage.

We should realize there have been countless highly civilized societies developed before electricity was used. There was plenty of employment for all able bodied people. The consumption of electric power per capita in 1940 was very much smaller than it is now and yet there is no evidence that the present American society is more civilized or happier than it was then. Nor are European people less civilized than Americans because they consume only half as much electricity per capita.

In closing, I would urge this subcommittee to recommend a go slow approach in leasing federal coal lands. Give us in Wyoming time to plan for the influx of miners into this state that values its way of life so highly. I would ask you Senators to recall the days when most Americans lived on farms and in small towns. The divorce rate was low and so were taxes. Hard work and saving for the future were virtues. Above all, personal integrity was strived for and those who achieved it were held in esteem. It is difficult to build character in a race of people who live lives of physical ease and mental stress.

It is time we listen again to some of the ancient philosophers such as Homer who said, "He is always a slave who cannot live on little."

[From the Washington Post]

FEDERAL COAL-LEASING POLICIES FAULTED

(By Tim O'Brien)

A private study group charged yesterday that federal coal-leasing policies have encouraged corporate speculators to keep thousands of acres of coal-bearing lands unproductive "until industry decides its profits will justify development."

In a report released by the nonprofit Council on Economic Priorities, it was disclosed that 70 per cent of the leases in seven Western states are controlled by 15 corporations, including five oil companies.

The large corporate leaseholders, the report said, "speculate the most," holding public coal unmined until prices go up. Only 11

per cent of the 474 leases examined by the study group were under active production, and 321 leases "have never produced a single ton of coal."

"The largest lease-holders speculate the most. While 89 per cent of all leases are inactive, 93 per cent of the leases held by the top 15 are not producing coal," the council said. . . . Five of those major lease-holders—El Paso Natural Gas, Westmoreland Resources, Shell Oil Co., Sun Oil and Richard Bass—have never produced a ton of coal from their leases."

The Council on Economic Priorities, which is supported by foundation grants and income on its publications, said a "gaping loophole in the law" allows leases to avoid actual coal production.

The loophole, the study said, allows the Interior Department to waive the production requirement in favor of the leaseholder's paying a year of advance rent. "But since the rents are so low," said James Cannon, author of the report, "this really puts no burden on the company and is not an incentive to actually dig coal."

The report said the Interior Department "has not planned or even considered the environmental, social, cultural or economic effects of its leasing practices."

Criticizing Interior's long-range planning, the study said public lease terms are adjusted every 20 years and only then can royalty rate increases or environmental safeguards be inserted as conditions of leasing. "Even after these long adjustment intervals, Interior has failed to consistently raise royalty rates to meet current standards, and it has neglected to insert an important environmental safeguard clause in 58 of the 85 leases which have come up for adjustment," the study said.

Moreover, the council's report said Interior has never canceled a coal lease because of violations of lease terms and "the costs of that failure have been transferred to the future."

The study examined 463 federal and 11 Indian-land coal leases in New Mexico, Arizona, North Dakota, Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and Montana. The two laws controlling lease policy on these lands—the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 and the Omnibus Tribal Leasing Act of 1938—do not require resource-use or land-use planning nor have the "strength to compel Interior to implement their directives for orderly development . . . at a fair market value," the report concluded.

"No pretense may be made that the public has ever received fair market value for its coal," the study said. "Every lease has been issued at industry's request rather than as a result of Interior determination that there was a market demand for coal . . . 247 of the 474 leases have been issued by the department at competitive lease sales, but 171 of those were granted without competition since one or no bidders appeared."

"The average winning bid at these 171 lease sales was only \$2.87 an acre. Another 210 leases were granted by the preference-right method, which returns no revenue to the lessor besides the \$10 filing charge."

Lease-holders have paid a total of only \$3.5 million in rent for public land leases and \$2.2 million in rent for Indian land leases. Royalty rates on public coal have also been low," the report said.

THIRTY-TWO YEARS IN CONGRESS

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of May 17, it was my honor and

privilege to address a large audience on the occasion of the annual Kerr County Chamber of Commerce banquet. My discussion included pending impeachment hearings and brief references to the regimes of the six Presidents under whom I have served while serving in the Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of that address. It follows:

REMARKS BY O. C. FISHER

First, let me express my appreciation for this privilege, which I very highly esteem. The people of Kerr County have honored me today far beyond my deserts, for which I am everlastingly grateful.

During my 32 years in Washington Kerr County has always been one of my favorite places in the district. Here, in the heartland of the Texas hills, drawing upon the heritage of proud and stable pioneers, your devotion to the American way of life is enduring and is second to none in the entire Nation. I salute Kerr County and I salute its people. In my book you are among the very best.

As has been pointed out, my tenure in the Congress has spanned a little more than 3 historic decades, during which 6 different Presidents have occupied the White House. Three wars have been fought, much tragedy has been suffered, and we have witnessed moon landings, the advent of television, and many other magnificent scientific and technological breakthroughs.

IMPEACHMENT THREAT

And now, on the eve of my departure, it appears likely that the House of Representatives will be called upon, for the second time in American history, to vote on Articles of Impeachment against the President of the United States. That will indeed be an awesome decision, the outcome of which could shake the Nation to its foundations and pose grave consequences for us abroad.

It goes without saying that this historic decision transcends partisanship. It will call for exercise of the highest attributes of statesmanship on the part of the Membership. In that spirit and as God gives me light I shall undertake to perform my responsibility as imposed by the Constitution.

Under our system sustainable impeachment clearly contemplates proof, beyond any reasonable doubt, of the commission of a serious crime. Thus far, in my opinion, that required quantum of proof has not been revealed. I shall, of course, reserve final judgment until the Judiciary committee has concluded its hearings and makes its report.

It is disturbing to me that, according to the press, some 12 or 15 members of the House Judiciary Committee long ago indicated support of impeachment charges, yet they serve as jurors who are supposed to be fair and impartial in considering evidence that is presented during the course of the hearings. In fact, it is well known in Congress that some of these members would have been expected to vote for impeachment of the President before they ever heard of Watergate.

Incidentally, it may be of interest to you to learn that, according to the press, a total of 55 different counts have been filed, and the committee has already indicated that all but 5 of the charges have been dropped from serious consideration. This serves to illustrate the mass of emotionalism which prompted hasty and ill-considered charges.

For myself I am still one of those who believes intensely in the presumption of innocence as applied to any accused person.

Let me add this, that I think it would be a serious mistake for the President to resign, while under fire and with the charges against him in a state of limbo. And I am convinced he will not resign.

POWER OF THE MEDIA

One lesson I think we can learn from the Watergate melee and its aftermath is the tremendous power of the news media in the molding of public opinion. This can be good, or it can be bad. It all depends.

In all fairness, we do know, and I think it is generally recognized, that some segments of the media have been absolutely merciless in their harassment of the President. Even most of the syndicated cartoonists have used some power of the poisoned pen in repeatedly depicting the President as a common criminal, or something worse.

In any event, I think it behooves all of us to keep our cool and maintain open minds until all the evidence has been processed and evaluated.

SIX PRESIDENTS

There are any number of inviting topics for public discussion on an occasion such as this. But since you have so magnanimously related this event to my retirement from Congress, I thought it might be appropriate and of some public interest for me to briefly refer to the various Presidents under whom I have served while in Washington. We know that heads of State and their administrations are always better judged in the perspective of history, and I shall strive to be factual and objective.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was in the White House when I was sworn in back in 1943. The war was then at its peak, and I think history recognizes FDR as a wartime President who performed well in his relationships with Winston Churchill and other allied heads of State, although his treatment of De Gaulle, then in exile, could have been improved upon.

Roosevelt did provide strong wartime leadership.

On the domestic front he left much to be desired. Elected on an economy platform, he promptly scrapped that design and proceeded to inaugurate social reforms and many new programs, many of them unrelated to relief measures for the unemployed.

Favored by a rubber-stamp Congress, FDR pushed through pet measures spawned by the New Deal, including the National Recovery Administration (ARA)—which the Supreme Court held to be unconstitutional. That triggered the President's attempt to have more men added to the 9-member Supreme Court, the celebrated court-packing scheme. The Senate blocked that effort, but vacancies soon occurred which were filled by dedicated New Dealers.

The Roosevelt years witnessed the surfacing of the socialist-minded and the liberals, many of whom were taken into the government and left their mark. As a practical politician, FDR capitalized on the depression to court favor with America's blacks. With Eleanor's help vast numbers of Negroes were enticed to leave the Republican party, and most of them have been aboard the Democratic bandwagon ever since.

Incidentally, speaking of the depression, I think history confirms the fact that Herbert Hoover had absolutely nothing to do with bringing on the depression, although he got much blame for it. It was world-wide and would have happened regardless of who was in the White House. Hoover was a man of great compassion. As a patriot and a statesman he was preeminent.

Few people know that President Hoover never accepted pay for his services while in the White House. His monthly salary checks were all returned to the treasury.

I recall the last time I ever saw President Roosevelt. It was on the 1st day of March, 1945, when he addressed a joint session of the Congress to report on the Yalta conference. He sat in a wheelchair and his failing health was quite noticeable. The American press had been critical about some reported concessions, and FDR gave his per-

sonal assurance that we could trust Stalin and that all was well. Stalin had agreed that there would be post-war free elections in all the Russian-occupied Balkan states—elections that have not yet been held, 30 years later.

Some 6 weeks later Roosevelt was dead.

HARRY TRUMAN

Then came Harry Truman of Missouri, a product of the Pendergast machine, who had gained some prominence as a United States Senator and Vice President. I would say, from my viewpoint, Truman will rate fairly high in history, due largely to three or four major historic actions. He ended World War II by ordering use of the atomic bomb, after first calling in vain for Japanese surrender. He provided aid for the Greeks against Yugoslav-based guerrillas; he approved the Marshall Plan, and he directed the Russians to observe their commitment and withdraw troops from Iran.

Like Roosevelt, on the domestic front Truman left much to be desired, in my own judgment. Like Roosevelt, he was strongly beholden to Labor leaders, vetoed the Taft-Hartley Act and the Hobbs Act at the behest of Bill Green and Phil Murray, and he allowed Phil Murray to have a hand in the drafting of his veto of a tax bill—which inspired a famous Senate speech by Senator Barkley.

Near the end of his regime Truman was so pro-labor that he stubbornly refused to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act to stop a costly and long-drawn-out steel strike. Finally when the situation became intolerable, instead of invoking the law to halt the strike Truman ordered the government to take over the steel plants—an action which was promptly held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court.

To Truman's credit, however, was his forthright move in asking and obtaining from Congress authority to take over the railroads and the railroad unions to prevent a nationwide disaster strike. But with passage of the new law, the unions called off the strike, a settlement was reached, and there followed a happy reconciliation between the President and the unions.

At the time Truman left office his popularity rating was registered lower than is President Nixon's at this time. Indeed, I recall there were demands for Truman's impeachment, but they were not taken seriously. Then, as now, some people thought we should get rid of an unpopular President a lot like we would get rid of an unpopular football coach. But the system does not work that way.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

Then came Dwight Eisenhower, a national hero, who for 8 years served the Nation well. He was not a crusader, and he came along at a time when the people were ready for some tranquility at the White House. He soon brought the Korean war to an end, and he bolstered our alignments against Communist threats, both at home and abroad.

Ike was economy-minded, and the budget was balanced on at least two occasions, as I recall, during his regime. He followed policies of restraint, good will, and conciliation in coping with racial and labor problems, and his policies were remarkably successful.

Of the 5 Presidents who preceded Nixon, Eisenhower was the only one who did not kowtow to labor leaders. Ike treated them fairly, but he was tough and forthright when the occasion required it. For example, on the night before the Landrum-Griffin Act was voted upon and approved in the House, the President went on a national TV hookup to urge support of the legislation to deal with secondary boycotts and other needed reforms. The unions, with no valid reason, fought that bill bitterly, but Ike took the issue to the American people, and he got the job done.

The State of Texas owes a special debt of gratitude to Eisenhower because he signed a bill which confirmed the title of Texas in its tidelands. So important was that issue, both Governor Alan Shivers and Attorney General Price Daniel bolted the Democratic party to favor Eisenhower in his campaign against Adlai Stevenson for President. Under the tidelands law Texas schools will reap billions of dollars in benefits from oil leases on offshore lands.

Incidentally, it was my honor and privilege to be named by the Speaker as one of two members to represent the House of Representatives at the Eisenhower funeral at Abilene, Kansas.

JOHN F. KENNEDY

That brings us to John Kennedy, a splendid New England gentleman whom I knew quite well. In fact, I was on the old Labor committee when during the 80th Congress hearings were held which produced the Taft-Hartley Act. On that committee at the time were two freshmen, both destined to become better known at later dates—John Kennedy and Richard Nixon. It happened that I joined with Nixon in supporting Taft-Hartley, while Kennedy opposed it.

The Kennedy days were too limited for us to form very much of an appraisal. Had he listened more to his father and less to his brother Robert, I personally think he would have been better off.

In terms of history he faltered, I think, after the CIA, with Administration knowledge, had helped plan and direct that abortive invasion of Cuba. Had there been air support at the critical time, military experts believe the Castro regime would have fallen, and there would have been a different ball game.

To his credit, however, John Kennedy's ultimatum to the Soviets to turn their Cuba-bound missile-laden ships around and head for home, was an act of courage and greatness.

As you know, the Kennedys were extremely pro-labor, pro-minority blocs, pro-liberal, and were socialistically oriented. They were crusaders and, whether intended or not, history reveals they fomented a great deal of turmoil and unrest throughout the country.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON

I am not going to say much about Lyndon Johnson because he is well known to all of you and hardly enough time has elapsed for history to evaluate some of his programs and policies.

As you know, LBJ was a dynamic leader, determined to forge a favorable image on the national scene. In terms of history perhaps his greatest achievement was his direction of the war against the Communist aggressors in Vietnam. Although militarily inept at times, he never relented. History may be critical of his failure to heed more of the military advice from the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

On the domestic front, in the name of Great Society Johnson initiated many new welfare and social programs, the mounting costs of which, since that time, have imposed a rather heavy burden upon American taxpayers. That can be considered good, or otherwise—depending on the way you look at it.

Personally, I took a dim view of most of the Great Society ventures and voted against them. Maybe that makes of me an old fogey, but that was the way I saw it—and still see it.

A multitude of civil rights and welfare measures, some of them ill-considered and counter-productive, sailed through the Congress, particularly during the notorious rubber-stamp 89th Congress.

RICHARD NIXON

Following Johnson came Richard Nixon the present incumbent. Whether you agree or disagree on the issue of impeachment, it is true that under Nixon the harbor of Halphong was mined, massive military supply

lines of the enemy were interdicted in the Hanoi area, and as a result a military victory was achieved. Our prisoners of war were released and a half million troops were returned home.

I thought Mr. Nixon did right well in helping bring the October 1973 Mid-East war to a halt, with some hope for a permanent settlement. This achievement may rate a high place in history.

Not to be overlooked, Nixon's 4 appointments to fill vacancies on the Supreme Court changed the complexion of that tribunal, for which I think history will give him some high marks.

Only the future can appraise the dialogue President Nixon established with the Chinese and the Soviets.

CONCLUSION

Now, in conclusion, to sort of shift gears for a moment, let us remember that while there is a lot that is wrong with America today, there is nothing that cannot be cured if a majority of our citizens make up their minds to act together and follow the right course. A people that can conquer outer space and land men on the moon, has the potential to accomplish almost anything. Let us proceed with pride in our heritage and faith in our system. By maintaining a military strength second to none, we can maintain peace. Surely we have the ingenuity and resources to find acceptable solutions for our domestic problems, however difficult they may appear to be.

Despite cries of doomsayers, our Nation is not falling apart. It is strong and viable. Our strength lies in the people, their dedication, and their capacity to perform—even in the face of adversity. I have unyielding faith in the people.

We are indebted to the early Chinese for many things, not the least of which was an attitude toward life which recognized an interdependence and balance beginning with the individual and carrying through to encompass the world.

I will leave you, therefore, with the Chinese proverb which so beautifully states that philosophy:

"When there is righteousness in the heart, there is beauty in the character; when there is beauty in the character, there is harmony in the home and strength in the Nation; when there is strength in the Nation there will be peace in the world."

A PICNIC IN RUSSIA

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, 10 south Floridians joined a group of 70 Russian Jews to celebrate the Lag Baomer spring festival with a picnic near Moscow.

The entire group was subject to harassment and intimidation by Soviet police.

The attitude of the Soviet Union toward its Jews is well known. Their attitude toward American tourists comes as a shock.

Dr. Lawrence Brant of North Miami Beach was a member of the group and he has written a very disturbing account of this event. His story follows:

THE PICNIC

There is nothing more peaceful and pleasant than a picnic in the country in May. Especially one with plenty of children along

with their parents to celebrate the Jewish spring festival of Lag Baomer.

This thought occurred to us when a group of Florida dentists and our wives were invited to such a picnic while visiting abroad. The one fact we neglected to seriously consider was that we were in the Soviet Union.

On May 6th, 1974, a group of one hundred dentists and their wives from the Broward County Dental Association of Florida departed Miami for a Soviet-American Dental Conference in Moscow and Leningrad. Ten of us, Dr. Lawrence and Shirley Brant, Dr. Michael and Lois Krop, Dr. Robert and Diane Blank, Dr. Charles and Sandy Friedman and Dr. Clifford and Harlene Marks, are all interested in Soviet Jewry. We had been given names of Jewish families to visit by the South Florida Conference on Soviet Jewry.

These families are "refuseniks", Jewish Soviet citizens who have applied to the Soviet Government for visas to emigrate to Israel and had their applications refused. Some have been waiting as long as five years. Most are highly educated people who cannot live as Jews, because of the Communist policy of restriction on religious freedom and expression. Almost all have lost their jobs when they applied for visas. Many live in poverty. Some exist mainly by support from Jewish sponsors outside of the Soviet Union. They all are very courageous people who have endured much mental and physical suffering to gain religious freedom; something most Americans take for granted.

Every Citizen of the USSR must carry identification papers.

One heading, Nationally, asks for the republic of the Soviet Union in which he is born. If he is born in Ukraine, he is Ukrainian. If he is born in Latvia, he is Latvian, and so on. However, no matter in which Soviet republic a Jew is born, he is always marked as a Hebrew. A Jew is virtually a second class citizen. He has no republic. He is often discriminated against. If he is classified as a Hebrew, then Israel should be his homeland. There is a Soviet policy in existence since 1966, allowing for reunification of families of all citizens, including Jews. These people want to return to Israel.

In Moscow we first contacted Vladimir Slepak who is a leader of the "refuseniks." Some of us visited his small, overcrowded apartment in which he shares his kitchen and bath with another couple. On meeting Vladimir we were immediately overcome by his quiet strength and sensitivity even though his long ordeal has taken its toll. Although Maria, his wife, cannot speak English, her enthusiastic and warm hospitality won us over at once. She produced a table of simple foods and wine that you could not turn down. Alexander, their twenty-two year old son, is intelligent and strong and has hope for the future. Their other son Leonid, was the first Jewish boy from Moscow to be publicly Bar Mitzvah in twenty-six years. How could any Bar Mitzvah be more meaningful? His large inquisitive eyes hid the uncertainty that must be inside him. This close family give each other strength. The Slepaks make you genuinely feel that just the simple visit of people from free countries gives them the courage to go on.

Vladimir spoke to us at length about the Jewish community in Moscow and the situation of those 150 families who have been denied exit visas. He was one of eight Jewish "refuseniks" who met with Senator Edward Kennedy in April 1974. There are over 100,000 Jews in the Soviet Union still waiting for approval of visa applications.

We then learned of the yearly Lag Baomer picnic that was planned for the next day, Friday, May 10th. It was to be just an outing in the country where the "refusenik" families could spend a few hours together celebrating a Jewish festival. There would be no demonstrations, no signs, no shouting of protests.

The next morning we met at the Slepak

apartment. Here we met twenty-seven year old blochemist, Alexander Goldfarb, and his wife Vala. Alex's enthusiasm, intelligence and boldness were very apparent. He pointed out a nearby car with two men in it. They were KGB secret police agents. Their presence was taken as a matter of course as was the accepted fact that their apartments were "bugged" with listening devices.

We then went as a group on the Moscow subway to the outlying district. Here we met with another contingent of about 75 Moscow Jews. We all jammed on to a large two-car public bus along with other Russians. The KGB agents were obviously present.

After riding about ten minutes, several jeep-like vehicles stopped the bus. Six uniformed police boarded and demanded to see our passports. They quickly looked at one passport and ordered that all Americans get off the bus. Immediately Slepak responded that all the Jews would get off with the ten Americans. Once off the bus, the Russian Jews kept us in the middle of the group. The police grabbed us and demanded to see our passports several times. At this point, Slepak and the others decided that we should have our picnic at the nearest convenient field.

By now we were surrounded by about thirty police and KGB agents. The police shouted that we were in a restricted military zone. To this Goldfarb informed us and them that we were safely within the forty kilometer area of Moscow where tourists are permitted to venture. Then the Jews formed a wedge and pushed through the police line. This action was repeated several times.

As this strange entourage walked along the country road in front of the farm houses, Lois Krop stopped to take a picture of a Russian woman and her daughter on the front porch of their simple house. A policeman burst forth and snatched the small camera from her hand. He vainly tried to open it and take the film out. Two of the Jewish men immediately wrestled the camera away from the policeman and returned it to Lois. This takes "chutzpah," courage. We Americans were amazed.

As we turned down the narrow dirt road off the highway, Alex Goldfarb said to me in his near-perfect English, "Do you hear what that mother is shouting to her children? 'Stay away from the Jews. They will kill you.'" Another woman hollered out, "Hitler should have killed all the Jews."

After a few minutes on the muddy road we came to a field with a small river on one side. I said to Goldfarb, "Are we allowed to go on to this field?" To this he philosophied, "In the Soviet Union all the land is owned by the people. Aren't we the people?" We trudged onward.

From out of nowhere a farmer's bulldozer quickly dug a trench across the field in front of us. At the end of the field he turned around and repeated this action several times. The Jews looked at the furrows as if to say "Isn't our life one obstacle after another?" Without comment we climbed over the muddy ditches to the field ahead.

By this time our group was being escorted by at least a hundred policemen, KGB agents, and brave local militia who unnoticed, turned up in their distinctive red arm bands. Up on the hillside many army trucks were seen with uniformed men in them. Across the river two motorcycles with sidecars stopped behind the trees where six soldiers stood guard.

All at once the significance of the situation hit us ten naive American tourists. We were astounded, appalled, outraged and somewhat frightened at what we saw around us.

The Jews matter of factly started their picnic. Out came the plastic table cloths and the old bedspreads. From their baskets and bags they produced a variety of picnic foods. From hard boiled eggs to pickled mushrooms.

From cold meat to honey cake. There were plenty of Jewish mothers to make sure you had more than enough to eat.

The men and women brought forth wine and toasted us, each other, and Israel. One old "Zayde" (grandfather) pridefully insisted that we drink his homemade schnapps with him.

The teenage boys and men set up stick goals and started a soccer game. They played with great enthusiasm. The young girls talked and gossiped with each other. The small children found toys and happily enjoyed playing in the field. In spite of the belittling intrusions around them it was a treat for these people to get together for a happy occasion, to demonstrate their love for their religion, and to gain courage from each other's presence. They acted oblivious to the authorities around them. They were breaking no Soviet laws and seemed to know just how far they dared go. They had seen this situation many times.

The police insults continued as a rather large and obvious KGB woman agent and her medal bedecked husband appeared with a blanket and sat with our group. She turned up the volume of her portable radio very loud. They were looking for a provocation, but the Jews ignored them.

KGB agents with cameras and a Sony video tape recorder came within five feet of the gathering and took point blank pictures over and over again. Other agents walked within the crowd.

The rest of our police protection—for us or for the local people, we don't know which—stayed back from a hundred to several hundred feet.

We Americans were amazed at their desire to show their solidarity. Everyone made us feel part of them. We talked in English and broken English. Some of us remembered the Yiddish that our Russian grandparents spoke to converse with the older people. Little groups materialized with an interpreter in each one and we had a chance to answer and ask many questions.

A campfire was built. One of the young people brought out a guitar and all felt the togetherness as we sang Hebrew Israeli songs. Most of them try to learn some Hebrew on their own for the day when they will be free Jews in Israel.

After about two hours the Russian sky darkened and a drizzle started. The rain seemed to be expected as the women magically pulled umbrellas from their bags. The plastic tablecloths were cleared and raised up as protection from the rain. Meanwhile, the police and KGB agents looked glumly on in their dripping grey raincoats and water soaked hats.

In an hour the remaining food was gathered and all the trash was carefully picked up. We all started walking back to the main road through mud filled fields and gulleys. No one seemed to mind the wet, mud caked shoes and trousers and the wet clothing. A small victory was won. The Jews lifted up their heads a little higher. We ten American tourists had tears in our eyes. Our Russian guard followed behind.

We waited at the side of the highway for the public buses. We boarded them in tens and twenties as the crowded vehicles allowed. In my bus the Jews sang Israeli songs while their Russian countrymen silently looked on. It was a great feeling. Their pride was showing.

At the subway terminal the Jews said goodbye to each other. The men as well as the women kissed each other and shouted "Shalom" as they departed.

We returned with the Slepaks and the Goldfarbs and a few following KGB agents. We talked quietly with them on the ride back to Moscow. When we left our new friends, we warmly embraced them and thanked them for the lesson in courage they

taught us this day. None of us will ever forget it.

We learned from the Russian Jews what had prompted them to emigrate. Most had been raised with no religion in their homes. It had been felt in order to get ahead assimilation and a good Russian education was the best policy for them to follow. In the early 1950's Russian Jews learned that this was not the answer when a group of Jewish doctors were purged, supposedly for trying to poison children and political leaders. The pogrom was back, but in a different form.

One would have thought that the government wanted the Jews to assimilate with the closing of all Hebrew schools and all but one synagogue. However, complete assimilation was impossible as long as the word Hebrew is written on the identification papers as the nationality of every Soviet Jew. This identification labels every Jew who applies for a job, or an apartment or to enter the University as a second-class citizen.

This was the background that served as a basis for thousands of Soviet Jews to decide to emigrate when they learned of the Six Day War in Israel. They realized that if the country of their birth considered their nationality to be Hebrew then the Hebrew Homeland, Israel, was the one place in the world where they belonged.

Why hasn't the government given these people visas? The official answers are vague. The "refuseniks" feel that they are being held up as an example. Their continued hard life and harassment puts fear into other Soviet Jews who might want to emigrate. If emigration were easy for the Jews, might not all dissatisfied Russians say "Let me out, too"?

We felt so moved by our experience at the picnic that we called the United Press International office in Moscow. The Slepaks had assured us that their only hope for survival was the support of the free world. When we had expressed our concern for their safety if the press were notified, they told us, "We are no longer 'The Jews of Silence.'" We spoke to UPI Correspondent Barry James. He too felt our experience was important and listened to our story. That night Barry came to our hotel with David Levy of NBC and we recorded our impressions of the day. A Russian Jew told us the next day that they heard about the picnic on Radio Free Europe and mind you—thanked us for being so brave. Thank God for the American and world free press that can tell this story about injustices and garner world opinion to right these wrongs.

We told the story to some of our Christian friends on our tour. Most felt intrigued and moved by our experience. A few wished that they had joined us. Some said we were very brave to do such a thing in Russia. I feel not much courage is needed if you have an American passport and don't break any Soviet laws, especially now with the Soviet-American détente solidifying. Moscow and Leningrad are showplaces of the USSR. You may learn about the country, but you won't learn about the people unless you go out on your own and talk to the Russian people on an individual basis.

I will always remember these people; especially the younger ones. The teenagers are old enough to understand that their whole lives lie ahead of them. I have seen their faces before in pictures of children in the 1930's in Hitler's Germany.

We didn't remember them then. We lost them. Can we afford not to remember these children?

All people with a feeling for humanity must help these people to be free. The Russian leaders are sensitive to world opinion. The Soviet government wants to trade with the United States. This is the time to encourage the Soviets to understand the most basic principles of humanity and brotherhood and allow free emigration. We should only trade

with them if these basic principles are upheld.

I feel that many American citizens should try to go to the Soviet Union. Visit these people. Show them that you are with them. Our support gives them the courage to go on.

WHO IS THE ENEMY?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the environment of our Nation's Capital continues to be one of Alice in Wonderland.

Yesterday, while the Congress was voting an authorization of \$22.6 billion for military procurement to bolster our national defense—reportedly with Soviet legislators watching from the gallery of the House Chamber—the administration announced approval of a \$400 million fertilizer deal with the Soviet Union, which included a \$180 million credit extension by the U.S. Export-Import Bank at 6-percent interest.

Today all Members of the House and Senate are invited to an official reception for eight members of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., to be held in the Senate wing of the U.S. Capitol.

In the morning paper, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Simon, announces that President Nixon's June trip to Moscow is for the purpose of entering into a joint Soviet-United States economic partnership. According to the announcement, the American taxpayers will put up the dollars, American industry and technology will provide the know-how, the Soviets will supply the raw material and—everyone will be happy?

Additionally, the morning paper carries an announcement from Commerce Secretary Frederick Dent, indicating that the Russian Yak-40 aircraft, designed for small feeder lines or executive-type sales will be marketed in the United States. Mr. Dent further suggests the possibility of two-way aircraft trade.

In March of this year, Dow Jones confirmed that the Soviets were planning on placing one of their subcompact automobiles: such as the Lada, the Zaz, the Moskvich, or the Volga on the U.S. market.

Americans may wonder why the need for such extensive military armaments for national defense. Where is the enemy? Who are we defending our people from?

The items follow:

[From the Washington Post, May 23, 1974]
UNITED STATES, SOVIETS TO SIGN ACCORD ON
JOINT ECONOMIC PROJECTS

(By Dan Morgan)

The United States and the Soviet Union are aiming to sign a new, long-term agreement for cooperating on large-scale joint economic projects when President Nixon goes to Moscow next month. Treasury Secretary William E. Simon announced yesterday.

In describing the proposed agreement, a U.S. official said its purpose will be to "see how what we produce can fit into their development plans over five-year periods and longer, and vice versa."

U.S. officials believe that American com-

panies can play a major role in future Soviet development of natural resources such as chrome, nickel and other minerals. However, because the Soviet Union traditionally has been secretive about its long-term planning, these possibilities have been limited.

In discussing the proposal yesterday, officials mentioned as a possible example of cooperation the construction of American aluminum smelting operations in areas of the Soviet Union where the large quantities of electricity needed are much cheaper than here.

"The aim is to match big projects which are mutually beneficial," said one official.

The proposal was the latest effort by the Nixon administration to maintain the momentum of its policy of detente through trade.

It was announced by Simon following a two-day meeting in Washington of the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Commercial Commission, which was established last year.

At a press conference, Simon said that the United States was still determined to obtain legislation giving Moscow nondiscriminatory tariff treatment for goods sold here.

He said that the United States was also determined to continue to make Export-Import Bank credits available to the Soviet Union when necessary to assist American exporters.

On Tuesday, the bank announced a loan of \$180 million, to be matched by American commercial banks, to finance the sale of fertilizer factory equipment to the Soviet Union. Yesterday, with Soviet acting Foreign Trade Minister Mikhail R. Kuzmin at his side, Simon said: "There are great economic benefits from the Russian trade."

President Nixon's signing of a generalized long-term economic agreement in Moscow in June would only partly offset Soviet disappointment over its failure to obtain "most-favored nation" tariff status from the U.S. Congress.

In October, 1972, the two countries signed a detailed trade and economic agreement covering tariffs, marketing, business contacts and other matters. However, it has never formally gone into effect because the United States has not provided the Soviet Union with the "most-favored-nation" status.

In a communique issued yesterday, the joint Soviet-American commission said that if "favorable conditions obtained," the estimated \$2 billion to \$3 billion trade volume foreseen earlier for the 1973 to 1975 period would be surpassed.

Trade between the two countries came to about \$1.5 billion last year.

Commerce Secretary Frederick B. Dent said yesterday that American firms have found a possible market for the Soviet produced Yakovlev-40 three-engine short-range transport plane. Officials said that the commission had agreed on the need for an "airworthiness agreement" which would enable aircraft made in the Soviet Union to be sold here.

[From the Washington Star-News, May 21, 1974]

SOVIETS RIGHT AT HOME

(By Joy Billington)

The first Soviet parliamentarians to visit Washington as an official delegation since 1933, when diplomatic relations were established, flooded the State Department's diplomatic reception rooms last night with a burst of Russian.

There were no toasts, and just two speeches, but the eight members of the Supreme Soviet seemed supremely at home.

The vodka was American, but most of the Russians—including 13 aides and a large group from the Soviet embassy here seemed to prefer scotch or gin.

The hosts were Deputy Secretary of State Kenneth Rush and various members of Congress. —, vice chairman of the U.S. dele-

gation of the international Interparliamentary Union, said the Soviet delegation was returning a visit by American Legislators to the Soviet Union of several years ago.

— and — will give a luncheon for the Soviet visitors today.

The visit was described by most State Department officials as substantive and important in terms of detente and trade.

The Soviet legislators, who are accompanied by a number of TV cameramen, arrived here Sunday night.

Yesterday, they met with members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Finance Committee.

Tomorrow, — said, the group will be watching from the galleries when the Defense Authorization Bill comes up for vote in the House.

Mrs. Z. P. Pukhova, the only woman delegate, described herself as a mother first, a working woman second (she runs a textile factory) and a member of the Presidium.

The whole Supreme Soviet is "in favor of disarmament," she said. "And we are in a position to use all our material means for the improvement of life rather than the destruction of life. . ."

Standing in for Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, Rush welcomed the Russians.

Replying, the head of the Soviet delegation, B. N. Ponomarev, (a member of the communist Party Politburo and chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Soviet House of Nationalities) invited a U.S. interparliamentary visit next year and said that "until now" the development of relations "took place on a government level and through summit meetings. Now we are filling the gap which existed between our two countries."

JOINT COMMUNIQUE ON THE FOURTH SESSION OF THE UNITED STATES-U.S.S.R. COMMERCIAL COMMISSION

The U.S.-U.S.S.R. Commercial Commission established during the summit meeting in May 1972 today concluded its Fourth Session. The session, which took place in Washington, D.C., on May 21-May 22 was, in accordance with the established procedure, chaired by William E. Simon, U.S. Secretary of the Treasury and Chairman of the U.S. Section of the Commission. The Soviet delegation was led by the Acting Minister of Foreign Trade of the U.S.S.R., Mikhail R. Kuzmin.

Other U.S. members of the Commission taking part in the Fourth Session were Secretary of Commerce Frederick B. Dent, Deputy Chairman; Under Secretary of the Treasury Jack F. Bennett; Assistant Secretary of State for Economic and Business Affairs-Designate Thomas O. Enders; Deputy Legal Adviser of the Department of State George H. Aldrich, Counsel; and Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce for East-West Trade Lewis W. Bowden, Executive Secretary, Ambassador William D. Eberle, the President's Special Trade Representative, and Helmut Sonnenfeldt, Counselor of the Department of State, also participated in the talks.

Members of the Soviet Delegation participating in the discussions in addition to Mr. Kuzmin included A. N. Manzhulov, Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade; V. S. Alkhimov, Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade; V. B. Spandaryan, Member of the GOSPLAN; S. A. Mkrtumov, Commercial Minister, Soviet Trade Representation, Washington, D.C.; V. N. Sushkov, Director of General Administration, Ministry of Foreign Trade; N. C. Nikitkin, Deputy Chairman of the Bank for Foreign Trade; N. V. Zinoviev, Chief of the Department for Trade with the Countries of America, Ministry of Foreign Trade; G. S. Burguchev, Chief of the Legal and Treaties Department, Ministry of Foreign Trade; and R. G. Gorbunov, Executive Secretary of the Soviet Section of the Commission.

The Joint Commission session included two plenary meetings and several working group meetings, which took place in a friendly and

constructive atmosphere. There was a comprehensive exchange of views on the development of American-Soviet trade and economic relations. The Parties noted with satisfaction further progress in the development of these relations since the Third Session of the Commission held in Moscow in October 1973.

The Commission agreed on the desirability of expanding and further developing long-term economic industrial and technical cooperation and discussed means of facilitating such cooperation, including the creation of favorable conditions for business activities, and the exchange of economic and financial data. With these objectives in mind, the Commission recommended to the two Governments the conclusion of a long-term agreement to facilitate economic, industrial and technical cooperation.

It was noted that in 1973, U.S.-U.S.S.R. trade amounted to almost \$1.5 billion. The Commission anticipated that bilateral trade would again this year exceed the 1 billion dollar level. This trade volume, if favorable conditions obtained, would permit the countries to surpass the total of 2-3 billion dollars for the three years 1973-75 foreseen by President Nixon and General Secretary Brezhnev in June of last year.

The Commission received reports and exchanged views on the current status of a number of long-term cooperation projects under negotiation between U.S. firms and Soviet foreign trade organizations, including projects in the fields of fertilizer production, exploration for natural gas and oil, timber products, machine building facilities and products of power-consuming industries. In many cases these projects would be carried out on a self-liquidating basis.

The U.S. Section reported that in accordance with its commitment made at the last session of the Joint Commission, the Department of Commerce had referred the Soviet interest in power-consuming production facilities, including aluminum, ferromanganese and ferro-chromium, and chemicals, to appropriate industry trade associations and directly to potentially interested U.S. companies. The Soviet Section provided the U.S. Delegation additional data on several of the projects for transmittal to U.S. firms.

To facilitate trade and cooperation in the field of civil aviation, the two Parties agreed upon the desirability of concluding a Bilateral Airworthiness Agreement.

To aid in the growth of two-way trade, agreement was reached with regard to the appropriate expansion of commercial representation at the present time, and on the need to facilitate suitable office, housing, and working conditions.

The Commission noted that the recent commitment by the U.S. Export-Import Bank to furnish credit for the exporting of U.S. equipment, materials and services for the construction in Moscow of the International Center for Commerce will add to the facilities available to meet the growing need of U.S. and other foreign companies and banks to open offices in Moscow. At present, seventeen (17) U.S. companies and banks have already been authorized to open offices in Moscow.

Both sides agreed to facilitate trade missions and to support participation of their nationals, companies and economic organizations in trade fairs and exhibitions organized in the other country.

The U.S. Section reaffirmed the U.S. Administration's determination to obtain legislation that would provide authority for non-discriminatory tariff treatment for the U.S.S.R., as called for under the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Trade Agreement of 1972, and would continue the availability of U.S. Export-Import Bank financing on a non-discriminatory basis when needed to assist U.S. exporters on their sales to the U.S.S.R.

At the final plenary session, the Commis-

sion heard a report on the progress of the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Trade and Economic Council from the two Co-Chairmen: Donald M. Kendall and V. S. Alkhimov. The Council, whose principal task is the promotion of trade and economic cooperation between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., was established pursuant to the U.S.-U.S.S.R. protocol signed at the Washington summit meeting in June of 1973.

The Commission expressed satisfaction with the results of the Fourth Session, considering the discussions a further major step in the constructive development of solid, long-term, mutually advantageous trade relations. It agreed to convene the next (Fifth) session in Moscow in 1975.

The Soviet delegation members expressed their appreciation for the hospitality extended to them by their American hosts during the delegation's stay in the U.S.

COMMENTS BY SECRETARY DENT: AIR WORTHINESS AGREEMENT

In order for aircraft to be operated in the United States, they have to be certified that their construction has been accomplished under specified conditions. The air worthiness Agreement reflects the successful conclusion of the examination of the procedures and processes under which such construction takes place. And in essence, is a prelude to certification.

The purpose is to enable aircraft produced under conditions such as they have to be sold in the United States. As a case in example, there is a manufacturer what is known as a Yack-40. The Yack-40 is an aircraft designed for small feeder lines, or else, executive-type sales. American firms have found a possible market for it and in order to have it sold in this country it has to be covered under the Air Worthiness Agreement. In addition, of course, there is the involvement of two-way trade in aircraft as a possibility.

This is Air Worthiness Agreements which relate solely to the sale of aircraft and has nothing to do with the commercial licensing of commercial flights.

SUPPORT BUILDING FOR RETENTION OF HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, few will deny that the latest tragic episode in the case of Patricia Hearst and the terroristic activities of the Symbionese Liberation Army—SLA, if repeated in other areas, would be a matter vitally related to the internal security of the United States.

Few will contest the fact that the penetration of high governmental circles by Communist agents—the recent revelations regarding Willy Brandt's key Communist adviser and Mr. Brandt's ensuing resignation is an excellent example—bears directly on the internal security issue.

Few realistic citizens will argue that the combination of newly developed terroristic techniques coupled with the presence in the United States of subversive and radical individuals and groups inclined to use such techniques should not be given a high internal security priority.

Yet, ironically, for the first time in

Congress a recommendation in the House has been proposed to abolish the committee which, with its predecessor, has dealt with the above-mentioned and similar issues for almost 30 years—the House Committee on Internal Security—HCIS.

Fortunately, concerned individuals and organizations have, for the last several months been going on record as supporting the continuance of HCIS in its present form. Various sources in the United States, knowledgeable and with more than a passing interest in the internal security field, have voiced opposition to effectively crippling internal security investigations as is presently called for by House Resolution 988.

A sampling of public support for HCIS indicates definite concern on the part of responsible individuals and organizations for the future of the committee. For instance, William Randolph Hearst, editor-in-chief of the Hearst Newspapers and the uncle of Patricia Hearst, made an observation that is worth repeating:

It makes no difference to its foes in Congress that the committee (HCIS) is acclaimed by our law enforcement officials everywhere as an invaluable source of continually updated information on radical groups of all descriptions, left and right alike. The committee must go.

Editor Hearst is, of course, referring to HCIS investigations of subversive and violence-prone groups which seek to establish themselves nationally, thus making them a matter of concern for law enforcement groups throughout the country. Local police, in some cases, need not wait for radical and extremist elements to set up shop in their locality but are forewarned, through HCIS publications, of the nature and techniques of potential troublemakers who seek a base in various States and localities. The high mobility of some agitators, turning up in city after city to foment discord, makes it imperative for police officials everywhere to be alert as to the identities and techniques of traveling extremists.

Other members of the press such as syndicated columnists Bill Buckley, Victor Riesel, Alice Widener and others have felt compelled to defend the existence of the committee in their columns. The Chicago Tribune, in an April 14, 1974, editorial, labeled the move to eliminate HCIS "A Sneak Attack."

Public statements by veterans' groups illustrate their apprehension regarding HCIS. The American Legion, through its National Commander Robert E. L. Eaton, summarized the Legion's position thus:

The American Legion has long supported the work of the Committee on Internal Security. We believe this standing Committee of the House has rendered valuable service to the Congress and to the Nation.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars 1973 National Resolution No. 102, still in effect, stated in part:

Our Commander-in-Chief commends the painstaking effort of the great majority of the House Committee on Internal Security for its fair-minded and comprehensive efforts to enhance our internal security without any valid witchhunting charges being brought against them.

The Catholic War Veterans, long a supporter of HCIS, stated in a letter to Chairman RICHARD ICHORD:

We urge you to continue your efforts to see that work of the Committee is not hindered or reduced.

Other veterans' groups expressing a similar theme include the Fleet Reserve Association, the Non-Commissioned Officers Association of the United States, the National Association of Uniformed Services, and the Air Force Sergeants Association. I consider these endorsements of the work of HCIS a significant indication of the sentiments of veterans' groups whose members number in the several millions.

More recently, at its annual 3-day seminar in Washington this month, Leadership Foundation, Inc., a coordinating vehicle for women's groups throughout the country, issued an alert on H.R. 988 and its recommendations regarding HCIS. The future of HCIS was obviously of sufficient concern to the foundation to necessitate alerting women's groups whose members number in the millions.

I realize that the above-mentioned expressions of support for HCIS cannot be taken as a fair cross-section of the many segments of American citizenry. I would be willing to wager, however, that if the past accomplishments of HCIS were judged in the light of the present serious situation in the internal security area today, citizens would follow the example of Members of the House in the past who have voted to approve the yearly appropriations of HCIS by very comfortable margins.

Finally, it must be stated that, in the House of Representatives, there is no suitable replacement for a standing committee, the highest unit in the House committee structure. In the case of HCIS and its predecessor, a standing committee for nearly 30 years, the chairman and his colleagues are free to conduct the vital business of the committee without interference from other Members not familiar with its work, as in the case of a subcommittee. The chairman of a standing committee is free to request suitable funds for the committee's work and in return must justify such requests. HCIS members are not required to vote on issues outside the internal security area as would be required if HCIS were to become a subcommittee of another committee.

In the final analysis, the basic question is: Is the internal security situation in the United States today serious enough to warrant the continued existence of an independent, compact, standing committee, zeroing in, without hindrance, on issues such as SLA, political kidnappings, terrorism in various forms in the United States implemented by subversive individuals and groups and other issues related to the internal security field.

I believe the overwhelming majority of concerned Americans would agree with me that there is a definite, urgent, compelling need for the continuance of the House Committee on Internal Security with consideration given to broad-

ening and expanding its present area of jurisdiction.

DR. BENJAMIN E. MAYS HONORED

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 23, 1974

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Benjamin E. Mays returned to his home county of Greenwood recently to receive from Lander College, his 34th honorary degree from institutions of higher learning at home and abroad. Dr. Mays was honored following the installation of Dr. Larry Jackson as the 10th president of Lander College.

Greenwood County has produced no more illustrious son than Dr. Mays, who was, I am proud to say, born only a short distance from where I now live. From a humble tenant-farm beginning, he became one of the world's most renowned and distinguished educators. Dr. Mays, a superb orator and gentlemen, has been an ambassador of culture, good will, brotherhood and understanding throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, may I commend the board of trustees of the South Carolina State College system for this honor bestowed upon Dr. Mays. The entire Lander community was thrilled on this historic occasion. Mrs. Dorn and I were delighted that the board of trustees could attend the dinner at our home honoring Dr. Mays.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Mays delivered a superb address to a special luncheon following the ceremony and received standing ovations from the audience. We commend to the attention of the Congress and the people of our country Dr. Mays' outstanding address:

[From the Index (S.O.) Journal, Apr. 2, 1974]

TEXTS OF MARCH 30 ADDRESS BY DR.

BENJAMIN MAYS

(By Dr. Benjamin Mays)

Dr. Benjamin E. Mays of Atlanta received the Doctor of Humanities Degree from Lander College on Saturday.

He was the main speaker at a luncheon at the American Legion Building following the ceremony at the Barksdale Education Center on the Lander campus where Dr. Larry A. Jackson was installed as the tenth president of Lander College.

Following is the text of the address by Dr. Mays, which drew standing ovations from the luncheon audience:

You honor me today more than my mind can imagine, more than my will can determine, and more than my heart can feel. When I consider what the Black-White relations were like in our County and in the South seven decades ago, I can only say "What hath God wrought?" No man in my early years here in the County could have dreamed that I, a Black man or any Black man would ever receive your most prestigious degree: Doctor of humane letters. Do not misunderstand me—please! Do not think I am boasting, do not think I am bragging. It is not my nature to do that, I am trying to drive home a point. Despite the struggles, the hardships, the high mountains that I had to climb, the deep valleys that I had to raise, the thorny paths I had to travel, the stifling racial prejudice I had to endure,

despite these things, life has been kind to me.

You honor me today with my 34th honorary degree. 32 from the United States and two from Africa, 22 from White institutions and 12 from Black institutions, from the South, East and West. They have been conferred by small prestigious colleges like Morehouse, Berea, and South Carolina State and large distinguished institutions like Howard in Washington, Emory in Atlanta, Harvard in Cambridge, and New York University. More than 125 awards hang on the walls of my family room. But believe me when I tell you that no honor, no award, no degree means quite as much to me as the honor you have conferred upon me today. To be recognized by my home county, a few miles from Phoenix, where I had my most terrifying early experience; to be recognized for what I have tried to be and for what I have tried to do; and to be recognized for the bridges of understanding I have tried to build to cement closer ties between Blacks and Whites in this Country and in the World is a good feeling.

If I am anything, have done any thing, have helped anybody, I owe it to God, to my parents and to the people. The people have driven me on. The people started this in my home. Illiterate people, yes, but intelligent. Mother and father never attended school a day in their lives. Father was nine years old when the Civil War ended and mother was three. With the exception of one brother who finished high school and one year in college, my sisters and brothers were at best fourth grade scholars. But Susie, my oldest sister, had a good mind and when I entered school at six, she had already taught me how to count, I knew my alphabet, and I could read and write. Being the only one entering the Brick House School that November morning who could do these things, the teacher marvelled, gave me great praise and spread the news at Church, the second Sunday in November in the year 1900. From that day on, I was a marked boy. I felt that I was somebody and I had to live up to expectations. The people were beginning to drive me on.

The next episode was electrifying. It was Children Day, the second Sunday in June at Big Mount Zion, less than a mile from Epworth. I was eight or nine years old. On Children Day those who wished to do so, learned a piece and recited it. I had committed to memory the beatitudes in Matthew 5. When I finished, the house went wild. Old men stamped their feet, women waved their handkerchiefs and young people applauded. I got a standing ovation. The people prophesied and predicted that I would be something worthwhile in life. The minister said I was going to be a preacher. Though a mere lad, so many people predicted great things for me that I began to believe what they said. I felt that I was different from the others and that I could not let the people down. Those untrained, poor, struggling wage hands, share croppers, renters, and a few land owners, had laid down the gauntlet and I felt that I had to pick it up. I felt then and I feel now that I cannot let those people down, though most of them died many years ago.

So eager was I to learn, that it was a joy to walk the seven miles round trip from our home on Bill Mays' place, to the Brick House School, named for a White farmer who lived in a big brick house; the school was a one-room wooden building. When I had to miss school a day, I cried. Family prayers, the Brick House School, and Big Mount Zion were my buckle and shield. The Pastor James J. Marshall, persuaded father to let me come to his school at McCormick. I went there for two years—the same old story as at the Brick House School—after four months, back home on the farm—to plow, knock cotton stalks, scatter guano, pull fodder, and pick cotton. I soon saw that McCormick wasn't

it. I begged my father to let me go to Orangeburg to attend State College. The first two years there, the same old story—four months and back to the farm. This continued until I was nineteen. Then I decided to disobey my father. I wouldn't return to the farm. At twenty-two, I finished high school as valedictorian of the class. All during the years in high school I saw the people at Zion waving their handkerchiefs, clapping their hands and stomping their feet—wishing me well. The people were driving me on. I could not let the people down.

For college, I had to seek a Northern climate. The doors of the University of South Carolina, and all other White schools in the South were closed to me with locks of steel. I had been told that I and my people were an inferior breed. I didn't believe it. But I didn't know. I had to find out for myself. My teachers at State College told me I would do well anywhere. As I left South Carolina for Bates College in Lewiston, Maine, I knew that the people of Mt. Zion and State College were expecting me to do well. The people were driving me on.

A new World at Bates. The weather was cold, 44 below zero at one time, but the people's hearts were warm. Four Blacks among 600 or more Whites. I had to make good. All eyes were upon me—this Negro

boy from Epworth, South Carolina. The eyes of the people at Mt. Zion and State College were upon me. I had no choice but to do well. At Bates, I won first place in a sophomore Declamation Contest, competed in junior and senior oratorical contests, and participated in intercollegiate debating. My classmates elected me their Class Day orator. I graduated with honors and afterward I was elected to membership in Phi Beta Kappa and Delta Sigma Rho. I knew then that God had not made me inferior. I had competed with the Yankee and had done better than most of them.

My professors were kind to me. My math teacher wanted to intercede for me to do graduate work in mathematics at the University of Chicago. My philosophy teacher offered to get me a fellowship in philosophy at the University of Chicago. My teacher in religion wanted me to study at Newton Theological Seminary in Newton, Massachusetts. But Newton was closed to Blacks in 1920. I chose the University of Chicago, graduating with the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees. Now the eyes of the people at the Brick House School, Big Mount Zion, South Carolina State, Bates College and the University of Chicago were fastened upon me. I could not let them down. The people the people, the people have driven

me on. I have written books, chapters in many books and hundreds of articles. I have served as a social worker in Tampa, Florida, as National Student Secretary of the YMCA, researcher, teacher at S. Carolina State, Morehouse and Howard, and President of Morehouse.

To get an education, I did many things: janitorial work—on campus and in buildings, cleaning outside toilets on a college campus when there was no plumbing, student helper in a library, dish washer in restaurants, painter and pullman porter. I have travelled a bit in North America, Europe, Asia and Africa. I return today to Greenwood County, where I was born seven decades plus ago. I have come to give an account of my stewardship, and to thank you for conferring upon me your honorary degree—Doctor of Humane Letters. I close with the words of that great Black poet, Paul Lawrence Dunbar:

"Mere human strength may stand ill fortunes frown

So I prevailed, for human strength is mine;
But from the awful throes of great renown
Naught can protect me save a strength divine.

Help me, O Lord, in this my trembling cause.

I scorn men's curses, but I dread applause."

SENATE—Tuesday, May 28, 1974

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, who has watched over this Nation in times past, be to us now our guard and guide. May the memory of Memorial Day linger with us to inspire our actions, undergird our deliberations, and encourage our sacrifices for a refined, morally renewed and spiritually strong America. Direct us by Thy spirit in all we do here, further all our undertakings and lead us in the ways of righteousness for the sake of this Nation and the advancement of Thy kingdom.

We pray in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

REPORT OF THE ALASKA RAILROAD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States transmitting the annual report on the operation of the Alaska Railroad, which was received on May 23, 1974, during the adjournment of the Senate under the order of May 22, 1974, which with its accompanying report was referred to the Committee on Commerce. The message is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the annual report on the operation of the Alaska Railroad as required by the Alaska Railroad Act of March 12, 1914.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 23, 1974.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 22, 1974, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

U.S. TAX COURT

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Theodore Tannenwald, Jr., of New York, to be a judge of the U.S. Tax Court for a term expiring 15 years after he takes office.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

There being no objection, the Senate

resumed the consideration of legislative business.

REPORT FROM THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. METCALF) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States transmitting a report from the Council of Economic Advisers. The message reads as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I submit herewith a report from the Council of Economic Advisers on the condition of the American economy and on policies for dealing with some of its problems. I believe that this report will help the Congress and the country to put in better perspective the flood of economic events and news that engulfs and confuses us.

In my message on the State of the Union, on January 30, 1974, after referring to the economic consequences of the energy shortage, I said:

"We expect, therefore, that during the early part of this year output will rise little if at all, unemployment will rise somewhat and inflation will be high. Our objective, however, is to turn this situation around so that later in the year output will be rising more rapidly, while unemployment will stop rising and will then decline, and the rate of inflation will slow."

As events turned out, total production declined about 1½ percent in the first quarter of the year because the gasoline shortage hurt automobile sales and production more than expected. Unemployment rose a little from its low of last October before the oil embargo began. The inflation rate was indeed high.

But by now we can see signs of the improvements that policy has been aim-